

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACEBOOK UTILIZATION, PERCEIVED
PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION AND IDENTITY ORIENTATION IN
ADOLESCENCE

HASAN KARABAKKAL

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2014

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACEBOOK UTILIZATION, PERCEIVED
PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION AND IDENTITY ORIENTATION IN
ADOLESCENCE

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Educational Sciences

by
Hasan Karabakkal

Boğaziçi University

2014

Thesis Abstract

Hasan Karabakkal, “The Relationship between Facebook Utilization, Perceived Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Identity Orientation in Adolescence”

This study aimed to get insight into the experiences of adolescents with Facebook and the possible impact of Facebook utilization on their personal, social and collective identity orientations; especially when considering the effects of perceived parental acceptance and rejection. The participants included 500 students from English preparatory classes at two established public universities in Istanbul. They consisted of 238 (47.6%) females and 262 (52.4%) males with a mean age of 19.10. Demographic Information, Facebook Utilization, Parental Acceptance-Rejection Perception Questionnaire [PARQ] Mother & Father Forms and Identity Questionnaire were administered to 500 students for data collection.

The findings indicated that the mean scores of the adolescents for perceived maternal and paternal acceptance were in the normal range, implying that they experienced much more maternal and paternal love than rejection. In addition, the utilization of Facebook by male and female participants was similar, and the personal identity orientation scores for both males and females were higher than the scores in social and collective identity orientations. In terms of PARQ subscales, merely the adolescents' hostility/aggression perceptions from father were positively correlated with their Facebook utilization. In terms of identity orientations subscales, merely the social identity orientations were positively correlated with Facebook utilization. Introducing the participants' non-warmth perceptions from mother and father into the analysis explained 4% and 3.5% of variations in their personal identity orientations, and 2% and % 3 variations in their collective identity orientations, respectively. There were no interactions of the variables for mother and father PARQ subscales. While introducing the participants' perceived total rejection from mother explained 2 % and 1% variations in their personal and collective identity orientations; perceived total rejection from father explained 1% and 2% variations in social and collective identity orientations, respectively. It was seen that lack of meeting the acceptance needs of adolescents by their parents may diminish their personal and collective identity orientations.

Tez Özeti

Hasan Karabakkal, “Ergenlik Döneminde Facebook Kullanımı, Algılanan Ebeveyn Kabul-Reddi ve Kimlik Yönelimleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi”

Bu çalışma, ergenlerin Facebook deneyimleri hakkında fikir sahibi olmayı ve anne-babalarından algıladıkları kabul-ret etkisi dikkate alındığında Facebook kullanımlarının kişisel, sosyal ve kolektif kimlik yönelimleri üzerindeki etkisini anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın katılımcıları, İstanbul’daki iki devlet üniversitesinin İngilizce hazırlık sınıfında okuyup yaş ortalamaları 19,10 olan 238 kadın (% 47,6) ve 262 erkek (% 52,4) toplam 500 öğrenciden oluşmuştur. Veri toplamak amacıyla 500 öğrenciye Demografik Bilgi Formu, Facebook Kullanım Düzeyi Formu, Ebeveyn Kabul-Ret Algısı Ölçeği Anne-Baba Kısa Formları ve Kimlik Ölçeği uygulanmıştır.

Çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre, ergenlerin anne ve babalarından algıladıkları kabul ortalama değerlerinin, ret algısından yüksek olduğu görülmüştür. Ayrıca, kadın ve erkek katılımcıların Facebook kullanımlarının birbirine benzer olduğu ve kişisel kimlik yönelimi puanlarının, sosyal ve kolektif kimlik yönelimi puanlarından yüksek olduğu görülmüştür. Anne ve baba kabul-ret algısı alt ölçekleri açısından, sadece babadan algılanan husumetin/saldırganlığın Facebook kullanımı ile pozitif korelasyon taşıdığı; öte yandan kimlik yönelimleri alt ölçekleri açısından sadece sosyal kimlik yönelimleriyle Facebook kullanımının pozitif korelasyon taşıdığı görülmüştür. Katılımcıların anne ve babalarından algıladıkları sevgisizliğin, kişisel kimlik yönelimlerini sırasıyla % 4 ve % 3,5 oranlarında; kolektif kimlik yönelimlerini ise % 2 ve %3 oranlarında açıklandığı görülmüştür. Hiçbir değişkende anne ve baba kabul-ret alt ölçekleri açısından bir etkileşimin olmadığı gözlemlenirken; anneden algılanan retin kişisel ve kolektif kimlik yönelimlerini % 2 ve % 1 oranlarında, babadan algılanan retin ise sosyal ve kolektif kimlik yönelimlerini %1 ve % 2 düzeylerinde açıkladığı görülmüştür. Ergenlerin kabul edilme ihtiyaçlarının anne-babaları tarafından karşılanmayışının, kişisel ve kolektif kimlik yönelimlerini azaltabildiği görülmüştür.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without guidance, support and inspiration of outstanding individuals who in one way or another contributed to the completion of this study.

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor, Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erkman for her constant emotional and academic support as well as her enthusiasm. Prof. Erkman, your advice on my research and my career has been priceless.

I would also like to thank, another committee member of my thesis, Prof. Dr. Kültegin Ögel for his support and his willingness to be a part of my thesis, despite his busy schedule. I have always admired his unique method of teaching the complex issues in a simple way.

I would like to thank Assist. Prof. Bengü Börkan, another committee member of my thesis, for her support, and crucial contributions, especially in statistical analysis part of the study. Her supervision facilitated one of the hardest parts of the study. My special thanks to the faculty of Educational Science Department for their numerous lectures that helped me to improve my knowledge and interest in the area. Data collection turned out a smooth process with the support of the directors of Schools of Foreign Languages of ITU and Boğaziçi University, as well as of the kind instructors and the volunteer participants. Thank you all.

My colleagues at ITU Counseling Service, the research assistants of the department and my colleagues and managers at TUBITAK TUSSIDE; I would like to express my gratitude for your invaluable support.

Most importantly, none of this would have been possible without my family and my wife, Seda. Thank you very much for your faith in me, your unconditional love and support.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	3
New Social Media	3
Facebook as a New Social Medium	5
The Identity as a Concept & Identity Orientation	7
Individual Social and Collective Identity Orientations	9
Identity as a Concept in terms of Facebook Utilization	13
Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PAR Theory)	18
CHAPTER III: THE STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE & RESEARCH QUESTION	23
CHAPTER IV: METHOD	25
Participants	25
Instruments	30
Procedure	40
Design	41
Data Analysis	42
CHAPTER V: RESULTS	43
Descriptive Analysis of Variables	43
Results According to Research Questions	51
CHAPTER VI: DISCUSSIONS	93
General Discussion.....	93
Discussion in Relation to Research Questions	96
Limitation of the Study & Recommendation for Further Research	110
Implications of the Study	112

APPENDICES

A. Demographic Information Form (Turkish Form)	114
B. Facebook Utilization Form (Turkish Form)	116
C. Parental Acceptance-Rejection Perception Questionnaire Mother Short Form (Turkish Form)	119
D. Parental Acceptance-Rejection Perception Questionnaire Father Short Form (Turkish Form)	123
E. Identity Questionnaire (Turkish Form)	127
F. Permission for Parental Acceptance-Rejection Perception Questionnaires Mother & Father Short Forms	130
G. Permission for Identity Questionnaire (Turkish Form)	132
H. Bogazici University Ethics Committee Approval	135
I. Informed Consent Form (Bilgilendirilmiş Onam Formu)	137
REFERENCES	139

TABLES

1.	Distribution of Participants according to Gender	26
2.	Distribution of Participants according to University & Gender	26
3.	Distribution of Participants according to Age	27
4.	Distribution of Participants according to Parent's being Alive or Not	27
5.	Distribution of Participants' Parent Education Level	28
6.	Distribution of Participants according to Place of Residence	29
7.	Distribution of Participants according to Facebook Utilization & Gender	29
8.	Cronbach Alpha Values of PARQ Adult– Mother & Father Short Forms (Turkish)	35
9.	Reliability & Validity of Identity Questionnaire Subscales- Turkish Form	38
10.	Cronbach Alpha Values of Revised Identity Questionnaire (Turkish)	40
11.	Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables	50
12.	Facebook Demographics of the Participants	51
13.	Facebook Activities among the Participants	52
14.	Facebook Utilization Purposes of the Participants	53
15.	Correlation of PARQ Mother & Father Subscales & Adolescents' Identity Orientations	56
16.	Correlation of Mother & Father Total Rejection Scores and Adolescents' Identity Orientations	57
17.	Correlations of Identity Orientation Subscales	58
18.	Correlations of Facebook Utilization and PARQ Subscales	59
19.	Correlations of Facebook Utilization and Identity Orientations	59
20.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Warmth/Affection Perception from Mother (Father) and Warmth/Affection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Personal Identity Orientation	62
21.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Warmth/Affection Perception from Mother and Warmth/Affection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation	65
22.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Warmth/Affection Perception from Mother and Warmth/Affection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation	68
23.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Indifference/Neglect Perception from Mother (Father) and Indifference/Neglect x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation	71
24.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Indifference/Neglect Perception from Mother (Father) and Indifference/Neglect x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation	74

25.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Hostility/Aggression Perception from Mother (Father) and Hostility/Aggression x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation	77
26.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Undifferentiated –Rejection Perception from Mother (Father)and Undifferentiated –Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation.....	80
27.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Undifferentiated –Rejection Perception from Mother (Father)and Undifferentiated –Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation	83
28.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Mother (Father) and Perceived Total Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Personal Identity Orientation	86
29.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Mother (Father) and Perceived Total Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation	89
30.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Mother (Father) and Perceived Total Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation	92

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Facebook has become one of the indispensable activities of people from all over the world. It can be indicated that it is particularly popular among the adolescents and young adults because it is enabling them to keep in touch with their friends, as long as there is access to the Internet (Sengupta, 2012). It can be asserted that the adolescents who know about the Internet are more likely to become familiar at least what Facebook is or probably most of them have a Facebook account. Current global statistics show that Facebook has 802 million daily active users and 1.28 billion monthly active users on average in March 2014 (“Company Info”, 2014). As for the national statistics in Turkey, there were about 34 million monthly, 21 million daily active Facebook users on average in 2013 (Kaytmaz, 2014). Considering this information both in the world and in Turkey, it can be claimed that Facebook is an inseparable part of the contemporary world.

In addition, 34% of Facebook users in Turkey are at the ages of 18-24 (“Facebook’ta Avrupa Lideriyiz”, 2012), which refers to adolescence and early adulthood periods. At this point, the development and the revision of identity can be stated as some of the main characteristics of the adolescence period. Identity is understood as something that is unique about each individual, something that we own. It also implies a connection to a broader social group, such as cultural identity, national identity, and other affiliations of shared interests and values (Buckingham, 2008). In terms of personal identity; it refers to ‘me’ versus ‘not me’ categorizations, where the individual makes interpersonal comparisons with other in-group members.

As for social identity, it refers to ‘us’ versus ‘them’ categorizations where the individual makes a collective comparison to a psychologically relevant out-group (Onorato & Turner, 2004). On the other hand, collective identity can be characterized by depersonalized relationships with shared symbols and cognitive representations of the group, which is independent of personal relationships within the group members (Etzioni, 1968; Turner et al., 1987).

When considering the development of identity, it should be noted that the culture we live in has a paramount role in the organization of the meaning. Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) indicates that identity emerges out of a social interaction and is socially situated at any point in time. On the other hand, identity is reflective in our sense of awareness and perception of it (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007), but it was not only the individuals as the actors of their lives, but also the roles they were assigned in the society and their enacting in relation to others are important in this process (Geertz, 1975, as cited in Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). At this point, the relationship between the young people and their parents, and the way how they perceive this relationship can also play a key role in the perception of the identities either in a desirable way because of parental warmth, affection, care, comfort and encouragement; or in an undesirable way for the withdrawal of positive feelings or emotionally upsetting behaviors. Here the parental acceptance-rejection theory helps to comprehend the role of the quality of parent-child relationship and its enduring consequences on the individuals’ social and emotional developments (Rohner, 1986).

All in all, this study aims to get insight into the adolescents’ experiences with Facebook and its possible impact on their identity orientations; especially when considering the effects of the quality of parent-child relationship.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section provides the review of the related literature in order to support the theoretical and the empirical basis of the study. In this part, new social media as a concept and Facebook in particular will be explained in terms of theoretical and statistical perspectives. Besides, the concept of identity will be described with respect to personal, social and collective identity orientations. Then, the relationship between the new social media utilization, especially Facebook, and the perception of identity will be discoursed. Finally, the parental acceptance-rejection theory will be investigated with respect to identity orientations and the Facebook utilizations of the adolescents.

New Social Media

The meaning, people attribute to media has been changing recently. Especially meeting with new social media, it can be claimed that the ways people relate to one another and their experiences with the external world have been transformed. Zuckerberg, the creator of Facebook, stated in one of his speeches; “When you give everyone a voice and give people power, the system usually ends up in a really good place. So, what we view our role as, is giving people that power.” By thinking about the statement of Zuckerberg, it can be asserted that people will no longer be seen as passive receivers in the process of stimuli transfer of media, instead, by possessing the power to share; maybe they have become an active agent in the creation of the content of the media.

The study of Wilcox-Ugurlu (2011) provided two important sources in terms of understanding this transformative effect of social media and their roles. Firstly, in her study, it was indicated that people's experiences are being used as currency in social networked environment and social media have been transforming the nature of people's experiences, which she called "the validation" or "the affirmation of the identity", as well as of those with whom they are shared, either intentionally or unintentionally (Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011).

Sharing the experiences with a group of people is one of the prominent aspects of new social media. In her study, Wilcox-Ugurlu (2011) tried to understand the role of social media in sharing experiences with respect to some theories. She investigated the self-promotion motives of people in terms of Goffman's Self Presentation in Modernity Approach (Goffman, 1959, as cited in Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011), of Baudrillard's Postmodern Existence Theory (Baudrillard, 1991, as cited in Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011), of de Certeau's Strategy and Tactics Theory (Certeau, 1984, as cited in Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011) and of Auge's Place & Non-Place Approach (Auge, 1989, as cited in Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011).

To begin with, Wilcox-Ugurlu (2011) indicated that Goffman (1959) views life as a sort of theater and the individuals act their parts in order to maintain the order in the social world (Goffman, 1959, as cited in Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011). Then she presented the relevance of the theory to sharing experiences in social media as enabling the young people to strive toward authenticity and seeking acceptance. In addition, she investigated the role of new media with postmodern point of view. She underlined the role of new social media by referring to the postmodern existence theory of Baudrillard (1991) as it is bringing back the routine of everyday life, which looks like the types of existence and experience in pre-modern times, in which the

people had direct awareness of the experiences of others around them (Baudrillard, 1991, as cited in Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011). In this regard, she questioned the role of Facebook in terms of bringing back “the authenticity”, which is characterized by a collapse of time and space, (it is also called as postmodern reality or “hyper reality”), where the copy has more power than the original; and people desire the “simulated” world over the “actual” one.

According to Wilcox-Ugurlu (2011), the second transformative effect of new social media is the increase in people’s “zone of conformity” where they desire to express many more about their experiences. Wilcox-Ugurlu (2011) pointed out this aspect of social media by utilizing the theory of de Certeau’s Strategy and Tactics (1984). She indicated that in using new social media, people sacrifice their privacy voluntarily in the name of the sense of connected with others (Certeau, 1984, as cited in Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011).

Facebook as a New Social Medium

Facebook was created on February 4, 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg and with his college fellow students at Harvard University. It is essentially an online social network site which offers various ways of communication and interaction with others. In the official webpage of Facebook, its mission is specified:

“...Facebook’s mission is to give people the power to share and make the world more open and connected. People use Facebook to stay connected with friends and family, to discover what’s going on in the world, and to share and express what matters to them” (“About Facebook,” 2014).

The individuals can share photographs, personal information, and join groups of friends with one another in Facebook. It provides an unlimited amount of storage opportunity for picture sharing. The users can take photos with cameras or mobiles and upload them instantly to their Facebook profiles. Since it provides the security options for sharing, the users can make the pictures available only for specific individuals. Besides picture uploading, the users can also create or involve in groups in Facebook. These groups can be graduate school connections, hobbies or areas of interests. Through creating groups, the users can organize activities and announce them to their friends. In addition to creating groups, the users can also write some personal notes and share them with their friends. They could state some ideas in the wall of their Facebook account and tag some individuals on the pictures.

Facebook has become one of the inseparable activities of people from all over the world. It can be indicated that it is particularly popular among adolescents and young adults. This assumption was supported by several findings. For instance, as a social network site, Facebook was visited by more users than Google for the first time in March 2010, which indicated 185 % increase for Facebook at that time (Pepitone, 2010). It is currently the second most frequently visited website on the Internet (“The top 500 sites on the web”, 2014) and according to the current statistics, Facebook has 802 million daily active users and 1.28 billion monthly active users on average in March 2014. Besides, there are 609 million mobile daily and 1.01 billion mobile monthly active users on average in March 2014, as well. It is interesting that approximately 81.2% of the daily active users live outside the U.S. and Canada (“Company Info”, 2014).

As for the situation in Turkey, according to the data gathered from Facebook, there were about 34 million monthly, 21 million daily active users on average in 2013.

Besides, there were 23 million mobile monthly and 12 million mobile daily active users on average in 2013, which composed of 77% total Facebook users. This number has doubled with respect to the statistics of 2010. Presently, 94 % of online people in Turkey use Facebook (Kaytmaz, 2014). Besides, Turkey, as a country, is on the sixth place in terms of the most prevalent Facebook users in the world after Mexico, Indonesia, India, Brazil and the US. However, it is in the first place among the European countries (Nierhoff, 2013).

What is more, Turkish users post 2.7 billion sharing monthly through Facebook where it accounts for 90 monthly sharing per person; they have on the average 130 registered friends in their accounts, and spend 56 minutes in Facebook each day (“Guncel Facebook Turkiye Istatistikleri”, 2011). Furthermore, we see that 34% of Facebook users of Turkey are at the ages of 18-24 (“Facebook’ta Avrupa Lideriyiz”, 2012), which refers to adolescence and early adulthood periods.

The Identity as a Concept & Identity Orientations

Identity is understood as something that is unique about each individual, something that we own. It also implies a connection to a broader social group, such as cultural and national identities, and other affiliations of shared interests and values (Buckingham, 2008).

Erikson, who is credited with being one of the prominent contributors in understanding the concept of identity, defined identity as awareness of self-sameness and continuity, which coincide with one’s individuality style in the immediate community and which helps people to distinguish them from other people (Erikson, 1968). Erikson stated that identity helps people to make sense of their world and to

find a place there within a variety of possibilities. For this reason, he stated that identity is a collaborative process between the people and their world, which was also supported by Mc Adams (2001) as the co-authorship of the people and their social world.

The development of identity is one of the major developmental underpinning of personality formation. Since personality, mental health and adjustment are intermingled areas, the development of identity is of utmost importance. The common denominator, at this point is adolescence, which is often viewed as a critical period in identity formation (Buckingham, 2008). Transition from childhood to adulthood is an important process throughout adolescence. Since the adolescents have become independent and imagine the future in terms of career, founding families and good relationships; they involve in a long exploration process. This exploration process is an important domain in the development of identities. It can be indicated that the identities of the adolescents are based on the outcomes of their explorations. In other words, the outcomes of these explorations have several meanings and people attach them to their selves or they identify the characteristics, values and beliefs of others (Michener, DeLamater, & Myers, 2004: 85).

When considering the development of identity, it should be noted that the culture people live in has a dominant role in the organization of the meaning. For instance, Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) indicates that identity emerges out of a social interaction and is socially situated at any point in time. Therefore, she points out that the identity is different from personality, which has enduring and stable characteristics, relatively unaffected by changing social situations. On the other hand, identity is reflective in our sense of awareness and perception of it (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007), but it was not only the individuals as the actors of their lives, but also the roles they were assigned in the

society and their enacting in relation to others are important in this process (Geertz, 1975, as cited in Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007).

Individual Social and Collective Identity Orientations

People usually accomplish how they define and interpret their “self” on the bases of three fundamental ways, which are (a) their unique traits, (b) their dyadic relationships, and (c) their group membership (Brewer & Gardner, 1996).

The concept of “self” can be investigated in terms of individual, social (relational) and collective domains. To begin with, people achieve their “individual self” by distinguishing themselves from other people as a unique configuration of qualities and characteristics that distinguish them within their social context. Besides, the sense of protecting the person psychologically in the context of interpersonal relationships is a powerful motivational tool in the perception of individual self (Brewer & Gardner, 1996).

In addition, people accomplish “social self” by absorbing the aspects of the relations with significant others. For instance, people define their “social self” role or their position within their significant relationships depending on personalized bonds of attachment such as parent-child relationships, friendship, and romantic relationships; or on specific role relationships such as teacher-student relationship. The state of protecting or enhancing the significant other, maintaining the relationship itself and the state of appraisal are important aspects for the representation of social self (Brewer & Gardner, 1996).

