

A COMPARISON OF PARENTAL AND TEACHER  
PERCEPTIONS OF CHILDREN'S ACTION  
IN RELATION TO FAMILY PSYCHOLOGICAL  
FUNCTIONING

Thesis submitted to the  
Institute of Social Sciences  
in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts  
in  
Educational Sciences

by

Nilay Dođanalp (Ekřiođlu)

Bođaziđi University  
1998

Bogazici University Library



39001100105652

14

To all of the children who have come into my life  
facing difficulties in their young lives each day with loving,  
trusting hearts, determination and extraordinary courage...

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It was an honour for me to have the chance of working with Prof. Aydan Gülerce. I would like to express my appreciation to my thesis advisor, for holding my hand from conception to completion of this study, and for making it such a pleasure to complete this thesis.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Assoc. Prof. Füsün Akarsu for her valuable advises and encouragement.

I am grateful to Assoc. Prof. Sevda Bekman who was always with me with her guidance and constructive criticism from the beginning to the end of this study.

I would like to thank to all the families and the teachers, for courageously sharing their ideas and privacy.

I am grateful to Dr. Clinton Vickers, who showed me “learning how to learn leads the way to realising everything a person is capable of doing.” He gave me the opportunity to work with wonderful children. His ideas about the “uniqueness” of each child became the center of my thesis around which everything revolved.

I would also like to thank Necla Erinç for, being my friend and listening to me.

My sincere thanks to Ayşe Sim Dirí, dear friend, for her great help in statistical analyses.

I would like to thank Ayfer Yeniçağlar for, supporting me and lighting my way with her lovely smile.

I would also like to thank to a very special group of people; ALEV team, for their understanding and for being beside me whenever I needed them.

My special thanks to my mother, father and my son, Tolga Can, for their patience and understanding during this serious phase of my life.

Last, but not least, I extend my special thanks to my husband, Mehmet Ekşiođlu, who encouraged me every minute of this study. Without his understanding and loving support it would have been impossible to complete this thesis.

## **ABSTRACT**

### **A COMPARISON OF PARENTAL AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF CHILDREN'S ACTION IN RELATION TO FAMILY PSYCHOLOGICAL FUNCTIONING**

**By**

**Nilay Dođanalp (Ekşiođlu)**

This study was designed to look for possible relationships between parental perception of the family's psychological functioning and the elementary school – child's action in the classroom as evaluated by the teachers and in the home environment as evaluated by their mothers. Significant differences were to be observed between the mothers' and the teachers' evaluations of the children. Furthermore, we hypothesized that the more the mother and the teacher agreed on the child's behavioral patterns, and the less problem behaviors, more abilities were reported by both parties, the higher perceived family's psychological functioning would be reported.

The participants of this study were the teachers and the parents of 193 first and second grade students aged between 7 to 8. The schools they

attended were located in higher SES neighborhoods. The families and the teachers were contacted by the researcher who worked as a school counselor in these schools.

The mothers were given the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL/ 4 – 18) to evaluate the ability areas and problem behavior of this age group children. A Teachers Report Form (TRF / 5-18) was given to the teachers to evaluate the school life and the problem behavior of the same children. A Family Structure Assessment Device (AYDA) was administered to the family members to assess the family system.

For the analysis of the data t-tests for paired samples and the Pearson Correlation Coefficient were used.

The results supported most of the hypotheses and revealed that there was a significant discrepancy between the Children Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and the Teacher Report Form (TRF) scores reported by teachers and mothers. Those children who had higher CBCL scores and TRF scores had families with low AYDA scores. On the other hand, those children who had families with high AYDA scores had a high discrepancy between their CBCL and TRF scores.

As a conclusion, although the high perceived family system has a significant positive impact on the action of children at home and in the classroom, such an effect of perceived family system on the discrepancy between CBCL and TRF was not found in this study.

## ÖZET

### AİLENİN PSİKOLOJİK İŞLEYİŞİ İLE İLGİLİ OLARAK ÇOCUKLARIN DAVRANIŞLARININ AİLELERİ VE ÖĞRETMENLERİ TARAFINDAN ALGILANIŞLARININ KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

Nilay Doğanalp (Ekşioğlu)

Bu tez çalışması, ailenin psikolojik işleyişinin aile tarafından algılanışı ve ilkökul çocuğunun davranışlarının sınıfta öğretmenler, ev ortamında anneler tarafından değerlendirilmesi arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmak üzere düzenlenmiştir..

Bu çalışmaya katılanlar yaşları 7 ve 8 olan 193 birinci ve ikinci sınıf öğrencilerinin öğretmenleri ve ailelerinden oluşmaktadır. Öğrencilerin devam ettikleri okullar ekonomik seviyesi yüksek çevrelerde yer almaktadır. Aileler ve öğretmenler ile, bu okullarda okul psikoloğu olarak çalışmış olan araştırmacının kendisi tarafından bağlantı kurulmuştur.

Bu yaş gurubu çocuklarda yeterlilik alanları ve problem davranışları değerlendirmek amacı ile annelere Çocuk Davranış Formu (CBCL/4-18), aynı çocukların okul hayatı ve okuldaki problem davranışlarını değerlendirmek amacı ile öğretmenlere Öğretmen Bilgi Formu (TRF/5-18) ve aile yapısı sistemini incelemek amacı ile aile üyelerine Aile Yapısını

Değerlendirme Aracı (AYDA) verilmiştir.

Verilerin analizi t-testi ve Pearson Korelasyon yöntemleriyle yapılmıştır.

Sonuçlar hipotezlerin çoğunu desteklemiştir. Anneler ve öğretmenler tarafından bildirilen çocuk davranışlarında (TRF ve CBCL puanlarında) belirgin farklılıklar olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, CBCL ve TRF’de yüksek puan alan çocukların düşük AYDA puanlı ailelerden geldiği görülmüştür. Diğer taraftan, yüksek AYDA Puanlı ailelerden gelen çocukların CBCL ve TRF puanlarında yüksek farklılıklar bulunmuştur.

Sonuç olarak, yüksek aile sistemi algısının çocukların ev ve okul davranışları üzerinde önemli pozitif bir etkisi görülürken; yüksek aile sistemi algısının, çocuğun algılanan ev davranışları ve okul davranışları (CBCL ve TRF puanları) farklılıkları üzerinde böyle bir etkisi görülmemiştir.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	111
ABSTRACT	VI
ÖZET	IX
LIST OF TABLES	XIII
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Statement of the Problem	1
B. Review of the Related Literature	3
1. The Need to look at a child's behavior	3
2. The Need for classroom behavior observation	5
3. The Need for home behavior observation	7
4. Discrepancy between teacher's and mother's reports	11
5. Importance of perceived family psychological functioning	17
C. Statement of Hypotheses	24
II. METHOD	25
A. Participants	25
B. Instruments	28
1. Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL / 4-18)	28
2. Teacher's Report Form ( TRF / 5-18)	31
3. Family Structure Assessment Device (AYDA)	33
4. Demographic Data Form	36

C. Procedure	36
III. RESULTS	38
IV. DISCUSSION	50
REFERENCES	64
APPENDIX A	72
APPENDIX B	77
APPENDIX C	82

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Frequency Distribution of the mothers by last graduated school	26
Table 2.	Frequency Distribution of the fathers by last graduated school	27
Table 3.	Means and Standard Deviations of CBCL Scores	38
Table 4.	Means and Standard Deviations of TRF Scores	39
Table 5.	Means and Standard Deviations of mothers and fathers	40
Table 6.	Correlation Coefficients between subtests of CBCL and Total Scores of AYDA	41
Table 7.	Correlation Coefficients between subtests of CBCL and measures of AYDA	43
Table 8.	Correlation Coefficients between subtests of TRF and Total Scores of AYDA	44

Table 9.	Correlation Coefficients between subtests of TRF and submeasures of AYDA	46
Table 10.	Correlation Coefficients between Total Scores of AYDA and difference scores of CBCL and TRF	47
Table 11.	Correlation Coefficients between submeasures of AYDA and difference scores of CBCL and TRF	49

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Statement of the Problem

For many years, studies targeting children yield higher than expected prevalence rates for behavioral and emotional problems. For instance, Verhulst and Koot (1992) recently in the U.S. reported that one out of five children in the population is suffering from a behavioral or emotional disorder. However, only a small number of families with problem children seek professional help. In most cases, therefore, school personnel are instrumental in bringing attention to the child.

However, it is a must to take into account both the child's behavior and the perception of an adult about this behavior, when evaluating a child's behavior disorder (Weisz and Eastman, 1995). Children can not decide for themselves that they want help with their problems. It is for this very reason various evaluation instruments to point out the problems in children have been developed for external observers. The most well known of these are the instruments developed by Thomas Achenbach. They have been standardized, adapted and used in 50 countries, including Turkey (Erol, 1995).

In Turkey, there has not been a study investigating the behavioral and emotional problems as well as the ability areas of children aged 2 – 18 based on the collection of data from parents, teachers and the child himself in general population for many years. The Mental Health Profile Survey of Turkey is the first study in Turkey which collects multiple data for children and makes appropriate assessment without generalizing the children's behavior (Erol, 1995).

One of the purposes of this study is to investigate whether there is a significant discrepancy between the young student's reported action in the classroom and at home through different observers, namely the teacher and the mother. The ultimate goal of the study, however, was to examine the relational pattern between the family psychological functioning and the children's behavior in both settings.

What we know is that, the family system, relationship and communication of its members affect the behavioral problems of the child generally, whether centered in the school, home or community. For example, if the overall communication pattern in the home is confused and contradictory; as a consequence the child has difficulty in integrating information and behavioral guidelines at school (Lachenmeyer, 1982).

Therefore, in the present research it is intended to find out the relationship between familial psychological patterns and the behavioral patterns of first and second graders in schools and at home by comparing teachers' and mothers' evaluations.

## B. Review of the Related Literature

### 1. The Need to look at a child's behavior

Behavior, as Kurumboltz (1972) defined in his book *Changing Children's Behavior* refers to any activity of children, whatever they do or say and how often they do it. Children have their own way of expressing their feelings or distress, and one can learn more about them simply by observing their behavior. Some understanding of their inner world is necessary for the adults for early detection of problems. Indeed, a study on public awareness of mental health showed that childhood psychopathology is not well appreciated in Turkey (Gülerce, 1991). Unlike adults, children can not decide for themselves that they want help with their problems. This decision is usually made for them by parents, educators, physicians, and other adults. Because they are not able to verbalize themselves properly, it is possible to overlook some behaviors (Achenbach, 1974).

Further, some important psychological behaviors such as displacement, withdrawal and hyperactivity are easily dismissed when adults don't recognize the significance these behaviors carry. Indeed, only if their meanings and high potentials for turning into more serious psychological and social problems, including criminal activity, were known they would be taken seriously (Moore, 1982). There are no explicit and uniform standards for distinguishing healthy from disturbed behavior. It is therefore important to be aware of the kinds of subjective standards applied in labeling behavior pathological and deciding what needs to be changed about a child in harmony with the subculture in which the child lives (Achenbach, 1974).

Targeted programs designed to prevent conduct problems in childhood rely on screening systems to identify high - risk individuals. For example, in Lochman's study (1995) the proximal usefulness of multiple - informants to screening, using teacher and parent ratings in a 2 - step procedure with a sample of 382 kindergarten children were examined. The study explored differences in the accuracy of the 2 steps of screening information and whether parents' reports of parenting practices augments the prediction of negative outcomes. The 2 - step screening system was found to effectively predict negative behavior outcomes over one year later. The Parenting Screen did not add to prediction accuracy.

## 2. The Need for Classroom Behavior Observation

Elementary schools in Turkey offer the very first opportunity for most children to be in a more or less standardized social environment and to interact with their peers (Akkök, 1997). In most societies, schools provide supportive and preventive models for intervention in the life of the child. Since children are able to express themselves via certain behaviors, elementary school teachers are in an exceptionally good position to observe and report on children's behavior problems and social competencies (Berlin, 1979).

The famous educator Rudolf Dreikurs, posited that people's actions are always purposeful and goal directed. His educational philosophy, therefore, focused on understanding children and correcting their deficiencies both of which require knowledge about the development of their personality. Dreikurs (1968) asserted that a child's every action has a purpose, to secure a place in the group. School is the ideal group setting for the child's mastery of various social skills. The teacher can be the best source of information, if he carefully observes the behavior of students in the classroom. For example, in their four year follow up study, Verhulst and Van der Ende (1991) examined the stability and change in teacher reported problem behaviors for 811 children (aged 4-12 yrs). Subjects were assessed twice with the

Teacher's Report Form (TRF). High stability was found in the level of TRF total problem scores. The highest stability was found for aggressive and other externalizing behaviors.

Similarly in another study, Verhulst (1994) investigated the ability of teacher ratings of problem behavior in children to predict outcome measures that were external to the initial measurements across a six year interval. The subjects were 946 children (aged 4-11 year) from the general population. Teachers' ratings were obtained via the Teacher's Report Form (TRF). The total problem scores in the deviant range on TRF were significantly associated with poor outcomes 6 yrs later.

