

THE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY STUDY OF TURKISH FORM OF PARENTAL
ACCEPTANCE REJECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

BY
TANSEL ERDEM
B. A. IN PSYCHOLOGY
ISTANBUL UNIVERSITY, 1986.

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

Bogazici University Library



39001101975699

14

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY
1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	
ABSTRACT	
ÖZET	
LIST OF TABLES	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND AND SURVEY OF LITERATURE	3
A. Psychological Abuse	3
B. Parental Acceptance Rejection Theory	8
1. The Construct of Parental Acceptance Rejection	8
2. PART as an Emotional Abuse theory	10
3. Factors Related to Parental Acceptance Rejection and/or Emotional Abuse	14
4. Coping with Emotional Abuse or Parental Rejection	16
C. Assessment of Parental Acceptance Rejection	18
D. Studies Conducted with PARQ (Child Form)	23
E. Studies on Child Maltreatment in Turkey	24
III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES	29
IV. METHOD	31
1. Subjects	31
2. Instruments	34
3. Procedure and Design	38
4. Data Analysis	40
V. RESULTS	42
A. Results on Construct Validation of the PARQ	42

	PAGE
B. Results on Reliability and Internal Consistency	69
VI. DISCUSSION	74
REFERENCES	81
APPENDIX A	87
" B	92
" C	93
" D	99
" E	101
" F	102
" G	107
" H	110
" I	112
" J	113

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES		PAGE
1	Cronbach alpha coefficients of the original PARQ	20
2	Correlations between PARQ scales and the validation scales	20
3	Cronbach alpha coefficients of the PARQ subscales	22
4	Subscale total correlations	22
5	Male and female subjects from each high school	31
6	Number of siblings	32
7	Mother Education	
8	Father Education	33
9	PARQ Groups	39
10	The mean, mode, median and standard deviation of the PARQ subscales and the total scale N=344	42
11	Four groups of subjects of PARQ	43
12	Means and S.D. of WIFAM by sex	44
13	Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on WIFAM	44
14	One way ANOVA results of WIFAM by four PARQ groups	45
15	Scheffe Procedure	45
16	Means and S.D. of Trait Anxiety by sex	46
17	Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on Trait Anxiety	46
18	One way ANOVA results on Trait Anxiety Section by four PARQ groups	47
19	Scheffe Procedure	47
20	Two way ANOVA results on Trait Anxiety by PARQ groups by sex	48
21	T-Test results of males and females on four PARQ groups	48
22	Means and S.D. of males and females on CASQ	49
23	Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on CASQ	49
24	One way ANOVA results on CASQ by four PARQ groups	50
25	Scheffe Procedure	50
26	Means and S.D. of males and females and PARI F1	51
27	Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on PARI F1	51
28	One way ANOVA results on PARI F1 by four PARQ groups	52
29	Means and S.D. of sexes on PARI F2	52
30	Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on PARI F2	53
31	One way ANOVA results on PARI F2 by four PARQ groups	53
32	Scheffe Procedure	54
33	Means and S.D. of sexes on PARI F3	54
34	Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on PARI F3	54
35	One way ANOVA results on PARI F3 by four PARQ groups	55

TABLES

PAGE

36	Scheffe Procedure	55
37	Means and S.D. of sexes on PARI F4	56
38	Means and S.D. of four PARQ groups on PARI F4	56
39	One way ANOVA results on PARI F4 by four rejection groups	57
40	Scheffe Procedure	57
41	Strict discipline groups	58
42	PARQ scores of the four strict discipline groups	58
43	One way analysis of variance on PARQ by PARI F5	59
44	Scheffe Procedure	59
45	Means and S.D. of Sexes on PARI F5	60
46	Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on PARI F5	60
47	One way ANOVA results on PARI F5 by four PARQ groups	61
48	Scheffe Procedure	61
49	Two way ANOVA results on PARI F5 by PARQ groups by sex	62
50	T test results of males and females on four PARQ groups	62
51	Means and S.D. of sexes on the G.P.A.	63
52	Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on the G.P.A.	63
53	One way ANOVA results of academic achievement by PARQ groups	64
54	Scheffe Procedure	64
55	Two way ANOVA results on academic achievement by four PARQ groups by sex	65
56	T test results of males and females on four PARQ groups	65
57	T test results of extreme groups	67
58	Pearson Correlations of PARQ with other variables	68
59	Factor Analysis	69
60	The test-retest reliability correlation coefficients for the PARQ subscales and the total scale score	70
61	Cronbach Coefficient Alpha for PARQ subscales and total scale N=344	70
62	Corrected item total correlation coefficients of the PARQ items N=344	71
63	Item-Subscale Correlation Coefficients N=344	72
64	Subscale and subscale total correlation coefficients for the PARQ	73

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor who is one of the few people I love very dearly, but have never able to express it. The completion of my thesis brought along joy as well as sadness to me, because for two years I really enjoyed our meetings that gave me the opportunity to learn from her patience in listening, unthreatening style of teaching and respect for the student's individuality. With her, the process of writing my thesis was a learning experience and fun. Many times she has been more than a thesis advisor, but a caring and loving person with whom I shared my personal problems. I am very proud of being her student.

I also would like to express my gratitude to my committee member Prof. Dr. Necla Öner for her suggestions. I have always enjoyed sharing her profound knowledge which had reached perfect clarity as a result of being a good academician for many years. It was a privilege for me to work with her and observe her work discipline and energy for academic studies. I always cherish the efforts she put in my personal growth.

I am also very grateful to my committee member Yrd. Doç. Dr. Aydan Gülerce for sharing her ideas not only for my thesis but in the whole process of the accomplishment of my graduate program. I have always used the feedback she had given me. She has helped me to develop a different perspective.

I am indebted to Dr. Talat Fırlar and Dr. Arif Kubat for the help they have provided during the statistical analyses of my study.