As for collective self, people accomplish the collective self by involving in large social groups or comparing the in-group, the group they are a member of, with relevant out-group. In other words, collective self implies to what extent the individual group member differs from the members of relevant out-group. However, in collective self, the bonds to others are not personal; rather they derive from symbolic identification with a group. Close personal relationships among group members are not required (Brewer & Gardner, 1996).

There is a common assumption that these three self-representations coexist within the same individual, nevertheless the nature of the interrelations among the three self-representations has been controversial (Sedikides & Brewer, 2002). For instance, Brewer (1991) developed “optimal distinctiveness model” as a motivational theory of social identity and attachment to large social groups. She mentioned about a dilemma of human beings; while they look for the validation and similarity to others (inclusion/assimilation), on the contrary, they consider having the uniqueness and individuation (differentiation/distinctiveness) qualities. For example, in terms of collective self, she stated that the conflict stems from belonging / inclusion and separation / distinctiveness. Besides, she asserted that the tension in interpersonal level (relational) caused by conflicts between the need for autonomy and the need for interdependence / intimacy with specific others (Brewer, 1991). However, in terms of individual (personal) self, the dilemma is expressed between the desire for similarity and the need for uniqueness at the same time (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980). At this point, Brewer pointed out that an optimal balance level must be fulfilled between the conflicting needs in defining self in relation to others. Otherwise, if individuals seek social inclusion in order to avoid social isolation, this may diminish their sense of distinctiveness due to being too much similar or lessening sense of individuation.

She stated that in order to realize the optimal balance level, the need for inclusion within the in-group and the need for distinctions between the in-group and out-groups should be satisfied (Brewer, 1991).

During the review of the literature, it was observed that identity orientations in social and collective domains came into prominence, especially if the study is designed around adolescents. This may be due to the importance of peer relationships among adolescents, as well as the significance of the senses of continuity and of uniqueness from others during adolescence. At this point, Erikson pointed out that adolescents want to be appearing more attractive to people around them or they look for the membership in a group of friends. Thus, they could monitor themselves in response to what others are doing or they look for the feeling of connected with friends (Erikson, 1980).

At this point, Onorato and Turner (2004)'s study is in line with Erikson's view. In their study, Onorato and Turner (2004) demonstrated that social identity can sometimes eliminate the effects of personal identity. They examined the nature of self-concept and found out that one's current self-category is a context-dependent cognitive representation. They indicated that unlike personal identity instructions, where people describe them as an individual; personal self-knowledge becomes less relevant when they describe them at a social level. However, in terms of the sets of behaviors, they indicated that males responded faster to independence implying ones, while females responded faster to dependence implying behavior (Onorato & Turner, 2004).

In addition, Tanti et al. (2011) investigated social identity change during adolescence by including 380 adolescents and found out that people show differences in their social identity across the adolescence period. Displaying stronger self, which involves "in-group similarity and in-group favoritism", was the strongest sense

especially among early-adolescents. Besides, they pointed out that social identity effects, as compared to gender identity conditions, were stronger in peer groups, which might be explained by the adolescents' preoccupation with the feelings of belongingness or affiliation (Tanti et al., 2011).

The findings of Tanti et al. (2011) are in line with those of Tarrant et al. (2001). Tarrant et al. (2001) examined the way how adolescents maintain positive evaluations of their peer groups and they placed Turner et al.'s social identity theory concept; 'social comparison' (Turner et al., 1979) in the center of that process. They found out that male adolescents were more likely to form strong group identifications, as well as be motivated to protect and enhance their in-group identity. Besides, they claimed that peer group membership is beneficial for social development and overall feelings of self-worth; because they indicated that adolescents' participations in activities are usually influenced by their group decisions (Tarrant et al., 2001).

On the other hand, in terms of collective identity orientations, a recent study of Smeekes and Verkuyten (2013) investigated collective self-continuity, group identification and in-group defense. They pointed out that identifying with a group is a basic need and people seek an attachment to the beliefs and the values of the groups, because they provide connectedness and relatedness. In their study, they investigated whether the sense of self continuity, which people derive from their group membership, provides a basis for group identification, or whether it underlies the desire for in-group protectionism and for opposition to out-groups in case of a threat to their identity. They found that the sense of continuity in collective self is an important motive for their identification with the group and a threat to identity may arouse in-group defense and distress (Smeekes & Verkuyten, 2013).

Identity as a Concept in terms of Facebook Utilization

In our global world, it can be claimed that the media have very powerful tools so that they have an influence on the way people think, act, and learn. Social media, especially Facebook, may play a prevalent role in the process of social construction and maintenance of culture and identity. Here, it can be claimed that Facebook has changed the conventional way of how we perceive the media: media are no longer merely consumed by an audience on these sites; it is almost entirely produced and distributed by participants. For instance, Zemmels (2011) states that with the prevalence of new media, there are no unifying truths, only negotiated, contested and contextualized processes for the social construction of reality. It allows the subject to construct the media to a greater degree than any communication media before (Zemmels, 2011).

In line with what Zemmels (2011) presented, Manovich (2001) explained the frame of new social media as a complex negotiation between the multiple selves of people, either online or offline, and computer structures through which people represent their selves to others (Manovich, 2001). In other words, what is novel about the social media can be summarized as the social practices of the people to be staged on the screen. In this regard, people can be entitled as the directors of their play and as Manovich claimed, people are not the passive agents of the new media anymore; instead they are the producers of the content in networked spaces (Manovich, 2001).

In addition, Wilcox-Ugurlu (2011) underlined another important aspect of social media as a communication technology in the frame of identity orientation. She made use of the theory of Auge's Place & Non-Place and indicated that Auge (1989) focused on the role of communication technologies on people's experiences, which

brought about an ambivalent space, or a non-place in social networking sites (Auge, 1989, as cited in Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011). She asserted that the experiences of people are rooted on personal and cultural domains, thus the sharing of the experiences in Facebook diminished the gap between the language and people's experiences due to the ultimate non-place aspect of Facebook. By using Facebook, she claimed that, people can check in if they are in the same direction with others without putting this intention into words (Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011). Some studies support the assertion of Wilcox-Ugurlu (2011). The young people's lives are occupied by mediated communication technologies 90 % as compared to 66 % of the adults (Lenhart, Madden, & Hitlin, 2005), thus they have been variously labelled as "digital natives" or "digital immigrant" living in the world (Prensky, 2001).

Social network sites were investigated in two categories, which were friendship-driven or interest-driven (Ito, 2010). The source of the categories was grounded on the concept of 'peers', to which the youth's senses of self, their reputations and statuses develop. Thus, friendship involves a powerful motivation for youth and it usually drives them to take a part in social network sites. On the other hand, some interests could also drive youth to utilize social network. Despite not being a friend in offline world, engagement in a particular hobby or an area of interest may draw the attention of the youth or bring a social group together (Ito, 2010). In addition to social media's influence on young people's friendship or interest driven use, they have transformed the leisure time perception in the home environment.

Livingstone (2002) underlined the transformation of "leisure time" perception at homes and stated that the concept of "doing things as a family" has begun to get associated with "media time". Recently as people have engaged with computers or TVs, they have passed from family spaces to more individualized spaces, which

brought about the concept of “media rich- environments”. Thus, Livingstone (2002) indicated the growing importance of the media to that group in terms of culture, education and consumption (Livingstone, 2002).

Davis (2012) stated that adolescents develop and reinforce some shared norms such as distinct language use, clothing styles, and music preferences within the scope of their peer interactions. These norms are usually employed as identity markers to define themselves in relation to their peers and as unique persons from their parents. She claimed that these shared interests and values contribute to their sense of belongingness to the group, which confirms their developing sense of identity. However, she underlined the changing role of new digital media through which the adolescents experience their peer relationships (Davis, 2012).

In her qualitative study, Davis (2012) investigated the role that digital media technologies play in adolescents’ experiences of friendship and identity, and the meaning they ascribe to them, by making in-depth interviews with 32 adolescents between the ages of 13 and 18 years. In her qualitative study, she utilized thematic analysis method to evaluate the responses and found out that online peer communications, which provide them with feedback on their identities, promote adolescents’ sense of belonging, self-disclosure and the circle of their friendships. Besides, digital media technologies enable adolescents to communicate with friends and it was the primary motivation for the sample group. Also, she pointed out the role of intimate online exchanges in self-disclosure of the adolescents. Finally, it was observed that 47% of the study group felt easier to share personal feelings online than offline and it was particularly common among girls (60%) and boys (57%) who described themselves as shy or quiet (Davis, 2012).

The findings of Davis (2012) can be supported by the claims of Wilcox-Ugurlu (2011). She indicated that in social media culture, the youth usually focus on positive elements of their experiences, not the negative ones. Thus, they usually present the idealized type of their identities as well as respond positively to the shared experiences of others, which she calls the process as ‘the implicit agreement between performer and audience on social media’. In return, they receive positive responses and have coherent and positive identity narratives on social media environment (Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011). Besides, the findings of Davis (2012) can be evaluated by utilizing the arguments of Wilcox-Ugurlu (2011) as well. She asserted that social media are not just channels of communication, but also engines of social change through which users can create networks and perform their identities. For instance, she indicated that users of Facebook either post their experiences as part of their identity enactment; or they reveal or conceal the elements of their identity, because Facebook enables them to endorse their identities with more freedom. If a Facebook friend does not respond to their shared experiences in a pleasing way, they may terminate their friendship by ‘unfriending’ that person. Here, she said that Facebook users do not have anxious feelings just like in real life communication or relationship with friends. Besides, they can make conscious decisions in performing roles or engaging in different activities on social media; however, she underlined that the associations can be dictated by the circumstances many times due to self-promotion wishes. In this respect, she pointed out that even loose-tie relationships may become more acceptable on social media (Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011).

On the other hand, with the increasing popularity of social media, there is a concern in the society about the diminishing role and place of face to face communication. Ahn and Shin (2013) investigated the relationships among the social

use of media, face-to-face communication, social isolation, connectedness, and people's subjective well-being. They surveyed 300 Korean adults and found out some interesting results. Firstly, they found that in the use of the media, respondents spent most of their time on communication use and this had a significant positive relationship with their sense of connectedness, which is similar to what Smeekes and Verkuyten (2013) found out. However, they pointed out that face-to-face communication facilitated both avoiding the sense of social isolation and seeking connectedness, whereas the social use of media facilitated only seeking connectedness among the participants. In other words, they asserted that the social function of face-to-face communication cannot be replaced or substituted by the social use of the media (Ahn & Shin, 2013).

All in all, as Zemmels (2011) indicated, the youth's ability to access digital technology and the Internet reformulated their understanding of new media in their lives as compared to any previous generation. Their participation and the practices have significant influences on the development of content. In other words, the media perceptions of youth have become intertwined within an interactive 'participatory culture' (Jenkins, 2009).

At this point, it can be claimed that Facebook has a prominent influence on the way young people think, act, and learn; and it plays an important role in the maintenance of youth identity orientations, with respect to its contribution to the generation of the content and its organization of the perceptions in their meaning making process. Besides, the effect of such a shift might be asserted as the depersonalization of self-concept such that the focus is no longer on 'me' and 'I,' instead, maybe on 'us' and 'we' (Onorato & Turner, 2004).

Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PAR Theory)

First of all, it is important to point out that family is the smallest but maybe the most important corner stone in the foundation of societies and cultures. Lewis (2008) described culture as a way of life which provides an open process of development and individual consciousness by means of mediated collective experiences and systems of shared activities and meanings. At this point, it can be claimed that in the creation of these collective experiences and systems of shared meaning, family fulfills an important duty, because for the first time people open their eyes in their family and interact with their parents, especially with mothers who serve the role of caregiver, nurturer and secure attachment base. Therefore, the relationships among the family members are expected to have an influence on the very first definition of self.

It can be asserted that people are the mirrors of their cultural backgrounds, thus they can reflect many aspects of them either implicitly or explicitly in many aspect of life. Lewis (2008) pointed out the role of family in the formation of the mechanisms of culture, as well as the influence of the parents in the composition of people's lives (Lewis, 2008). In other words, it can be proposed that the parents may fulfill a catalyzing effect on transmitting their cultural accumulation to their children in very early ages and it can be expected that the quality of the relationships within the family members constitutes more meaning to individuals in terms of their identity orientations. However, the transmission of the family's cultural accumulation to the children may not be considered without involving the mother-child and father-child relationships, as well as the people's perceptions of obtaining constructive emotional responses from the parents. Here, the theory of Parental Acceptance-Rejection

(PAR Theory) assists to understand the role of people's perceptions of obtaining constructive emotional responses from parents.

PAR Theory was introduced by Rohner (1986) and based on an evolutionary developmental psychology perspective. This theory indicates that the senses of acceptance or rejection of children by their parents play an important role in children's lives (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002). In other words, meeting the emotional needs of the people, particularly the acceptance of children by their caregivers constitutes the center of the theory, because it was underlined that people have evolved to have these emotional needs (Rohner, 2004). Perceived parental acceptance and rejection is reported on the basis of individuals' interpretations of major caregivers' behaviors on the basis of their own cultural and personal perspectives (Rohner & Khaleque, 2002). This was confirmed by Demo et al. (1987). They indicated that the impact of the perceptions of children about parental attitudes and behavior is much more influential on children than actual parental attitudes and behavior. That study underlined the significance of parents' considering their children's perceptions on their sets of parenting behaviors.

The main emphasis of the PAR Theory is on the perceived and subjective account of parental acceptance-rejection of a person, known as the "warmth dimension" of parent-child ties (Rohner, Khaleque & Cournoyer, 2003). On the foundation of parenting, the perceptions are assumed to be the key stone (Rohner, 1991; Baumrind, 1991). The "warmth dimension" can involve all human beings on its continuum, because everyone experiences love or rejection from their parents or other caretakers in life, especially during childhood (Rohner, 1986). Parental acceptance refers to verbal and physical signs of warmth, affection, care, comfort, concern, nurturance, support. On the other hand, parental rejection, the other end of the

dimension, implies the physical and psychological abuse or as simple as the absence of the parent (Rohner, 1975, 2004, 2005).

PAR theory has been supported by several studies about child and adolescent behaviors from different ages, cultures, genders and races so far (Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005). For instance, there have been more than 500 studies all around the world, including Turkey, regarding parental acceptance–rejection phenomena. All of them generated four universal classes of acceptance or rejection behavior (Rohner, 2004; Rohner & Cournoyer, 1994). These are;

1. Warmth/Affection versus Coldness/Lack of Affection

Warmth and affection can be expressed both verbally and physically. Physical demonstration of warmth can be approval or support by hugs, kisses, caress, smiles, pats or cuddles etc. Verbal expression may include compliments, praises, verbal approval of love like telling stories or public announcements of success etc. (Rohner, 1986).

2. Hostility/Aggression

Anger, hostility, ill will, dislike or meanness is all part of inner psychological issues or emotions of individuals toward children. Aggression associates with physical abuse like hitting, pushing or physical punishments. It also refers to hurting psychologically like cursing, belittling or scorns etc. (Rohner, 1986).

3. Indifference/Neglect

Indifference stands for the lack of care or concern for children. But if the socio-physical, medical or educational needs of children cannot be satisfied or their wishes

and interests are ignored by the parents; this may end up with the sense of neglect (Rohner, 1986).

4. Undifferentiated Rejection

The sense of undifferentiated rejection may emerge sometimes even if the parents may not intend the feelings of unloved or uncared towards the child (Rohner, 1986).

The PAR theory actually involves three sub-theories, which are personality, coping and socio-cultural sub-theories. In this study, however, the PAR theory's personality sub-theory will be overviewed. According to personality sub-theory, the quality of the relationship between parents and children determines the emotional and psychological status of children. For this reason, if parents meet their children's biologically-based emotional needs, which can be best satisfied by parents, such as love, comfort, nurturance, support, care; they may contribute to the personality developments of their children favorably. Otherwise, children are more likely to end up with the feelings of anxiety, insecurity and dependence (Rohner, 2004; Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

Rohner (1986) indicated that all individuals, regardless of their socio-cultural difference, can be assessed in terms of their level of psychological well-being as perceived by self, according to seven personality and behavior dispositions. On the basis of the degree of their rejection perceptions according to the personality sub-theory, the individuals will be more or less healthy in terms of the following dispositions: (1) dependence or defensive independence, (2) emotional unresponsiveness, (3) hostility and aggression, (4) negative self-esteem, (5) negative self-adequacy, (6) negative worldview and emotional instability (Rohner, 1986).

It is important to note that the association between perceived acceptance-rejection and the youth's psychological adjustment was investigated by the meta-analysis study of Khaleque and Rohner (2002). They indicated that the psychological adjustments of youth are more likely to be stronger when they perceive higher levels of their parents' love. The relationship between the experience of children's parental acceptance-rejection and their psychological adjustment has been supported by many studies cross culturally (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002) including Turkey (Erkman, 2003; Varan, 2001).

Furthermore, the impact of mother relationship quality and digital media use on adolescents' sense of identity was also investigated. In her study, Davis (2013) investigated the effects of interpersonal relationships and digital media use on a sample of 2079 adolescent students' senses of identities between the ages of 11 and 19 years. She measured the perceptions of the participants on online peer communication and online identity expression and exploration, mother relationship quality, friendship quality and self-concept clarity, respectively. The researcher found out that positive relationships with one's parents and friends contribute positively to the adolescents' sense of self. Besides, it was revealed that self-concept clarity was influenced clearly by the experience of positive mother relationships, partly as a result of the mediating role of high friendship quality. With respect to adolescents' digital media use, the results showed that adolescents' online communication with their existing friends has a positive relationship with their self-concept clarity levels, which was mediated by high friendship quality, as well. Considering the results of Davis' study (2013), it can be stated that the quality of parental and interpersonal relationships may contribute to the development of personally meaningful and socially validated identities.

CHAPTER III

THE STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE & RESEARCH QUESTIONS

According to the current global statistics, Facebook has 802 million daily and 1.28 billion monthly active users on average in March 2014 (“Company Info”, 2014) and it is currently the second most frequently visited website on the Internet (“The top 500 sites on the web”, 2014). As for the situation in Turkey, in terms of the prevalent usage of Facebook, Turkey is on the sixth place in terms of the most prevalent Facebook users in the world (Nierhoff, 2013). Besides, according to the data of 2013 gathered from Facebook, there are about 34 million monthly and 21 million daily active users on average (Kaytmaz, 2014), and we see that 34% of Facebook users of Turkey are at the ages of 18-24 (“Facebook’ta Avrupa Lideriyiz”, 2012), which refers to adolescence and early adulthood periods. Thus, when considering Facebook’s number of users all over the world and the aspects of the development of identities during adolescence, it can be claimed that Facebook is most likely to have a prominent influence on the way young people think, act, and learn; and it can play an important role in the maintenance of youth identity orientations, with respect to its contribution to the generation of the content and its organization of the perceptions in their meaning making process.

Therefore, this study aims to get insight into the adolescents’ experiences with Facebook and its possible impact on their identity orientations; especially when considering the effects of the quality of parent-child relationship.

It is intended with this study that the information pool of counselors and scholars will be enriched in understanding the efficient use of Facebook and in creating awareness about family ties and family relationships.

In this respect, the research questions of the study are the following:

- ❖ What are the Facebook activities among the participants and their Facebook utilization purposes?
- ❖ Is there a relationship between the adolescents' paternal and maternal acceptance or rejection perceptions and their individual, social and collective identity orientations?
- ❖ Is there any relationship between the adolescents' Facebook utilization and their identity orientation scores that are affected by their perceived parental acceptance and rejection?

CHAPTER IV

METHOD

This section involves information about the participants of the study, instruments employed in the study, procedure, design and data analysis of the study.

Participants

The sample of the study was generated by means of convenient sampling method. The participants were ITU and Bogazici University English Preparatory class students and the selection criterion was attending the preparatory classes regularly. The sample of the study consisted of 500 students; 238 of them from ITU and 262 from Bogazici University. Since the participants were at the ages of 18 to 25, parental consent was not required for their participation in the study; instead, the voluntary participation was the rule and they were asked to read and sign the informed consent.

For data collection, 530 questionnaires were distributed while 30 of them were dismissed from the study, because of the respondents' missing responses to the items. As a result, 500 questionnaires were analyzed statistically.