On the other hand, pupil behavior is influenced in many ways by the behavior and perceptions of the teacher (Hall, 1961). Often the teacher is unaware that he is influencing his pupil by his tone of voice, his choice of activities for children, and the like. Ojerman (1955) argues that most children learn to behave and to view themselves in the way in which their teachers expect. Although some children behave in their own way at home, the school situation provided for them plays a tremendous role in influencing the same behavior. In another study, parental perceptions of the development and treatment of children's emotional and behavioral problems were investigated (Phares, 1996). 200 parents rated their perceptions of responsibilities for the child's problems (6 to 15 years old).

Teachers were seen as more responsible for younger rather than older children's problems. However, teachers were seen as more responsible for children's internalizing problems and children were seen as more responsible for their own externalizing problems. Overall, internalizing problems were perceived as more severe than externalizing problems.

In most studies about child behavior problems, teacher reports are given great importance because the teacher is the person who defines the social tasks of the classroom and then judges the adequacy of the child's social responses, responses to orders, and responses to tasks requiring attention and persistence, through observations of children and interactions with children in the classroom (Kellam, 1983).

### 3. The Need for Home Behavior Observation

The family still keeps its position as the first social group that the children socialize in and exists as a significant group for the children while they grow up (Özbay, 1985). Within the family, a child learns styles of interaction that must suffice to provide the child with basic and social affiliative needs, both within the home setting and in environments outside the home. A social learning perspective of behavior postulates that behavior patterns are acquired through learning processes that take place in the home environment which plays a primary role in the development of a child's behavior repertoire (Bernal, 1977).

A large body of evidence additionally suggests that family members teach by example. Bandura's Social Learning Theory postulated that "Modeling" and "Imitation" are the primary mechanisms which affect the behavior development in children. The child learns how to behave by the way he is treated and by the way he sees other members behave toward the people and objects that surround him. The child receives message from the family unit about values, conditions, ways of behaving (Whitman, 1970). Because the child is dependent on his family, controlled by them, directly involved in their conflicts shaped by the models, rewards and punishments they provide and usually brought for help only at their initiative, his problems can not be assessed in isolation from his family context. The emerge of psychiatric disorder in a child is regularly preceded by family conflict (Ackerman, 1968). Examining the dysfunctional aspects of the family interaction by objective data will serve as the basis for describing attributes of problem behaviors (Bernal and North, 1977). The Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977) places importance on modeling effects in the home as determinants of child behavior. For example, Patterson (1976) investigated the relationship between parental behavior patterns and behavior in problem children. He found out that parental behavior patterns were related to similar patterns of behavior in problem children. Mothers of control problem children engaged in high rates of aversive behaviors, i.e., excessive commands, disapproving statements. Likewise, control problem children engaged in high rates of aversive behavior (Patterson, 1976).

Patterson (1967) also focused on the relationship of family interaction to problem behavior and developed a theory of coercive interaction in problem families. The coercion theory, based on principles of social learning, postulates that deviant child behavior is the result of inappropriate and inconsistent contingencies applied to children behavior by parents. Within a framework of inconsistency the child learns that the most advantageous method for producing predictable patterns in the home environment is to use aversive behaviors, such as crying, demanding and tantrums to achieve desired outcomes and to alter the behavior of others (Patterson and Reid, 1980). Patterson (1980) investigated the coercive dimension of family interaction. He reported that problem families engaged in higher rates of aversive behaviors than nonproblem behaviors. The parents of problem children were more likely than parents of nonproblem children to respond negatively to positive child behavior or positively to negative child behavior. This finding supports the contention that the parents of the problem children provide unpredictable or inconsistent consequences for child behavior. It was also reported that both problem and nonproblem children were more likely to engage in aversive behavior when responding to aversive intrusions from other family members than at other times. Therefore, some children may learn aversive modes of responding to terminate the aversiveness of others.

With respect to psychoanalytical theory it is claimed that a person's uniqueness is partly determined by external realities,

eg -, parental attitudes, behavior and social norms. Because the child is not able to express himself clearly with words, his inner state of excitation can be understood by observing the child in his natural environment. During playing, the child can relieve unconscious conflicts (Freud, 1917). Generally children tend not to perceive themselves in emotional distress. Their capacities to externalize are legendary and they tend to perceive themselves as victims of outside forces rather than suffering from internalized conflicts. Therefore it is often parents or teachers who desire treatment for them (Vandersall, 1982). An individual's own childhood inevitably influences his reaction to children. The parent's memories of his childhood also serves as a source for interpreting or empathizing with a child; he may for example, strongly identify with some children or some kinds of problems, while reacting against others as he did when he was a child (Ackerman, 1960).

It is widely believed that mothers have more opportunity to observe children's behavior at home therefore are more accurate in reporting behavior disorders of the child. Having mothers fill out structured rating forms describing their children's behavior may improve the reliability and validity of the data upon which inferences, and diagnostic conclusions are predicted (Peter, 1996). Wimberger and Gregory (1968) have tried out a procedure in which mothers fill out a

behavioral checklist consisting of 66 symptoms scored on four point scales. Agreement between mothers' and therapists' ratings for the items was highly significant.

#### 4. Discrepancy between teachers' and mothers' reports

The child's behaviors at home and in school are different expressions of who she is and what she is (Thomas, 1968). In Lochman's study (1992), it was found that the best indicator of the observed behavior of children are by parents and teachers. Lochman and his Conduct Problem Prevention Research Group aimed to prevent later conduct problems in elementary school students and called it the *Fast Track Program* which was a school-family based prevention intervention. The sample consisted of 382 children at entry into first grade and 362 children at the end of the first grade. The sociometric status of the sample was largely lower to lower middle class. The first part of the multiple gate screening procedure involved the teacher screen which used 14 items such as stubborn, breaking the rules, etc. From the Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation (TOCA-R) (Werthamer-Larsson, Kellam and Wheeler et al) (1991). At the second stage of screening, parents of these children were contacted, and the parents responded to 38 items about child externalizing behavior problems and 32 items about Internalizing scales in the Children's Behavior Checklist (Achenbach, 1991). The parents were

also given a 22- item questionnaire assessing the consistency of their discipline efforts. It was hypothesized that the screening variables would better predict externalizing outcomes than non externalizing outcomes. The Parent Screen accounted for a significant portion of the variance. The amount of variance accounted for in the prediction of externalizing outcomes was substantially higher than in the prediction of nonexternalizing outcomes. The parent screen clearly added to the effectiveness of the teacher screen in the regression analyses in predicting first grade problem behavior. They concluded the best indicator of conduct problems for first grade children was the combined behavioral reports of parents and of teachers. Parenting practices did not contribute significantly to the prediction of the combined parent and teacher rated externalizing outcomes. The results supported that screening variables were predictive of a broad range of externalizing and non externalizing behavioral problems for first grade children.

Further, Achenbach in his well-known study examined the degree of consistency between different informants' reports of the behavioral and emotional problems of subjects aged from 1.5 to 19 years. Data were sought from parents, teachers, and peers. Correlations were significantly higher for 6 to 11 year olds. It was also concluded that three types of informants are needed in most cases. Parents are almost always needed as informants, whereas teachers are

needed for many school-aged children. Considerable progress has been made in constructing norms for standardized ratings by parents and teachers (Achenbach, 1986). For children above the age of about 10, self report instruments paralleling those completed by parents and teachers served as a third source of data (Achenbach, 1987).

Similarly, in a 2– phase survey in Puerto Rico, the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) was used as a screening instrument for psychopathology in the 1<sup>st</sup> stage and 386 children were evaluated clinically in the second stage. Data indicate that, in using the CBCL for screening for psychopathology in children, parent information is the most informative. Data also reinforce the need to obtain teacher information with the Teacher Report Form to enhance screening sensitivity. The Youth Self – Report was of limited usefulness for screening purposes (Bird, 1991).

In another study, Phares (1997) investigated the accuracy of informants. 200 parents rated the accuracy of a variety of informants (mothers, fathers, teachers, children) for a variety of behaviors (internalizing problems, externalizing problems, adaptive functioning and family problems) exhibited by a hypothetical child. Overall, mothers were perceived to be more accurate in reporting internalizing problems, mothers and teachers were perceived to be more accurate in reporting externalizing problems, mothers, fathers and teachers were seen as more accurate in

reporting children's adaptive behaviors, and mothers, fathers and children were seen as more accurate in reporting family problems. In a similar study, Sawyer (1996) investigated the course of childhood emotional and behavioral problems (EBPs) over time and determined how well mother reports of children's EBPs at the age of 5 years predicted mother-, teacher- and self-reports when the children were aged 11-12 years. 147 girls and 130 boys from Port Pirie, South Australia were available for analysis at both ages. Childhood EBPs were identified at the age of 5 years using Child Behavior Checklists completed by mothers. When the subjects were aged 11-12 years, problems were identified using checklists completed by mothers, children, and teachers. Attention problems, aggressive behavior, and anxious/depressed problems were the most persistent problems over the period. In general, the strongest relationship over time occurred when reports were obtained from mothers on each occasion. A weaker relationship existed between earlier mother-reported problems and later teacher-reported problems.

On the other side of the issue, when mothers sympathize with their children, they can no longer evaluate the behavior of the child objectively (Sawyer, 1996). Therefore, Graudenz stressed the need for communication between mothers, teachers and children. In his study with 96 preschool children, their 96 mothers and 20 teachers answered 35 questions concerning emotionality and striving for contact. 71% of the mothers'

answers differed from those of the teachers and almost always toward a more positive evaluation.

However, the study of child behavior requires attention to the reporter of the behavior and the context in which such behavior occurs (Lambert, 1993). In a study carried out with Jamaican children, Micheal (1993) compared parent and teacher reports on behavioral / emotional problems for 359 nonreferred Jamaican 6-11 year olds, using the Jamaican Youth Checklist and the Jamaican Youth Checklist Teacher Report Form. Similar to clinic – referred findings, low to moderate correlations emerged for parent and teacher reports on nonreferred children. Correlations were also significantly higher for ratings of undercontrolled (e.g., disobedience, stealing, fighting ) than for ratings of overcontrolled (e.g., shyness, depression, fearfulness) behavior. However, correlation coefficients varied across referral status for ratings of overcontrolled problems in girls and undercontrolled problems in boys.

With respect to children's problems, Verhulst (1989) compared parents' and teachers' reports of behavioral and emotional problems in 161 4-12 year olds, using the Child Behavior Checklist. Moderate agreement was found, with parents reporting more problems than teachers. Agreement was higher for externalizing problems than for internalizing problems. Further, in the Mental Health Profile Survey of Turkey, parents

were given the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL /2-3, CBCL / 4-18), teachers were given the Teacher's Report Form (TRF) and Youth Self – Report were given to children to find out the problem areas of the children. Teachers tended to score higher problems on Attention Problems (7.9) and Anxiety (7.0) than the parents (Erol, 1997).

Although some parents are aware of problem behaviors in their children, they do not view them as signs of maladjustment. Such parents have to witness a wider variety of deviant actions before seeking assistance (Johnson,1975). The study by Moore (1975) compared problem and nonproblem children who were referred by their school teachers. With one exception, the parents of the referred children did not consider them problems in the home. Observations were obtained in both home and school settings, and teachers and parents rated the child daily on overall behavior and recorded the occurrence of low –rate problem behaviors (e.g., fighting, lying, and stealing). School observations showed that the referred children were more oppositional to rules and instructions, engaging in less schoolwork and other appropriate behaviors than the nonreferred children. The teachers rated the referred children more negatively and also reported more problem incidents for this group. The referred children had significantly lower rates of sustained activity (toy play, work, and so forth) and higher rates of seeking adult attention. Parents of referred children interacted with their children more frequently

and were more likely to use aversive styles when interacting. These parents reported much higher rates of problem incidents, but did not rate their children more negatively than parents of nonreferred children.

### 5. Importance of Perceived Family Psychological Functioning

Family structure is a crucial concern for many researchers because of its strong impact on the child. The need for some information about the family functioning is pointed up by the fact that the family is the first social unit, that the patterns of socialization and learning are first acquired in the family setting, and that the parents of the child are indeed his first teachers. Thus, the impact of the family interaction on school learning and behavior disorder is considerable (Meyer, 1967). The family system has been defined by Meyer as a related group of persons and the characteristics of their interactions. To understand the family it is necessary to understand the characteristics of its interactions. Papp (1983) emphasized that in the system theory events are explained within the sphere that they are occurring, the emphasis is on relations and connections rather than personalities of the family members. Further, Russell (1983) studied parental characteristics and interactional dysfunction in families with child behavior problems and assessed them relative to the family systems theory. Russell assessed 36 families with a behavior – problem child (aged 4-12 years) on measures of marital discord (e.g. Marital Status

Inventory), parental psychopathology (e.g. , Self- Rating Depression Scale), and 3 parental cognitive factors: knowledge of behavioral principles, tolerance for child deviancy, and expectations regarding their child's behavior. Nine nonproblem families with demographic characteristics similar to the problem families were also assessed. Correlational analyses across all families revealed a strong association between marital discord and the parental index of child behavior problems. While a number of significant associations were discovered between the various measures of marital discord, parental psychopathology, and parental cognitive factors, only marital discord was associated with parental perception of child behavior problems.