I also would like to express my appreciation to the administrators and students of the high schools which constituted the sample of the study.

My sincere thanks to school counselors Bike Edmonds and Nevin Dölek for their help in data collection.

My special thanks go to Necla Karakaya for typing the text with a great willingness and Cafer Arslan for his help in copying the questionnaires.

I am also very grateful to my dear friend Banu Erdoğan for the support she provided during the photocopying of the text.

I would like to thank my mother, for her financial and emotional support.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this piece of work to my friends Melda Yahşi and Halil Ataman who have been very dear to me since almost my childhood. I am indebted for the acceptance they have shown for all these years. It is a wonderful feeling to that they are going to be beside me whenever I need them. I thank for the love they have generously given.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study is to provide supporting evidence for the construct validity of the Turkish Parental Acceptance Questionnaire (PARQ) which gives information about the child's perception of the way his/her mother treats him/her. The original instrument was developed by Rohner, Saavedra and Granum in 1980. The instrument consists of four subscales including a total of 60 items. These subscales are 1) warmth 2) aggression-hostility 3) indifference-neglect 4) undifferentiated rejection.

The reliability coefficients of the instrument were calculated by Polat (1988) and in order to assess its construct validity, in the present study, the relationship of perceived parental rejection and some outcome variables and perceived parental attitudes were investigated. The instruments which were used to assess the outcome variables were:

1. Piers Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (WIFAM)
2. State Trait Anxiety Inventory, Trait Anxiety Scale (STAI)
3. Children's Attributional Style Questionnaire (CASQ)
4. Academic Achievement

To assess perceived parental attitudes, five factors of Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) F1: Overprotection, F2: Democracy, F3: Rejection of homemaking role, F4: Marital conflict, F5: Strict discipline were utilized.

344 males and females were taken from nine high schools in Istanbul, each three representing low, middle and upper middle SES.

The scores on PARQ were divided into four groups to form different levels of perceived rejection. The relationship of four levels of perceived rejection and other variables was computed by the use of one way ANOVA statistics.

The ANOVA results showed that the children who score higher on PARQ were found to score significantly higher on Trait Anxiety Scale, Children's Attributional Style Questionnaire, PARI F3 (rejection of homemaking role), PARI F4 (marital conflict) and PARI F5 (strict discipline) than those who score lower.

In addition, the children who score higher on PARQ were found to score significantly lower on 1) Piers Harris Children's Self Concept Scale 2) PARI F3 (Democracy) and 3) Academic Achievement.

No significant relationship was found between perceived overprotection and perceived rejection. T-test results and Pearson Correlation Coefficients supported these findings.

Additional support for the conceptual validity came from the factor analysis results which showed that the items clustered into two factors which can be readily named warmth and rejection when the items are investigated closely.

For the reliability test retest coefficients over an interval of two or three weeks were found to be .70 for the total scale score. Internal consistency was assessed through Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient which came out to be .95 for the total scale as well as item total

correlations which ranged between .34 and .67 except for two items, 28 and 50 which are recommended to be deleted from the questionnaire as they had very low item total correlations.

These results gave support for the conceptual validity and reliability of the child PARQ.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı çocuğun annesiyle olan ilişkisini nasıl algıladığını ölçen Aile Kabul ve Reddetme Ölçeği Türkçe formunun yapı geçerliğini destekleyen veriler sağlamaktır. Bu ölçeğin aslı Rohner, Saavedra ve Granum (1980) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Ölçek toplam 60 maddeden meydana gelen dört alt ölçekten oluşur.

- 1) Sevgi 2) Saldırganlık ve Kin 3) İlgisizlik ve İhmal
- 4) Ayrıştırılmamış Reddetme

Ölçeğin güvenilirlik katsayıları Polat (1988) tarafından saptanmış ve şimdiki çalışmada ölçeğin yapı geçerliliğini saptamak için çocuk tarafından algılanan reddedilme ile bağlantılı değişkenlerin ilişkileri araştırılmıştır. Bu değişkenleri ölçen ölçeklerden bazıları şunlardır:

- 1) Piers Harris'in Çocuklarda Öz Kavramı Ölçeği
- 2) Durumluk-Sürekli Kaygı Envanteri, Sürekli Kaygı Skalası
- 3) Çocuklarda Öğrenilmiş Çaresizlik Ölçeği
- 4) Akademik Başarı

Algılanan aile hayatı tutumlarını ölçmek üzere Aile Hayatı Tutum Ölçeğinin Faktör 1: Aşırı Koruyuculuk, Faktör 2: Demokrasi, Faktör 3: Annenin Ev Kadınlığı Rolünü Reddetmesi, Faktör 4: Aile İçi Çatışma, Faktör 5: Sıkı Baskı ve Disiplin Boyutları kullanılmıştır.

344 kız ve erkekten oluşan örneklem grubu, aşağı, orta ve orta üstü sosyo ekonomik seviyeleri temsil eden dokuz okuldan meydana gelmiştir.

PARQ skorları dört gruba bölünmüş ve dört farklı seviyede algılanan reddedilme grubu oluşturulmuştur. Bu dört değişik seviyedeki reddedilme ile diğer değişkenlerin ilişkileri tek yönlü varyans analiziyle işleme sokulmuştur.

ANOVA sonuçları, PARQ da yüksek sonuçlar alan öğrencilerin Sürekli Kaygı Skalası, Çocuklarda Öğrenilmiş Çaresizlik Ölçeği, PARI Anmenin ve Ev Kadınlığı Rolünü Reddetmesi, Aile İçi Çatışma ve Sıkı Baskı ve Disiplin alt boyutlarından anlamlı bir şekilde yüksek skorlar aldıklarını göstermiştir.

Buna ek olarak, PARQ dan yüksek sonuçlar alan öğrencilerin Piers Harris Çocuklarda Öz Kavramı Ölçeği, PARI Demokrasi alt boyutu ve Akademik Başarıda anlamlı olarak düşük sonuçlar aldıkları görülmüştür.