Female adolescents made up 47.6 % (238 persons), and male adolescents made up 52.4% (262 persons) of the sample (See Table 1)

Table 1. Distribution of Participants according to Gender

Gender	<i>n</i>	(%)	Cum. (%)
Female	238	47.6	47.6
Male	262	52.4	100
Total	500	100	

The sample consisted of female and male preparatory class students of Istanbul Technical University (ITU) and Bogazici University (BOUN). There were 98 female (41.17%) and 160 male (61.06%) students from ITU; whereas there were 140 female (58.83%) and 102 male (38.94%) students from BOUN. The distribution of participants according to university and gender can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of Participants according to University & Gender

Gender	ITU		BOUN		TOTAL	
	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	Cum.(%)
Female	98	41.17	140	58.83	238	100
Male	160	61.06	102	38.94	262	100

Note: ITU (Istanbul Technical University), BOUN (Bogazici University)

In terms of age, majority of the participants (49.2%) were 19. While the mean of participants' ages was 19.10, the median and the mode were 19, and the standard deviation was 1.22. The age range was between 17 and 28. The distribution of participants' ages can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Distribution of Participants according to Age

Age	<i>n</i>	(%)	Cum. (%)
17	3	0.6	0.6
18	140	28	28.6
19	246	49.2	77.8
20	77	15.4	93.2
21	17	3.4	96.6
22	3	0.6	97.2
23	5	1	98.2
24	4	0.8	99
25	3	0.6	99.6
26	1	0.2	99.8
28	1	0.2	100
Total	500	100	

In terms of the participants' parents, majority of the participants' parents were alive (96.4%) (See Table 4).

Table 4. Distribution of Participants according to Parent's being Alive or Not

Deceased / Alive	<i>n</i>	(%)	Cum. (%)
Mother deceased but father alive	3	0.6	0.6
Father deceased but mother alive	13	2.6	3.2
Both deceased	2	0.4	3.6
Both alive	482	96.4	100
Total	500	100	

In terms of parents' education level, the most frequent level of education for mothers was high school (31.8%), which was followed by primary school (27.8%) and university (20.8%), respectively. As for fathers, the most frequent level of education was university (36.4%), which was followed by high school (26.6%) and primary school (12.6%), respectively. The participants' parent education levels can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Distribution of Participants' Parent Education Level

Education Level	Mother		Father	
	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)
Illiterate	8	1.6	2	0.4
Literate	13	2.6	5	1
Primary School	139	27.8	63	12.6
Secondary School	51	10.2	59	11.8
High School	159	31.8	133	26.6
University (2 Year)	18	3.6	40	8
University	104	20.8	182	36.4
MA/PhD	7	1.4	15	3
Other	1	0.2	1	0.2
Total	500	100	500	100

In terms of the participants' place of the residence, majority of the students were living with their family (38.2%), which was followed by university dormitories (21.4%), and living with friends (17.6%) (See table 6). As for the place of the residence on the basis of gender; 21 % of female students living with their families, which was followed by living with friends (10.2%) and living in university dormitories (8.6%), respectively. As for the case of male students, living with family was also the most frequent place of residence (17.2%), which was followed by living in university dormitories (12.8%), and in private dormitories (8.4%), respectively. The distribution of the participants according to their place of residence can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Distribution of Participants according to Place of Residence.

Residence	<i>n</i>	(%)	Cum. (%)
Public Dorm (KYK)	22	4.4	4.4
University Dorm	107	21.4	25.8
Private Dorm	59	11.8	37.6
Family	191	38.2	75.8
Relative	24	4.8	80.6
Friends	88	17.6	98.2
Other	9	1.8	100
Total	500	100	

Finally, in terms of the participants' Facebook utilization, 87.2% of the students were using Facebook, but 12.8% of them stated that they did not use Facebook. While 12.6 % of females responded that they did not use Facebook, 87.4% of them responded affirmatively. As for the males, 12.97 % of them stated that they did not use Facebook, but 87.03% of them responded the opposite. The distribution of Facebook utilization according to gender can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Distribution of Participants according to Facebook Utilization and Gender

Gender	Facebook Utilization		Facebook Non Utilization	
	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)
Female	208	87.4	30	12.6
Male	228	87.03	34	12.97
Total	436		64	

Instruments

There were five instruments employed in the study:

- ❖ Demographic Information Form
- ❖ Facebook Utilization Level Form
- ❖ Parental Acceptance - Rejection Questionnaire – Mother Short Form
- ❖ Parental Acceptance and Rejection Questionnaire – Father Short Form
- ❖ Identity Questionnaire

Demographic Information Form (Demografik Bilgi Formu)

Demographic Information Form involved questions about gender, age, place of birth, place of residence, the students' major, and their parents' education level. The form was developed by the researcher under the supervision of Prof Erkman, Prof Ögel and Assist. Prof Börkan (See Appendix A).

Facebook Utilization Level Form (Facebook Kullanım Düzeyleri Formu)

Facebook Utilization Level Form covers some descriptive questions about the experiences of the users in Facebook such as: how many times they sign in Facebook, how much time they spend daily on it, how many posts they send, how many friends they have in their accounts and how often they change their profile pictures etc.

(See Appendix B).

Firstly, the initial version of the form was developed by the researcher under the supervision of the Prof Erkman, Prof Ögel and Assist. Prof Börkan. Then the form was applied to twenty students on Bogazici University campus to make sure that the

questions of the form were clear and understandable by the students. The researcher applied the form to each student and asked the participant to read the questions loudly and give feedback about the readability and the apprehensibility of the questions. The feedbacks of the participants were shared with the professors and the necessary revision was carried out under their supervision.

Facebook utilization scores of the participants were calculated by employing the technique of structural equation modeling. Facebook utilization score was considered as a latent variable with five measured variables. Facebook utilization score (factor score) was calculated with regression method in statistics software IBM SPSS Amos 20. The items included in the model were question two (How long have you got Facebook account), question three (Have you ever suspended your Facebook account), question four (How many minutes do you usually spend on daily Facebook usage in the last three months), question six (How many times you logged daily in Facebook in the last three months) and question seven (How many times did you change your Facebook profile picture in the last three months), respectively. Question five (How many posts do you share daily in Facebook in the last three months) of Facebook utilization form did not fit in the model, so it was excluded.

Parental Acceptance and Rejection Questionnaire – Mother & Father Short Forms

(Ebeveyn Kabul-Red Ölçeđi – Anne & Baba Kısa Formları)

Parental Acceptance and Rejection Questionnaire is a self-report instrument and it is a 4-point Likert-type scale from 4 (almost always true) to 1 (almost never true) developed by Rohner and Rohner in 1981. Unlike the long form, which contains 73 items, the short form, which is used in this study, contains 29 items. The PARQ is

made up of 24 items and designed to measure individual's perceptions of parental acceptance and rejection with respect to warmth, affection, care, nurturance, support or love they received in their family of origin (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). There are actually three versions of PARQ: the Adult PARQ, which assesses the adults' perceptions of their mother's and father's behavior when they were at the ages of 7 through 12. The Parent PARQ elaborates the way how the parents treat their children now, and the Child PARQ asks youth to respond about their perception on the way how their parents (mother and father) treat them now. Nevertheless, the two versions of the PARQ are identical except for the items' grammatical structure, either present or past tense, as well as the target, either mother or father (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

In this study, the mother & father PARQ short forms were utilized (See Appendices C & D). The mother (father) short form has 24 items. The items encompassed the four different dimensions of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire, which includes warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect, and undifferentiated rejection scales, and together the total score is the score for the perceived rejection level. In other words, these four scales assess the parents' perceived accepting-rejecting behaviors (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

The maximum scores of the respondents according to subscales appear that they range on the warmth/affection subscale from 8 to 32; the hostility/aggression subscale from 6 to 24, the indifference/neglect subscale from 6 to 24, the undifferentiated rejection subscale from 4 to 16. Scores on the four acceptance-rejection scales are summed after reversing the score of the warmth/affection scale in order to be able to measure the perceived coldness and lack of affection. At this point, it is important to note that the scores of the warmth/affection subscale were reversed to create a measure of perceived coldness and lack of affection. In other words, the high

scores in warmth/affection subscale originally refer to high perception of warmth. That is why, it is necessary to reverse the score to show coldness and lack of affection. Besides, the scores on the four acceptance-rejection scales are summed to produce an overall measure of perceived acceptance-rejection ranging from a low of 32 (maximum perceived acceptance) to a high of 96 (maximum perceived rejection).

As for the reliability and the validity of the instrument, it is valid and reliable cross-culturally. For instance, the mean weighted effect size of coefficient alpha as reported in a cross-cultural meta-analysis, based on 7152 respondents, was .89 for PARQ (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002a).

In addition, Polat (1988) adapted the original work into Turkish culture. According to the results, the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the total scale was .80 (Polat, 1988). Besides, Erdem and Erkman (1990) studied the construct validity of Turkish PARQ child form. Just like in the original form, the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the subscales ranged from .78 to .90 according to results of the factor analysis (Erdem & Erkman, 1990).

Erkman (2003) computed the Cronbach alpha coefficients for subscales of Turkish Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) Child PARQ. She reported that the Cronbach alpha values for the warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect and the undifferentiated rejection subscales of the mother version were .91, .87, .86, and .81, respectively. While the Cronbach alpha values for the warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect and the undifferentiated rejection subscales of the father version were .94, .91, .86, and .58, respectively. The Cronbach alpha values for PARQ total of the mother and father version were .81 and .85.

While the above reported values are for the long form of PARQ, Yılmaz and Erkman (2008) utilized the short form in Turkey for the first time. They reported the Cronbach alpha values for the warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect and undifferentiated rejection subscales of the mother short form as .88, .69, .66, .53, respectively. The Cronbach alpha values for the warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect and undifferentiated rejection subscales of the father short form were .88, .66, .70, .65, respectively. The Cronbach alpha values for PARQ total scales of mother & father short forms were .89 and .90, respectively (Yılmaz & Erkman, 2008).

In the present study, the Cronbach alpha values for the warmth/affection, the hostility/aggression, the indifference/neglect and the undifferentiated rejection subscales of both mother and father short forms were calculated.

In terms of mother short form, the results showed that the Cronbach alpha values for the warmth/affection, the hostility/aggression, the indifference/neglect and the undifferentiated rejection subscales were .84, .64, .57, .49 respectively. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the total scale for mother form was .86.

In terms of father short form, the results showed that the Cronbach alpha values for the warmth/affection, the hostility/aggression, the indifference/neglect and the undifferentiated rejection subscales of the father version were .90, .76, .75, .67 respectively. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the total scale for father form was .91. The Alpha values of present study ranged between .49 and .90 for subscales, and it is .86 for maternal acceptance and .91 for paternal acceptance. The alpha values of present study can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8. Cronbach Alpha Values of PARQ Adult– Mother & Father Short Forms (Turkish)

PARQ	Yılmaz & Erkman's Study Results (2008)* (mean age 15.34)		Present Study Results (mean age 19.10)	
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father
Non-warmth	.88	.88	.84	.90
Hostility	.69	.66	.64	.76
Indifference-Neglect	.66	.77	.57	.75
Undifferentiated-Rejection	.53	.65	.49	.67
PARQ Total	.89	.90	.86	.91

Note: * Yılmaz, B. & Erkman, F. (2008) Understanding Social Anxiety Through Adolescents' Perceptions of Interparental Conflict and Parental Rejection. In F. Erkman (ed.), *Acceptance: The essence of peace* (67-96). Istanbul: Turkish Psychological Association.

Identity Questionnaire (Kimlik Ölçeği)

Identity Questionnaire is originally developed by Cheek in 1982. It involves 35 items which cover personal identity orientation (10 items), social identity orientation (7 items) and collective identity orientation (8 items) subscales, respectively. The rest of the items are not included into the subscales, rather employed as fillers.

Personal identity orientation subscale assesses how people perceive themselves different from others, what unique thoughts and attitudes they have about themselves, and if they remain the same in essence despite the changes in life. In addition, social identity orientation subscale searches for how individuals view themselves or their behaviors sets in their relationships with others, as well as what they believe other people think about them in their social interactions. As for collective identity

orientation subscale, it investigates how people view being a member of their family, their ethnicity, being a member of their society and the norms of their cultural group.

Identity Questionnaire can be implemented to adolescents and adults either individually or as a group. It is 5-point Likert-type scale where the respondents select through 1 (Not important to my sense of who I am), 2 (Slightly important to my sense of who I am), 3(Somewhat important to my sense of who I am), 4(Very important to my sense of who I am) and 5 (Extremely important to my sense of who I am). The minimum total scores from the scale can be 25, and the maximum score can be 125.

The initial steps to measure the personal and social identities were attempted by Cheek and Briggs (1982) with respect to social identity theories in the literature. Check and Briggs (1982) stated that in the process of development of the aspects of Identity Questionnaire, they utilized some items from Sampson's (1978) list of identity characteristics and they judged the items to represent personal and social identity domains. Coşkun (2004) indicated that in order to increase the validity and reliability values, the authors revised some of the items, as well as added some additional items (Cheek, 1982, 1983; Cheek & Hogan, 1981; Hogan & Cheek, 1983, as cited in Coşkun, 2004). In this process, Coşkun (2004) stated that the factor loadings of some of the items appeared in a novel category, which was then named as collective identity. Eventually further researches were done to develop the collective identity (Cheek, Underwood & Cutler, 1985; Cheek, Tropp, Chen & Underwood, 1994; Cheek & Tropp, 1995, as cited in Coşkun, 2004).

The validity studies regarding the original form demonstrated that the items of the original scale were loaded on three basic factors, and there was a significant relationship among the subscales of the questionnaire (Cheek et al., 1994, as cited in Coşkun, 2014). Besides, the results of the criterion validity showed that there was a

medium correlation of the subscales of the identity questionnaire with respect to other measurement tools (Coşkun, 2000; Cheek & Hogan, 1983; Briggs & Cheek, 1986, as cited in Coskun, 2004).

The item total correlations for personal identity orientation ranged between .29 and .66, for social identity orientation ranged between .38 and .64, and for collective identity orientation ranged between .29 and .49 (Coşkun, 2000). The internal consistency of the scale was reported to be high, where Cronbach alpha values ranged from .70 to .80. In addition, they indicated that the Cronbach alpha coefficient for personal identity orientation subscale ranged from .68 to .82, for social identity orientation subscale it was from .68 to .83, and for collective identity orientation it ranged from .68 to .72 (Berzonsky, 1994; Cheek et al., 1994; Coskun, 2000; Tropp, 1992, as cited in Coşkun, 2004).

The Turkish form of Identity Questionnaire was translated by Coşkun (2004). He examined Identity Questionnaire in terms of validity and reliability in a study which consisted of 275 university students with a mean age of 20.59.

The construct validity of the Turkish Identity Questionnaire was studied by Coşkun (2004). The items of personal identity orientation subscale explained 31.72%, the items of social identity orientation subscale explained 42.83% and the items of collective identity orientation subscale explained 41.58% of variance. However, the total scores of each subscale explained 63.29% of the variance after the factor analysis (Coşkun, 2004).

The criterion validity of the scale was studied by Coşkun (2004) by utilizing the following Turkish scales, which, he indicated, were reliable and valid for Turkish culture: Submissive Scale (Boyun Eğici Davranışlar Ölçeği -BEDÖ), (Şahin & Şahin, 1992, as cited in Coşkun, 2004), Social Comparison Scale (Sosyal Karşılaştırma

Ölçeği-SKÖ), (Şahin & Şahin, 1992, as cited in Coşkun, 2004) and Self-Manipulation Scale (Kendini Kurgulama Ölçeği , KKÖ) (Coşkun, 1994; Haran & Aydın, 1995, as cited in Coşkun, 2004).

The results concerning the content and criterion validity of the Identity Questionnaire indicated that the subscales (personal, social and collective identity orientations) reflected one single factor. The results also showed that the reliability coefficients of the total scale, subscale, and test-retest reliabilities (N = 160) were at satisfactory levels (Coşkun, 2004).

The Cronbach alpha coefficient of Identity Questionnaire was .79. The internal consistency values of the each subscale are .76, .78 and .80 for personal, social and collective identity orientations, respectively.

Coşkun (2004) reports the test-retest reliability coefficients of the subscales with an interval of six weeks to be .79, .84 and .68 for personal, social and collective identity orientations respectively. The test-retest reliability coefficient of total scale was .86. This information about the reliability & validity of Identity Questionnaire Subscales can be seen in Table 9*.

Table 9*: Reliability & Validity of Identity Questionnaire Subscales-Turkish Form

Subscales	X	S	Factor Load	Item-total Correlation	Internal Consistency	Test-Retest (N=160)
Personal	39.52	4.74	.66	.52	.76	.79
Social	20.53	4.86	.66	.51	.78	.84
Collective	27.46	5.73	.81	.67	.80	.68
Total Scale	87.52	10.99	1.00	1.00	.79	.86

*Coşkun, H.(2004). A Study of the Validity and Reliability of the Identity Questionnaire in a Turkish Sample. *Turkish Psychological Articles*, 7 (14), 49-60.

Revision & Reliability Study of Identity Questionnaire

A pilot work was carried out with the Identity Questionnaire. It was administered to a group of students at Bogazici University. It was observed that some items could not be fully understood by some of the students. These items were item 4, 6, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33 and 34, respectively. Thus, the need for the revision of the wording of some items was seen by the thesis advisor, Prof. Erkman. Then, the revised version of identity scale was applied to 100 students at Bogazici University English preparatory class students after getting the necessary permission from YADYOK (School of Foreign Languages of Bogazici University) directorate. Afterwards, the dimensions of reliability of the questionnaire were analyzed. Since satisfactory results were obtained, the revised version of the Identity Questionnaire was employed in data collection of the study (See Appendix E).

The Cronbach alpha values for personal, social and collective identity orientations were calculated to be .79, .83 and .72 for personal, social and collective identity orientation subscales, respectively. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the total scale was found to be .83.

Unlike the alpha value of collective identity orientation subscale, the Cronbach alpha values for personal, social and total identity scores increased after the revision of some items. The Cronbach Alpha values of Revised Identity Questionnaire (Turkish) form can be seen in Table 10.

Table 10. Cronbach Alpha Values of Revised Identity Questionnaire (Turkish)

	Coşkun's Study Results*	Present Study Results
Respondents	(mean age 20.59)	(mean age 19.10)
Identity Questionnaire (TR)		
Personal	.76	.79
Social	.78	.83
Collective	.80	.72
Total	.79	.83

*Coşkun, H.(2004). A Study of the Validity and Reliability of the Identity Questionnaire in a Turkish Sample. *Turkish Psychological Articles*, 7 (14), 49-60.

Procedure

Research proposal was prepared and presented to the thesis committee after getting the permissions for the utilization of questionnaires from the authors, specifically the permission for Parental Acceptance and Rejection Questionnaire – mother & father short forms from Ronald Rohner and Fatoş Erkman (See Appendix F) and the permission for Identity Questionnaire from Hamit Coşkun (See Appendix G). Then, the research proposal was presented to Ethics Committee of Bogazici University and the necessary permission was granted (See Appendix H). Afterwards, before starting to data collection, the permissions were obtained from the administrations of the School of Foreign Languages of Istanbul Technical University (ITU) and Bogazici University (BOUN). First round of the data collection took place at School of Foreign Languages of ITU and the second round at BOUN School of Foreign Languages. The researcher entered the classrooms and explained the purpose of the study and informed them about the instructions of the question forms. Informed Consent Form

(Bilgilendirilmiş Onam Formu) was distributed to the participants. It involved the aims and the overview of the study. The participants signed that form before taking part in the study. The signature of participants was accepted as assuring their volunteer status, and understanding the expectations of the researcher (See Appendix I). The researcher was present in each classroom throughout the data collection process in order to answer the possible questions of the respondents.

Then the researcher administrated the question forms in such an order: Demographic Information Form, Facebook Utilization Level Form, Parental Acceptance and Rejection Questionnaire – Mother Short Form, Parental Acceptance and Rejection Questionnaire – Father Short Form and Identity Questionnaire, respectively. Data collection was completed in ten days.

Design

This study was a descriptive exploratory research in essence. However, the types of the relationships between the designated variables were investigated as well. The participants' identity orientation was the dependent variable of the study, which had three subscales; personal identity orientation, social identity orientation and collective identity orientations. The participants' Facebook utilization was the independent variable of the study.

The relationship between Facebook utilization, maternal and paternal acceptance-rejection and the adolescents' personal, social and collective identity orientations were investigated by using hierarchical regression method.

Data Analysis

The SPSS 17.0 (Statistics Packages of Social Sciences) computer program was used in the analysis of the data of this study. The scores of the participants were attained from each questionnaire; Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire short form (PARQ) for mothers and for fathers; Facebook Utilization Form and Identity Questionnaire. For the general demographic characteristics of the sample, the descriptive analyses of the scores were carried out in terms of means, standard deviations, observed ranges, and minimum and maximum scores.

Then, the research questions were tested by conducting hierarchical regression analyses. Hierarchical regression analyses were employed to determine the contributions of the participants' Facebook utilization and their paternal and maternal acceptance or rejection perceptions, to their personal, social and collective identity orientations. The variables were entered into the regression equation one at a time. In order to determine whether a variable is important and to test the statistical significance of each variable in the equation, the change in R^2 , rather than the regression coefficients, was emphasized. In other words, this regression method helped to control for the effects of covariates to test the effects of certain predictors independent of the influence of others.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

This section includes the results of the data analysis with respect to the variables and the research questions of the study. In terms of descriptive statistics, characteristics of the participants, their means, standard deviations, maximum and minimum scores related to the variables were calculated. In terms of the inferential statistics, the contributions of the participants' Facebook utilization and their paternal and maternal acceptance or rejection perceptions, to their personal, social and collective identity orientations were calculated by employing hierarchical regression method.