Similarly, theorized by Bertalanffy (1968), the general system theory stresses the importance of the interaction between the complexes of elements. A system is formed by the interaction of its interdependent elements. Therefore any change in one element of the system influences others. To understand the family the connections of their elements should be analyzed. Robert Friedman in his book *Family Roots of School Learning and Behavior Disorders* claimed that parallel to the developmental process of each child, a developmental process goes on in each parent and in the family as a whole. The family system, relationship, and communication factors affect the behavior problems of the child generally, whether centered in the school, home or community. Therefore, Brody, Mahler,

Spitz and Solnit (1945) studied the different phases of children and focused on the interaction between parents and children. When there is generalized mutuality and warmth in the family, children and adults feel safe. They are comfortable about exploring their environment, asking questions of each other, sharing findings and thoughts and showing enthusiasm for each other's achievements. A positive attitude about learning and experiencing arises out of such a family milieu. The family style and standards about how one person listens to another have long lasting and powerful effects on children. Their openness to ideas at school and elsewhere grows out of a listening attitude at home.

In his work on *Effects of Family Structure on Child Adjustment* Kerig (1995) used the Family Cohesion Index with 75 families to type their family system as cohesive (all close), separate (all distant), triangulated (cross generational coalitions) or detouring (child excluded from the parental subsystem). Mothers and fathers rated child behavior on the Child Behavior Checklist. It was concluded that parents in triangulated families, rated their marriages highest in marital conflict and maladjustment. Parents in detouring or triangulated families rated their children higher in total problems. Mothers in detouring families also rated their children higher in internalizing and externalizing than did those in cohesive families. However, mothers who depicted the family as separate rated their children highest in externalizing symptoms.

On the other hand, if the overall communication pattern in the home is confused and contradictory; as a consequence the child has difficulty in integrating information and behavioral guidelines at school (Weiner, 1971). The development of the Family Communication Theory by Jackson has evolved as a result of considerable interest in family – unit psychodynamics. According to his findings; in the “pathological family system” roles are inconsistent, role reversals are common, communication is a closed system of distortion, confusion or double – binding and the relationships are mutually destructive whereas in the well – functioning family system communication serves to meet the needs of family members, permits open expression of strong feelings (including love, hate, warmth, anger, fear etc.) and healthy communication facilitates internal role consistency within the individual and mutually enhancing interrelationships within the family. With respect to familial relations, Verhulst (1985) studied the prevalence of child psychiatric disorders in 16, 8 and 11 year old children by administering the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and the Teacher Report Form (TRF) and by conducting standardized parent and child interviews. Poor marital relationships, parental lack of empathy, maternal hostility and frequent conflicts with the child were some of the family and social factors associated with psychiatric problems in the subjects.

Similarly, Tschann (1996) examined the effects of stressful family functioning on child behavior problems among 145 school children aged 5-6 years. Subjects were evaluated by teachers, mothers and independent observers. Both teachers and independent observers rated child behavior problems with the Child Behavior Checklist (Achenbach). Subjects who were in high conflict families had the most internalizing and externalizing behavior problems.

In another research, after studying 60 families, Malone and Parenstedt (1963) described the pathological family environment with its lack of predictability of emotional response, high degree of physical abuse and danger and pointed out the effect of this environment on the children's development as conflicts in parent – child, marital or family – unit relationships are upsetting to the child; the upset is manifested in school behavior. The expressed family value is nonconformity; the child loyally identifies with the value and acts upon it by not conforming to school rules. Strong parental disagreement in regard to behavioral expectations or management is confusing to the child and leads to erratic classroom behavior; home standards that are contradictory or inconsistent may result in the child's nondeliberate distortion of class rules. When the overall communication pattern in the home is confused and dishonest, the child has difficulty in integrating information and behavioral guidelines at school. In school they do not lend themselves to guidance from teachers

and they resist shared activities and pleasures. Their maturity and autonomy are at the expense of gratifying basic needs. Understanding a child's behavior in the light of his family experience by the teacher was emphasized to be an important factor.

Similarly, in Campbell's study (1996) 112 hard-to-manage preschool boys and comparison boys were studied at age 4 yrs and followed at ages 6 and 9 years. Externalizing problems at ages 4 and 9 were associated with concurrent family stress. Problems were more likely to persist in the context of chronic family stress, negative life events, marital dissatisfaction, and maternal depressive symptoms. When problem boys who met diagnostic criteria for Oppositional Disorder and / or Attention Deficit Disorder were compared with boys who had improved by age of 9 years, family stress and earlier symptom levels, as well as maternal control differentiated between them . Teacher ratings suggested that these boys were on a clear pathway to persistent problems by age of 6 years. In another research, the relationship between family conditions and fighting across settings was investigated (Loeber, 1984). Boys reported to fight at home, at school and in both settings were compared in terms of their behavior and family backgrounds. 210 families completed the Child Behavior Checklist and Marital Interaction Scale. Data was collected from the teachers through use of the Teacher Report Form. It was concluded that in families with a boy that

identified to fight in two settings family problem solving is more impaired, the parents experience more marital stress than in families with boys reported to fight by only one adult or boys who do not fight.

On the other side of the issue, Forehand (1986) tested the hypothesis that a combination of marital dissatisfaction and child disruptive behavior is more important than either variable alone in effecting parent perceptions of child behavior problems. 51 mothers and their young referred children (aged 27 to 108 months) served as subjects. Child behavior was assessed in the home by independent observers, and a marital adjustment test was used to establish marital satisfaction. A parent attitude test served as the measure of parent perceptions of child behavior. It was supported that a high level of marital dissatisfaction plus a high level of child disruptive behavior (noncompliance, deviance, and conflict) were associated with greater perceptions of behavior problems than either a high level of marital dissatisfaction alone or a high level of child disruptive behavior alone.

Therefore, in this study, it is attempted to examine parental and teacher perceptions of young children's behavior profile in relation to family psychological functioning.

### C. Statement of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant difference between the teachers' reports and mothers' reports on the child's action as a comparison of the Children Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and Teacher Report Form (TRF) scores.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a negative correlation between the Children Behavior Checklist (CBCL) scores and Family Structure Assessment Device (AYDA) total scores.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a negative correlation between the Teacher Report Form (TRF) scores and Family Structure Assessment Device (AYDA) total scores.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a negative correlation between the total Family Structures Assessment Device (AYDA) scores and the discrepancy between Children Behavior Checklist (CBCL) scores and Teacher Report Form (TRF) scores.

## II. METHOD

### A. Participants

The parents of 193 first and second grade students enrolling at two private schools in Istanbul and 16 teachers formed the participants of the study.

All families were included. The age of the students ranged from 6 to 8 years old and the number of boys and girls were equal from each school. All parents were estimated to be within high SES, since both schools involved were private and required the most expensive school fees in Istanbul. Yet families were given a demographic data sheet about their socio-economic status level. The expectation was validated as most of the participants reported a high income on the demographic data sheet administered. The mean age of the mothers was 36 and of the fathers 39. The range for the mothers age was 13 years whereas for the fathers was 20 years.

About 85.50% of the mothers were university graduates, 13.47% lycee graduates and 1.03% holding masters degrees. Frequency distribution of the mothers according to the schools they graduated from is presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Frequency Distribution of the mothers by last graduated school

---

MOTHERS

---

	f	%
Primary	—	—
Secondary	—	—
Lycee	26	13.47
University	165	85.50
Masters	2	1.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>100.00</b>

---

90.16% of the fathers graduated from university, 8.29% graduated from high school and 1.55% hold masters degrees. Frequency distribution of the fathers according to their graduation is presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

Frequency Distribution of the fathers by last graduated school

Fathers		
	f	%
Primary	—	—
Secondary	—	—
Lycee	16	8.29
University	174	90.16
Masters	3	1.55
TOTAL	193	100.00

In both schools the classroom teacher who evaluated the students, attended all the classes every day from 9:00 to 15:00. The mean age of the teachers was 36 ranging from 45 years old to 30 years old. Both schools were chosen for their success in adapting *Active Learning* philosophy where children learned through active experiences with people and, in the process, developed their own understanding of the world around them (Weikart, 1996). There were no comparisons of the two schools. The schools were thought to be similar because of their students coming from high SES level families and the adopted education model. It was also convenient for the researcher to work with these schools because of her

school psychologist position in both. Therefore, the researcher was an inside and outside observer.

## B. Instruments

For the three main variables of the study, three separate instruments were used. Namely, children's home behavior was assessed with the Children Behavior Checklist (CBCL), children's classroom behavior was assessed with the Teacher Report Form (TRF), and family psychological functioning was evaluated with the Family Structure Assessment Device (AYDA). A demographic data sheet was also administered.

### 1. Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL / 4-18)

The Child Behavior Checklist, which was developed by Achenbach (1978) is an assessment instrument designed to obtain the parents' reports of their children (age 4-18) and to provide a standardized frame of a child's behavior related to behavioral and adaptive competencies (See Appendix A). CBCL includes behavior problems and social competence items designed to be reported by parents and is scorable in terms of the Child Behavior profile. The checklist consists of 20 competence and 118 problem items.

Competency items consist of the sports activities the child is interested in and the work the child does at home or outside home such as the child's membership of a social club or sports club, parent and siblings relations, ability to play by himself and the degree the child participates in the school activities. In addition to Competency items, open ended questions regarding the personality and health of the child were asked in the first part of Children Behavior Checklist (CBCL). The profiles are scored from the CBCL, which was designed to obtain parents reports of their children's competences and problems in a standardized format. For scoring the Activities section and Social Competence section, if the parent reported 0 or 1 item, it is scored as 0, if two answers are reported it is scored as 1, and three or more answers are scored as two. In the school section being in a special class because of behavioral and emotional problems, repetition of a class and any school problems are scored as 0 and other items carrying the opposite meaning as 1. Total competence score is calculated by taking the sum of Activities, Social Competence and school submeasures (Achenbach, 1991).

The second part of the measurement consists of 118 problem items about the child's perceived emotional and behavior problems and these items are grouped in various submeasures. Problem behavior items are rated as 0, 1, 2 according to the frequency of the problem behavior in the last 6 months. 0 meaning "not true", 1 "sometimes true" and

2 “mostly true”. From the items two different behavior scores can be obtained. These are Externalizing scale and Internalizing scale. The sum of subtests such as “Socially Withdrawn”, “Somatic Complaints” and “Anxious / Depressed” form the Internalizing Scale Score. The sum of subtests such as “Aggressive” and “Delinquent behavior” form the Externalizing Scale Score. Social problems, thought problems and attention problems do not fit in these two groups but the “Total problem score” is obtained from the sum of these subtests. For scoring the total problem score, scores rated as 0,1,2 in CBCL are added. The T score of each problem score is listed for girls and boys separately. The scores obtained from both parts and each subtest are recorded for each age group to form the profile of that child. The idea is to evaluate the problem areas and social competency of the children.

CBCL/4-18 was revised to Turkish by Akçakın and Savaşır in 1983 (Akçakın, 1983). Due to the lack of normative data regarding different age groups and gender, it was not used in Turkey in the following years. The CBCL 1991 form was revised and adapted to the Turkish culture by Neşe Erol and Cengiz Kılıç. After checking the differences and similarities with the 1983 revision, it was translated into English and then to Turkish twice to test the test – retest reliability. The correlations were found to be .78 in Total Competency and .84 in Total Problem.

Cronbach Alpha coefficients were used in calculations for the internal consistency of the scale and found to be .73 for competency subtests and .85 in problem behavior. The high results made it possible to use the CBCL in specific age groups and gender groups safely.

## 2. Teacher's Report Form TRF / 5-18

The Teacher's Report Form was aimed to obtain the reports of the teachers in connection with their students' problems and adaptive functioning in a standard format (See Appendix B). It was standardized for boys and girls at ages 5-18 to reflect the age and sex differences in prevalence of behavioral patterns.

The norms of each scoring profile were established by a representative sampling of nonreferred children in order to provide comparisons of data on individual children with the baselines for normal peers. The TRF which was modeled on the CBCL was developed by Edelbrock and Achenbach in 1986 to make use of the teachers' perceptions of children's performances at school and behaviors, since apart from the parents, teachers have more contact with school children than adults do.

The first 2 pages of the TRF cover demographic information including the child's age, sex, grade, parent's occupation, questions

about the child's academic performance and basic information about the school. Space is provided for teachers to report on the child's work, behavior or potential. The measure intends to gather data on the student's "School Adaption". The Total Adaptation Score is obtained by subtests which are "School Success", "Hard-working", "Appropriate Behavior" and "Happiness" (Achenbach, 1991).

The second part of the Teacher Report Form (TRF 5-18) is parallel to the second part of the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL / 4-18). Scoring the Teacher Report Form (TRF) is identical with the Children Behavior Checklist (CBCL). TRF 5-18 was adapted and standardized by Füsün Akkök only for the "boys". Melda Akçakın and Neşe Erol worked on the 1991 version of the TRF in order to find out the differences with the previous version. In 1992 Akkör and her friends developed TRF 5-18 by making some changes in the format but keeping its original content. The measurement was given to the teachers of 49 students twice in 30 days for Turkish test-retest purposes and calculated the test-retest correlation as .88. The internal consistency of the scales was calculated by scoring 2340 children's answers and using Cronbach Alpha Coefficients. Cronbach internal consistency of the scale scores was .84 in "Total Problem".