PARI Aşırı Koruyuculuk alt boyutları ile PARQ skorları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunamamış, bu sonucu t-testi ve Pearson çarpımlar katsayısı da desteklemiştir.

Yapı geçerliğine başka bir destek ise faktör analizinden gelmiştir. Faktör analizinde maddelerin iki faktörde kümelendikleri ve maddeler yakından incelendiğinde bu faktörlerin kabul ve reddedilme şeklinde isimlendirilebilecekleri görülmüştür.

Güvenirlik çalışmalarında, iki üç haftalık bir aradan sonra test tekrar test katsayısı .70 olarak saptanmış, iç tutarlık için kullanılan Cronbach Alpha katsayısı .95 olarak bulunmuştur. Madde artan korelasyonları 28 ve 50 nolu maddeler dışında .34 ve .67 arasında değişmiş, 28 ve 50 nolu maddelerin korelasyonları düşük olduğu için ölçekten çıkartılmaları tavsiye edilmektedir.

Bu sonuçlar ölçeğin geçerlik ve güvenilirliğini desteklemiştir.

I. INTRODUCTION

Family is the primary institution in which socialization and the process of humanization takes place (Bower, 1972). The growing acknowledgement of the effect of parental behaviour on the personality growth and development of the offspring revealed that the parents are the most significant people during childhood and all human beings have a need to receive positive response from them. It is a need to be loved, valued and cared for (Hjelle and Ziegler, 1981). Parents vary in how openly, intensely or frequently they express their affection towards their children, yet the need for positive response that is essential for normal development does not vary and withdrawal of affection is by itself sufficient to produce negative effects on the functioning of the person (Hague, 1987; Rohner, 1975, 1986). Studies pertaining to the effects of the negative parental behaviours reveal a diversity of negative outcomes. These negative outcomes can range from academic problems, stuttering or low self esteem to more serious behavioral problems (Rohner, 1975, 1980a, 1980b, 1986).

The field of counseling intends to help the growth and self actualization of the individuals. Efforts of primary prevention focus on reaching large number of individuals before problems occur and main targets of these efforts have been children, so that they can grow up into effectively functioning adults. For the maintenance of healthy parent child interactions, educational programmes and policies need to be developed (Bower, 1972; Rappaport, 1977). In order to minimize the negative effects of parental behaviours which cause psychological impairment in the child, constructive intervention strategies need to be developed.

The initial step to achieve these goals is to have valid assessment tools. In terms of parental behaviour, acceptance rejection dimension has been proposed as a cross culturally valid construct embracing a wide range of phenomena (Rohner, 1975, 1980a, 1980b, 1986). Yet empirical work in this area is limited in Turkey since there is no valid tool measuring parental acceptance rejection (Ramazan, 1988). Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) which was developed by Rohner, Saavedra and Granum in 1980, was translated into Turkish by Polat (1988) and its reliability coefficients were calculated. The purpose of the present study was to establish the validity of the PARQ through construct validity techniques. In terms of reliability of the Turkish form, internal consistency and item stability was assessed.

II. BACKGROUND AND SURVEY OF LITERATURE

A. Psychological Abuse

Child maltreatment has always been an issue that received public attention. Though the literature on child abuse and neglect dates back to ancient Greeks, it is a veritable newcomer to the field of empirical investigation. The recognition of child abuse in the scientific circles starts with the publication of Henry Kempe's famous work in 1962 where he used the term "Battered Child Syndrome" for the first time. This famous paper described the conditions of children who receive serious physical injuries from their parents, evoking great concern and interest. Following this, numerous studies focused on physical abuse and efforts emphasized prevention and intervention (Lynch, 1985, Radbill, 1987).

In the last decades, with the help of media, public and professional awareness shifted from physical abuse to sexual abuse of children (Garrison, 1987).

Emotional abuse was the latest focus of inquiry in the field of child maltreatment. The lack of essential love, care, attention and related behaviours by the parents and resultant negative behaviour and state of their children is covered under the heading of psychological maltreatment or emotional abuse. Emotional abuse accompanies other forms of abuse or it can occur singly.

Though emotional abuse is potentially more destructive than other forms of maltreatment, the inadequacy of definitions blocked the progress in research. Recently, operational definitions have been formulated and different theoretical perspectives were developed (Brassard, Germain and Hart, 1987).

Many different definitions of abuse were formulated by psychologists and legal authorities. One of the most popular definitions belongs to Garbarino and Gilliam (1987). They define emotional abuse as:

"The acts or omission by a parent or guardian that are judged by a mixture of community values and professional expertise to be inappropriate and damaging" (1)

Based on the definitions developed the International Conference on Psychological Abuse of Children and Youth and their refinement by a wide variety of parties and organizations, a final list which classified acts of maltreatment was formed. The categories of maltreatment and some behavioural examples are as follows:

Rejecting. To refuse to recognize the value of the child, to decline to accept, to discard as useless or unsatisfactory. Examples: actively refusing to help the child, treating a child differently from siblings or peers in ways that show dislike for the child.

Degrading. To reduce from a higher to lower degree, depreciating the child's accomplishments. Examples: To use derogatory adjectives for the child, publicly humiliating and belittling, putting inferior labels on the child.

(1) Brassard, M.R., Germain, R., Hart, S.N. (Eds.) (1987) .

Psychological maltreatment of children and youth . New York: Pergamon Press (p.6)

Terrorizing: To intimidate, to create an atmosphere of fear and violence. Examples: Threatening to physically hurt or kill, to verbally assault, or forcing the child to watch violence directed to people significant to him/her, to put the child in double bind situations by presenting inconsistent demands, to leave a young child unattended by an adult.

Isolating: To place apart, to separate the child from other people. Examples: to lock up in a closet for long periods of time, not permitting the child to have relationships with peers, keeping the child from school or play with friends to perform household duties.