Descriptive Analysis of Variables

The participants of the study consisted of 500 adolescents, 238 (47.6%) females and 262 (52.4%) males with a mean age of 19.10. There were 98 female (41.17%) and 160 male (61.06%) students from ITU; whereas there were 140 female (58.83%) and 102 male (38.94%) students from BOUN (See Table 1 & Table 2).

Table 11 shows the means, standard deviations, observed ranges, and minimum and maximum scores for Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire short form (PARQ) for mothers and for fathers, as well as their subscales: perceived warmth-affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect and undifferentiated rejection; for Facebook utilization levels as well as for personal identity orientation, social identity orientation, collective identity orientation and total identity scores in terms of females and males, respectively (See Table 11).

The scores on the four acceptance-rejection scales are summed to produce an overall measure of perceived acceptance-rejection ranging from a low of 32 (maximum perceived acceptance) to a high of 96 (maximum perceived rejection).

According to the results, the mean score of perceived maternal rejection for females was 32.99 and for males it was 33.96; where a low score of 32 meant the maximum perceived acceptance. Higher scores meant more perceived rejection where the highest score was 96. The minimum and maximum scores of the PARQ mother for females were 24 and 69, while they were 24 and 63 for males, respectively. Besides, the mean scores of perceived paternal rejection for females were 35.54, and for males 38.19, where higher scores meant more sense of rejection perception. The minimum and maximum scores of the PARQ father for females were 24 and 83, while they were 24 and 80 for males, respectively.

In terms of warmth/affection (or non-warmth) subscale of PARQ, females' mean scores for mother form were 12.08, where the minimum and maximum scores were 8 and 26, respectively. As for the values of the same subscale for males, the mean scores for mother form were 12.67, where the minimum and maximum scores were 8 and 25, respectively. In terms of warmth/affection subscale of PARQ, females' mean scores for father form were 13.46, where the minimum and maximum scores were 8 and 30, respectively. As for the values of the same subscale for males, the mean scores for father form were 15.24, where the minimum and maximum scores were 8 and 32, respectively. At this point, it is important to note that the scores of the warmth/affection subscale were reversed to create a measure of perceived coldness and lack of affection. In other words, the high scores in warmth and affection subscale refer to high perception of coldness and lack of affection.

In terms of hostility/aggression subscale of PARQ, females' mean scores for mother form were 7.94, where the minimum and maximum scores were 6 and 19 respectively. As for the values of the same subscale for males, the mean scores for mother form were 8.17, where the minimum and maximum scores were 6 and 18, respectively. In terms of hostility/aggression subscale of PARQ, females' mean scores for father form were 7.73, where the minimum and maximum scores were 6 and 21 respectively. As for the values of the same subscale for males, the mean scores for father form were 8.17, where the minimum and maximum scores were 6 and 22, respectively.

In terms of indifference/neglect subscale of PARQ, females' mean scores for mother form were 8.19, where the minimum and maximum scores were 6 and 18 respectively. As for the values of the same subscale for males, the mean scores for mother form were 8.25, where the minimum and maximum scores were 6 and 16, respectively. In terms of indifference/neglect subscale of PARQ, females' mean scores for father form were 9.52, where the minimum and maximum scores were 6 and 23, respectively. As for the values of the same subscale for males, the mean scores for father form were 9.84, where the minimum and maximum scores were 6 and 21, respectively.

In terms of undifferentiated rejection subscale of PARQ, females' mean scores for mother form were 4.77, where the minimum and maximum scores were 4 and 13 respectively. As for the values of the same subscale for males, the mean scores for mother form were 4.84, where the minimum and maximum scores were 4 and 11, respectively. In terms of undifferentiated rejection subscale of PARQ, females' mean scores for father form were 4.81, where the minimum and maximum scores were 4 and 15 respectively. As for the values of the same subscale for males, the mean scores for

father form were 4.94, where the minimum and maximum scores were 4 and 12, respectively.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to understand whether there was a difference in perceived non-warmth from mother (father) based on gender. There was no significant difference in the scores for perceived non-warmth from mother between females ($M = 12.08, SD = 4.21$) and males ($M = 12.67, SD = 3.62$); $t(468) = -1.69, p > .05$. However, there was a significant difference in the scores for perceived non-warmth from father between females ($M = 13.46, SD = 5.34$) and males ($M = 15.24, SD = 5.34$); $t(498) = -3.70, p < .00$, with males perceiving slightly higher non-warmth than females.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to understand whether there was a difference in perceived hostility/aggression from mother (father) based on gender. There was no significant difference in the scores for perceived hostility/aggression from mother between females ($M = 7.94, SD = 2.29$) and males ($M = 8.17, SD = 2.20$); $t(498) = -1.14, p > .05$. There was also no significant difference in the scores for perceived hostility/aggression from father between females ($M = 7.73, SD = 2.59$) and males ($M = 8.17, SD = 2.70$); $t(498) = -1.82, p > .05$.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to understand whether there was a difference in perceived indifference/neglect from mother (father) based on gender. There was no significant difference in the scores for perceived indifference/neglect from mother between females ($M = 8.19, SD = 2.26$) and males ($M = 8.25, SD = 2.09$); $t(498) = -.32, p > .05$. There was also no significant difference in the scores for perceived indifference/neglect from father between females ($M = 9.52, SD = 3.24$) and males ($M = 9.84, SD = 3.20$); $t(498) = -1.10, p > .05$.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to understand whether there was a difference in perceived undifferentiated rejection from mother (father) based on gender. There was no significant difference in the scores for perceived undifferentiated rejection from mother between females ($M = 4.77, SD = 1.35$) and males ($M = 4.84, SD = 1.23$); $t(498) = -.64, p >.05$. There was no significant difference in the scores for perceived undifferentiated rejection from father between females ($M = 4.81, SD = 1.67$) and males ($M = 4.94, SD = 1.53$); $t(498) = -.92, p >.05$.

In addition, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to understand whether there was a difference in perceived total rejection from mother (father) based on gender. There was no significant difference in the scores for perceived total rejection from mother between females ($M = 32.99, SD = 8.17$) and males ($M = 33.96, SD = 6.99$); $t(497) = -1.42, p >.05$. However, there was a significant difference in the scores for perceived total rejection from father between females ($M = 35.54, SD = 10.53$) and males ($M = 38.19, SD = 10.57$); $t(498) = -2.81, p <.005$, with males perceiving slightly higher rejection than females.

The results of the current study showed that the mean scores of the adolescents for perceived maternal and paternal acceptance were in the normal range, implying that they experienced much more maternal and paternal love than rejection (See Table 11).

In addition, mean scores of Facebook utilization for females and males were -.66 and .60, where the minimum and maximum scores were -13.39 and 37.17, and -13.39 and 57.80, respectively (See Table 11).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to understand whether there was a difference in Facebook utilization levels of adolescents based on gender. It was found that there was no significant difference in the scores for Facebook utilization between females ($M = -.66, SD = 9.11$) and males ($M = .60, SD = 610.47$); $t(498) = -1.44, p > .05$. The results of the current study showed that Facebook was utilized by male and female participants similarly.

Furthermore, personal identity orientation subscale's mean scores for females and males were 42.10 and 40.39, where the minimum and maximum scores were 23 and 50 for females, and 27 and 50 for males, respectively. Social identity orientation's mean scores for females and males were 21.55 and 22.13, where the minimum and maximum scores were 7 and 33 for females, and 7 and 35 for males, respectively. Collective identity orientation mean scores for females and males were 26.18 and 25.53, where the minimum and maximum scores were 11 and 39 for females, and 8 and 40 for males, respectively (See Table 11).

Independent-samples t-tests were conducted separately for personal, social and collective identity orientations to understand whether there were differences in the identity orientations of adolescents based on gender. Among three identity orientations, only personal identity orientation showed a significant difference between females ($M = 42.10, SD = 4.90$) and males ($M = 40.39, SD = 5.34$); $t(498) = 3.73, p < .00$; with females having slightly higher personal identity orientation scores than males. Social and collective identity orientations did not show a significant difference between females [$(M = 21.55, SD = 4.94$ for social identity orientation), $(M = 26.18, SD = 5.66$ for collective identity orientation)] and

males [$M = 22.13$, $SD = 5.39$ for social identity orientation), ($M = 25.53$, $SD = 6.09$ for collective identity orientation)]; [$t(498) = -1.27$, $p > .05$ for social identity orientation), $t(498) = 1.21$, $p > .05$ for collective identity orientation)].

Nevertheless, it is important to note that personal identity orientation subscale has ten items; social identity orientation subscale has seven items and collective identity orientation subscale eight items, where each item has the maximum point of five. Thus, the raw scores of each subscale were converted to percentage values in order to compare the scores of each identity orientation subscale. The average percentages of personal, social and collective identity orientations were 82%, 62% and 65%, respectively.

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables

Measures	Female (<i>n</i> = 238)				Male (<i>n</i> =262)			
	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
PARQ Mother (P.M.)	24	69	32.99	8.17	24	63	33.96	3.62
(P.M.) Warmth /Affection	8	26	12.08	4.21	8	25	12.67	3.62
(P.M.) Hostility/Aggression	6	19	7.94	2.29	6	18	8.17	2.20
(P.M.) Indifference/Neglect	6	18	8.19	2.26	6	16	8.25	2.09
(P.M.) Und-Rejection	4	13	4.77	1.35	4	11	4.84	1.23
PARQ Father (P.F)	24	83	35.54	10.53	24	80	38.19	10.57
(P.F.) Warmth/Affection	8	30	13.46	5.34	8	32	15.24	5.34
(P.F.) Hostility/Aggression	6	21	7.73	2.59	6	22	8.17	2.70
(P.F.) Indifference/Neglect	6	23	9.52	3.24	6	21	9.84	3.20
(P.F.) Und-Rejection	4	15	4.81	1.67	4	12	4.94	1.53
Facebook Utilization	-13.39	35.17	-.66	9.10	-13.39	57.80	.60	10.46
Personal Identity Orientation	23	50	42.10	4.90	27	50	40.39	5.34
Social Identity Orientation	7	33	21.55	4.93	7	35	22.13	5.39
Collective Identity Orientation	11	39	26.18	5.66	8	40	25.53	6.09
Total Identity Score	51	115	89.84	11.72	52	120	88.06	12.13

Note: Warmth/Affection subscale of PARQ (Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire Short Form) measures the perceived coldness and lack of affection, P.M (Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire Short Form for Mother), P.F (Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire Short Form for Father).

Results According to Research Questions

Research Question 1: What are the Facebook activities among the participants and their Facebook Utilization Purposes?

According to the descriptive analysis of Facebook demographics of the participants, the mean of how long they have been using Facebook was 42.75 months, where the maximum was 96 months with a standard deviation of 22.98. Besides, the mean score of how many minutes they spend for daily Facebook usage was 54.72 minutes, where the maximum minutes was 480 with a standard deviation of 61.98. As for how many posts they share daily in Facebook in the last three months, it was 1.09 with a standard deviation of 3.12. In addition, 3.89 was the mean of how many times they log daily in Facebook, where the maximum was 30, and 388.47 was the mean number of friends in Facebook with a maximum number of 3202. The results are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12. Facebook Demographics of the Participants

Facebook Demographics	F.Q.1 (months)	F.Q.4 (minutes)	F.Q.5 (number)	F.Q.6 (times)	F.Q.9 (number)
N	500	500	500	500	436
Mean	42.75	54.72	1.09	3.89	388.47
Median	48	30	0	2	333.5
Mode	60	60	0	2	400
Std. Deviation	22.98	61.98	3.12	4.75	284.56
Minimum	0	0	0	0	10
Maximum	96	480	50	30	3202

Note: F.Q 1 asks how long have you got Facebook account (month), F.Q.4 asks how many minutes do you usually spend on daily Facebook usage in the last three months, F.Q.5 asks how many posts do you share daily in Facebook in the last three months, F.Q.6 asks how many times you logged daily in Facebook in the last three months and F.Q.9 how many friends do you have in your Facebook account?

Furthermore, mobile phone (47.4 %) was the most frequent way of logging in Facebook among the participants, which was followed by laptop (29.2%), desktop (8.4%) and tablet computer (2.2%).

In terms of the percentages of the Facebook activities among the participants; following the posts of the friends was the most frequent activity (76%), which was followed by watching videos in Facebook (48.6%), uploading pictures (41.4%), celebrating the friends' birthdays (36.2%), playing games in Facebook (18.6%), writing post on their Facebook wall (13.6%) and organizing activities with friends (8%), respectively. The results are summarized in Table 13.

Table 13. Facebook Activities among the Participants

Facebook Activities	Percentage* (%)
Following the posts of the friends	76
Watching videos in Facebook	48.6
Uploading pictures	41.4
Celebrating friends' birthdays	36.2
Playing games in Facebook	18.6
Writing post on Facebook wall	13.6
Organizing activities with friends	8

*the frequencies of activities fulfilled by the participants in terms of percentages

In terms of percentages of Facebook utilization purposes of the participants, communicating with friends was the most frequent motivation to use Facebook (71.6%), which was followed by getting information about interesting issues (45.2%), wondering about the friends' activities (38.2%), spending pleasant time (30%) and making new friendships (5.2%), respectively. The results are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14. Facebook Utilization Purposes of the Participants

Facebook Utilization Purposes	Percentage* (%)
Communicating with friends	71.6
Getting info. about interesting issues	45.2
Wondering about the friends' activities	38.2
Spending pleasant time	30
Making new friendships	5.2

*the frequencies of Facebook Utilization Purposes of the Participants in terms of percentages

Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between the adolescents' paternal and maternal acceptance or rejection perceptions and their individual, social and collective identity orientations?

Pearson's r correlation coefficient was computed among the perceived parental acceptance and rejection of the participants and their identity orientations. The results are summarized in Table 15.

According to the results, it was found that there was a negative correlation between female and male adolescents' perceptions of non-warmth from mothers and their personal identity orientations, where $r = -.19$ ($n = 237, p < .01$) for females and $r = -.22$ ($n = 262, p < .01$) for males. Besides, there was a negative correlation between the female adolescents' perceptions of non-warmth from mothers and their collective identity orientations, $r = -.21$ ($n = 237, p < .01$).

There was also a negative correlation between male adolescents' perception of non-warmth from fathers and their personal identity orientations, $r = -.22$ ($n = 238, p < .01$). In terms of collective identity orientations, there was a negative

correlation between male ($r = -.19, n = 262, p < .01$) and female adolescents ($r = -.17, n = 238, p < .01$) perceptions of non-warmth from their fathers and collective identity as can be seen in Table 15.

There was a positive correlation between male adolescents' perceptions of hostility/aggression from mothers and their social identity orientations ($r = .13, n = 262, p < .05$) and between their perceptions of hostility/aggression from mothers and their collective identity, $r = .15$ ($n = 262, p < .01$). There was also a positive correlation between female adolescents' perceptions of hostility/aggression from fathers and their social identity orientations, $r = .16$ ($n = 238, p < .01$).

There was a negative correlation between female adolescents' perceptions of indifference/neglect from mothers and their collective identity orientations ($r = -.15, n = 238, p < .01$). On the other hand, there was a positive correlation between female adolescents' perceptions of indifference/neglect from fathers and their social identity orientations ($r = .14, n = 238, p < .05$). Nevertheless, there was negative correlation between male adolescents' perceptions of indifference/neglect from fathers and their collective identity orientations ($r = -.12, n = 262, p < .05$).

There was a positive correlation between male adolescents' perceptions of undifferentiated rejection from mothers and their social identity orientations ($r = .14, n = 262, p < .05$).

On the other hand, there was a positive correlation between female adolescents' perceptions of undifferentiated rejection from fathers and their social identity orientations ($r = .17, n = 238, p < .05$). Besides, there was a negative correlation between their perceived undifferentiated rejection from mothers and their collective identity orientations ($r = -.15, n = 238, p < .05$). Whereas a negative

correlation between male adolescents' perception of undifferentiated rejection from fathers and their collective identity orientations ($r = -.17$, $n = 262$, $p < .01$) was seen.

In terms of perceived total rejection from mother, while there was a negative correlation between female adolescents' perceived total rejection from mother and their collective identity orientations ($r = -.18$, $n = 237$, $p < .01$), there was a negative correlation between male adolescents' perceived total rejection from mother and their personal identity orientations ($r = -.13$, $n = 262$, $p < .05$). As for the case of perceived total rejection from father, there was a positive correlation between female adolescents' perceived total rejection from father and their social identity orientations ($r = .16$, $n = 238$, $p < .05$). In terms of male adolescents' perceived rejection, there were negative correlations between male adolescents' perceived total rejection from father and their personal identity orientations, and their collective identity ($r = -.12$, $n = 262$, $p < .05$ and $r = -.17$, $n = 262$, $p < .01$, respectively) (Table 15).

Table 15. Correlation of PARQ Mother & Father Subscales and Adolescents' Identity Orientations

		Personal I.O	Social I.O	Collective I.O
M-Warmth/affection	Female	-.19**	.01	-.21**
	Male	-.22**	-.04	-.11
F- Warmth/Affection	Female	-.09	.10	-.17**
	Male	-.22**	-.01	-.19**
M-Hostility/aggression	Female	.02	.08	-.01
	Male	.05	.13*	.15*
F-Hostility/aggression	Female	.01	.16*	-.04
	Male	-.02	.06	.48
M-Indifference/neglect	Female	-.03	.03	-.15*
	Male	-.10	.07	-.02
F- Indifference/neglect	Female	-.03	.14*	-.08
	Male	-.03	.09	-.12*
M- Undiff. Rejection	Female	-.00	.05	-.15*
	Male	.01	.14*	-.05
F- Undiff. Rejection	Female	-.05	.17*	-.06
	Male	-.00	.09	-.17
M-Total Rejection	Female	-.10	.04	-.18*
	Male	-.13*	.07	-.02
F-Total Rejection	Female	-.06	.16*	-.12
	Male	-.12*	.05	-.17**

Note: Warmth/affection subscale measures perceived coldness and lack of affection from parents. PARQ (Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire), Personal I.O (Personal Identity Orientation), Social I.O (Social Identity Orientation), Collective I.O (Collective Identity Orientation), M (Mother), F (Father), p (Sig.2-tailed), * p < .05, ** p < .01

When the adolescent participant population was taken as a whole, it was found that personal identity orientation was negatively correlated with both mother and father rejection ($r = -.12$, $n = 499$, $p < .01$; $r = -.12$, $n = 500$, $p < .05$). While a positive correlation was seen between father rejection and social identity ($r = .11$, $n = 500$, $p < .05$), collective identity orientation was negatively correlated with both mother and father rejection ($r = -.10$, $n = 499$, $p < .05$; $r = -.15$, $n = 500$, $p < .01$). Correlation of

mother & father total rejection scores and adolescents' identity orientations can be seen in Table 16.

Table 16. Correlation of Mother & Father Total Rejection Scores and Adolescents' Identity Orientations

	Personal I.O	Social I.O	Collective I.O
Mother Total Rejection	-.12**	.06	-.10*
Father Total Rejection	-.12*	.11*	-.15**

Note: Total PARQ (Total Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire), Personal I.O (Personal Identity Orientation), Social I.O (Social Identity Orientation), Collective I.O(Collective Identity Orientation).
 p (Sig.2-tailed), * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Besides, Pearson's r correlation coefficient was computed among the Identity Orientation subscales of male and female participants. The results are summarized in Table 17.

According to the result, it was found that there was a positive correlation between female and male adolescents' personal identity orientations and their social identity orientations, where $r = .32$ ($n = 238$, $p < .01$) for females and $r = .26$ ($n = 262$, $p < .01$) for males. Besides, there was a positive correlation between female and male adolescents' personal identity orientations and their collective identity orientations, where $r = .42$ ($n = 238$, $p < .01$) for females, and $r = .31$ ($n = 262$, $p < .01$) for males. In addition, there was a positive correlation between female and male adolescents' social identity orientations and their collective identity orientations, where $r = .34$ ($n = 238$, $p < .01$) for females, and $r = .27$ ($n = 262$, $p < .01$) for males.

Table 17. Correlations of Identity Orientation Subscales

		Personal I.O	Social I.O	Collective I.O
Personal I.O	Female		.32**	.42**
	Male		.26**	.31**
Social I.O	Female	.32**		.34**
	Male	.26 **		.27**
Collective I.O	Female	.42**	.34**	
	Male	.31**	.27**	

Note: Personal I.O (Personal Identity Orientation), Social I.O(Social Identity Orientation), Collective I.O (Collective Identity Orientation) p (Sig.2-tailed), ** p < .01.