### 3. Family Structure Assessment Device (AYDA)

AYDA (Gülerce, 1992) is a self-report measure which can be applied to literate people above the age of twelve. It consists of 36 items each of which respond on a 5 point scale ranging between “just like us” to “just the opposite.” The maximum score from each item is 5 and minimum is 1 hence the total maximum score is 180. The higher the score one gets the healthier the reported family functioning is regarded. AYDA intends to measure five domains of the family system. Various index scores can be obtained from AYDA in addition to these domains.

Communication within the family; this is all kinds of behavior that transmits interpersonal messages. Contradictory, hostile and conflicting communication is regarded unhealthy, whereas open and mutual communication, self-disclosure and overlap between expressed and received messages are defined as healthy. The communication index score is the total score of the items 1 to 9 .

Unitedness within the family is defined as togetherness, attachment , dependency and boundaries that maintain the system. Too much closeness and distance are not healthy. The unitedness index score is the total score of the items 10 to 18.

Management within the family is the implicit and explicit rules that define the way of ongoing activities. These are discipline rules and decision making. Clearly defined rules and equal responsibilities represent a healthy management and organization. The management index score is the total score of the items 19 to 26 .

Competency within the family, is the ability to cope with problems by finding effective solutions and adapting to changes. Competency within a family is regarded as healthy. The competency index score is the total score of the items 27 to 31 .

Emotional context within the family is the emotional climate such as support, tension and emotional satisfaction. Flexibility of the emotional context is regarded as healthy. The emotional context score is the total score of the items 32 to 36 .

In order to find the content validity of AYDA, one social psychologist's, one clinical psychologist's, one psychiatrist's and two other psychologists' views were taken. They evaluated each item on a scale from 1 to 10 considering how much they reflected the properties of the area they are supposed to represent. The interjudge reliability was calculated to be .73 for categorizing and .58 for ordering items. For criterion related validity 100 people between the ages 16 to 60 coming

from different socio-economic levels and nonbroken families with no psychiatric problems received AYDA. Sixty of them also received the Family Environment Scale. Pearson moment product correlation coefficient between the total scores of two scales was .53 ( $P < .001$ ). 12 families received Beavers – Timber Family Assessment Scale, and AYDA and were clinically interviewed. These interviews were video taped and analyzed by a clinical psychologist who was unaware of the results obtained from AYDA. The total scores of the families obtained from both scales showed a meaningful correlation ( $r = .78$ ,  $P < .001$ ).

In a study with 100 high school students, the correlation between the total scores of AYDA and Minnesota Counseling Inventory Family Relations subscale was found to be .69 ( $P < .01$ ).

A one month test retest reliability was found to be .79 by Pearson's Moment Product Coefficient. The split – half reliability was found as .85 by Stanley Correlation Coefficient. The internal consistency of AYDA was found to be .70 by Cronbachalpha. For the construct validity 42 psychiatric patternts, and 42 people of the similar age, gender and social status considered as healthy were taken as samples. When AYDA individual scores are compared in terms of the t-test meaningful differences are found ( $t = 3.74$ ,  $P < .001$ ).

#### 4. Demographic Variables :

Demographic variables of the study were the educational level of participants, employment and age (See Appendix C).

#### C. Procedure

The families were sent the Family Structure Assessment Device (AYDA) forms and Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) with a letter, explaining the purpose of this academic study. The package also included a demographic data sheet for the family.

The parents were also informed that they did not have to write any names on the forms. Each participant was informed and assured all data would be kept confidential. Each student was assigned a code number and only the code number was written on the envelope. Only mothers were asked to reply to the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL). After answering each item, the parents returned the AYDA and CBCL forms to the researcher using the same envelope within one week. The researcher also called each participant personally to make sure that they did not have any questions about the forms .

Teachers Report Forms (TRF) were given to the teacher of each student who was asked to fill out the forms only for the students he knew well .

193 families from both schools were given the AYDA forms. CBCL's were given to 193 mothers in total. TRF's were answered by 16 teachers for 193 students. Each student was rated by one classroom teacher.

The questionnaires were given to the parents (Family Assessment Structure Device-AYDA), mothers (Child Behavior Checklist-CBCL) and the teachers (Teacher Report Form –TRF) directly by the researcher.

### III. RESULTS

Scores derived from the subtests of the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), Teachers Report Form (TRF), and Family Structure Assessment Device (AYDA) served as data for the analysis.

#### Hypothesis 1:

As a test of Hypothesis 1, predicting a significant discrepancy between CBCL and TRF scores, t-tests for paired samples were applied to the subtests of CBCL and TRF. Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of subtests of CBCL and Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations of subtests of TRF.

Table 3.

#### Means and Standard Deviations of CBCL Scores

CBCL Scores	Mean	SD
Competency	36.8	8.05
Total Problem	48.9	12.62
Internalizing	49.1	9.59
Externalizing	48.7	13.54

Table 4.

Means and Standard Deviations of TRF Scores

TRF Scores	Mean	SD
Competency	45.3	5.02
Total Problem	55.8	9.11
Internalizing	55.2	8.34
Externalizing	56.9	10.27

T-tests for paired samples revealed that the competency score of TRF was significantly higher than that of the competency score of CBCL [ $t(187) = -14.53, p < .001$ ]. The total problem score of TRF was significantly higher than the total problem score of CBCL [ $t(187) = -11.84, p < .001$ ]. The Internalizing score of TRF was significantly higher than the internalizing score of CBCL [ $t(187) = -12.31, p < .001$ ]. The externalizing score of TRF was significantly higher than the externalizing score of CBCL [ $t(188) = -9.41, p < .001$ ].

Hypothesis 2:

Table 5 presents the means and standard deviations of subtests of AYDA scores of the mothers and fathers.

Table 5.

Means and Standard Deviations of subtests of AYDA Scores of mothers and fathers.

	<u>AYDA Scores</u>			
	Mother		Father	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Individual	124.6	47.61	122.9	48.69
Family	123.3	48.74	123.3	48.74
Communication	33.3	16.72	31.7	14.55
Unitedness	28.3	11.87	28.1	12.58
Management	27.5	12.75	26.8	11.79
Competency	18.9	7.30	19.3	8.20
Emotional	17.6	6.05	17.9	6.99

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient test was carried out to test hypothesis 2, predicting that those children who have higher CBCL scores will have families with lower AYDA scores.

The analyses revealed a positive relationship between the competency score of CBCL and total score of AYDA, a negative relationship between total problem score of CBCL and total score of AYDA, a negative correlation between internalizing score of CBCL and total score of AYDA, and a negative relationship between externalizing score of CBCL and total score of AYDA.

Table 6 shows a summary of the correlation analyses.

Table 6.

Correlation Coefficients between Subtests of CBCL and Total Score of AYDA

<u>CBCL</u>	<u>AYDA</u>	
	r	p
Competency	.44	p<.001
Total	-.74	p<.001
Internal	-.59	p<.001
External	-.66	p<.001

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was computed also to see the degree of correlation between the subtests of CBCL and submeasures of AYDA. The analyses show that there is a positive relationship between the competency score of CBCL and communication scores, unitedness scores, management scores, competency scores, emotional scores of AYDA both for the fathers and the mothers. There is a negative correlation between the total problem scores of CBCL and all the submeasures of AYDA, a negative relationship between the internalizing score of CBCL and all submeasures of AYDA and a negative correlation between the externalizing scores of CBCL and all submeasures of AYDA. Table 7 shows a summary of correlation coefficients.

Table 7.

Correlation Coefficients between Subtests of CBCL and Measures of AYDA

AYDA Scores	CBCL Scores								
	Competency		Total Problem		Internalizing		Externalizing		
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	
Father (F)									
Mother(M)									
Communication -F	.38	p<.001	-.66	p<.001	-.52	p<.001	-.60	p<.001	
Communication -M	.43	p<.001	-.54	p<.001	-.43	p<.001	-.51	p<.001	
Unitedness - F	.45	p<.001	-.66	p<.001	-.51	p<.001	-.60	p<.001	
Unitedness -M	.37	p<.001	-.67	p<.001	-.54	p<.001	-.56	p<.001	
Management- F	.41	p<.001	-.73	p<.001	-.57	p<.001	-.65	p<.001	
Management- M	.38	p<.001	-.66	p<.001	-.52	p<.001	-.58	p<.001	
Competency-F	.41	p<.001	-.58	p<.001	-.50	p<.001	-.52	p<.001	
Competency-M	.38	p<.001	-.66	p<.001	-.52	p<.001	-.58	p<.001	
Emotion-F	.40	p<.001	-.67	p<.001	-.56	p<.001	-.60	p<.001	
Emotion-M	.49	p<.001	-.75	p<.001	-.58	p<.001	-.67	p<.001	

### Hypothesis 3:

To test Hypothesis 3, predicting a negative relationship between TRF scores and AYDA scores, Pearson Correlation coefficients were computed. Analyses showed that there is a positive relationship between competency score of TRF and total score of AYDA, a negative relationship between total problem score of TRF and total score of AYDA, a negative relationship between internalizing score of TRF and total score of AYDA and a negative relationship between externalizing score of TRF and total score of AYDA. See Table 8 for a summary of correlation coefficients.

Table 8.

#### Correlation Coefficients between Subtests of TRF and AYDA

TRF	<u>AYDA</u>	
	r	p
Competency	.46	P<.001
Total	-.64	p<.001
Internalizing	-.41	p<.001
Externalizing	-.42	p<.001

Analyses also reveal that there is a positive correlation between the competency scores of TRF and communication scores, unitedness scores, competency scores, emotional scores of AYDA. There is a negative correlation between the total problem scores of TRF and submeasures of AYDA , negative correlation between internalizing scores of TRF and submeasures of AYDA, negative correlation between externalizing scores of TRF and submeasures of AYDA. See Table 9 for a summary of correlation coefficients.

Table 9.

Correlation Coefficients between Subtests of TRF and Submeasures of AYDA

AYDA Scores	TRF Scores								
	Competency		Total problem		Internalizing		Externalizing		
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	
Father (F)									
Mother (M)									
Communication-F	.39	p<.001	-.56	p<.001	-.34	p<.001	-.40	p<.001	
Communication-M	.31	p<.001	-.43	p<.001	-.26	p<.001	-.22	p<.001	
Unitedness-F	.38	p<.001	-.56	p<.001	-.38	p<.001	-.34	p<.001	
Unitedness-M	.48	p<.001	-.63	p<.001	-.39	p<.001	-.38	p<.001	
Management-F	.43	p<.001	-.62	p<.001	-.37	p<.001	-.41	p<.001	
Management-M	.38	p<.001	-.55	p<.001	-.33	p<.001	-.38	p<.001	
Competency-F	.43	p<.001	-.51	p<.001	-.31	p<.001	-.36	p<.001	
Competency-M	.42	p<.001	-.56	p<.001	-.37	p<.001	-.38	p<.001	
Emotional-F	.33	p<.001	-.53	p<.001	-.36	p<.001	-.37	p<.001	
Emotional-M	.39	p<.001	-.59	p<.001	-.42	p<.001	-.42	p<.001	

Hypothesis 4:

The Pearson Correlation Coefficients tests were carried out to test Hypothesis 4, predicting that those children who have families with high AYDA scores will have a low discrepancy between the CBCL and TRF scores. Results of correlations were as follows: There is a negative relationship between CBCL and TRF competency difference score and total score of AYDA, a positive relationship between total score of AYDA and total problem difference score of CBCL and TRF, a positive relationship between total score of AYDA and internalizing score difference of CBCL and TRF, a positive relationship between total score of AYDA and externalizing score difference of CBCL and TRF. See Table 10 for a summary of correlation coefficients.

Table 10.  
Correlation Coefficients between Total Score of AYDA and Difference Scores of CBCL and TRF

CBCL and TRF	<u>AYDA</u>	
	r	p
Competency difference	-.17	p<.05
Total difference	.44	p<.001
Internalizing difference	.29	p<.001
Externalizing difference	.37	p<.001

The Pearson Correlation Coefficients were also carried out to see results of correlations between submeasures of AYDA and different scores of CBCL and TRF. Results were as follows: There is a negative correlation between the competency difference scores of CBCL and TRF and communication, unitedness, management, competency, emotional submeasures of AYDA. In addition, positive correlation exists between the internalizing difference scores of CBCL and TRF and submeasures of AYDA, positive correlation between externalizing difference scores of CBCL and TRF and the submeasures of AYDA.

See Table 11 for a summary of correlation coefficients.

Table 11.

Correlation Coefficients between Submeasures of AYDA and  
Difference Scores of CBCL and TRF

	Comp-difference		Total Problem difference		Internalizing		Externalizing	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Father (F)								
Mother (M)								
Communication (F)	<b>-16</b>	p<.001	.40	p<.001	.27	p<.001	.33	p<.001
Communication (M)	<b>-26</b>	p<.001	.35	p<.001	.23	p<.001	.37	p<.001
Unitedness (F)	<b>-.24</b>	p<.001	.40	p<.001	.22	p<.001	.38	p<.001
Unitedness (M)	<b>-.10</b>	p<.001	.32	p<.001	.25	p<.001	.30	p<.001
Management (F)	<b>-.17</b>	p<.001	.45	p<.001	.30	p<.001	.38	p<.001
Management (M)	<b>-.17</b>	p<.001	.41	p<.001	.28	p<.001	.32	p<.001
Competency (F)	<b>-.16</b>	p<.001	.33	p<.001	.28	p<.001	.28	p<.001
Competency (M)	<b>-.16</b>	p<.001	.40	p<.001	.22	p<.001	.33	p<.001
Emotional (F)	<b>-.21</b>	p<.001	.45	p<.001	.33	p<.001	.36	p<.001
Emotional (M)	<b>-.26</b>	p<.001	.50	p<.001	.30	p<.001	.40	p<.001

#### IV. DISCUSSION

In this study it was claimed that there would be a significant discrepancy between the young student's reported behavior in the classroom and at home reported by the teacher and the mother in relation to a family's psychological functioning. Thus the hypotheses were constructed accordingly.