Corrupting: To missocialize, to force the child into antisocial behaviours, to maladapt to social needs. Examples: To reinforce behaviours that degrade other races or ethnic groups, encouraging drug and alcohol use, teaching and reinforcing aggressive and delinquent behaviours.

Exploiting: Using for one's benefit, to take advantage of the child for one's own needs. Examples: Keeping the child at home as a servant, exposing the child to pornography, involving the child with prostitution.

Denying Emotional Responsiveness: Not providing adequate nurturance and affection. Failing to provide sensitive, responsive caregiving. Examples: Mechanistic handling of the child, avoiding the child's attempts to interact. Denying

emotional responsiveness refers to passively ignoring the child's emotional needs as opposed to active rejecting (Brassard et. al., 1987).

Adultifying: To put unreasonable demands on the child, to expect success above the child's capacity, to give inappropriate responsibilities for his/her age, to have high expectations that the child cannot meet (Finkelhor and Korbin, 1988).

Another effort to develop definitions of emotional abuse came from Bailey and Bailey (1986) who conducted a project which included 207 protective service practitioners living in five different states in the U.S.A. The respondents were asked to:

- develop statements of maltreatment
- categorize these statements
- indicate if any psychological or legal service is necessary for that particular parent child interaction.

The results can be translated into specific parental actions and a list is provided below.

1. The parent fails to provide nurturance and attachment.
2. The parent treats the child differently from other siblings; consistently punishes, criticizes, gives fewer rewards or praise to him/her.
3. The parent has high expectations from the child which are above his/her normal abilities and punishes, criticizes the child when s/he does not meet that level.

4. The parent exploits the child by forcing the child to perform difficult household tasks, and take care of the parent.
5. The parent ignores the child's need for physical closeness; expresses no affection.
6. The parent confuses the sexual identity of the child by treating or teasing him/her as if s/he were from the opposite sex.
7. The parent does not show stability and predictability about what is expected from the child.
8. The parent exposes the child to maladaptive influences and forces the child to be involved in it.
9. The parent exposes the child to maladaptive influences and allows the child to be involved in it.
10. The parent ridicules and belittles the child.
11. The parent exposes the child to pornographic materials by force.
12. The parent allows the child to watch pornographic materials.
13. The parent threatens the child excessively and uses psychological punishment.
14. The custodial parent does not allow the child to develop attachment and visit the other parent.
15. The parent refuses to have any professional help for the child's problems and forbids the child to receive any counseling services.

As can be seen, these acts of maltreatment can be categorized under the seven categories which were mentioned earlier. In addition to the attempts of defining emotional abuse, different theoretical perspectives were developed (Rosenberg and Germain, 1987). One of which is the Parental Acceptance Rejection Theory (PART) (Rohner, 1980b).

B. PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE REJECTION THEORY (PART)

PART is a theory of emotional abuse that attempts to predict the major consequences of parental acceptance and rejection for behavioural, cognitive and emotional development of children. The theory is based on the phylogenetic perspective which tries to establish empirically derived principles of specieswide regularities (universals) of human behaviour. Therefore the main assumption underlying the theory is that, human beings all around the world have a need to receive warmth from the people important to them. This need is inherent in all human beings regardless of culture, race, physical type, social class, language, geographic region or other limiting conditions. This need is phylogenetically acquired through evolution. PART predicts that withdrawal of parental acceptance will lead to negative outcomes (Rohner, 1975,1986).

1. The Construct of Parental Acceptance-Rejection

Parental acceptance and rejection is the warmth dimension of parenting. Parental warmth is a bipolar dimension that has acceptance on one end and rejection on the other end. Every individual can be placed somewhere on this hypothetical continuum because everyone receives more or less warmth from his/her parents (Salama, 1987; Hague, 1987; Balaman, 1986).

Parental love and affection finds its expression in two major ways: physical and verbal. Warmth can be shown physically through kissing, holding, fondling, caressing, smiling, hugging and the like. On the other hand, expressions of verbal warmth consist of saying nice things, complimenting or praising. In other words, warmth can be

expressed through all forms of behaviours that give the message to a child that he is loved and cared for.

On the other hand, rejection in PART, is defined as absence or withdrawal of acceptance and warmth. In the theory, rejection is postulated to take three different forms; hostility-aggression, indifference-neglect and undifferentiated rejection. Hostility refers to the internal feelings of enmity, resentment and anger toward the child. Hostility may show itself behaviourally in forms of verbal and physical aggression. Aggression refers to behaviours that aim at physically or psychologically hurting another person. Physical aggression includes behaviours like pinching, shaking, hitting, pushing, biting, scalding, burning, scratching, tying up and the like. Verbal aggression includes sarcasm, cursing, belittling, scapegoating, denigrating and the like.

Indifference is simply not showing concern for the child which may show itself as neglect in behavioural form. Physical or psychological nonavailability of the parent can reveal itself in forms of emotional unresponsiveness and distance or failing to attend to the medical and physical needs of the child.

Undifferentiated rejection refers to the child's feelings of rejection without a discrimination of parental behaviour as either neglect or aggression, but the child's global feelings of being unloved.

In PART, rejection is viewed from the perspective of the child, rather than measuring the observable parental behaviour objectively (Rohner, 1986). Many researchers today believe that parental behaviour effects the child's development to the extent and in the form he perceives it (Herzberger, Potts and Dillon, 1985) so it is not the event itself, but the interpretation of it that determines the impact on the individual (Ney, Moore, Mc Phee and Trought, 1986). For this reason, in the theory subjective experiences of the individuals are emphasized.