Finally, Pearson's r correlation coefficient was computed among Facebook Utilization, perceived parental acceptance and rejection and identity orientation of the participants. The results are summarized in Table 18 & Table 19. According to the results, it was found that in terms of Parental Acceptance Rejection subscales, only the adolescents' hostility/aggression perception from father was positively correlated with their Facebook utilization, $r = .09$ ($n = 500, p < .05$) (See Table 18).

On the other hand, in terms of identity orientations subscales, only the adolescents' social identity orientation was positively correlated with their Facebook utilization ($r = .19, n = 500, p < .01$) (See Table 19).

Table 18. Correlations of Facebook Utilization and PARQ Subscales

	Facebook Utilization	
PARQ Subscales		
M-Warmth/affection		-.01
F- Warmth/Affection		.02
M-Hostility/aggression		.03
F-Hostility/aggression		.09*
M-Indifference/neglect		.01
F- Indifference/neglect		.04
M- Undifferentiated Rejection		.05
F- Undifferentiated Rejection		.05
M-Total Rejection		.02
F- Total Rejection		.05

Note: Warmth/Affection subscale of PARQ (Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire Short Form) measures the perceived coldness and lack of affection from parents, M (Mother), F (Father). p (Sig.2-tailed), * p < .05

Table 19. Correlations of Facebook Utilization and Identity Orientations

	Personal I.O	Social I.O	Collective I.O
Facebook Utilization	.02	.19**	.02

Note: Personal I.O (Personal Identity Orientation), Social I.O(Social Identity Orientation), Collective I.O (Collective Identity Orientation)
p (Sig.2-tailed), ** p < .01.

Research Question 3: Is there any relationship between the adolescents' Facebook utilization levels and identity orientation scores that are affected by their perceived parental acceptance and rejection?

It is important to note that independent-samples t-tests were conducted separately for personal, social and collective identity orientations to understand whether there were differences in the identity orientations of adolescents based on gender. Among three identity orientations, only personal identity orientation showed a significant difference between females ($M = 42.10, SD = 4.90$) and males ($M = 40.39, SD = 5.34$); $t(498) = 3.73, p < .00$; with females having slightly higher personal identity orientation scores than males. Since computing more analyses on this data would be sacrificing the validity of the results, it was chosen to compute the results on personal identity orientation for the total population.

A three step hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to answer the third research question. In the regression tables, regression coefficients (b), their t statistics, R² change, and F change after each step of the regression were summarized. The measure of the contribution of each variable to the model was given by standardized Beta coefficients. A large value indicates that a unit change in this variable has a large effect on the dependent variable.

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with personal identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. The warmth/affection perceptions (it refers to perceived coldness and lack of affection) from mother (and father) were entered at stage two, and then the warmth /affection for mother (and father) x Facebook utilization were entered at stage three.

Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 20.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization,
Warmth/Affection Perception from Mother and Warmth/Affection x Facebook
Utilization, Predicting Personal Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $[F(1,498) = .09, p > .05]$, meaning that it did not account for variation in personal identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' non-warmth perception from mother contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 4% of variation in personal identity orientation, $[F(2,498) = 11.37, p < .01]$. Nevertheless, introducing non-warmth perception from mother x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, $[F(3,498) = 8.45, p > .05]$.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization,
Warmth/Affection Perception from Father and Warmth/Affection x Facebook
Utilization, Predicting Personal Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook Utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $[F(1,499) = .10, p > .05]$, meaning that it did not account for variation in personal identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' non-warmth perceptions from father contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 3.5% of variation in personal identity orientation, $[F(2,499) = 8.64, p < .01]$. Nevertheless, introducing non-warmth perception from father x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, $[F(3,499) = 5.75, p > .05]$.

Table 20. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Warmth/Affection Perception from Mother (Father) and Warmth/Affection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Personal Identity Orientation (N = 499 for Mother & 500 for Father)

Variable	Mother*****					Father*****				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.00	.00				.00	.00
Facebook Utilization	.00	.02	.01			.00	.02	.01		
Step 2				.04	.04**				.03	.03**
Facebook Utilization	.00	.02	.01			.00	.02	.01		
Warmth/Affection	-.27	.05	-.20**			-.17	.04	-.18**		
Step 3				.04	.00				.03	.00
Facebook Utilization	.13	.08	.24			.01	.06	.02		
Warmth/Affection	-.27	.05	-.21**			-.17	.04	-.18**		
Warmth/Affection x Facebook Utilization	-.00	.00	-.24			.00	.00	-.01		

Note: Mother***** (Perceived coldness and lack of affection of the adolescents from Mother), Father***** (Perceived coldness and lack of affection of the adolescents from Father), p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < .01

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with social identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. The warmth/affection perception (it refers to perceived coldness and lack of affection) from mother (and father) were entered at stage two, and then the warmth /affection for mother (and father) x Facebook utilization were entered at stage three. Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 21.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization,
Warmth/Affection Perception from Mother and Warmth/Affection x Facebook
Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization contributed significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,498) = 17.79, p < .01$], meaning that it accounted for 3.5% variation in social identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' non-warmth perception from mother did not contribute significantly to the regression model [$F(2,498) = 8.90, p > .05$]; as well as introducing non-warmth perception from mother x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [$F(3,498) = 6.56, p > .05$].

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization,
Warmth/Affection Perception from Father and Warmth/Affection x Facebook
Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization contributed significantly to the regression model, $[F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01]$, meaning that it accounted for 3.5% variation in social identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' non-warmth perception from father did not contribute significantly to the regression model $[F(2,499) = 9.45, p > .05]$; as well as introducing non-warmth perception from father x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, $[F(3,499) = 6.81, p > .05]$.

Table 21. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Warmth/Affection Perception from Mother (Father) and Warmth/Affection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation (N = 499 for Mother & 500 for Father)

Variable	Mother*****					Father*****				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.03	.03**				.03	.03**
Facebook Utilization	.09	.02	.18**			.09	.02	.18**		
Step 2				.03	.00				.03	.00
Facebook Utilization	.09	.02	.18**			.09	.02	.18**		
Warmth/Affection	-.01	.05	-.01			.04	.04	.04		
Step 3				.03	.00				.04	.00
Facebook Utilization	-.00	.08	-.01**			.16	.06	.31**		
Warmth/Affection	-.01	.05	-.01			.04	.04	.04		
Warmth/Affection x Facebook Utilization	.00	.00	.21			-.00	.00	-.14		

Note: Mother***** (Perceived coldness and lack of affection of the adolescents from Mother), Father***** (Perceived coldness and lack of affection of the adolescents from Father), p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < .01

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with collective identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. The warmth/affection perception (it refers to perceived coldness and lack of affection) from mother (and father) were entered at stage two, and then the warmth /affection for mother (and father) x Facebook utilization were entered at stage three. Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 22.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization,
Warmth/Affection Perception from Mother and Warmth/Affection x Facebook
Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,498) = .31, p > .05$], meaning that it did not account for variation in collective identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' non-warmth perception from mother contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 2% of variation in collective identity orientation, [$F(2,498) = 6.94, p < .01$]. Nevertheless, introducing non-warmth perception from mother x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [$F(3,498) = 4.63, p > .05$].

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization,
Warmth/Affection Perception from Father and Warmth/Affection x Facebook
Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $[F(1,499) = .30, p > .05]$, meaning that it did not account for variation in collective identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' non-warmth perception from father contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 3% of variation in collective identity orientation, $[F(2,499) = 9.59, p < .01]$. Nevertheless, introducing non-warmth perception from father x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, $[F(3,499) = 7.07, p > .05]$.

Table 22. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Warmth/Affection Perception from Mother and Warmth/Affection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation (N = 499 for Mother) (N = 500 for Father)

Variable	Mother*****					Father*****				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.01	.01				.00	.00
Facebook Utilization	.01	.02	.02			.01	.02	.02		
Step 2				.02	.02**				.03	.03**
Facebook Utilization	.01	.02	.02			.01	.02	.02		
Warmth/Affection	-.23	.06	-.16**			-.19	.04	-.19**		
Step 3				.02	.00				.04	.00
Facebook Utilization	.00	.08	.00			.10	.06	.18		
Warmth/Affection	-.23	.06	-.16**			-.19	.04	-.18**		
Warmth/Affection x Facebook Utilization	-.00	.00	.02			-.00	.00	-.16		

Note: Mother***** (Perceived coldness and lack of affection of the adolescents from Mother), Father***** (Perceived coldness and lack of affection of the adolescents from Father) p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < .01

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with social identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. The indifference/neglect perceptions from mother (and father) were entered at stage two, and then the indifference/neglect for mother (and father) x Facebook utilization was entered at stage three. Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 23.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization,
Indifference/Neglect Perception from Mother and Indifference/Neglect x Facebook
Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization contributed significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01$], meaning that it accounted for 3.5% variation in social identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' indifference/neglect perception from mother did not contribute significantly to the regression model [$F(2,499) = 9.58, p > .05$]; as well as introducing indifference/neglect perception from mother x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [$F(3,499) = 6.79, p > .05$].

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization,
Indifference/Neglect Perception from Father and Indifference/Neglect x Facebook
Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization contributed significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01$], meaning that it accounted for 3.5% variation in social identity orientation. Unlike the participants' indifference/neglect perception from mother, introducing that perception from father contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 1% of variation in social identity orientation, [$F(2,499) = 12.11, p < .01$]. Nevertheless, introducing indifference/neglect perception from father x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [$F(3,499) = 8.40, p > .05$].

Table 23. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Indifference/Neglect Perception from Mother (Father) and Indifference/Neglect x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation (N = 500 for Mother & Father)

Variable	Mother*****					Father*****				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.03	.03**				.03	.03**
Facebook Utilization	.09	.02	.18**			.09	.02	.18**		
Step 2				.03	.00				.04	.01**
Facebook Utilization	.09	.02	.18**			.09	.02	.18**		
Indifference/Neglect	.11	.10	.05			.17	.07	.10**		
Step 3				.03	.00				.04	.00
Facebook Utilization	.20	.09	.38**			.15	.06	.29**		
Indifference/Neglect	.11	.10	.05			.17	.07	.10**		
Indifference/Neglect x Facebook Utilization	-.01	.01	-.20			-.00	.00	-.12		

Note: Mother***** (Indifference/Neglect perception of adolescent from Mother), Father***** (Indifference/Neglect perception of adolescent from Father) p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < 01

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with collective identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. The indifference/neglect perceptions from mother (and father) were entered at stage two, and then the indifference/neglect for mother (and father) x Facebook utilization was entered at stage three. Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 24.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization,
Indifference/Neglect Perception from Mother and Indifference/Neglect x Facebook
Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,499) = .30, p > .05$], meaning that it did not account for variation in collective identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' indifference/neglect perception from mother contributed significantly to the regression model and explained almost 1% of variation in collective identity orientation, [$F(2,499) = 2.44, p < .05$]. Nevertheless, introducing indifference/neglect perception from mother x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [$F(3,499) = 2.55, p > .05$].

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization,
Indifference/Neglect Perception from Father and Indifference/Neglect x Facebook
Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $[F(1,499) = .30, p > .05]$, meaning that it did not account for variation in collective identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' indifference/neglect perception from father contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 1% of variation in collective identity orientation, $[F(2,499) = 3.60, p < .01]$. Nevertheless, introducing indifference/neglect perception from father x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, $[F(3,499) = 2.55, p > .05]$.

Table 24. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Indifference/Neglect Perception from Mother (Father) and Indifference/Neglect x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation (N = 500 for Mother & Father)

Variable	Mother*****					Father*****				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.00	.00				.01	.01
Facebook Utilization	.01	.02	.02			.01	.02	.02		
Step 2				.01	.00*				.01	.01**
Facebook Utilization	.01	.02	.02			.01	.02	.03		
Indifference/Neglect	-.24	.11	-.09*			-.20	.07	-.11**		
Step 3				.01	.00				.01	.00
Facebook Utilization	-.15	.10	-.27			.06	.07	.10		
Indifference/Neglect	-.24	.11	-.09*			-.20	.07	-.11**		
Indifference/Neglect x Facebook Utilization	-.02	.01	.30			-.00	.00	-.08		

Note: Mother***** (Indifference/Neglect perception of adolescent from Mother), Father***** (Indifference/Neglect perception of adolescent from Father), p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < 01

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with social identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. The hostility/aggression perceptions from mother (and father) were entered at stage two, and then the hostility/aggression for mother (and father) x Facebook utilization was at stage three. Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 25.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, the
Hostility/Aggression Perception from Mother and the Hostility/Aggression x
Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization contributed significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01$], meaning that it accounted for 3.5 % variation in social identity orientation. In addition, introducing the participants' the hostility/aggression perception from mother contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 1% of variation in social identity orientation, [$F(2,499) = 11.82, p < .05$]. Nevertheless, introducing the hostility/aggression perception from mother x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [$F(3,499) = 8.03, p > .05$].

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, the
Hostility/Aggression Perception from Father and the Hostility/Aggression x
Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization contributed significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01$], meaning that it accounted for 3.5 % variation in social identity orientation. In addition, introducing the participants' the hostility/aggression perception from father contributed significantly to the regression model and explained almost 1% of variation in social identity orientation, [$F(2,499) = 11.31, p < .05$]. Nevertheless, introducing the hostility/aggression perception from father x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [$F(3,499) = 8.09, p > .05$].

Table 25. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Hostility/Aggression Perception from Mother (Father) and Hostility/Aggression x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation (N = 500 for Mother & Father)

Variable	Mother*****			Father*****						
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2
Step 1				.03.	.03**				.03.	.03**
Facebook Utilization	.09	.02	.18**			.09	.02	.18**		
Step 2				.04	.01**				.04	.00*
Facebook Utilization	.09	.02	.18**			.09	.02	.17**		
Hostility/Aggression	.23	.10	.10**			.18	.08	.09*		
Step 3				.04	.00				.04	.00
Facebook Utilization	.03	.09	.06**			.17	.06	.32**		
Hostility/Aggression	.24	.10	.10**			.19	.08	.10*		
Hostility/Aggression x Facebook Utilization	.00	.01	.12			-.00	.00	-.15		

Note: Mother***** (Hostility/Aggression perception of adolescent from Mother), Father***** (Hostility/Aggression perception of adolescent from Father) p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < .01

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with social identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. The undifferentiated-rejection perceptions from mother (and father) were entered at stage two, and then the undifferentiated-rejection for mother (and father) x Facebook utilization was entered at stage three. Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 26.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, the Undifferentiated-Rejection Perception from Mother and the Undifferentiated-Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization contributed significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01$], accounted for 3.5 % variation in social identity orientation. In addition, introducing the participants' the undifferentiated-rejection perception from mother contributed significantly to the regression model and explained almost 1% of variation in social identity orientation, [$F(2,499) = 11.05, p < .05$]. Nevertheless, introducing the undifferentiated-rejection perception from mother x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [$F(3,499) = 7.71, p > .05$].

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, the Undifferentiated-Rejection Perception from Father and the Undifferentiated-Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization contributed significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01$], meaning that it accounted for 3.5 % variation in social identity orientation. In addition, introducing the participants' the undifferentiated-rejection perception from father contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 1% of variation in social identity orientation, [$F(2,499) = 12.59, p < .05$]. Nevertheless, introducing the undifferentiated-rejection perception from mother x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [$F(3,499) = 9.38, p > .05$].

Table 26. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Undifferentiated –Rejection Perception from Mother (Father) and Undifferentiated –Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation (N = 500 for Mother & Father)

Variable	Mother*****					Father*****				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.03	.03**				.03	.03**
Facebook Utilization	.09	.02	.18**			.09	.02	.18**		
Step 2				.04	.00*				.04	.01**
Facebook Utilization	.09	.02	.18**			.09	.02	.18**		
Undifferentiated –Rejection	.35	.17	.08*			.37	.14	.11**		
Step 3				.04	.00				.05	.04
Facebook Utilization	.01	.08	.02**			.20	.06	.38**		
Undifferentiated –Rejection	.35	.17	.08*			.36	.14	.11**		
Undifferentiated –Rejection x Facebook Utilization	.01	.01	.16			-.02	.01	-.21		

Note: Mother***** (Undifferentiated –Rejection perception of adolescent from Mother), Father***** (Undifferentiated –Rejection perception of adolescent from Father) p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < .01

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with collective identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. The undifferentiated rejection perceptions from mother (and father) were entered at stage two, and then the undifferentiated rejection for mother (and father) x Facebook utilization was entered at stage three. Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 27.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, the Undifferentiated-Rejection Perception from Mother and the Undifferentiated-Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $[F(1,499) = .30, p > .05]$. Nevertheless, introducing the participants' the undifferentiated rejection perception from mother contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 1% of variation in collective identity orientation, $[F(2,499) = 2.61, p < .05]$. On the other hand, introducing the undifferentiated rejection perception from mother x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, $[F(3,499) = 2.36, p > .05]$.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, the Undifferentiated-Rejection Perception from Father and the Undifferentiated-Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $[F(1,499) = .30, p > .05]$.

Nevertheless, introducing the participants' the undifferentiated rejection perception from father contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 1.4 % of variation in collective identity orientation, $[F(2,499) = 3.73, p < .01]$. On the other hand, introducing the undifferentiated rejection perception from father x Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, $[F(3,499) = 2.49, p > .05]$.

Table 27. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Undifferentiated –Rejection Perception from Mother (Father) and Undifferentiated –Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation (N = 500 for Mother & Father)

Variable	Mother*****					Father*****				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.00	.00				.00	.00
Facebook Utilization	.01	.02	.02			.01	.02	.02		
Step 2				.01	.01*				.01	.01**
Facebook Utilization	.01	.02	.02			.01	.02	.03		
Undifferentiated –Rejection	-.42	.19	-.09*			-.41	.15	-.11**		
Step 3				.01	.00				.01	.00
Facebook Utilization	-.10	.09	-.19			.00	.07	.00		
Undifferentiated –Rejection	-.42	.19	-.09			-.41	.15	-.11		
Undifferentiated –Rejection x Facebook Utilization	.02	.01	.22			.02	.01	.02		

Note: Mother***** (Undifferentiated –Rejection perception of adolescent from Mother), Father***** (Undifferentiated –Rejection perception of adolescent from Father)
p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < 01

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with personal identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. Perceived total rejections from mother (father) were entered at stage two, and then perceived total rejections from mother (father) x Facebook utilization were entered at stage three. Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 28.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Mother and Perceived Total Rejection from Mother x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Personal Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,498) = .10, p > .05$], meaning that it did not account for variation in personal identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' perceived total rejection from mother contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 2 % variation in personal identity orientation, [$F(2,498) = 3.65, p < .01$]. Introducing perceived total rejection from mother x Facebook Utilization contributed significantly to the regression model overall and explained almost 1% variation in personal identity orientation, [$F(3,498) = 3.79, p < .05$].

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Father and Perceived Total Rejection from Father x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Personal Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $[F(1,499) = .11, p > .05]$, meaning that it did not account for variation in personal identity orientation.

However, introducing the participants' perceived total rejection from father contributed significantly to the regression model and explained almost 1 % variation in personal identity orientation, $[F(2,499) = 3.43, p < .01]$. Nevertheless, introducing perceived total rejection from father x Facebook Utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, $[F(3,499) = 2.30, p > .05]$.

Table 28. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Mother (Father) and Perceived Total Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Personal Identity Orientation (N = 499 for Mother and 500 for Father)

Variable	Mother*****					Father*****				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.00	.00				.00	.00
Facebook Utilization	.01	.02	.01			.01	.02	.02		
Step 2				.02	.02**				.01	.01**
Facebook Utilization	.01	.02	.01			.01	.02	.02		
Total Rejection	-.08	.03	-.20**			-.06	.02	-.12**		
Step 3				.02	.00*				.01	.00
Facebook Utilization	.23	.11	.24			-.00	.07	-.01		
Total Rejection	-.08	.03	-.21**			-.06	.02	-.12**		
Total Rejection x Facebook Utilization	-.01	.00	-.24*			.00	.00	.03		

Note: Mother***** (Perceived total rejection of the adolescents from Mother), Father***** (Perceived total rejection of the adolescents from Father) p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < 0

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with social identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. Perceived total rejections from mother (father) were entered at stage two, and then perceived total rejections from mother (father) x Facebook utilization were entered at stage three. Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 29.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Mother and Perceived Total Rejection from Mother x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one Facebook utilization contributed significantly to the regression model, [$F(1,498) = 17.79, p < .01$], meaning that it contributed significantly to the regression model and explained almost 4 % variation in social identity orientation. However, introducing the participants' perceived total rejection from mother did not contribute significantly to the regression model, [$F(2,498) = 9.68, p > .05$]. Introducing perceived total rejection from mother x Facebook Utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall as well, [$F(3,498) = 6.68, p > .05$].