The first, second, third hypotheses were supported whereas the last hypothesis was not supported.

The first hypothesis suggested a significant discrepancy between TRF scores and CBCL scores. It was concluded that the competency score, total problem score, externalizing score and internalizing score for TRF were significantly higher than CBCL scores. That is children behave quite differently in the classroom than they do at home. The result of this hypothesis is consistent with the opinion of Thomas (1968). In his study with young children he found that the child often behaves quite differently in two completely different surroundings. When sharp differences in behavior are observed at home and at school a variety of factors may be contributory. One factor is that parent and teacher may have different norms relative to acceptable and nonacceptable behavior. Extreme differences may have to do with greater restrictiveness and exercise of

adult control in one situation and greater freedom of choice and broader limits in the other. Children from homes where few limits are set feel strange at first in a situation where certain limits are imposed.

He may be rebellious and have difficulty accepting new limits, or even be resentful and hostile towards adults, as well as toward children in the new setting. On the other hand, a child who is used to excessive freedom, may feel secure and safe within reasonable boundaries set for him and be more productive and more socially outgoing than he may have been in his home.

On the other side of the issue, children identified with behavior problems by their teachers are likely to have mothers who try to gain control over their child's behavior at home. It may well be, as some research indicates, that the parents' strictness is an individual factor responsible for the child's behavior problems outside of the home (Dielman, 1972; Patterson, 1982).

When the results were analyzed in relation to the Turkish families a traditional type of family in Turkey is the authoritarian, patriarchal family (Wolf, 1966). In this kind of family, roles are very differentiated and authority is well established. Adults dominate children in all aspects of life. Men dominate women at all levels. The most dominant member of the family, therefore, is the father. Data from the 1968 Turkish National Survey suggests that the man is dominant in most families, since both sexes

are very likely to report that he is the decisionmaker in general. Husbands were reported to see themselves as having more control over the family and having more control over what their wives do (Olson, 1976). The lack of clear boundaries is especially evident with regard to rules governing economic support and decision making. Among all the nine countries which attended *Values of Children Study* (VOC), the highest levels of male decision making and lowest levels of role sharing are found in Turkey (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1979).

Turkish nuclear family structure could be seen as a mixture of high role differentiation and low personal differentiation. The status distinction between husband and wife and the separation of their spheres of activity would result in a spouse subsystem which is differentiated along the sex roles dimension, with clear boundaries between the selves of the two spouses. The relative lack of emotional expression and communication between the spouses is an indication of these boundaries (Fişek, 1980).

In previous descriptions of husband - wife relationships in Turkey, the family is seen as evolving from a traditional form characterized by a patriarchal structure to a modern form characterized by an egalitarian structure. In addition, duofocality of family structure is analyzed as a reflection of the sexual separation which characterizes Turkish society in general (Olson, 1971). Sexual separation appears to be most marked on

the dimension of social interaction. Even within family, the most intimate relationships tend to be among members of the same sex. This is a result of the separation of male and female spheres. The female members of the family seek emotional support and companionship primarily from each other (Mansur, 1972).

On the other side of the issue, the western model posits that the Turkish family is evolving into the familiar modern form with egalitarian, companionate husband -wife relationships and joint decision making (Timur, 1972).

The second hypothesis claimed that those children who have higher CBCL problem scores will have families with lower AYDA scores and the third hypothesized that the children with higher TRF problem scores will have families with lower AYDA scores. The results showed a negative relationship between the total problem scores, internalizing scores and externalizing scores of TRF, CBCL and AYDA scores. That is to say; children with behavior problems such as Social withdrawn, anxiety, depression, somatic complaints, aggression and delinquency at home and in the classroom had families with low psychological functioning. Children with the above mentioned behavioral problems at home and in the classroom came from families where communication level was lower than families having children with lower behavioral problems.

On the other hand, children who are highly competent at home and in the classroom came from families where there is higher communication, unitedness, management, competency and emotionality between its members. If we consider that much of the communication between spouses revolves around negotiations of role sharing allocation of responsibilities we should not be very surprised at the relative lack of communication in a traditional Turkish family. Decision on major issues involving the household are the husband's responsibility. For example, in one survey, only 1% of male respondents acknowledged that their wives could make important decisions, while only 3% of the women made such an acknowledgement (Timur, 1972). This pattern does not seem to differ between rural and urban couples (Gökçe, 1976). Among all the nine countries which attended *Values of Children Study* (VOC), lowest level of communication is found in Turkey (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1979). On the subject of status differentiation and gender, we can make one single generalization regarding Turkey: despite all changes, women's status is clearly lower than that of men (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1981). The lives of women in Turkey present sex-segregated socializing (Kandiyoti, 1978). The results of the VOC Study reflect the traditional intro-family sex role segregation and low status of women in Turkey (Kandiyoti, 1977).

The Turkish VOC Study has shown that socio-economic cultural factors affect people's perceptions and values and are reflected in intra family relations (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). Since the subjects in this study came from high SES, a closer examination of their styles was needed. Many of the educated elite in Turkey have tended to be active and self-conscious advocates of modernization and even westernization, at least since the latter part of nineteenth century (Türkdoğan, 1976).

Compared to other categories of women, relatively little is known about the lives of upper class or elite women (Kandiyoti, 1978). These women may also be considered a transitional generation with regard to their way of entering marriage, their conception of their roles as women and their leisure activities. Thus it is possible to conclude that mothers have developed new role strivings without making any fundamental changes in their traditional domestic expectations. When asked what attributes they considered a successful woman to possess, 32.9% defined the successful woman in exclusively domestic terms as a good mother and wife. On the otherhand, Le compte (1978) found that higher SES women reject the homemaker role more than middle class women.

Kuyaş (1980) observed the class differences on women's norms about male power or dominance in the family, which indicate a normative change in the high class towards a more egalitarian marital ideology.

The difference of means across classes was enormous in male control attitude scores, lower class women preferring male domination to a significantly higher extent than high class women who had a very low group mean.

Mothers who are satisfied with the emotional context and the problem solving mechanisms in the family perceived their children as having less behavior problems at home. Related to the general values in the VOC Study, the most important sex difference was found in “being close to spouse” which is highly important for women but not for men. This indicates that women value their relationship with their spouses more than men do. Indeed, men stress values implying social recognition, such as “achievement” and being “accepted by others” more than women do (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). If husband wife don't have much open expression of emotional closeness, it is than natural for the wife to seek closeness with her children (Sümer, 1969). With respect to relations between parents and children, the general atmosphere surrounding children is one of love and control (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1972).

Mothers have the highest positive correlation between competency scores of CBCL and emotional scores of AYDA. Mothers also have the highest negative correlation between the internalizing scores of CBCL and emotional scores of AYDA, between the emotional scores of AYDA and

total problem scores of CBCL, between the emotional scores of AYDA and the externalizing scores of CBCL. When Family Structure Assessment Device (AYDA) was given to 2050 individuals to find out the OTA values, no significant difference was found between the mothers and fathers in AYDA Emotional in an average Turkish family. The difference between the two results may be because of the variance in the income and culture of the families chosen. In this study, high SES women showed greater emphasis on the emotional context of the family than men did.

On the other hand, fathers have the highest positive correlation between unitedness AYDA scores and the competency scores of CBCL whereas the strongest negative correlation was between AYDA management scores and internalizing score of CBCL , between AYDA management scores and externalizing score of CBCL , between AYDA management scores and total problem scores of CBCL .

Interesting results were found by examining the Average Turkish Family (OTA) values. The results were as the following; the psychological situation of the average turkish family were perceived better by the fathers than the mothers. When looked at AYDA Communication submeasures in the average Turkish family, fathers have significantly higher scores than the mothers. Also fathers have higher AYDA-Unitedness scores than the mothers which leads to the assumption that the individual is alone in the

family. When members are compared in terms of management, in the average Turkish family fathers have higher management scores than the mothers (Gülerce, 1996). But the fact that the mother and the children are also powerful as individuals or subsystems can not be underestimated. For the Competency measures of AYDA in the average Turkish family it is interesting to find out that the mothers' scores are significantly higher than the fathers. There is no significant difference between the mothers and fathers in AYDA-Emotional in an average Turkish family. This shows that the members of the average Turkish family find themselves sufficient for their emotional necessities.

Children who are competent in the classroom have mothers with balanced attachment and dependency in the family. The same children also have fathers who believe in the importance of discipline rules and decision making in the family. The results are also consistent with the VOC Study in which the highest levels of male decision making are found in Turkey (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1979).

On the other side, upper class men seem more willing to share their power with women on an egalitarian basis, chiefly because education has exposed them to more liberal sex role standards (Safilios, 1967). TRF competency scores is the highest positively correlated score with

AYDA unitedness score whereas fathers' management and competency scores are positively correlated with the TRF competency scores. Children having problems in the classroom had mothers who perceived their family lower in unitedness as well as children who are socially withdrawn, with somatic complaints, anxious, aggressive and delinquent in the classroom had mothers who perceived the family system lower in emotional context. There is a negative correlation between mothers' AYDA unitedness scores and total problem scores of TRF, between AYDA emotional scores and internalizing scores of TRF, between AYDA emotional scores and externalizing scores of TRF. Fathers have the highest negative correlation between AYDA management scores and TRF total problem score, AYDA unitedness score and TRF internalizing score and AYDA management scores and TRF externalizing scores .

The data clearly reveal that the family's structure is important to children's action at home and in the classroom. Although some other studies have shown that unhealthy family structures can have an adverse impact on child behavior (Kellam, 1991), this is one of the few studies in Turkey to show such effects in an epidemiologically defined sample of first and second grade children. Furthermore, the TRF and CBCL are the very instruments in Turkey to report teachers' and mothers' perceptions systematically to interpret the scores based on standardized

norms (Akkok et al, 1988). Therefore it is expected to be a good source for clinicians to learn about the referred children's school performance behavior. Also they may be regarded as tools to describe the relationship of behavior problems to specific student characteristics such as sex, age, grade, SES and achievement. Moreover, this study is expected to lead to further research related to the applicability of the TRF and CBCL to different age, SES and education level groups.

Low correlations between informants may indicate that the target variables differ from one situation to another, rather than that the informants reports are invalid or unreliable. Behavior disorder reported by a particular informant does not necessarily mean, however, that the child should be changed. Instead, interventions may sometimes more appropriately focus changing the informants perceptions of or behavior toward the child (Achenbach, 1987). The best indicator of behavior problems for elementary school children is the combined behavioral reports of parents and teachers (Lochman, 1995).

Based on the results it can be concluded that AYDA, TRF and CBCL can be satisfactorily administered, scored and profiled for young children. Differences in teachers' expectations of their young students seem to be influential factors. This could be further investigated.

On the other hand, children who display problem behaviors in more than one setting (eg. home and the school) are likely to persist with such behavior through time (Loeber, 1982). One potential explanation of the effect of teacher student interaction on these children's behavior is that teachers may have a harder time managing children at risk and these children are more likely to behave inappropriately in response to lower levels of teacher attention than children who are not at risk. Teachers may also spend more time interacting with high achieving, well behaving students than with low achieving and misbehaving students (Leder, 1987).

The 4<sup>th</sup>. hypothesis was not supported. It claimed that those children who have families with high AYDA scores will have a low discrepancy between the CBCL and TRF scores. The data revealed that although there is a negative correlation between TRF scores and AYDA scores, CBCL scores and AYDA scores, those children who have families with high AYDA scores have high discrepancy between CBCL and TRF total scores. A positive correlation was found between AYDA total scores, AYDA communication, AYDA unitedness, AYDA management, AYDA competency, AYDA emotional and a discrepancy between TRF Internalizing scores and CBCL Internalizing scores, between AYDA total scores, AYDA submeasures and the discrepancy

between CBCL Externalizing scores and TRF Externalizing scores. On the other hand, there was a negative correlation between AYDA scores, AYDA submeasures and the discrepancy between TRF competency scores and CBCL Competency scores. That is, children with high AYDA scores have a lower discrepancy between their TRF competency scores and CBCL Competency scores. In this study, almost in all cases, there was a tendency to score a child's behavior in the same direction by mothers and teachers. Although there was a discrepancy between the TRF and CBCL scores, children with high TRF and CBCL scores came from families with lower AYDA scores. Due to this fact, the discrepancy between TRF and CBCL does not show a negative effect on the family's psychological functioning.

In conclusion, although the high perceived family system has a significant positive impact on the behavior profile of children at home and in the classroom, such an effect of the perceived family system on the discrepancy between CBCL and TRF was not found in this study.