2. PART as an Emotional Abuse Theory

The conceptualization of parental acceptance and rejection embraces, to a great extent, psychological child abuse and neglect definitions. PART encompasses the categories of rejecting, degrading, terrorizing, isolating, adultifying and denying emotional responsiveness while leaving exploiting and corrupting out. The definitions of child abuse and neglect can change from from one nation to another, from culture to culture, whereas PART comes along with the universalist approach which tries to establish principles for all human beings. Another difference is, that some definitions of psychological child abuse and neglect solely rely on the parental behaviour, disregarding the perceptions of the child. PART, on the other hand, always relies on the subjective perceptions of the children (Rohner, 1986).

Research on outcomes of parental rejection and assessments of child abuse and neglect show similarities.

PART predicts that parental rejection has consistent negative effects on personality functioning. Although these consequences show

a great diversity. PART focuses on a limited constellations of personality characteristics. To be more specific, PART asserts that rejected children everywhere will tend to be more hostile and aggressive, more dependent and with a more impaired self esteem than accepted children. Rejected children are also expected to be more emotionally unstable, emotionally unresponsive and have a negative world view. These predictions were supported by numerous research findings (Rohner, 1980b; Salama, 1987; Haque, 1987; Kitahara, 1987; Polat, 1988).

Herrenkohl and Herrenkohl (1981) defining psychological maltreatment as parental rejection, mental cruelty and terrorizing found that the subjects were suffering from low frustration tolerance and aggression (cited in Brassard et. al., 1987). Aber and Zigler (1981) and Fontana (1973) report that abused and neglected children frequently become anxious, aggressive and hostile. Their aggression can be internalized which manifests itself in self destructiveness, depression, avoidance of socializing with people and passivity. Children who externalize tend to be impulsive, overactive, violent toward other people and environment and disobedient (cited in Garbarino, Guttman and Seeley, 1986).

Newell (1934, 1936) and Zimmermann (1931) using neglect, overprotection and inconsistent discipline as the criteria of maternal rejection, found feelings of insecurity, less stable and more aggressive behaviours in the rejected children than the controls.

Knight (1933) compared the maternal attitudes of submissive and aggressive children. He found that maternal attitudes tended to be overprotective for submissive children and rejective for aggressive children (cited in Radke, 1945).

Green (1978) examined 60 abused, 30 neglected and 30 control children. Abused and neglected groups were found to have poor impulse control, low self esteem, aggressive behaviours and school related problems and poor academic performance (cited in Browne and Saqi, 1989).

Martin and Beezley (1977) studied 50 abused children; over half of these children were described as having low self esteem, hostile and socially isolated (cited in Lynch, 1988).

Egeland, Sroufe and Erickson (1983) in their longitudinal study, found that young children who had been exposed to abusive and neglectful acts by their parents, showed low self esteem, school related adjustment problems, lack of affection for mother, less persistence in learning tasks, distractibility and noncompliance (cited in Brassard et al., 1987).

Starkey (1980) examined the relationship of achievement and parental rejection on 220 school children. He found that achievement test scores as well as grade point averages changed directly with the children's perceptions of parental warmth. The children who perceived their parents as accepting, performed better on both measures of academic success (cited in Rohner, 1980b).

Aber and Allen (1987) found that maltreated children demonstrated significantly less readiness to learn which referred to low effectance motivation and cognitive maturity (cited in Augoustinos, 1987). Many abused children show overall poor performance, are underachieving in all areas and very frequently show delays in speech development (Lynch, 1978).

Kent (1976) reported that in his sample which was made up of three groups namely abused, neglected and control groups, 53% of the abused group, 82% of the neglected group and 28% of the controls were doing below average or failing work at school. Furthermore, IQ scores revealed that 78% of the neglected children and 44% of the abused children had IQs less than or equal to 89 (cited in Browne and Saqi, 1989).

Causal attributions play a major role in the individual's feelings of gaining a sense of meaning, coherence, predictability and control in their world (Strickland, 1989). Rejected children attribute their painful and unpleasant family experiences to the essence of life and universe (Garbarino, Guttman and Seeley, 1986). Therefore rejected children are characterized by a negative world view and pessimism (Rohner, 1986).

Barahal, Waterman and Martin (1981) reported that abused children were found to attribute the causes of events to external forces significantly more than the nonabused children. They had little confidence in their power to shape their experiences, especially the unpleasant and frustrating ones.

These empirical findings solidify the hypothetical theory based statements about the negative, destructive outcomes of parental rejection and child abuse and neglect.

3. Factors Related to Parental Acceptance and Rejection and/or Emotional Abuse

In this section, the factors that are related to parental abuse and neglect will be discussed.

There is considerable empirical evidence that abusive parents are more likely to have experienced aggression, physical punishment and/or emotional maltreatment during their own childhood than nonabusive parents. Abusing parents learn their child rearing techniques from their own parents. These parents can not show affection to their children as they had not received it themselves. Hence, the rejection cycle is perpetuated (Rohner, 1980b, 1986; Belsky, 1980; Berger, 1983a; Berger, 1983b; Garbarino et al., 1986; Kitahara, 1987; Trickett and Susman, 1989; Stern, 1989).

Disbrow et al. (1977) found that abusing mothers have lower self esteem and more difficulty to empathize with others than the control mothers. Blumberg (1974) and Terr (1970) found that these parents are narcissistic, immature and impulsive (cited in Berger, 1983b; Garbarino et al., 1986).

Abusive incidents occur within the disciplinary behaviour repertoire of the parent. Reid and Taplin (1976) found that abusive parents discipline their children inconsistently and

display more verbal and physical aggressive behaviours than the nonabusive parents. Young (1964) also supported that abusive parents do not have consistent disciplinary techniques and the children often have difficulty in guessing what is expected of them (cited in Berger, 1983a). The inconsistent parenting style gives the child contradictory messages, therefore making the parental reactions and actions unpredictable to the child (Garbarino et al., 1986).