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Father and Perceived Total Rejection from Father x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one Facebook utilization contributed significantly to the regression model and explained almost 4 % variation in social identity orientation [$F(1,499) = 17.87, p < .01$]. Introducing the participants' perceived total rejection from father contributed significantly to the regression model and explained almost 1 % variation in social identity orientation, [$F(2,499) = 11.45, p < .05$]. Nevertheless, introducing perceived total rejection from father x Facebook Utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [$F(3,499) = 8.37, p > .05$].

Table 29. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Mother (Father) and Perceived Total Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Social Identity Orientation (N = 499 for Mother and 500 for Father)

Variable	Mother*****					Father*****				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.04	.04**				.04	.04**
Facebook Utilization	.10	.02	.19**			.10	.02	.19**		
Step 2				.04	.00				.04	.00*
Facebook Utilization	.10	.02	.19**			.10	.02	.18**		
Total Rejection	.04	.03	.06			.05	.02	.10*		
Step 3				.04	.00				.05	.01
Facebook Utilization	.01	.11	.24			.19	.07	.37**		
Total Rejection	.04	.03	.21			.05	.02	.10*		
Total Rejection x Facebook Utilization	.00	.00	.16			-.00	.00	-.20		

Note: Mother***** (Perceived total rejection of the adolescents from Mother), Father***** (Perceived total rejection of the adolescents from Father) p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < 0

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with collective identity orientation as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. Perceived total rejections from mother (father) were entered at stage two, and then perceived total rejections from mother (father) x Facebook utilization were entered at stage three. Intercorrelations between the multiple regression variables and the regression statistics are reported in Table 30.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Mother and Perceived Total Rejection from Mother x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $[F(1,498) = .27, p > .05]$. However, introducing the participants' perceived total rejection from mother contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 1 % variation in collective identity orientation, $[F(2,498) = 2.76, p < .05]$. Introducing perceived total rejection from mother x Facebook Utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, $[F(3,498) = 2, p > .05]$.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Father and Perceived Total Rejection from Father x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation

The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one Facebook utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model, [F (1,499) = .26, $p > .05$]. Introducing the participants' perceived total rejection from father contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 2 % variation in collective identity orientation, [F (2,499) = 6.15, $p < .01$]. Nevertheless, introducing perceived total rejection from father x Facebook Utilization did not contribute significantly to the regression model overall, [F (3,499) = 4.29, $p > .05$].

Table 30. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary of Facebook Utilization, Perceived Total Rejection from Mother (Father) and Perceived Total Rejection x Facebook Utilization, Predicting Collective Identity Orientation (N = 499 for Mother & 500 for Father)

Variable	Mother*****					Father*****				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.00	.00				.00	.00
Facebook Utilization	.01	.03	.02			.01	.03	.02		
Step 2				.01	.01*				.02	.02**
Facebook Utilization	.01	.03	.03			.02	.03	.03		
Total Rejection	-.08	.03	-.10*			-.08	.02	-.15**		
Step 3				.01	.00				.02	.00
Facebook Utilization	-.07	.13	-.13			-.08	.08	.13		
Total Rejection	-.07	.03	.03*			-.08	.02	-.15**		
Total Rejection x Facebook Utilization	.00	.00	.00			-.00	.00	-.10		

Note: Mother***** (Perceived total rejection of the adolescents from Mother), Father***** (Perceived total rejection of the adolescents from Father) p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < 0

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

This section involves the discussion of results of the study with respect to current literature. First of all, the descriptive results are examined by comparing the results of the previous studies, which is followed by the discussion of research questions of the study, respectively. Afterwards, general conclusion, limitations of the study and recommendation for further studies are presented.

General Discussion

This study aimed to get insight into the experiences of adolescents in Facebook and the possible impacts on their identity orientations; especially when considering the effects of the quality of parent-child relationship. By considering the aim of the study, the data collection tools of the study were administrated to a total of 500 adolescents, consisted of 238 (47.6%) females and 262 (52.4%) males with a mean age of 19.10, from ITU and Bogazici University English preparatory class students.

The scores on the four acceptance-rejection (PARQ) scales are summed to produce an overall measure of perceived acceptance-rejection ranging from a low of 32 (maximum perceived acceptance) to a high of 96 (maximum perceived rejection).

In terms of warmth/affection subscale of PARQ (it refers to perceived coldness and lack of affection), females' mean scores for mother form were 12.08; for males, the mean scores were 12.67. On the other hand, females' mean scores for

father form of warmth-affection subscale of PARQ were 13.46; and for males, the mean scores were 15.24. According to the results of hostility/aggression subscale, females' mean scores for mother form were 7.94, and it was 8.17 for males. As for the mean scores of the same subscale's father form, females' mean scores were 7.73 and it was 8.17 for males. In addition, according to the results of indifference/neglect subscale, females' mean scores for mother form were 8.19, and it was 8.25 for males. As for the mean scores of the same subscale's father form, females' mean scores were 9.52 and it was 9.84 for males. In terms of the results of undifferentiated rejection subscale, females' mean scores for mother form were 4.77, and it was 4.84 for males. As for the mean scores of the same subscale's father form, females' mean scores were 4.81 and it was 4.94 for males.

It is important to note that an independent-samples t-test was conducted to understand whether there was a difference in the perceived non-warmth from mother (father) based on gender. It was found that males ($M = 15.24, SD = 5.34$) rather than females ($M = 13.46, SD = 5.34$) perceived slightly higher non-warmth from father, $t(498) = -3.70, p < .00$. In addition, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to understand whether there was a difference in the perceived total rejection from mother (father) based on gender. It was found that males ($M = 38.19, SD = 10.57$) perceived slightly higher total rejection from father than females ($M = 35.54, SD = 10.53$), $t(498) = -2.81, p < .005$. According to the results of perceived paternal and maternal acceptance-rejection questionnaires (PARQ), the mean scores of perceived maternal rejection for females were 32.99 and for males 33.96. Here, a low score of 32 meant the maximum perceived acceptance and higher values meant more perceived rejection with the highest score of 96.

The results of the current study showed that the mean scores of the adolescents for perceived maternal and paternal acceptance were in the normal range, implying that they experienced much more maternal and paternal love than rejection. These findings were in line with the results of various parental acceptance rejection studies conducted in Turkey (Erkman & Rohner, 2006) as well as in studies conducted in different cultures (Rohner et al., 2005).

In addition, mean scores of Facebook utilization for females and males were -.66 and .60, where the minimum and maximum scores were -13.39 and 37.17, and -13.39 and 57.80, respectively. An independent-samples t-test was conducted to understand whether there was a difference in the Facebook utilization levels of adolescents based on gender. It was found that there was no significant difference in the scores for Facebook utilization between females ($M = -.66, SD = 9.11$) and males ($M = .60, SD = 610.47$); $t(498) = -1.44, p > .05$.

Furthermore, personal identity orientation subscale' mean scores for females and males were 42.10 and 40.39; social identity orientation subscale' mean scores for females and males were 21.55 and 22.13; and collective identity orientation subscale's mean scores for females and males were 26.18 and 25.53. Nevertheless, it is important to note that personal identity orientation subscale has ten items; social identity orientation subscale has seven items and collective identity orientation subscale eight items, where each item has the maximum point of five. Thus, the raw scores of each subscale were converted to percentage values in order to compare the scores of each identity orientation subscale. The average percentages of personal, social and collective identity orientations were 82%, 62% and 65%, respectively. It can be claimed from the results of the study that the mean values of personal identity orientation score were higher than collective and social identity orientations.

Independent-samples t-tests were conducted separately for personal, social and collective identity orientations to understand whether there were differences in the identity orientations of adolescents based on gender. Among three identity orientations, only personal identity orientation showed a significant difference between females ($M = 42.10, SD = 4.90$) and males ($M = 40.39, SD = 5.34$); $t(498) = 3.73, p < .00$; with females having slightly higher personal identity orientation scores than males. However, it is important to note that computing more analyses on this data would decrease the validity of the results; it was chosen to compute the results on personal identity orientation for the total population, not for females and males separately.

According to the study of Schlenker and Weigold (1990), being social and autonomous and feeling unique were associated with individuals with higher personal identity orientations. In addition, another study Wade and Brittan-Powell (2000) showed that decision-making process of the individuals with higher personal identity orientation was associated with being rationale and basing on personal motivations. On the other hand, it was indicated that individuals with higher scores in social identity orientation are more likely to behave and make decisions on the basis of group preferences and priorities, instead of individual priorities. Besides, the sense of self-esteem may increase in individuals with higher scores in collective identity orientations (Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2000).

Discussion in Relation to Research Questions

Research Question 1: What are the Facebook activities among the participants and their Facebook Utilization Purposes?

According to the results of the study, the participants have been using Facebook for about 42.75 months and spending 54.72 minutes for daily Facebook usage. Besides, they have been sharing one post daily and logging on Facebook daily about four times. It seems that the average daily Facebook usage of the participants looked similar to the case of Turkish people in general, where the average daily usage was 56 minutes (“Guncel Facebook Turkiye Istatistikleri”, 2011). In our global world, it can be claimed that the social media are very powerful tools. Facebook has changed the conventional way of how we perceive the media: media are no longer merely consumed by audiences; it is almost entirely produced and distributed by participants. Now people can be entitled as the directors of their play and as Manovich (2001) claimed, they are no longer the passive agents of new media anymore; instead they are the producers of the content in networked spaces (Manovich, 2001).

In terms of the percentages of the Facebook activities of the participants, following the posts of the friends was the most frequent activity (76%), which was followed by watching videos in Facebook (48.6%), uploading pictures (41.4%), celebrating the friends’ birthdays (36.2%), playing games in Facebook (18.6%), writing post on their Facebook wall (13.6%) and organizing activities with friends (8%), respectively.

The study of Wilcox-Ugurlu (2011) indicated that people’s experiences are being used as currency in social networked environment and social media have been transforming the nature of people’s experiences. By using Facebook, she claimed that, people can check in if they are in the same direction with others without putting this intention into words (Wilcox-Ugurlu, 2011). At this point, the participants’ experiences with Facebook may be associated with seeking for authenticity and

acceptance, as well as with a wish for having direct awareness of the experiences of others around them. They prefer to express many more about their experiences in a volunteer sense, which may be meant Facebook's contribution to the increase in the "zone of conformity" of the adolescents.

In terms of percentages of Facebook utilization purposes of the participants, communicating with friends was the most frequent motivation to use Facebook (71.6%), which was followed by getting information about interesting issues (45.2%), wondering about the friends' activities (38.2%), spending pleasant time (30%) and making new friendships (5.2%), respectively. Facebook experiences of the participants were similar in some other studies. For instance, Barker (2009) found that communication with peer group members was the most important motivator for social media usage. Besides, one of the main reasons why adolescents use Facebook was the association between social adjustment to the university and adjustment among the adolescent (Yang & Brown, 2013). In addition, Davis (2012) indicated that digital media technologies' enabling the adolescents to communicate with friends was the primary motivation for the participants.

It is important to note that the participants of the study were not using Facebook with the purpose of making new friendships (5.2%). Rather, they were using it with their offline friends mostly and it can be claimed that adolescents' online communication with their existing friends has a positive relationship with their self-concept clarity levels, which was mediated by high friendship quality, as well (Davis, 2013).

In addition, communicating with friends (71.6 %) and getting information about interesting issues (45.2 %) were the most common motivators for using Facebook among the participants. It can be asserted that the preference to use

Facebook can be influenced friendship-driven or interest-driven motivations. For instance, Ito (2010) pointed out that friendship and some interests could drive the youth's social network uses. Friendship involves a powerful motivation for the youth in terms of their reputations and statuses. On the other hand, some interests may encourage them to use Facebook, too. Despite not being a friend in offline world, engagement in a particular hobby or an area of interest may draw the attention of the youth or bring a social group together in social media (Ito, 2010).

Even though Facebook enabled the adolescents to keep in touch with each other, some research underlined the importance of face-to-face communication. Ahn and Shin (2013) pointed out that face-to-face communication facilitated both avoiding the sense of social isolation and seeking the sense of connectedness, whereas the social use of media facilitated only seeking the sense of connectedness among the participants. In other words, they asserted that the social function of face-to-face communication cannot be replaced or substituted by the social use of the media (Ahn & Shin, 2013).

Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between the adolescents' paternal and maternal acceptance-rejection perceptions and their individual, social and collective identity orientations?

According to the results of the study, it was found that there was a negative correlation between female and male adolescents' perceptions of non-warmth from mothers and their personal identity orientations ($r = -.19$, $n = 237$, $p < .01$ for females and $r = -.22$, $n = 262$, $p < .01$ for males). Besides, there was a negative correlation between the female adolescents' perceptions of non-warmth from

mothers and their collective identity orientations, $r = -.21$ ($n = 237$, $p < .01$). The result may show that the increase in the perceived maternal non-warmth or disaffection may diminish the personal identity orientations of the male and female participants. What is more, lower maternal warmth and affection perception in females may diminish their collective identity orientation, too. As for the perceived non-warmth or disaffection from father, it was observed that there was a negative correlation between male adolescents' perception of non-warmth from fathers and their personal identity orientations ($r = -.22$, $n = 238$, $p < .01$), as well as a negative correlation between male and female adolescents' collective identity orientations ($r = -.20$, $n = 262$, $p < .01$ for males, $r = -.17$, $n = 238$, $p < .01$ for females).

By considering the results, it can be claimed that lower level of both personal and collective identity orientations may be associated with lower sense of self-esteem among the adolescents (Schlenker & Weigold, 1990; Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2000). In addition, according to the results of the study, there was positive correlation between male adolescents' perceptions of hostility/aggression from mothers and their social identity orientations ($r = .13$, $n = 262$, $p < .05$) and between their perceptions of hostility/aggression from mothers and their collective identity, $r = .15$ ($n = 262$, $p < .01$). There was also a positive correlation between female adolescents' perceptions of hostility/aggression from fathers and their social identity orientations, $r = .16$ ($n = 238$, $p < .01$).

Increase in the perceived hostility and aggression from parents may lead to increase in social and collective identity orientations, where the personal priorities or preferences might be sacrificed to those of social and collective groups (Tanti et al., 2011).

It can be asserted that receiving hostile and aggressive parenting during the childhood was more likely to end up with poor performance at school, lacking in the need for social skills later in life. A study conducted in Canada stated that exposing to hostile or ineffective parenting during the childhood was nine times risky to have behavioral problems (Family Conflict Resolution Services, 2003).

According to the results of the study, there was a negative correlation between female adolescents' perceptions of indifference/neglect from mothers ($r = -.15$, $n = 238$, $p < .01$) and between male adolescents' perceptions of indifference/neglect from fathers ($r = -.12$, $n = 262$, $p < .05$) and the collective identity orientations. On the other hand, there was a positive correlation between female adolescents' perceptions of indifference/neglect from fathers and their social identity orientations, $r = .14$, $n = 238$, $p < .05$.

In terms of perceived total rejection from mother, there was a negative correlation between female adolescents' perceived total rejection from mother and their collective identity orientations ($r = -.18$, $n = 237$, $p < .01$), and there was also a negative correlation between male adolescents' perceived total rejection from mother and their personal identity orientations ($r = -.13$, $n = 262$, $p < .05$). As for the case of perceived total rejection from father, there was a positive correlation between female adolescents' perceived total rejection from father and their social identity orientations ($r = .16$, $n = 238$, $p < .05$). In terms of male adolescents' perceived rejection, there were negative correlations between male adolescents' perceived total rejection from father and their personal and their collective identity orientations ($r = -.12$, $n = 262$, $p < .05$ and $r = -.17$, $n = 262$, $p < .01$, respectively).

It is important to note that perceived neglect in childhood was associated with increased risk of personality disorders, symptoms of anxiety and depression, as well as displaying suicidal and self-harming behavior in adolescence (Lipschutz et al., 1999, as cited in Watson, 2005). In terms of cognitive and social consequences, perceived neglect in childhood was related with having lower scores on intelligence and reading ability (Perez & Widom, 1994, as cited in Watson, 2005), and juvenile delinquency in adolescence (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986, as cited in Watson, 2005), respectively.

Furthermore, according to the results of the study, there was a negative correlation between perceived undifferentiated rejection of females from mother ($r = -.15$, $n = 238$, $p < .05$) and of males from fathers ($r = -.17$, $n = 262$, $p < .01$) and collective identity orientations. On the other hand, there was a positive correlation between female adolescents' perceptions of undifferentiated rejection from fathers and their social identity orientations, $r = .17$ ($n = 238$, $p < .01$).

It is important to note that perceived undifferentiated rejection from parents may contribute to the increase in social identity orientation. This could be stemming from the adolescents' way of compensating the inadequate acceptance needs. The state of protecting or enhancing the significant other, maintaining the relationship itself and the state of appraisal are important aspects for the representation of social self (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). However, Brewer (1991) indicated that an increase in social identity orientation in adolescence, because of the need for autonomy and the need for interdependence / intimacy with specific others may play a source of dilemma. Tanti et al. (2011) claimed that displaying social self, which involves "in-group similarity and in-group favoritism", was the strongest sense especially among the early-adolescents. However, it can be claimed that the sense of rejection from

parents may bring about the sacrifice of individual preferences or priorities in case of inflated social identity orientations, which, in turn, might come up with the lower self-worth or the need for others in adolescence.

Finally, correlation coefficient was computed among Facebook utilization, perceived parental acceptance and rejection and identity orientation of the participants. According to the results it was found that in terms of parental acceptance rejection subscales, only the adolescents' hostility/aggression perceptions from fathers were positively correlated with their Facebook utilization ($r = .09$, $n = 500$, $p < .05$). It can be claimed that the lack of meeting the emotional needs of the adolescents, particularly their acceptance by their caregivers may contribute to the adolescents' personality developments unfavorably, which, in turn, may evoke the feelings of anxiety, insecurity and dependence (Rohner, 2004; Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). Thus, they may use of Facebook increasingly for the compensation of their perceived hostility and aggression from parents.

On the other hand, in terms of identity orientation subscales, only the adolescents' social identity orientations were positively correlated with their Facebook utilization ($r = .19$, $n = 500$, $p < .01$). As Erikson (1980) pointed out, the adolescents want to be appearing more attractive to people around them or they look for the membership to a group of friends. Thus, they could monitor themselves in response to what others are doing or they look for the feeling of connected with friends (Erikson, 1980). Therefore, it can be claimed that adolescents' Facebook activities and usage motivations can contribute to this unique need in adolescence, which, in turn, may give rise to an increase in social identity orientations.

Research Question 3: Is there any relationship between the adolescents' Facebook utilization levels and identity orientation scores that are affected by their perceived parental acceptance and rejection?

It is important to note that independent-samples t-tests were conducted separately for personal, social and collective identity orientations to understand whether there were differences in the identity orientations of adolescents based on gender. Among three identity orientations, only personal identity orientation showed a significant difference between females ($M = 42.10$, $SD = 4.90$) and males ($M = 40.39$, $SD = 5.34$); $t(498) = 3.73$, $p < .00$; with females having slightly higher personal identity orientation scores than males. Since computing more analyses on this data would be sacrificing the validity of the results, it was chosen to compute the results on personal identity orientation for the total population.

A three step hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to answer the third research question. The measure of the contribution of each variable to the model was given by standardized beta coefficients. Three-stage hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted with personal, social and collective identity orientation, respectively, as the dependent variable. Facebook utilization was entered at stage one of the regression. The PARQ subscales for mother (and father) were entered at stage two, and then the PARQ subscales for mother (and father) x Facebook Utilization were entered at stage three.

In mother and father warmth/affection subscale, at stage one, Facebook utilization did not account for variations in personal identity orientations of adolescents [$F(1,498) = .09$, $p > .05$ for mother subscale] and [$F(1,499) = .10$, $p > .05$ for father subscale]. However, introducing the participants' non-warmth perceptions from mother and father explained 4% and 3.5% of variations in personal identity

orientations of adolescents, [F (2,498) = 11.37, $p < .01$ for mother subscale] and [F (2,499) = 8.64, $p < .01$ for father subscale], respectively. There were no interactions of the variables for mother and father subscales.

As for the variations in social identity orientations, in mother and father warmth/affection subscale, at stage one, Facebook utilization accounted for 3.5% variations in social identity orientation [F (1,498) = 17.79, $p < .01$ for mother subscale] and [F (1,499) = 17.86, $p < .01$ for father subscale], respectively. However, introducing the participants' non-warmth perception from mother and father did not explain any variation in social identity orientations [F (2,498) = 8.90, $p > .05$ for mother subscale] and [F (2,499) = 9.45, $p > .05$ for father subscale], respectively. There were no interactions of the variables for mother and father subscales.

For the variations in collective identity orientations, in mother and father warmth/affection subscale, at stage one, Facebook utilization did not account for variation in collective identity orientations [F (1,498) = .31, $p > .05$ for mother subscale] and, [F (1,499) = .30, $p > .05$ for father subscale]. However, introducing the participants' non-warmth perception from mother and father explained 2% and % 3 variations in collective identity orientation [F (2,498) = 6.94, $p < .01$ for mother subscale] and [F (2,499) = 9.59, $p < .01$ for father subscale]. There were no interactions of the variables for mother and father subscales.