It is also important to note that data was not available on the child's classroom environment. This means that in the next stage of work, the effect of classroom climate and the teacher's classroom management procedures on the misbehaving child needs to be understood. This research should involve direct child-child and teacher-child interactions.

Further investigations of mechanisms operating in the relationship between family, teacher and child behavior will contribute to the understanding and prevention of child behavior problems.

## REFERENCES

- Achenbach, T. (1974). *Developmental psychopathology*.  
New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Achenbach, T. (1978). The child behavior profile. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46,3, 478-488.
- Achenbach, T. (1987). Child behavioral and emotional problems. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101, 2, 213-232.
- Ackerman, N. W. (1958). *The psychodynamics of family life*.  
New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Ackerman, N. W. (1968). *Foundations of child psychiatry*.  
New York: Pergamon Press.
- Akkok, F. (1989). The adaptation and the standardization of the teacher version of the child behavior profile. *International Journal of Psychology*, 24, 129-136.
- Ammerman, R. T. (1990). *Children at risk*.  
New York: Plenum Press.

- Anderson, L. M. (1969). Personality characteristics of parents of aggressive boys. *Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology*, 33, 575-581.
- Arbor, A. (1996). High scope children. *High Scope Resource*, 96, 9-12.
- Armentrout, A. (1971). Parental child-rearing attitudes. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 37, 278-285.
- Axline, V. M. (1969). *Play Therapy*.  
New York: Ballantine Books.
- Bandurg, A. (1963). *Social learning and personality development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Bird, H. (1991). Screening for childhood psychopathology in the community using the child behavior checklist. *Journal of the Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 30, 1, 116-123.
- Campbell, S. (1996). Behavior problems. *Development and Psychopathology*, 8, 4, 701-719.
- Dahike, H. O. (1965). *School Days*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Erol, N. (1997). *Türkiye Ruh Sağlığı Profili* .  
Ankara: Aydoğdu Ofset.
- Forehand, R. (1986). Contribution of child behavior and marital dissatisfaction and maternal perceptions of child maladjustment. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 24, 1, 43-48.
- Frank, G. H. (1965). The role of the family in the development of psychopathology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 64 , 191-205.
- Farel, A. (1980). Effects of maternal roles on school adjustment and competence. *Child Development*, 51, 1179-1196.
- Friedman, R. (1990). *Family roots of school learning*.  
New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Gay, L. R. (1992 ). *Educational Research*.  
New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Graudenz , I. (1978). Self perception and perception by others. *Psychologic - in Erziehung und Unterricht*, 25, 4, 205-209.
- Glidewell, J. C. (1963). Screening in schools for behavior disorders. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 26, 38-41.

- Gottfried, A. E. (1988). *Maternal Employment and Children's Development*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Gökçe, B. (1976). *Gecekondu gençliği*.  
Ankara: Hacettepe University Publication.
- Gülerce, A. (1992). *Aile Yapısını Değerlendirme Aracı: El Kitabı ve Türk Normları*, Alphagraphics, Istanbul.
- Gülerce, A. (1996). *Türkiye 'de Ailelerin Psikolojik Örüntüleri*.  
İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Matbaası
- Hjelle, L. A. (1981). *Personality theories*.  
New York: McGraw Hill International Book Co.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1982). *Sex roles, family and community in Turkey*.  
Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1993). *İnsan, aile, kültür*.  
İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures*.  
New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, Inc.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1978). Sex roles and social change. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 77, 3, 1.

- Kellam, S. & Werthamer, L. (1991). Effect of first grade classroom environment on shy behavior, aggressive behavior and concentration problems. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 19*, 4, 585-601.
- Kerig, P. K. (1995). Triangles in the family circle: Effects of family structure on marriage, parenting, and child adjustment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 1*, 28-43.
- Krumboltz, J. D. (1972). *Changing Children's Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Lachenmeyer, J. R. (1989). *Psychopathology in Childhood*. New York: Gardner Press Inc.
- Loeber, R. (1984). Family conditions influencing cross setting consistency. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52*, 5, 759-768.
- Lochman, J. E. (1995). Screening of child behavior problems for prevention programs at school entry. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 4, 549-559.

- Mansur, F. (1972). *A town in the Aegean*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Meacham, M. L. (1974). *Changing classroom behavior*.  
New York: Intext Educational Publishers.
- Pederson, F. A. (1982). *Families as learning environments for children*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Peterson, D. (1959). Factors in parental behavior and personality as related to problem behavior in children.  
*Journal of Consulting Psychology, 23*, 107-118.
- Phares, V. (1996). Parental perceptions of the development and treatment of children's emotional and behavioral problems.  
*Child and Family Behavior Therapy, 18*, 4, 19-36.
- Phares, V. (1997). Accuracy of informants. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 25*, 2, 165 -171.
- Safilios C. (1967). *Women and social policy*.  
Englewood cliffs, N.J. : Prentice Hall.
- Schechtman, A. (1970). Psychiatric symptoms in normal and disturbed children. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*, 508-515.

Timur, Ş. (1972). *Türkiye'de aile yapısı*.

Ankara: Hacettepe üniversitesi Yayınları.

Tschann, J. M. (1996). Family functioning and behavior problems.

*Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 35, 2, 184 - 192.

Veernam, W. (1995). Family stress, family functioning and

behavioral problems following child psychiatric treatment.

*European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Journal*, 4, 1, 21-31.

Verhulst, F. (1985). Mental health in dutch children.

*Acta Psychiatrica*, 72, 45.

Verhulst, F. (1989). Agreement between parents and teachers rating

of behavioral / emotional problems of children aged 4-12, *Journal of*

*Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 30, 1, 123 -136.

Verhulst, F. (1991). Four year follow-up of teacher-reported

problem behaviors. *Psychological Medicine*, 21, 4, 965-977.

Verhulst, F. (1994). Differential predictive value of parents' and

teachers' reports of children's problem behaviors. *Journal of*

*Abnormal Child Psychology*, 22, 5, 531-546.

- Verhulst, F. (1995). Recent developments in the assessment of child psychopathology. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 11, 3, 203-212.
- Weiner, H. (1971). *Maladaptive patterns of family interaction*. Boston: Brown Company.
- Willard, W. (1988). Family cohesion and childhood behavior problems. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 16, 2, 233-246
- Whitman, W. (1989). *The family setting*. New York: Gardner Press Inc.
- Wolf, E. (1966). *Peasants*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. :Prentice Halls, Inc.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **CHILDREN BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST (CBCL/4-18)**

## 4-18 YAŞ ÇOCUK VE GENÇLER İÇİN DAVRANIŞ DEĞERLENDİRME ÖLÇEĞİ

ID: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>ÇOCUĞUN ADI, SOYADI :</b>	<b>EV ADRESİNİZ VE TEL. NO :</b>	<b>ANNE BABANIN İŞİ, EĞİTİMİ VE YAŞI</b>	
		BABANIN İŞİ : _____ TEL NO. _____ EĞİTİMİ : _____ YAŞI : _____	ANNENİN İŞİ : _____ TEL NO. _____ EĞİTİMİ : _____ YAŞI : _____
<b>CİNSİYETİ :</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ERKEK <input type="checkbox"/> KIZ	<b>YAŞI :</b>	<b>FORMU DOLDURAN :</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ANNE <input type="checkbox"/> BABA <input type="checkbox"/> DİĞER _____ Çocukla olan ilişkisi _____	
<b>BUGÜNÜN TARİHİ</b>	<b>ÇOCUĞUN DOĞUM TARİHİ</b>		
AY --- GÜN --- YIL ---	AY --- GÜN --- YIL ---		
<b>OKULUN ADI :</b>	Çocuğunuzun davranışlarıyla ilgili bu formu titizlikle doldürünüz. Her bir madde ile ilgili bilgi verebilir ve 2. sayfadaki boşluklara yazabilirsiniz. Teşekkürlerimizle.		
<b>SINIFI :</b>			
<b>OKULA DEVAM ETMİYOR</b> <input type="checkbox"/>			

### I. ÇOCUĞUNUZUN YAPMAKTAN EN ÇOK HOŞLANDIĞI SPORLARI

SIRALAYINIZ. Örneğin: Yüzme, futbol, basketbol, voleybol, atletizm, tekvando, jimnastik, bisiklete binme, güreş, balık tutma gibi.

Hiçbiri

Yaşlarına oranla çocuğunuz her birine ne kadar zaman ayırır?

Yaşlarına oranla çocuğunuz her birinde ne kadar başarılıdır?

- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
b. \_\_\_\_\_  
c. \_\_\_\_\_

her birine ne kadar zaman ayırır?				her birinde ne kadar başarılıdır?			
Bilmiyorum	Normalden az	Normal	Normalden fazla	Bilmiyorum	Normalden az	Normal	Normalden fazla
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### II. ÇOCUĞUNUZUN SPOR DIŞINDAKİ İLGİ ALANLARI, UĞRAŞ, OYUN VE AKTİVİTELERİNİ SIRALAYINIZ.

Örneğin: Pul, bebek, araba, akvaryum, el işi, kitap satranç, müzik aleti çalmak, şarkı söylemek, resim yapmak gibi (Radyo dinlemeyi ya da televizyon izlemeyi katmayınız)

Hiçbiri

Yaşlarına oranla çocuğunuz her birine ne kadar zaman ayırır?

Yaşlarına oranla çocuğunuz her birinde ne kadar başarılıdır?

- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
b. \_\_\_\_\_  
c. \_\_\_\_\_

her birine ne kadar zaman ayırır?				her birinde ne kadar başarılıdır?			
Bilmiyorum	Normalden az	Normal	Normalden fazla	Bilmiyorum	Normalden az	Normal	Normalden fazla
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### III. ÇOCUĞUNUZUN ÜYESİ OLDUĞU KURULUŞ, KULÜP, TAKIM YA DA GRUPLARI SIRALAYINIZ.

(Spor, müzik, izcilik, folklor gibi.)

Hiçbiri

Yaşlarına oranla çocuğunuz her birinde ne kadar aktiftir?

- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
b. \_\_\_\_\_  
c. \_\_\_\_\_

Bilmiyorum	Az aktif	Normal	Çok aktif
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### IV. ÇOCUĞUNUZUN EVDE YA DA EV DIŞINDA YAPTIĞI İŞLERİ

SIRALAYINIZ. Örneğin: Gazete alma, bakkala gitme, pazara gitme, elektrik-su faturası yatırma, çocuk bakımı, yatak düzeltme, sofa kurma, kaldırma, bir dükkanda çalışma gibi ödeme yapılan ve yapılmayan her türlü işleri katınız.

Hiçbiri

Yaşlarına oranla her birini ne kadar başarı ile yapar?

- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
b. \_\_\_\_\_  
c. \_\_\_\_\_

Bilmiyorum	Normalden az	Normal	Normalden fazla
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

V. 1- Çocuğunuzun yaklaşık olarak kaç tane yakın arkadaşı vardır?

(Kardeşlerini katmayınız)

Hiç yok

1

2 ya da 3

4 ya da fazla

2- Çocuğunuz okul dışı zamanlarda haftada kaç kez arkadaşlarıyla birlikte olur ?

(Kardeşlerini katmayınız)

1 den az

1 ya da 2

3 ya da daha fazla

VI. Yaşıtlarına oranla çocuğunuzun :

Normal

Oldukça

Kötü

sayılır

İyidir

Kardeşi yoktur.

a. Kardeşleriyle arası nasıldır?

b. Diğer çocuklarla arası nasıldır?

c. Anabasına karşı davranışı nasıldır?

d. Kendi başına oyun oynaması ve iş yapması nasıldır?

VII. 1- Çocuğunuzun okul başarısı nasıldır? (6 yaş ve yukarı için) Çocuğunuz eğer okula gitmiyorsa lütfen nedenini belirtiniz \_\_\_\_\_

Başarısız

Orta

Başarılı

Çok Başarılı

a. Okuma yazma, Türkçe

b. Hayat bilgisi, Sosyal bilgiler

c. Aritmetik

d. Fen bilgisi

Diğer derslerde nasıldır? Örneğin: Yabancı dil, bilgisayar.

(Beden eğitimi, resim ve müziği katmayınız)

e. \_\_\_\_\_

f. \_\_\_\_\_

g. \_\_\_\_\_

2- Çocuğunuz alt özel sınıf ya da bir özel eğitim kurumunda okuyor mu ?

Hayır

Evet - Ne tür bir sınıf ya da okul? \_\_\_\_\_

3- Çocuğunuz hiç sınıfta kaldı mı?

Hayır

Evet - Kaçınıcı sınıfta ve nedeni \_\_\_\_\_

4- Çocuğunuzun okulda ders ya da ders dışı sorunları oldu mu?

Hayır

Evet - açıklayınız \_\_\_\_\_

Bu sorunlar ne zaman başladı? \_\_\_\_\_

Sorunlar bitti mi?

Hayır

Evet - Ne zaman \_\_\_\_\_

5- Çocuğunuzun herhangi bir hastalığı, fiziksel rahatsızlığı ya da zihinsel özürü var mıdır?