Abusive parents mostly lack respect for the child's personality, thoughts and feelings and fail to see the child as a separate entity and frequently undervalue his/her accomplishments. They may have irrational expectations of performance from their children and maltreat them when these expectations are not met (Belsky, 1980; Berger, 1983b; Garbarino et al., 1986).

Marital relationships in the abusing families have also been an area of investigation. Single parent families were found to be at the greatest risk for rejection because the mother is to bear the burden of child care alone. Presence of father at home relieves the mother from this continuous burden. Presence of alternative caretakers also free the mother from the tension of unremitting interaction with the child (Rohner, 1986).

Smith (1975) found that abusing parents were more dissatisfied with their marriage than the controls. The abusing sample reported more quarrels, spouse abuse and lack of spouse cooperation in child rearing. Young (1964) examined case reports

of 300 abusing and neglecting families and found marital discord in both family types. She reported that fighting and lack of support was common in both neglecting and rejecting families (cited in Berger, 1983b).

Parents tend to use the same strategies to resolve spousal disputes in disciplining their children. Therefore, the verbal and physical aggressive tactics in the spousal relationship are applied to children (Belsky, 1980; Berger, 1983b; Garbarino et al., 1986; Trickett and Susman, 1989).

Another factor that has a role in the ecology of the abusing family is the lack of social support and alienation. The abusing families are found to be isolated from community, supportive networks and friendships. Verbally and physically aggressive behaviours are easily triggered as the parents have lost the positive constructive coping skills necessary when faced with stressors (Belsky, 1980 ; Berger, 1983a;Garbarino et al., 1986 Rohner, 1986).

Other than the above cited, economic and social hardships, inadequate material resources, exposure to stressful conditions and unemployment problems lead to parental abusive behaviours (Belsky, 1980; Rohner, 1986; Stern, 1989;).

4. Coping with Emotional Abuse or Parental Rejection

Every child who is subjected to emotional abuse or rejection does not necessarily exhibit the negative outcomes. Some children can manage to deal with hurt more effectively than others.

Lourie and Stephano (1978) found that children differ in their responses to parental treatment and some children can be competent and prosocial even though they grow up in hostile and harsh environments. They have come to call these children "stress resistant" (cited in Garbarino et al., 1986).

Such children are called copers in PART. The factors that allow these children to cope with perceived rejection are not completely known. PART predicts that there are at least three factors that help rejected children cope more effectively. These factors are: sense of self, self determination and capacity to depersonalize.

Sense of self refers to the child's awareness of his own individuality, in other words, the child's differentiation of himself and others. It is the ability to understand what other person thinks and feels and to differentiate these from what oneself thinks and feels. In this way, the child with a clearly differentiated sense of self is less effected by the negative messages sent by the abusing parents.

Self determination is the child's sense of personal control over life events. It is the feeling that events are not externally controlled by forces like fate, chance or parents, but can be changed by the individual. Children who have less self determination experience hopelessness, futility and helplessness.

The third factor is depersonalizing which refers to the child's ability of perspective taking or decentring. A copers does

not relate life events to him/herself, in other words, does not take events personally. If a child can understand why his/her parents act the way they do, s/he can be able to cope more effectively (Rohner, 1980b, 1986).

There are other factors that contribute to effective coping, like the child's sex, intelligence and temperament, but studies show conflicting results. One consistent finding is that, the presence of an alternate caretaker, a peer or a teacher with whom the child can establish a warm supportive relationship, helps in coping (Rosenberg, 1987; Garbarino and Vondra, 1987).

C. ASSESSMENT OF PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE REJECTION

Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) child form was developed by Rohner, Saavedra and Granum in 1980. It is a self report questionnaire measuring the respondent's perception of the way s/he is treated by the mother. PARQ also has an adult form which measures the adult's perception of the way s/he was treated by the mother and a mother form measuring the mother's perceptions of how she treats her child.

PARQ child form is made up of four scales with a total of 60 items (see Appendix A). The subscales measure:

- parental warmth and affection (20 items),
- parental hostility and aggression (15 items),
- parental indifference and neglect (15 items),
- undifferentiated rejection (10 items).

Representative items include:

"My mother says nice things about me" (perceived warmth/affection).

"My mother treats me harshly" (perceived hostility/aggression).

"My mother totally ignores me" (perceived indifference/neglect).

"My mother views me as a burden (perceived undifferentiated rejection).

Items are scored on a 4 point likert scale with "Almost Always True" assigned a score of 4 and "Almost Never True" assigned a score of 1. Some are reverse items to avoid response set bias. Items 7,14,21,28,35,42,49 and all of the items falling under the warmth subscale are reverse scored. Therefore, a high score received on PARQ means a high level of perceived rejection.

Original → The reliability and validity studies of the child PARQ were carried out on a sample of 220 children whose ages ranged from 9 to 12. The sample was drawn from metropolitan Washington, D.C. area. The subjects were almost equally distributed in sex, ethnicity and socio-economic status.

Cronbach's coefficient alpha which was used to assess the →reliability ranged from .72 to .90 (see Table 1).

Table 1**Cronbach alpha coefficients of the original PARQ**

Scales	Cronbach alpha coefficient
Warmth	.90
Aggression/Hostility	.87
Neglect/ Indifference	.77
Undifferentiated rejection	.72

Note: From Handbook for the Study of Parental Acceptance and Rejection (p. 32.) by R. Rohner, 1980. Center for the Study of Parental Acceptance and Rejection. University of Connecticut

The concurrent validity of the PARQ was achieved by using three subscales from Schaefer's (1964) Child's Report of Parental Behaviour Inventory (CRPBI) and one subscale from Bronfenbrenner's Parental Behaviour Questionnaire (BPB) along with the PARQ child form. The correlations ranged from .55 to .83 (See Table 2).