For the variations in social identity orientations, in mother and father indifference/neglect subscale, at stage one, Facebook utilization accounted for 3.5% variations in social identity orientation [F (1,499) = 17.86, $p < .01$ for mother subscale] and [F (1,499) = 17.86, $p < .01$ for father subscale], respectively. However, unless introducing the participants' indifference/neglect perceptions from mother [F (2,499) = 9.58, $p > .05$], the indifference/neglect perception from father did explain 1%

of variation in social identity orientations [$F(2,499) = 12.11, p < .01$]. Nevertheless, there were no interactions of the variables for mother and father subscales.

As for the variations in collective identity orientations, in mother and father indifference/neglect subscale, at stage one, Facebook utilization did not account any variations in collective identity orientation [$F(1,499) = .30, p > .05$ for mother subscale] and [$F(1,499) = .30, p > .05$ for father subscale], respectively. However, introducing the participants' indifference/neglect perceptions from mother [$F(2,499) = 2.44, p < .05$] and father [$F(2,499) = 3.60, p < .01$] explained 1% of variations in collective identity orientations. Nevertheless, there were no interactions of the variables for mother and father subscales.

For the variations in social identity orientations, in mother and father hostility/aggression subscale, at stage one, Facebook utilization accounted for 3.5% variations in social identity orientation [$F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01$ for mother subscale] and [$F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01$ for father subscale], respectively. In addition, introducing the participants' hostility/aggression perceptions from mother [$F(2,499) = 11.82, p < .05$] and father [$F(2,499) = 11.31, p < .05$] explained 1% of variations in social identity orientations. Nevertheless, there were no interactions of the variables for mother and father subscales.

As for the variations in social identity orientations, in mother and father undifferentiated-rejection subscale, at stage one, Facebook utilization accounted for 3.5% variations in social identity orientation [$F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01$ for mother subscale] and [$F(1,499) = 17.86, p < .01$ for father subscale], respectively. In addition, introducing the participants' undifferentiated-rejection perceptions from mother [$F(2,499) = 11.05, p < .05$] and father [$F(2,499) = 12.59, p < .05$] explained

1% of variations in social identity orientations. Nevertheless, there were no interactions of the variables for mother and father subscales.

For the variations in collective identity orientations, in mother and father undifferentiated-rejection subscale, at stage one, Facebook utilization did not account any variations in collective identity orientation [$F(1,499) = .30, p > .05$ for mother subscale] and [$F(1,499) = .30, p > .05$ for father subscale], respectively. However, introducing the participants' undifferentiated-rejection perceptions from mother [$F(2,499) = 2.61, p < .05$] and father [$F(2,499) = 3.73, p < .01$] explained 1% and 1.4 % of variations in collective identity orientations, respectively. Nevertheless, there were no interactions of the variables for mother and father subscales.

For the variations in personal identity orientations, in mother and father total rejection scale, at stage two introducing the participants' perceived total rejection from mother contributed significantly to the regression model and explained 2 % variation [$F(2,498) = 3.65, p < .01$], and perceived total rejection from father explained almost 1 % variation [$F(2,499) = 3.43, p < .01$] in personal identity orientation, respectively. However, introducing perceived total rejection from mother x Facebook Utilization contributed significantly to the regression model overall and explained almost 1% variation in personal identity orientation, as well [$F(3,498) = 3.79, p < .05$].

For the variations in social identity orientations, in father total rejection scale, at stage two, introducing the participants' perceived total rejection from father explained significantly almost 1 % variation in social identity orientation, [$F(2,499) = 11.45, p < .05$].

For the variations in collective identity orientations, in mother and father total rejection scales, at stage two, introducing the participants' perceived total rejection

from mother explained significantly 1 % variation [$F(2,498) = 2.76, p < .05$], and perceived rejection from father explained 2 % variation in collective identity orientation, [$F(2,499) = 6.15, p < .01$].

By considering both the results of hierarchical regression analysis and the development of identity, it could be asserted that there are a number of factors that may play, more or less, a role in the development of identity such as childhood experiences, parents' socio-economic status, environment in general, life experiences, peer relationships, sibling relationships, society and culture, media, gender, physical appearance and religion etc. That was supported by what Erikson (1980) indicated about identity, which is a collaborative process between people and their world. That was also supported by Mc Adams (2001), as a process and a product of the co-authorship of people and their social world. Besides, Honess and Yardley (1987) indicated that adolescence is a period in which rapid and apparent physical and cognitive changes take place such as new schools, friends and responsibilities, relationships with people out of the family circle. They claimed that all those changes make adolescence a difficult time to maintain the sense of continuity in identity (Honess & Yardley, 1987). In other words, as Erikson (1980) stated, identity development in adolescence is maybe the most elusive concept during adolescence (Erikson, 1980).

It was considered that this study may underline the crucial role of parent-child relationships and their consequences in many respects. As Lewis (2008) underlined that family fulfills an important duty in terms of collective experiences and systems of shared meaning, because for the first time people open their eyes in their family and interact with their parents, especially with mothers who serve the role of

caregiver, nurturer and secure attachment base. Therefore, the relationships among family members are expected to have an influence on the very first definition of self.

In addition, receiving maternal and paternal warmth and affection could act as a buffer, which may balance the adolescents' identity development and potential dilemmas in that process. For instance, as Brewer (1991) pointed out that persons should fulfill an optimal balance level between their conflicting needs in defining the self in relation to others. Otherwise, if individuals seek social inclusion in order to avoid social isolation, this may diminish the sense of distinctiveness due to being too much similar or lessening sense of individuation (Brewer, 1991). The so-called conflicting needs may stem from the low-quality parent-child interaction, or parental rejection perception. However, it is important to note that communication technology and new social media have contributed unfavorably to the quality of the time spent together by the members of the family. As Livingstone (2002) indicated that social media have transformed leisure time perception at homes. The concept of "doing things as a family" has begun to get associated with "media time". Recently as people have engaged with computers, TVs or smartphones, they have passed from family spaces to more individualized spaces, which brought about the concept of "media rich- environments" (Livingstone, 2002). Nevertheless, when people keep to be provided with their parents' love, their psychological adjustments are more likely to be stronger (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002). Because it was found that positive relationships with one's parents and friends contribute positively to the adolescents' sense of self; and self-concept clarity was influenced clearly by the experience of positive mother relationships, partly as a result of the mediating role of high friendship quality (Davis, 2013).

Considering the results of Davis' study (2013), it can be stated that the quality of parental and interpersonal relationships may contribute to the development of personally meaningful and socially validated identities. Nevertheless, social media, in general, and Facebook, in specific, might play an unfavorable role in individuals' socialization and in family life. It can be claimed that people have become anxious about what they may be missing in Facebook. Besides, as indicated in a video, which was watched 8 million times in three days, people make much of self-promotion in social media but they leave out the emotions among each other. As they turn on their computers, they start to open their doors to their sense of loneliness, and not look into the eyes of their friends on the screen, but on their names. Thus, looking up from the phone and shutting down those displays may encourage to live the life real way; by going out the real world and giving people love, rather than 'likes' in social media ("Look up from your phone and shut down those displays", 2014).

All in all, considering 2% to 4 % contribution of adolescents' Facebook utilization in explaining their identity orientations, especially when parental warmth and affection taken into consideration, it could be concluded that the efficient use of Facebook and people' spending quality time with their parents come into prominence in the development of healthy identities and meaningful identity perceptions in adolescence.

Limitation of the Study and Recommendation for Further Research

This study involves some limitations, thus it is important to consider the limitations of the study throughout the interpretations of the results.

One limitation of this study is the selection of the participants, which based on convenience sampling method. The participants were the English Preparatory class students in the School of Foreign Languages at Istanbul Technical University and Bogazici University.

The students from these universities perform very well in national university entrance exam and they are usually considered as being industrious and well-organized and having desirable study conditions in primary, elementary and high schools. Thus, the results may not be generalizable to all English preparatory class students at universities in Turkey. In order to increase the generalizability of the results, further research is highly recommended for involving more university students from different universities in Istanbul and in other cities of Turkey.

It is also important to note that the age of the sample group was mostly ranging from 18 to 21, so that the results may not be generalizable to other age groups.

The participants of the study were living mostly with their families (38.2%), in dormitories (33.2) and with their friends (17.6 %). In this study, the variation in Facebook utilization according to the place of the residence was not investigated. Thus, further research is recommended for investigating the mediating role of the place of the residence in identity orientations and perceived parental acceptance and rejection in adolescence.

Even though females had slightly higher personal identity orientation scores than males, the analysis of gender was not computed for the purpose of not sacrificing the validity of the results. Thus, further research is recommended for investigating the identity orientations in terms of gender.

In addition, the study's data collection took place in May 2013, just before the Gezi Park protest in Taksim, which spread out throughout the country in the following days of the protests. It can be claimed that the Turkish people, especially the youth, made use of social media tools such as Facebook and Twitter in an increasing trend after the Gezi park protests. Thus, Facebook utilization of the participants would have increased if the data collection took place after June 2013. Thus, further research can be done in order to compare the Facebook utilization responses, because the generalizability of the current scores may be low, as compared to the scores to be collected after the Gezi Park Protests.

Besides, further research can also be done by investigating the Twitter utilization of the adolescents, and their identity orientations, especially by including their perceived paternal and maternal acceptance and rejection.

Implications of the Study

The current study was a preliminary study, which was descriptive-explorative in essence. Therefore, it can be claimed that this study was an important first attempt to understand the adolescents' Facebook utilization and its relationship with personal, social and collective identity orientations, especially when considering the mediating role of their perceived paternal and maternal acceptance and rejection.

This research is expected to contribute to the understanding of Facebook utilization and its relationship to meaning making process in the development of identity throughout adolescence. It is assumed to contribute to the increase in the awareness of new social media's influence, particularly Facebook, on the way people think, act and learn.

Besides, it is expected that this study will be enriching the information pool of counselors and scholars in developing necessary intervention strategies on the basis of the unconventional media logic of Facebook, because with Facebook, the media culture has evolved to a participatory sense with user generated content. Finally, this study is assumed to create awareness of the importance of the parenting practices and parent-child relationships, and all of their influence on the creation of healthy identities. Eventually, the findings of the study may contribute to promote the efficient use of Facebook among adolescents.

APPENDIX A

Demographic Information Form

Demografik Bilgi Formu

Demografik Bilgi Formu

- 1) Doğum yeriniz (il):
- 2) Ailenizin ikamet ettiği yer
(il):.....
- 3) Yaşınız:
- 4) Cinsiyetiniz: Kadın Erkek
- 5) Bölümünüz: (lütfen belirtiniz)
- 6) Nerede ikamet ediyorsunuz?
 - KYK yurdu
 - Üniversitenin yurtları
 - Özel yurt
 - Aile yanı
 - Akraba yanı
 - Arkadaşlarla evde
 - Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz)
.....
- 7) Anne ve babanız hayatta mı?
 - Anne vefat etti baba hayatta
 - Baba vefat etti anne hayatta
 - İkisi de vefat etti
 - İkisi de hayatta
 - Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz).....
- 8) Annenizin eğitim durumu nedir?
 - Okur yazar değil
 - Okur yazar
 - İlkokul (5. sınıf mezunu)
 - Ortaokul
 - Lise
 - Yüksekokul
 - Üniversite
 - Yüksek Lisans/Doktora
 - Diğer: (lütfen belirtiniz)
.....
- 9) Babanızın eğitimi durumu nedir?
 - Okur yazar değil
 - Okur yazar
 - İlkokul(5. sınıf mezunu)
 - Ortaokul
 - Lise
 - Yüksekokul
 - Üniversite
 - Yüksek Lisans/Doktora
 - Diğer: (lütfen belirtiniz)
.....

APPENDIX B

Facebook Utilization Form

Facebook Kullanım Düzeyleri Formu

Facebook Kullanım Düzeyleri Formu

Bu form gençlerin Facebook kullanım düzeylerini ölçmek amacıyla hazırlanmıştır. Soruların doğru veya yanlış cevabı yoktur. Bilgileriniz gizli tutulacaktır. Cevaplarınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

1) Facebook kullanıyor musunuz?

- Hayır. (Cevabınız hayır ise bu formu doldurmayınız, diğer sayfaya geçiniz)
- Kullanıyorum (Cevabınız evet ise lütfen 2. soruyla devam ediniz)

2) Ne kadar süredir Facebook hesabınız var?

-Yaklaşık:(yıl).....(ay)

3) Bugüne kadar Facebook hesabınızı hiç dondurdunuz mu?

- Evet dondurdum (Ne kadar süre dondurduğunuzu lütfen belirtiniz)

-Yaklaşık(yıl)(ay)

- Hayır dondurmadım

4) Son üç ayda Facebook kullanımına günde yaklaşık ne kadar zaman ayırıyorsunuz?

-Yaklaşık:(saat)(dakika)

5) Son üç ayda Facebook'ta günde yaklaşık kaç paylaşımda bulunuyorsunuz?

- Paylaşımda bulunmuyorum.
- Paylaşımda bulunuyorum (lütfen belirtiniz)

-Yaklaşık (defa)

6) Son üç ayda Facebook' a günde ortalama kaç defa giriş yapmaktasınız?

-Yaklaşık (defa)

7) Son üç ayda Facebook profil fotoğrafınızı yaklaşık kaç defa güncellediniz?

- Güncellemedim
- Güncelledim (lütfen belirtiniz)

- Yaklaşık(defa)

8) Son üç ayda Facebook' a çoğunlukla hangi kanallarla bağlanıyorsunuz?

(Sadece birini belirtiniz)

- Masaüstü (Desktop) bilgisayarla
- Mobil telefonla
- Dizüstü (Laptop)
- Tabletle

9) Facebook hesabınızda arkadaş olduğunuz kaç kişi bulunmaktadır?

-Yaklaşık (kişi)

10) Facebook'taki paylaşımlarınızı ve profilinizi kimler görebilmektedir?

- Sadece Ben Sadece arkadaşlarım Benim Belirlediklerim Herkes

11) Facebook'ta genelde hangi etkinlikleri yaparsınız?

(Birden fazla işaretleyebilirsiniz)

- Fotoğraf Yükleme
 Arkadaşlarımın paylaşımlarını izleme
 Doğum günlerini kutlama
 Kendi duvarımda fikirlerimi/hislerimi paylaşma
 Paylaşılan videoları izleme
 Etkinlik oluşturma ve/ya duyurma
 Oyun oynama
 Diğer (lütfen açıkça belirtiniz).....

12) Facebook'u genelde hangi amaçlar için kullanırsınız?

(Birden fazla işaretleyebilirsiniz)

- Arkadaşlarımla iletişim kurmak ve ilişkiyi sürdürmek için
 Keyifli zaman geçirmek için
 Yeni arkadaşlıklar kurmak için
 Arkadaşlarımın neler yaptığını merak ettiğim için
 İlğimi çeken konularda (spor, sanat vb) bilgi sahibi olmak için
 Diğer (lütfen açıkça belirtiniz).....

APPENDIX C

Parental Acceptance Rejection Perception Questionnaire –Mother Short Form

Ebeveyn Kabul Red Algısı Ölçeđi -Anne Kısa Formu

Yetişkin EKRÖ - Anne (Kısa Form)

Yönerge: Bu sayfada anne-çocuk ilişkisini içeren ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Bu ifadelerin annenizin size olan davranışlarına uygun olup olmadığını düşünün.

Her ifadeyi okuduktan sonra o ifade annenizin size karşı davranışları konusunda ne kadar doğruysa, “ Hemen hemen her zaman doğru“, “Bazen doğru“, “Nadiren doğru“ veya “Hiçbir zaman doğru değil“ şeklinde işaretleyiniz.

	ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU		ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen Her Zaman Doğru	Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
ANNEM				
Ben hiç yokmuşum gibi davranırdı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

© Rohner Research Publications, 2012
Translation and adaptation by F.Erkman, B. Yılmaz

		ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU		ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
ANNEM		Hemen			Hiçbir
		Hemen	Bazen	Nadiren	Zaman
		Her	Doğru	Doğru	Doğru
		Zaman			Değil
		Doğru			
1	Benim hakkımda güzel şeyler söylerdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	Bana hiç ilgi göstermezdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	Benim için önemli olan şeyleri anlatabilmemi kolaylaştırırdı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	Hak etmediğim zaman bile bana vururdu	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	Beni büyük bir baş belası olarak görürdü	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	Kızdığı zaman beni cezalandırırdı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	Sorularımı cevaplayamayacak kadar meşguldü.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	Benden hoşlanmıyor gibiydi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	Yaptığım şeylerle gerçekten ilgilenirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10	Bana bir sürü kırıncı şey söylerdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11	Ondan yardım istediğimde beni duymazlıktan gelirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12	Bana istenilen ve ihtiyaç duyulan biri olduğumu hissettirirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13	Bana çok ilgi gösterirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14	Beni kırmak için elinden geleni yapardı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15	Hatırlaması gerekir diye düşündüğüm önemli şeyleri unutturdu	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16	Eğer kötü davranırsam benden hoşlanmadığını hissettirirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17	Bana yaptığım şeylerin önemli olduğunu hissettirirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18	Yanlış bir şey yaptığımda beni korkutur veya tehdit ederdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

19	Benim ne düşündüğüme önem verir ve düşündüklerim hakkında konuşmamdan hoşlanırdı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20	Ne yaparsam yapayım, diğer çocukların benden daha iyi olduğunu hissederdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21	Bana istenmediğimi belli ederdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22	Beni sevdiğini belli ederdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23	Onu rahatsız etmediğim sürece benimle ilgilenmezdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24	Bana karşı yumuşak ve iyi kalpliydi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix D

Parental Acceptance Rejection Perception Questionnaire –Father Short Form

Ebeveyn Kabul Red Algısı Ölçeđi –Baba Kısa Formu

Yetişkin EKRÖ - Baba (Kısa Form)

Yönerge: Bu sayfada baba-çocuk ilişkisini içeren ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Bu ifadelerin babanızın size olan davranışlarına uygun olup olmadığını düşünün.

Her ifadeyi okuduktan sonra o ifade babanızın size karşı davranışları konusunda ne kadar doğruysa, “Hemen hemen her zaman doğru“, “Bazen doğru“, “Nadiren doğru“ veya “Hiçbir zaman doğru değil“ şeklinde işaretleyiniz.

	BABAM İÇİN DOĞRU		BABAM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
BABAM	Hemen Hemen Her Zaman Doğru	Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
Ben hiç yokmuşum gibi davranırdı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

© Rohner Research Publications, 2012

Translation and adaptation by F.Erkman, B. Yılmaz.

		BABAM İÇİN DOĞRU		BABAM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
BABAM		Hemen			Hiçbir
		Hemen			
		Her	Bazen	Nadiren	Zaman
		Zaman	Doğru	Doğru	Doğru
		Doğru			Değil
1	Benim hakkımda güzel şeyler söylerdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	Bana hiç ilgi göstermezdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	Benim için önemli olan şeyleri anlatabilmemi kolaylaştırırdı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	Hak etmediğim zaman bile bana vururdu	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	Beni büyük bir baş belası olarak görürdü	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	Kızdığı zaman beni cezalandırırdı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	Sorularımı cevaplayamayacak kadar meşguldü.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	Benden hoşlanmıyor gibiydi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	Yaptığım şeylerle gerçekten ilgilenirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10	Bana bir sürü kırıcı şey söylerdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11	Ondan yardım istediğimde beni duymazlıktan gelirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14	Ne söyleniyorsa onu aynen yapmam gerektiği konusunda ısrar ederdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12	Bana istenilen ve ihtiyaç duyulan biri olduğumu hissettirirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13	Bana çok ilgi gösterirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14	Beni kırmak için elinden geleni yapardı	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15	Hatırlaması gerekir diye düşündüğüm önemli şeyleri unuturdu	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16	Eğer kötü davranırsam benden hoşlanmadığımı hissettirirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17	Bana yaptığım şeylerin önemli olduğunu hissettirirdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18	Yanlış birşey yaptığımda beni korkutur veya tehdit ederdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19	Benim ne düşündüğüme önem verir ve düşündüklerim hakkında konuşmamdan hoşlanırdı.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20	Ne yaparsam yapayım, diğer çocukların benden daha iyi olduğunu hissederdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21	Bana istenmediğimi belli ederdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22	Beni sevdiğini belli ederdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23	Onu rahatsız etmediğim sürece benimle ilgilenmezdi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24	Bana karşı yumuşak ve iyi kalpliydi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

APPENDIX E

Identity Questionnaire

Kimlik Ölçeđi

KİMLİK ÖLÇEĞİ*

YÖNERGE: Aşağıdaki ifadeler kimliğin farklı yönlerini tanımlamaktadır. Lütfen her ifadeyi dikkatli bir şekilde okuyarak size uygunluğunu değerlendiriniz. Her ifadenin yanındaki boşluğu aşağıdaki ölçekten size uygun bir numarayı seçerek doldurunuz.