Hayır

Evet - açıklayınız \_\_\_\_\_

6- Çocuğunuzun sizi en çok üzen, kaygılandıran özellikleri nelerdir? \_\_\_\_\_

7- Çocuğunuzun en beğendiğiniz özelliklerini belirtiniz : \_\_\_\_\_

Aşağıda çocukların özelliklerini tanımlayan bir dizi madde bulunmaktadır. Her bir madde çocuğunuzun şu andaki ya da son 6 ay içindeki durumunu belirtmektedir. Bir madde çocuğunuz için çok ya da sıklıkla doğru ise 2, bazen ya da biraz doğru ise 1, hiç doğru değilse 0 sayılarını yuvarlak içine alınız. Lütfen tüm maddeleri işaretlemeye çalışınız.

0 : Doğru Değil (bildiğiniz kadarıyla)

1 : Bazen ya da Biraz Doğru

2 : Çok ya da Sıklıkla Doğru

- 0 1 2 1.Yaşından daha küçük bir çocuk gibi davranır
- 0 1 2 2.Allerjisi vardır (Yeme, koklama ile, tozlu bir yerde bulunmak-  
la kaşıntı, döküntü, göz yaşarması vs. olması) : \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 3.Çok tartışır
- 0 1 2 4.Astımı (nefes darlığı) vardır
- 0 1 2 5.Karşı cinsten biri gibi davranır
- 0 1 2 6.Kakasını tuvaletten başka yerlere yapar
- 0 1 2 7.Övünür, yüksekte atar, hava yapar
- 0 1 2 8.Dikkatini uzun süre bir konu üzerinde toplayamaz
- 0 1 2 9.Bazı düşünceleri kafasına takar ve bunları aklından çıkaramaz  
(açıklayınız) \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 10.Yerinde rahat duramaz, çok hareketlidir
- 0 1 2 11.Yetişkinlerin dizinin dibinden ayrılmaz, onlara çok bağımlıdır
- 0 1 2 12.Yalnızlıktan yakılır
- 0 1 2 13.Kafası karışık, şaşkın görünür
- 0 1 2 14.Çok ağlar
- 0 1 2 15.Hayvanlara eziyet eder
- 0 1 2 16.Başkalarına eziyet eder, zalimce ve kötü davranır
- 0 1 2 17.Hayale dalıp gider, kendini unuttur
- 0 1 2 18.Bile bile kendine zarar verir ya da intihar girişiminde bulunur
- 0 1 2 19.Hep dikkat çekmek ister
- 0 1 2 20.Eşyalarına zarar verir
- 0 1 2 21.Ailesine ya da başkalarına ait eşyalara zarar verir
- 0 1 2 22.Evde söz dinlemez
- 0 1 2 23.Okulda söz dinlemez
- 0 1 2 24.İştahsızdır, az yemek yer
- 0 1 2 25.Diğer çocuklarla geçinemez
- 0 1 2 26.Yanlıştır davranışından dolayı suçlanmış gibi görünmez
- 0 1 2 27.Genellikle kiskançtır
- 0 1 2 28.Yenilip içilmeyecek şeyleri yer, ya da içer (kum,kil, kalem,  
silgi gibi) (açıklayınız) : \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 29.Bazı hayvanlardan ve okul dışı ortamlardan ya da yerlerden  
korkar (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 30.Okula gitmekten korkar
- 0 1 2 31.Kötü bir şey düşünmek ya da yapmaktan korkar
- 0 1 2 32.Mükemmel olmasının gerektiğine inanır

- 0 1 2 33.Kimsenin onu sevmediğine inanır ve bundan yakılır
- 0 1 2 34.Başkalarının ona zarar vereceğini, kötülük yapacağını düşünür
- 0 1 2 35.Kendini değersiz hisseder
- 0 1 2 36.Çok sık bir yerlerini incitir, başı kazadan kurtulmaz
- 0 1 2 37.Çok kavgalı, dövülür eder
- 0 1 2 38.Onunla çok alay edilir (Arkadaşları onunla çok alay eder)
- 0 1 2 39.Baş belada olan kişilerle dolaşır
- 0 1 2 40.Olmayan sesler işitir (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 41.Düşünmeden ya da aniden hareket eder (aklına eseni yapar)
- 0 1 2 42.Başkalarıyla beraber olmaksızın yalnız kalmayı tercih eder
- 0 1 2 43.Yalan söyler ve hile yapar
- 0 1 2 44.Tırnaklarını yer
- 0 1 2 45.Sinirli ve gergindir
- 0 1 2 46.Kas seğirmeleri, tikleri vardır : \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 47.Gece kabusları, korkulu rüyaları vardır
- 0 1 2 48.Diğer çocuklar tarafından sevilmez
- 0 1 2 49.Kabızlık çeker
- 0 1 2 50.Çok korkak ve kaygılıdır
- 0 1 2 51.Baş dönmesi vardır
- 0 1 2 52.Kendini çok suçlu hissedir.
- 0 1 2 53.Aşırı yemek yer
- 0 1 2 54.Aşırı yorgundur
- 0 1 2 55.Çok kiloludur
- 56.Tıbbi nedeni bilinmeyen bedensel şikayetleri vardır:
- 0 1 2 a. Ağrılar, sızılar
- 0 1 2 b.Başağrıları
- 0 1 2 c.Bulantı, kusma hissi
- 0 1 2 d.Gözle ilgili şikayetler (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 e.Döküntüler ya da başka cilt sorunları
- 0 1 2 f.Mide-karın ağrısı ve krampları
- 0 1 2 g.Kusma
- 0 1 2 h.Diğer (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_

0 : Doğru Değil (bildiğiniz kadarıyla)

1 : Bazen ya da Biraz Doğru

2 : Çok ya da Sıklıkla Doğru

- 0 1 2 57.İnsanlara fiziksel saldırıda bulunur
- 0 1 2 58.Burmuşla, cildiyle, vücudunun başka kısımlarıyla oynar ve yolar (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 59.Herkesin ortasında cinsel organlarıyla oynar
- 0 1 2 60.Cinsel organlarıyla çok fazla oynar
- 0 1 2 61.Okul başarısı düşüktür
- 0 1 2 62.Dengesiz ve sakardır
- 0 1 2 63.Kendinden büyük çocuklarla olmayı tercih eder
- 0 1 2 64.Kendinden küçük çocuklarla olmayı tercih eder
- 0 1 2 65.Konuşmayı reddeder
- 0 1 2 66.Bazı hareketleri tekrar tekrar yapar (tanımlayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 67.Evden kaçır
- 0 1 2 68.Çok bağırır, çağırır
- 0 1 2 69.Sır vermez, düşüncelerini kendine saklar
- 0 1 2 70.Olmayan şeyleri görür (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 71.Sıkılgan ve utangaçtır
- 0 1 2 72.Yangın çıkarır
- 0 1 2 73.Cinsel sorunları vardır (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 74.Gösterişten hoşlanır, maskaralık yapar
- 0 1 2 75.Çekingen ve ürkektir
- 0 1 2 76.Çocukların çoğundan daha az uyur
- 0 1 2 77.Çocukların çoğundan gece ve gündüz daha çok uyur (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 78.Kakasıyla oynar yada etrafa bulaştırır
- 0 1 2 79.Konuşma güçlüğü vardır (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 80.Boş gözlerle uzun uzun bakar
- 0 1 2 81.Evden çalmaları vardır
- 0 1 2 82.Evin dışında çalmaları vardır
- 0 1 2 83.İhtiyacı olmayan nesnelere toplar, biriktirir (tanımlayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 84.Acayip, tuhaf davranışları vardır (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_

- 0 1 2 85.Acayip, tuhaf düşünceleri vardır (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 86.İnatçı, somurtkan ve rahatsız edicidir
- 0 1 2 87.Duygu durumunda ani değişiklikler olur
- 0 1 2 88.Çok sık küser
- 0 1 2 89.Şüphelidir
- 0 1 2 90.Küfürlü ve açık saçık konuşur
- 0 1 2 91.Kendini öldürmekten söz eder
- 0 1 2 92.Uykuda yürür ve konuşur (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 93.Çok fazla konuşur
- 0 1 2 94.Başkalarıyla çok dalga geçer, alay eder
- 0 1 2 95.Öfke nöbetleri vardır, çok çabuk öfkelenir
- 0 1 2 96.Cinsel konuları fazlaca düşündür
- 0 1 2 97.İnsanları tehdit eder
- 0 1 2 98.Parmak emer
- 0 1 2 99.Temizliğe ve titizliğe aşırı düşkündür
- 0 1 2 100.Uyku sorunu vardır: \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 101.Okuldan kaçır, dersini asar
- 0 1 2 102.Hareketsiz ve yavaşır, enerjik değildir
- 0 1 2 103.Mutsuz, üzgün, çökkün ve bezgindir
- 0 1 2 104.Çok gürlütlüktür
- 0 1 2 105.Tıbbi amaç dışında alkol yada ilaç kullanır (açıklayınız): \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 106.Etrafındaki eşyalara amaçsız olarak zarar vermekten zevk alır
- 0 1 2 107.Gündüz altını ıslatır
- 0 1 2 108.Yatağını ıslatır
- 0 1 2 109.Sızlanır, mızırdanır
- 0 1 2 110.Karşı cinsten olmayı ister
- 0 1 2 111.İçe kapanıktır, başkalarıyla birlikte olmak istemez
- 0 1 2 112.Evhamlıdır, herşeyi dert edinir
- 113.Çocuğunuzun yukarıdaki listede belirtilmeyen başka sorunu varsa lütfen yazınız: \_\_\_\_\_
- 0 1 2 \_\_\_\_\_

TÜM MADDELERİ LÜTFEN CEVAPLAYINIZ.

SİZİ KAYGILANDIRAN MADDELERİN ALTINI ÇİZİNİZ

\* Son 6 aylık sürenin dışında yukarıda sözlü edilen özellikler çocuğun yaşamının herhangi bir döneminde görüldü mü?  Hayır  Evet \_\_\_\_\_

\* Son 1 yıl içinde çocuk ruh sağlığı kliniklerine başvurdunuz mu?  Hayır  Evet \_\_\_\_\_

\* Çocuğunuz Kur'an Kursuna gitti ya da halen gidiyor mu?  Hayır  Evet \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX B**

**TEACHER REPORT FORM  
(TRF/5-18)**

## ÖĞRETMEN BİLGİ FORMU

Öğrencinizle ilgili verdiğiniz yanıtlar, aynı yaştaki öğrencilerden elde edilen ve diğer kaynaklardan sağlanan bilgilerle karşılaştırılacaktır. Her bir maddeden elde edilen puan öğrencinizin genel davranışını belirlemeye katkıda bulunacaktır. Maddelerin tümünü işaretlemeye çalışınız. Eklemek istediğiniz bilgiler ve öneriler olursa lütfen boşluklara ve arka sayfalara yazınız.

ID :

ÖĞRENCİNİN ADI, SOYADI		ANNE BABANIN İŞİ, EĞİTİMİ (Soo bitirilen okula göre eğitim durumları): BABANIN İŞİ : ----- EĞİTİMİ : ----- ANNENİN İŞİ : ----- EĞİTİMİ : -----
CİNSİYETİ : 1. <input type="checkbox"/> ERKEK 1. <input type="checkbox"/> KIZ	YAŞI :	FORMU DOLDURAN : 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Sınıf öğretmeni (adı) ----- 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Rehber öğretmen ----- 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Diğer -----
BUGÜNÜN TARİHİ	DOĞUM TARİHİ (Büünüyorsa)	
GÜN --- AY --- YIL ---	AY --- GÜN --- YIL ---	
SINIFI : -----	OKULUN ADI : -----	

I. Bu öğrenciyi ne kadar zamandır tanyorsunuz ? -----

II. Bu öğrenciyi ne kadar iyi tanyorsunuz ? -----

1.  İyi tanıyorum      2.  Oldukça iyi tanıyorum      3.  Çok iyi tanıyorum

III. Bu öğrenciyi haftada kaç saat dersiniz var ? -----

IV. Okulun türü ve uygulanan eğitim sistemini lütfen belirtiniz.

1.  Devlet okulu      1.  Tam gün  
2.  Özel okul      2.  Yarı gün  
3.  Üçü öğretim

V. Öğrencinizin herhangi bir alanda özel eğitime ihtiyacı var mıdır ? -----

- Bilmiyorum      0.  Hayır      1.  Evet-Ne tür -----

VI. Öğrenciniz hiç sınıfta kaldı mı ? -----

- Bilmiyorum      0.  Hayır      1.  Evet-Kaçıncı sınıfta -----

VII. Şu andaki okul başarısı nasıldır-Dersleri süreleyip uygun sınımu lütfen işaretleyiniz:

DERS	1. Sınıf düzeyinin çok altında	2. Sınıf düzeyinin altında	3. Sınıf düzeyinde	4. Sınıf düzeyinin üstünde	5. sınıf düzeyinin çok üstünde
1. -----	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. -----	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. -----	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. -----	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. -----	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. -----	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Copyright 1991 T.M.Achenbach, U. of Vermont,

Türkçe çeviri ve uyarlaması : Neşe Erol tarafından

T.M.Achenbach'ın izniyle yapılmış ve basılmıştır (2-1992).