Table 2**Correlations between PARQ scales and the validation scales**

PARQ scales	Validation scales	r
Warmth	CRPBI Acceptance	.83
Aggression/Hostility	BPB Physical Punishment	.55
Neglect/Indifference	CRPBI Hostile Detachment	.64
Undifferentiated Rejection	CRPBI Rejection	.74

Note: From Handbook for the Study of Parental Acceptance and Rejection (p. 33) by R. Rohner, 1980. Center for the Study of Parental Acceptance and Rejection. University of Connecticut.

Factor analysis was computed to assess the construct validity of the questionnaire. Two primary factors were found to account for 58.0% of the variance. The correlation between two primary factors was .50.

Another supporting evidence for the construct validity of the PARQ subscales was accomplished by three undergraduate students who were taught the theoretical definitions of the constructs measured by the PARQ. The students were told to sort the items into four piles and were also given the information of the item sizes of each subscale. Affection items were sorted with 100% accuracy. Aggression/Hostility and Indifference/Neglect items were sorted with 17% error. Undifferentiated rejection items were sorted with 40% error, mostly confused with Indifference/Neglect items.

PARQ was used in many different countries. It has been translated into Bengali, Czechoslovakian, French, Hindi, Korean, Mexican, Telugu, Puerto Rican, Tiv, Urdu and Turkish.

→ Polat (1988) undertook the translation of the PARQ into Turkish by using back translation techniques. She administered the questionnaire to 120 fifth graders evenly chosen from two primary schools one representing upper middle SES and the other low SES. She found alpha coefficients of the PARQ subscales ranging from .76 to .89. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the total scale was .80.

Table 3 shows the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the subscales.

Table 3

Cronbach alpha coefficients of the PARQ subscales

Scales	Cronbach Alpha Coefficient
Warmth	.89
Aggression/Hostility	.86
Neglect/Indifference	.79
Undifferentiated Rejection	.76

Note: From Parental Acceptance Rejection. Unpublished master's thesis (p.27) by S. Polat, 1988, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

The item total correlations of the warmth subscale ranged from .38 to .74, neglect-Indifference subscale .40 to .62 and undifferentiated rejection subscale .44 to .71. Item total correlations for the Aggression- Hostility subscale were not reported. On the other hand, the subscale total correlations ranged from .73 to .90. These findings can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4

Subscale total correlations

Subscale	Subscale-total Correlations
Warmth	.73
Aggression/Hostility	.83
Neglect/Indifference	.90
Undifferentiated rejection	.78

Note: From Parental Acceptance Rejection. Unpublished master's thesis (p.30) by S. Polat, 1988, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

D. STUDIES CONDUCTED WITH PARQ (Child Form)

Studies conducted in different countries using PARQ support Rohner's hypothesis about cross cultural validity of the construct. Thus some of these studies are presented below.

Rohner (1980) administered the PARQ to a sample of 220 students in the age range of 9 to 12 who were living in the metropolitan Washington D.C. area. The subjects equally represented ethnic group, social class and sex. The results showed no significant difference in terms of sex, age, social class or ethnic group in the level of perceived rejection.

The results of Rohner and Rohner (1980) study on 171 Korean American families inhabiting in the U.S.A. who came from working and middle class families indicated that the children in working class Korean American families perceive their mothers as more hostile and neglecting and less warm than the children in middle class families. Korean American boys perceive themselves slightly, but significantly more accepted than the Korean American girls.

Rohner et. al. (1980) in another study conducted on a Mexican sample, however, found the middle class children perceiving their parents to be less warm, more aggressive and more neglecting than did their working class counterparts (cited in Rohner, 1986).

In India, caste differences were found in terms of perceived rejection. In a Bengali sample, the higher the caste, the less maternal warmth and the more maternal neglect was perceived. Studies investigating the sex differences in the level of perceived rejection gave conflicting results in this country (cited in Rohner, 1986).

On the other hand, Haque (1987) found no social class differences in the Pakistani sample of 200 students coming from middle and working class families. Whereas there were sex differences; Haque reported that Pakistani boys perceived more rejection than the girls.

E. STUDIES ON CHILD MALTREATMENT IN TURKEY

Family is embedded in the society and in the culture. Attitudes of these two systems toward child rearing have important influences on the parent child interactions which take place in the family. Thus it is necessary to examine these attitudes which mold the perception of the individuals (Belsky, 1980).

Turkish family is generally warm rather than hostile, loving rather than rejecting (Ohlson-Prather, 1978; Gleason, 1989). In addition to this, Turkish family is described as patriarchal, coercive and authoritarian. The general attitude is controlling and protective. Compliance, quietness, submissive and respectful behaviours are rewarded whereas curiosity, independency and initiative are punished. Beating, shaming, scaring through threats and calling upon supernatural beings constitute the common means of discipline. The dynamics in the Turkish family are likely to foster passive, dependent personalities, with a reliance on external locus of control (Fişek, 1982).

According to Ohlson-Prather (1978), in the Turkish family infants and small children are indulged and expectations from them are limited, but by the age of six or seven when the child starts primary school tolerance of the parents decrease, expectations of

obedience and the use of physical punishment increase. The overall pattern of child rearing is nonpurposive and unsystematic, without the presence of long term goals in the discipline; which is mostly directed toward controlling the immediate situation. Thus the rules in discipline are set upon the criteria of the child irritating the parent at that moment.

The use of verbal reasoning is very rare and physical punishment is the most commonly used discipline technique (Yörükoğlu, 1982; Zeytinoğlu and Kozcu, 1987). Though strict discipline and control is not perceived as parental rejection in Turkish families since love and control go together in the parent child interaction in contrast to Western families where love accompanies permissiveness and use of control implies insufficiency of affection (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1970).

Kağıtçıbaşı (1982), in the Turkish Value of Children (VOC) study found the economic/utilitarian value of the child to be prevalent. Children, sons in particular, were found to be seen as sources of old age security as well as having psychological value as providing companionship and strengthening the marriage. Child's dependence, obedience and loyalty to parents were valued behaviours whereas independence and self reliance were found to be the least desired behaviours.