Kimlik Duygum İçin ...

Cinsiyeti: Kadın Erkek
Yaşı:

		Önemli Değil 1	Kısmen / Biraz Önemli 2	Önemli 3	Oldukça Önemli 4	Çok Önemli 5
1	Sahip olduğum şeyler, eşyalarım	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	Değerlerim ve ahlaki standartlarım (kıstaslarım)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	Başkalarına göre popüler oluşum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	Aile soyağacımın (kuşağımın) bir parçası oluşum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	Hayallerim ve düşlerim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	Söylediğim ve yaptığım şeylere başkalarının gösterdiği davranış biçimleri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	İrkim ya da etnik özgeçmişim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	Geleceğe yönelik kişisel amaçlarım ve beklentilerim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	Fiziksel görünüşüm; boyum, kilom ve bedenimin şekli	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10	Dinim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11	Heyecanlarım ve duygularım	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12	Başkalarının benim hakkımda ne düşündüğü, nasıl tanıdığım	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13	Yaşadığım ya da büyüdüğüm yerler	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14	Düşüncelerim ve görüşlerim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15	Başkalarına göre çekiciliğim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16	Yaşım, yaş grubuma ait oluşum ya da kuşağımın bir parçası oluşum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17	Korku ve kaygılarımla nasıl baş ettiğim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18	Cinsiyetim, erkek ya da kadın oluşum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19	Başkalarından farklı, kendine özgün bir kişi olduğum duygusu	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20	Sosyal sınıfım; alt, orta ya da üst ekonomik sınıflardan birine ait oluşum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21	Yaşam, dışsal birçok değişim içerse de içsel olarak özde aynı olmaya devam ettiğim bilinci	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22	Jestlerim ve bana özgü tavırlarım; başkaları üzerinde oluşturduğum izlenim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23	Toplumuma ait olma duygum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24	Kendimi tanımam / bilmem, gerçekte ne tür bir kişi olduğuma ilişkin düşüncelerim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25	Sosyal davranışım, başkalarıyla bir araya geldiğim zaman sergilediğim davranış şeklim	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26	Ülkemden gurur duyma, vatandaşı olmaktan övünç duyma	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27	Fiziksel becerilerim, atletik faaliyetlerde iyi ve koordineli oluşum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28	Kişisel öz değerlendirmem, kendimle ilgili özel görüşüm / kanım	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29	Bir spor hayranı oluşum, bir spor takımıyla özdeşleşmem	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30	Mesleki tercihlerim ve kariyer planlarım	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
31	Politik konular veya siyasi etkinliklerle ilgili kararlılığım	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32	Akademik yeti ve performansım (Aldığım notlar ve öğretmenlerimin verdiği öneriler)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
33	Dilim, örneğin aksanım ve telaffuzum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34	Üniversitede öğrenci olarak rolüm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
35	Cinsel eğilimim (Heteroseksüel, homoseksüel ya da biseksüel oluşum)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Developed by J.M. Cheek & L.R. Tropp. 2nd online edition. 2002
Translated and adapted by H. Coşkun. Abant İzzet Baysal Üni. 2004
Modified by F.Erkman, B. Börkan and H.Karabakkal. Boğaziçi Üni. 2013

Appendix F

Permission for Parental Acceptance Rejection Perception Questionnaire

Mother & Father Forms



Ronald and Nancy Rohner Center ©
for the Study of Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection

Human Development & Family Studies, Box U-1058, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT
06269-1058 USA

Limited License
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE FOR
LIMITED EDUCATIONAL, CLINICAL, AND RESEARCH PURPOSES

April 1, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

Permission is granted to Hasan Karabakkal to reproduce and use any measures purchased from Rohner Research Publications for use in a research project on the relation between Facebook utilization and the development of self in adolescents. This includes unlimited numbers of questionnaires for this purpose. Permission extends to use of electronic survey means such as SurveyMonkey. Use of the measures and scoring software[©] is restricted to this practice. Scoring and data storage is available at no cost on the Google cloud using a Gmail account. Purchaser of this license may register at <http://parscore6.appspot.com> to set up scoring and database storage.

We respectfully request that results be reported to the Rohner Center when your work is completed. Articles resulting from research will be archived in the Center and placed in the Center's online bibliography.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'R. Rohner'.

Ronald P. Rohner, Professor Emeritus
Family Studies and Anthropology
Director, Ronald and Nancy Rohner Center

CEO, ROHNER RESEARCH
255 Codfish Falls Road
Storrs, CT 06268-1425 USA
www.home.earthlink.net/~rohner_research

RPR:n

Rohner@uconn.edu PHONE (860) 486-0073 FAX (860) 486-39

Appendix G

Permission for Identity Questionnaire

Limited License
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE FOR
LIMITED EDUCATIONAL, CLINICAL AND RESEARCH PURPOSES

April 4, 2013

To Whom It May Concern

Permission is granted to **Hasan Karabakkal** to reproduce and use Identity Scale in a thesis research project on the "The Relationship between Facebook Utilization, Parental Acceptance-Rejection Perception, Gender and Development of Identity in Adolescence."

This includes unlimited numbers of questionnaires for this purpose. Permission extends to use of electronic survey means such as SurveyMonkey.

I respectfully request that results be reported to me when your work is completed.



Prof. Dr. Hamit COŞKUN
Psychology Department
Abant İzzet Baysal University

04 Nisan 2013

Sayın **Hasan KARABAKKAL**,

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümünde danışman hocanız Prof. Dr. Fatoş ERKMAN denetiminde yürütmekte olduğunuz “Ergenlik Döneminde Sosyal Medya Kullanımı, Ebeveyn Kabul – Red Algısı ve Cinsiyet ile Kimlik Gelişimi Arasındaki İlişki.” konulu tez çalışmanızda Türkçe’ye uyarlamış olduğum Kimlik Ölçeğini kullanma isteğiniz tarafıma bildirilmiştir.

Bu araştırmada kullanılmak üzere, tarafımdan adaptasyon çalışmaları yapılmış olan Kimlik Ölçeğini kullanma izin talebiniz tarafımda bulunmuştur.

Araştırma amaçlı olarak kullanmanıza izin veriyorum.

Çalışmalarınızın bitiminde, bir kopyasını bana iletmenizi rica ediyorum.

Bilgilerinize,



Prof.Dr. Hamit COŞKUN
Bölüm Başkanı
Psikoloji Bölümü
Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi
Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi

Appendix H

Bogazici University Ethics Committee Approval

BOĞAZIÇI ÜNİVERSİTESİ
İnsan Araştırmaları Kurumsal Değerlendirme Kurulu (İNAREK) Toplantı Tutanağı
2013/2

15.04.2013

Hasan Karabakkal,
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, 34342 Bebek İstanbul
hasankarabakkal@gmail.com

Sayın Araştırmacı,

"Ergenlik Döneminde Sosyal Medya Kullanımı, Ebeveyn Kabul – Red Algısı ve Cinsiyetin Kimlik Gelişimi Arasındaki İlişki" başlıklı projeniz ile yaptığımız Boğaziçi Üniversitesi İnsan Araştırmaları Kurumsal Değerlendirme Kurulu (İNAREK) 2013/33 kayıt numaralı başvuru 15.04.2013 tarihli ve 2013/2 sayılı kurul toplantısında incelenerek etik onay verilmesi uygun bulunmuştur.

Saygılarımızla,



Prof. Dr. Hande Çağlayan (Başkan)
Moleküler Biyoloji ve Genetik Bölümü,
Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi,
İstanbul

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özgür Kocatürk (üye)
Biyo-Medikal Mühendisliği Enstitüsü
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi,
İstanbul



Prof. Dr. Betül Baykan-Baykal (üye)
Nöroloji Bölümü, İstanbul Tıp Fakültesi,
İstanbul Üniversitesi
İstanbul



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özlem Hesapçı (üye)
İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi,
İşletme Bölümü, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi,
İstanbul



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ekin Eremsoy (üye)
Psikoloji Bölümü, Doğu Üniversitesi,
İstanbul



Appendix I
Informed Consent Form
Bilgilendirilmiş Onam Formu

Bilgilendirilmiş Onam Formu

Bu araştırma, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Psikolojik Danışmanlık ve Rehberlik Bölümü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Hasan KARABAKKAL'ın Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü öğretim üyesi Prof. Dr. Fatoş ERKMAN'ın danışmanlığında yürüttüğü Yüksek Lisans tez çalışmasıdır.

Bu çalışma ergenlik döneminde sosyal medya kullanımı (Facebook kullanımı), ebeveyn kabul-ret algısı ve kimlik oryantasyonu arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaktadır. Kimlik gelişimi, kişilik gelişiminin temel noktalarından birisidir ve her bir birey için özgündür. Ergenlik dönemi kimlik gelişimi açısından kritik bir dönemdir. Bu dönemde, kimlik gelişimin temel özellikleri göz önüne alındığında sosyal medya kullanımının (Facebook kullanımının) kimlik gelişimi sürecine etkisinin olabileceği düşünülmektedir. Bunun yanında, ebeveyn kabul-ret algısının tüm bu süreçlerle birlikte kimlik gelişimiyle ilişkili olduğu bilinmektedir. Dolayısıyla araştırmamızın, ergenlik döneminde sosyal medya kullanım düzeyi ve kimlik oryantasyonu arasındaki ilişki konusunda önemli bilgiler sağlaması hedeflenmektedir.

Çalışmaya destek vermeye gönüllü olacak değerli katılımcıların doldurmalarını istediğimiz dört adet form bulunmaktadır. Bunlar:

- Demografik Bilgi Formu
- Facebook Kullanım Düzeyleri Formu
- Ebeveyn Kabul Ret Algısı Ölçeği -Anne Formu
- Ebeveyn Kabul Ret Algısı Ölçeği -Baba Formu
- Kimlik Ölçeği

Yaklaşık 30 dakikada tamamlanabilecek bu form ve anketlere kimlik bilgisi yazılmayacağından, kimliğiniz gizli kalacaktır.

Bu çalışmaya dolduracağınız anketlerle katkı sağlamak istiyorsanız, aşağıda bulunan “Bu formu okudum ve araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum” yazısının altını lütfen imzalayın. Dilerseniz bu formun bir kopyasını saklayabilirsiniz.

Ayırdığınız zaman ve katkınız için teşekkür ederiz.

BU FORMU OKUDUM VE ARAŞTIRMAYA KATILMAYI KABUL EDİYORUM.

Katılımcının adı:

İmzası:

Tarih:

REFERENCES

- About Facebook: Mission.* (2014). Retrieved on May 14, 2014 from <https://www.facebook.com/facebook/info>
- Ahn, D. & Shin, D.H. (2013). Is the social use of media for seeking connectedness or for avoiding social isolation? Mechanisms underlying media use and subjective well-being. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, 2453–2462.
- Annotated SPSS Output Principal Component Analysis.* (n.d.). Retrieved on May 14, 2014, from http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/spss/output/principal_components.htm
- Barker, V. (2009). Older Adolescents' Motivations for Social Network Site Use: The Influence of Gender, Group Identity, and Collective Self-Esteem. *Cyber Psychology & Behavior*, 12 (2), 209.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-95.
- Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self-representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 83-93.
- Brewer, M.B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 475-482.
- Buckingham, D. (2008). *Youth, identity and digital media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cheek, J. M. (1982). Aggregation, moderator variables, and the validity of personality tests: A peer-rating study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 1254-1269.
- Cheek, J. M., & Briggs, S. R. (1982). Self-consciousness and aspects of identity. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 16, 401-408.
- Company Info. Statistics.* (2014) Retrieved on May 14, 2014 from <http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/>
- Coşkun, H. (2000). *The effects of out-group comparison, social context, intrinsic motivation, and collective identity in brainstorming groups* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Texas at Arlington, US.
- Coşkun, H. (2004). A Study of the Validity and Reliability of the Identity Questionnaire in a Turkish Sample. *Turkish Psychological Articles*, 7 (14), 49-60.

- Davis, K. (2012). Friendship 2.0: Adolescents' experiences of belonging and self-disclosure online. *Journal of Adolescence* 35, 1527–1536.
- Davis, K. (2013). Young people's digital lives: The impact of interpersonal relationships and digital media use on adolescents' sense of identity. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, 2281–2293.
- Demo, D. H., Small, S. A., & Savin-Williams, R. C. (1987). Family relations and the self-esteem of adolescents and their parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 705-715.
- Erdem, T. & Erkman, F. (1990, November). *The validity and reliability of the Turkish form of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire*. Paper presented at the 8th International Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect. Hamburg, Germany.
- Erikson, E.H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E.H. (1980): *Identity and the Life Cycle*. New York: W.H. Norton and Co.
- Erkman, F. (2003). *Turkish children's perception of parental warmth, corporal punishment and psychological adjustment*. Paper presented at the SCCR 32nd Annual Meeting, Charleston South Carolina.
- Erkman, F., & Rohner, R. P. (2006). Youths' perceptions of corporal punishment, parental acceptance, and psychological adjustment in a Turkish metropolis. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 40(3), 250-267.
- Etzioni, A. (1968). *The active society*. New York: Press Press.
- Facebook'ta Avrupa Lideriyiz* (2012). Retrieved on December 12, 2012 from <http://www.sabah.com.tr/Teknoloji/Haber/2012/01/27/facebookta-avrupa-lideriyiz>
- Family Conflict Resolution Services. (2003). *Understanding and Effectively Dealing with Hostile Aggressive Parenting*. Retrieved on May 30, 2014 from <http://www.fact.on.ca/Info/pas/hap200311.pdf>
- Guncel Facebook Turkiye Istatistikleri*. (2011). Retrieved on May 14, 2014 from <https://www.facebook.com/notes/promoqube/g%C3%BCncel-facebook-t%C3%BCrkiye-istatistikleri/230108337030128>
- Honess, T., & Yardley, K. (1987). *Self and identity: Perspectives across the lifespan*. New York; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ito, M. (Ed.). (2010). *Hanging out, messing around, and geeking out: Kids living and learning with new media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Jenkins, H. (2009). *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Retrieved on May 14, 2014 from http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/free_download/9780262513623_Confronting_the_Challenges.pdf
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2007). *Family, self, and human development across cultures: theory and applications*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates, 2007.
- Kaytmaz, Y. (2014, February 14). "Facebook Türkiye rakamlarını açıkladı". (Online news) Retrieved on May 14, 2014 from <http://www.campaigntr.com/2014/02/20/68209/facebook-turkiye-rakamlarini-acikladi/>
- Khaleque, A., & Rohner, R. P. (2002). Perceived parental acceptance– rejection and psychological adjustment: A meta-analysis of cross-cultural and intracultural studies. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 54–64.
- Khaleque, A., & Rohner, R. P. (2002a). Reliability of measures assessing the relation between perceived parental acceptance-rejection and psychological adjustment: Meta-analysis of cross-cultural and intracultural studies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33, 87-99.
- Lenhart, A., & Madden, M. (2005). *Teen content creators and consumers: More than half of online teens have created content for the Internet; and most teen downloaders think that getting free music files is easy to do*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project.) Retrieved on May 14, 2014 from: <http://www.pewinternet.org/2005/11/02/teen-content-creators-and-consumers/>
- Lewis, J. (2008). *Cultural Studies the Basics* (2nd Ed.). London, Sage Publication.
- Livingstone, S. (2002). *Young people and new media: Childhood and the changing media environment*. London; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Look up from your phone and shut down those displays*. (2014). Retrieved on June 10, 2014 from <https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?v=10154158097035106&set=vb.235465410105&type=2&theater>
- Manovich, L. (2001). *The language of new media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- McAdams, D. P. (2001). The psychology of life stories. *Review of General Psychology*, 5, 100–122.
- Michener, H. A., DeLamater, J.D. & Myers, D.J. (2004). *Social Psychology* (5th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.

- Nierhoff, M.H. (2013). "Facebook Country Statistics May 2013 – Rough Estimates Or Something?" (Online blog message). Retrieved on May 14, 2014 from: <http://www.quintly.com/blog/2013/05/facebook-country-statistics-may-2013/>
- Onorato, R.S & Turner, J.C. (2004) Fluidity in the self-concept: the shift from personal to social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 257–278.
- Pepitone, J. (2010). "Facebook traffic tops Google for the week". Retrieved on March 13, 2014 from: <http://bit.ly/bIpAID>
- Prensky, M. (2001). *Digital natives, digital immigrants*. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6.
- Rohner, R. P. (1975). *Parental acceptance-rejection and personality development: A universalist approach to behavioral science*. In R. W. Brislin, S. Bochner, & W. & W.
- Rohner, R. P., & Rohner, E. C. (1981). Parental acceptance- rejection and parental control: Crosscultural codes. *Ethnology*, 20, 245-260.
- Rohner, R. P. (1986). *The warmth dimension: Foundations of parental acceptance-rejection theory*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rohner, R. P. (1991). *Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection*. Storrs: University of Connecticut.
- Rohner, R. P. (2004). The parental "acceptance-rejection syndrome": Universal correlates of perceived rejection. *American Psychologist*, 59, 827-840.
- Rohner, R. P. (2005). *Parental acceptance-rejection theory*. In V. L. Bengston, A. C. Acock, K. R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory & research* (pp. 370- 372). Sage Publications Inc.
- Rohner, R. P., & Cournoyer, D. E. (1994). *Universals in youths' perceptions of parental acceptance and rejection: Evidence from factor analyses within eight sociocultural groups worldwide*. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 28, 371–383.
- Rohner, R.P., & Khaleque, A. (2005). *Handbook for the Study of Parental Acceptance and Rejection (4th Ed.)*. CT, USA: Rohner Research Publications.
- Rohner, R. P., Khaleque, A., & Cournoyer, D. E. (2003). Cross-national perspectives on parental acceptance-rejection theory. *Marriage and Family Review*, 35, 85-105.
- Rohner, R. P., Khaleque, A., & Cournoyer, D. E. (2005). *Parental acceptance rejection theory, methods, evidence, and implications*. *Ethos*, 33, 299-334.

- Sampson, E. E. (1978). Personality and the location of identity. *Journal of Personality, 46*, 552-568.
- Schlenker, B. R. & Weigold, M. F. (1990). Self-consciousness and self-presentation: Being autonomous versus appearing autonomous. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 820-828.
- Sedikides, C. & Brewer, M.B. (2002). *Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self*. Psychology Press; New Ed edition.
- Sengupta, S. (2012, May 14). "Facebook's Prospects May Rest on Trove of Data". The New York Times. Retrieved May 15, 2014 from: http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/technology/facebook-needs-to-turn-data-trove-into-investor-gold.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Smeeke, A. & Verkuyten, M. (2013). Collective self-continuity, group identification and in-group defense. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 49*, 984-994.
- Snyder, C. R., & Fromkin, H. L. (1980). *Uniqueness: The human pursuit of difference*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Tanti, C., Stukas, A.A., Halloran, M.J. & Foddy, M. (2011). Social identity change: Shifts in social identity during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence, 34*, 555-567.
- Tarrant, M., North, A.C., Edridge, M.D., Kirk, L.E, Smith, E.A., Turner, R.E. (2001). Social identity in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence, 24*, 597-609.
- The top 500 sites on the web*. (2014). Retrieved on May 14, 2014 from <http://www.alexa.com/topsites>
- Turner, J. C., Brown, R. J. and Tajfel, H. (1979). Social comparison and group interest in ingroup favouritism. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 9*, 187-204.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M., Oakes, P., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Varan, A. (2001). *Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ), Turkish form*. Unpublished manuscript, Ege University, Izmir, Turkey.
- Wade, J. C. & Brittan-Powell, C. (2000). Male reference group identity dependence: support for construct validity. *Sex Roles, 43*(5/6), 323-340.

- Watson, J. (2005). Child Neglect. Literature Review. Retrieved on May 30, 2014, from NSW Department of Community Services, Centre for Parenting & Research, Ashfield, Australia. Website:
http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/docswr/_assets/main/documents/research_child_neglect.pdf
- Wilcox-Ugurlu, C.C. (2011). *Social Media, Existence, Identity and Experiential Consumption* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation & Theses: Full Text (UMI Number : 3454990).
- Yang, C., & Brown, B. (2013). Motives for Using Facebook, Patterns of Facebook Activities, and Late Adolescents' Social Adjustment to College. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 42, 3, 403.
- Yılmaz, B. & Erkman, F. (2008) Understanding Social Anxiety Through Adolescents' Perceptions of Interparental Conflict and Parental Rejection. In F. Erkman (ed.), *Acceptance: The essence of peace* (67-96). Istanbul: Turkish Psychological Association.
- Zemmels, D.R. (2011). *Youth and new media: constructing meaning and identity in networked spaces*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from UMI Dissertation Publishing. (UMI Number: 3466453).