Ankara Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Çocuk Psikiyatri Bilim Dalı

1-91 Bz-

## ÖĞRETMEN BİLGİ FORMU

III. Yaşlarına oranla öğrenciniz :	1.Çok az	2.Oldukça az	3.Az	4.Normal sayılır	5.Fazla	6.Oldukça fazla	7.Çok fazla
1.Derslerinde başarılı mıdır?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.Uyumlu mudur?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.Kolay öğrenir mi?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.Mutlu mudur?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1. Bu yıl öğrencinize okulda herhangi bir anket ya da ölçek uygulandı mı?

Hayır  Evet-Adı \_\_\_\_\_

2. Bu yıl öğrencinize okulda zeka ya da yetenek testleri uygulandı mı?

Hayır  Evet - (Testlerin adı) \_\_\_\_\_ Sonucu : \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Öğrencinin herhangi bir hastalığı, fiziksel rahatsızlığı ya da zihinsel özürü var mıdır?

Hayır  Evet-açıklayınız \_\_\_\_\_

4. Öğrencinizin sizi en çok kaygılandıran özelliği nedir?

5. Öğrenciyi en iyi tanımlayan olumlu özelliklerini belirtiniz:

6. Öğrencinin ders durumu, davranışları ve becerileri ile ilgili görüş ve önerilerinizi lütfen yazınız:

## ÖĞRETMEN BİLGİ FORMU

Aşağıda öğrencilerin özelliklerini tanımlayan maddeler bulunmaktadır. Her bir madde öğrencinin şu andaki ya da son 2 ay içindeki durumunu belirtmektedir. Bir madde öğrenciniz için çok ya da sıklıkla doğru ise 2, bazen ya da biraz doğru ise 1, hiç doğru değilse 0 sayılarını yuvarlak içine alınız. Lütfen tüm maddeleri işaretlemeye çalışınız.

0 : Doğru Değil (bildiğiniz kadarıyla)

1 : Bazen ya da Biraz Doğru

2 : Çok ya da Sıklıkla Doğru

- | 0 1 2 1.Yaşından daha küçük bir çocuk gibi davranır  | 0 1 2 33.Kimsenin onu sevmediğine inanır ve bundan yakınır             |
|--|--|
| 0 1 2 2.Sınıfta mırıldanır, garip sesler çıkarır   | 0 1 2 34.Başkalarının ona zarar vereceğini, kötülük yapacağını düşünür |
| 0 1 2 3.Çok tartırır   | 0 1 2 35.Kendini değersiz hisseder                                     |
| 0 1 2 4.Başladığı işi bitiremez  | 0 1 2 36.Çok sık bir yerlerini incitir, başı kazadan kurtulmaz         |
| 0 1 2 5.Karşı cinsten biri gibi davranır   | 0 1 2 37.Çok kavgaya dövlüş eder                                       |
| 0 1 2 6.Öğretmenlerine ve diğer okul personeline karşı gelir   | 0 1 2 38.Onunla çok alay edilir (Arkadaşları onunla çok alay eder)     |
| 0 1 2 7.Övünür, yüksekten atar, hava yapar   | 0 1 2 39.Baş belada olan kişilerle dolaşır                             |
| 0 1 2 8.Dikkatini uzun süre bir konu üzerinde toplayamaz   | 0 1 2 40.Olmayan sesler işitir (açıklayınız): _____                    |
| 0 1 2 9.Bazı düşünceleri kafasına takar ve bunları aklından çıkaramaz (açıklayınız) _____                | 0 1 2 41.Düşünmeden ya da aniden hareket eder (aklına eseni yapar)     |
| 0 1 2 10.Yerinde rahat duramaz, çok hareketlidir   | 0 1 2 42.Başkalarıyla beraber olmaksızın yalnız kalmayı tercih eder    |
| 0 1 2 11.Yetişkinlerin dizinin dibinden ayrılmaz, onlara çok bağımlıdır                                  | 0 1 2 43.Yalan söyler ve hile yapar                                    |
| 0 1 2 12.Yalnızlıktan yakınır  | 0 1 2 44.Turnaklarını yer  |
| 0 1 2 13.Kafası karışık, saçkın görünür  | 0 1 2 45.Sinirli ve gergindir  |
| 0 1 2 14.Çok ağlar   | 0 1 2 46.Kasları oynar, seğirir, tikleri vardır : _____                |
| 0 1 2 15.Kıpır kıpırdır  | Kasları oynar, seğirir   |
| 0 1 2 16.Başkalarına eziyet eder, zalimce ve kötü davranır   | 0 1 2 47.Kurallara çok fazla uyar                                      |
| 0 1 2 17.Hayale dalıp gider, düşüncelerinde kaybolur   | 0 1 2 48.Diğer öğrenciler tarafından sevilmez                          |
| 0 1 2 18.Bile bile kendine zarar verir ya da intihar girişiminde bulunur                                 | 0 1 2 49.Öğrenme güçlüğü vardır  |
| 0 1 2 19.Hep dikkat çekmek ister   | 0 1 2 50.Çok korkak ve kaygılıdır                                      |
| 0 1 2 20.Eşyalarına zarar verir  | 0 1 2 51.Baş dönmesi vardır  |
| 0 1 2 21.Ailesine ya da başkalarına ait eşyalara zarar verir   | 0 1 2 52.Kendini çok suçlu hisseder                                    |
| 0 1 2 22.Söylenenleri anlamakta güçlüük çeker  | 0 1 2 53.Sırasını beklemeden konuşur                                   |
| 0 1 2 23.Okulda söz dinlemez   | 0 1 2 54.Aşırı yorgundur   |
| 0 1 2 24.Diğer öğrencileri rahatsız eder   | 0 1 2 55.Çok kiloludur   |
| 0 1 2 25.Diğer öğrencilerle iyi geçinemez  | 56.Tıbbi nedeni bilinmeyen bedensel şikayetleri vardır:                |
| 0 1 2 26.Yanlıı davranışından dolayı suçlanmış gibi görünmez   | 0 1 2 a. Ağrılar, sızılar  |
| 0 1 2 27.Genellikle kıskançtır   | 0 1 2 b.Baş ağrıları   |
| 0 1 2 28.Yenilip içilmeyecek şeyleri yer, ya da içer (kum, kil, kalem, silgi gibi) (açıklayınız) : _____ | 0 1 2 c.Bulanti, kusma hissi   |
| 0 1 2 29.Bazı hayvanlardan ve okul dışı ortamlardan ya da yerlerden korkar (açıklayınız): _____          | 0 1 2 d.Gözle ilgili şikayetler (açıklayınız): _____                   |
| 0 1 2 30.Okula gitmekten korkar  | 0 1 2 e.Döküntüler ya da başka cilt sorunları                          |
| 0 1 2 31.Kötü bir şey yapmaktan ya da düşünmekten korkar   | 0 1 2 f.Mide-karın ağrısı ve kramplar                                  |
| 0 1 2 32.Mükemmel olmasının gerektiğine inanır   | 0 1 2 g.Kusma  |
|  | 0 1 2 h.Diğer (açıklayınız) : _____                                    |
|  | 0 1 2 57.İnsanlara fiziksel sahlında bulunur                           |

## ÖĞRETMEN BİLGİ FORMU

0 : Doğru Değil (bildiğiniz kadarıyla)

1 : Bazen ya da Biraz Doğru

2 : Çok ya da Sıklıkla Doğru

<p>0 1 2 58. Burnuyla, cildiyle, vücudunun başka kısımlarıyla oynar ya da yolar (açıklayınız): _____</p> <p>0 1 2 59. Sınıfta uyur</p> <p>0 1 2 60. Hevessiz, isteksiz ve durgundur</p> <p>0 1 2 61. Okul başarısı düşüktür</p> <p>0 1 2 62. Dengesiz ve sakardır</p> <p>0 1 2 63. Kendinden büyük çocuklarla olmayı tercih eder</p> <p>0 1 2 64. Kendinden küçük çocuklarla olmayı tercih eder</p> <p>0 1 2 65. Konuşmayı reddeder</p> <p>0 1 2 66. Bazı hareketleri tekrar tekrar yapar (açıklayınız): _____</p> <p>0 1 2 67. Sınıf disiplinini bozar</p> <p>0 1 2 68. Çok bağırır, çağırır</p> <p>0 1 2 69. Sır vermez, düşüncelerini kendine saklar</p> <p>0 1 2 70. Olmayan şeyleri görür (açıklayınız): _____</p> <p>0 1 2 71. Sıkılgan ve utançtır</p> <p>0 1 2 72. Dağınık, düzensiz çalışır</p> <p>0 1 2 73. Sorumsuzca davranır (açıklayınız): _____</p> <p>0 1 2 74. Gösterişten hoşlanır, maskaralık yapar</p> <p>0 1 2 75. Çekingen ve ürkektir</p> <p>0 1 2 76. Beklenmedik ani, fevri hareketleri vardır</p> <p>0 1 2 77. İstekleri yerine getirilmezse hevesi çabuk kırılır</p> <p>0 1 2 78. Dikkati çabuk dağılır, dikkatsizdir</p> <p>0 1 2 79. Konuşma güçlüğü vardır (açıklayınız): _____</p> <p>0 1 2 80. Boş gözlerle uzun uzun bakar</p> <p>0 1 2 81. Eleştirildiğinde incinir, gücenir</p> <p>0 1 2 82. Evin dışında çalmaları vardır</p> <p>0 1 2 83. İhtiyacı olmayan nesnelere toplar, biriktirir (açıklayınız): _____</p> <p>0 1 2 84. Acayip, tuhaf davranışları vardır (açıklayınız): _____</p>	<p>0 1 2 85. Acayip, tuhaf düşünceleri vardır (açıklayınız): _____</p> <p>0 1 2 86. İnatçı, somurtkan ve rahatsız edicidir</p> <p>0 1 2 87. Duygu durumunda ani değişiklikler olur, bir anı bir anını tutmaz</p> <p>0 1 2 88. Çok sık küser</p> <p>0 1 2 89. Şüphelidir</p> <p>0 1 2 90. Küfürlü ve açık saçık konuşur</p> <p>0 1 2 91. Kendini öldürmekten söz eder</p> <p>0 1 2 92. Başarısızdır, yeterince çaba göstermez</p> <p>0 1 2 93. Çok fazla konuşur</p> <p>0 1 2 94. Başkalarıyla çok dalga geçer, alay eder</p> <p>0 1 2 95. Öfke nöbetleri vardır, çok çabuk öfkelenir</p> <p>0 1 2 96. Cinsel konuları fazlaca düşündür</p> <p>0 1 2 97. İnsanları tehdit eder</p> <p>0 1 2 98. Okula ve derse geç kalır</p> <p>0 1 2 99. Temizliğe ve titizliğe aşırı düşkündür, çok önem verir</p> <p>0 1 2 100. Kendine verilen görevleri yerine getirmez</p> <p>0 1 2 101. Okuldan kaçır, dersini asar</p> <p>0 1 2 102. Hareketsiz ve yavaştır, enerjik değildir</p> <p>0 1 2 103. Mutsuz, üzgün, çökkün ve keyifsizdir</p> <p>0 1 2 104. Çok gürültücüdür</p> <p>0 1 2 105. Tıbbi amaç dışında alkol ya da ilaç kullanır (açıklayınız): _____</p> <p>0 1 2 106. Başkalarını memnun etmeye çok meraklıdır</p> <p>0 1 2 107. Okulu sevmez</p> <p>0 1 2 108. Hata yapmaktan korkar</p> <p>0 1 2 109. Sızlanır, mızırdanır</p> <p>0 1 2 110. Dış görünüşü temiz değildir</p> <p>0 1 2 111. İçre kapanıktır, başkalarıyla birlikte olmak istemez</p> <p>0 1 2 112. Evhamlıdır, her şeyi dert edinir</p> <p>113. Öğrencinizin yukarıdaki listede belirtilmeyen başka sorunu varsa lütfen yazınız: _____</p> <p>0 1 2 _____</p> <p>0 1 2 _____</p> <p>0 1 2 _____</p>
---	---

BÜTÜN MADDELERİ CEVAPLAYIP CEVAPLAMADIĞINIZI LÜTFEN KONTROL EDİNİZ

## **APPENDIX C**

### **DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM**

## AILE BILGI FORMU

Evinizde yaşayanların sayısı -----

Kimler oldukları-----

Kardeş sayısı-----

Öz-Üvey-----

Cinsiyetleri-----

Kardeşlerin devam ettikleri okul tipleri

a) Anaokulu b) İlkokul c) Orta d) Lise e) Üniversite f) devam etmiyor

Çocuklarınız için ödediğiniz toplam okul taksidi

a) 0-200 milyon b) 200 milyon-500 milyon c) 500 milyon-1 milyar  
d) 1 milyar ve üstü

Anne:

Öz-Üvey-----

Eğitim gördüğü yıl sayısı-----

Son aldığı diploma derecesi

a) İlkokul b) Orta c) Lise d) Üniversite e) Yüksek Lisans

Mesleği-----

Çalıştığı Kurum

a) Özel sektör b) Devlet c) Kendi işi d) Ev Hanımı

Baba:

Öz- Üvey-----

Eğitim gördüğü yıl sayısı-----

Son aldığı diploma derecesi

a) İlkokul b) Orta c) Lise d) Üniversite e) Yüksek Lisans

Mesleği-----

Çalıştığı Kurum

a) Özel Sektör b) Devlet c) Kendi işi d) Çalışmıyor