Other than the VOC study, some studies were carried out to investigate the relationship of parental attitudes on the personality characteristics of the offspring in Turkey. Erbaş (1983) investigated the relationship of parental attitudes and ego strength. She found

negative correlations between ego strength and perceived maternal overprotection; ego strength and perceived maternal rejection of home making role. Findings of her study indicated that high SES adolescents perceived less overprotection and less rejection of maternal homemaking role and had higher ego strength. Other researchers like Peker (1985) and Kozacıoğlu (1982) found positive relationships between maternal overprotection and dependency and higher anxiety levels of children. Odabaş (1985) report that extreme mothering and strict discipline were found to be significantly and negatively correlated with children's self concept, on the other hand, maternal democratic attitude was positively correlated with self concept.

Küçük (1987) found mother's attitudes toward the rejection of homemaking role and marital conflict to be significant predictors of adolescent's psychological characteristics like self concept, anxiety or social and familial relationships whereas mother's democratic attitude was seen to be related to adolescent's having less trait anxiety and father's democratic attitude was related to the adolescent's more positive family and social relationships.

So far the literature related to Turkish family and parental attitudes have been mentioned. In the recent years there has been a growing sum of research in the area of parental rejection and/or emotional abuse in Turkey.

Polat (1988) in her study investigated the relationship of maternal acceptance rejection and child's self evaluation and perceived control Her findings showed that warmth had a strong inverse relationship with negative self evaluation.

No significant correlation was found between perceived rejection and perceived control. Her findings also revealed that maternal employment and sex had no effect on perceived acceptance and rejection. Upper middle class children were found to score significantly higher on perceived acceptance than lower class children, on the other hand, control was perceived more in upper middle class families than the lower class.

Zeytinoğlu (1988) in her study asked experts to give their definitions of child abuse and neglect in Turkey. 78.33% of the abusive behaviours cited by the experts fell into the category of psychological maltreatment. Behaviours like: belittling, lack of love and care, putting emotional pressures on the child, not giving them decision making power or opportunity, forcing the child to meet the expectations of the family, favouring the male child were reported to be abusive.

Alantar and Erkman(1989) like Zeytinoğlu asked experts their definitions of emotional abuse and behaviours that feel into this category. They utilized the abusive behaviours which were reported by the experts as the basis of the emotional abuse inventory they developed. Administering Perceived Emotional Abuse Inventory for Adolescents (PEAIFA) to 337 adolescents from upper, middle and low SES groups, it was found that the adolescents who perceived high emotional abuse, had lower self concept, poorer family and social relations, higher anxiety and depression as compared to the low

emotional abuse group. It was also found that the same adolescents perceived their mothers significantly more rejecting, more aggressive, more neglecting and less warm as assessed by the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire.

Erkman (1989) investigated the perceived emotional abuse and maternal rejection experienced by the remigrant adolescents from Germany. The remigrant group was made up of 359, ninth and tenth grade students who were compared to 337 nonmigrant subjects. Her findings indicate that the remigrant group perceived higher levels of emotional abuse inflicted by their parents and were experiencing more rejection from their mothers than the nonmigrant group. There was no significant difference found between the two groups in terms of perceived maternal aggression or neglect. Males were found to perceive more rejection than females.

Zeytinoğlu and Kozcu (1987) investigated the attitudes of the general population towards physical child abuse. Their results show that 66% of their sample was against physical abuse and would interfere if they witnessed it. The people who physically abuse their children were described as nonhealthy people who needed treatment. Their findings also show that the majority of the physically abused children were males older than three years old whose parents were from low educational levels.

The existing data in Turkey, support to a great extent the conceptualizations and findings related to child abuse and parental acceptance rejection in other western societies.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES

The purpose of the present study was to provide evidence for the construct validity of child PARQ, through hypothesis testing and factor analysis. Internal consistency and reliability analysis were also conducted.

General Hypothesis

The children who perceive higher rejection are expected to have more psychological problems. They are also expected to perceive their mothers to have more negative attitudes.

Operational Hypotheses

- 1) The children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly lower scores on Piers Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (WIFAM) as compared to those who have lower rejection scores.
- 2) The children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly higher scores on the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), Trait Anxiety Scale as compared to the children who have lower rejection scores.
- 3) The children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly higher scores on Children's Attributional Style Questionnaire (CASQ) as compared to children who have lower rejection scores.

- 4) The children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly higher scores on mother's perceived overprotection as measured by PARI Factor I, compared to those who have lower rejection scores.
- 5) The children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly lower scores on mother's perceived democratic behaviour as measured by PARI Factor II, compared to those who have lower rejection scores.
- 6) The children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly higher scores on mother's perceived rejection of homemaking role as measured by PARI Factor III as compared to children who have lower rejection scores.
- 7) The children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly higher scores on perceived marital conflict as measured by PARI Factor IV, as compared to children who have lower rejection scores.
- 8) The children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have either significantly higher or lower scores on perceived strict discipline as measured by PARI Factor V.
- 9) The children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly lower academic achievement as measured by the G.P.A.S, as compared to children who have lower rejection scores.

METHOD

1. Subjects

The subject population was drawn from nine high schools in Istanbul through convenience sampling. Ibrahim Turhan Lisesi, Gültepe Lisesi and Etiler Lisesi represented the low socioeconomic status group. Beyoğlu Anadolu Lisesi, Nişantaşı Anadolu Lisesi, Beşiktaş Anadolu Lisesi represented the middle SES group while Özel Selin Lisesi, Robert Lisesi and Semiha Şakir Lisesi represented the upper middle SES group.

According to the class size in each school, one or two classes of eight graders were administered the questionnaires. 58% of the sample was made up of 14 year olds and 31% was 13 year olds. Table 5 shows the number of students taken from each high school.

Table 5
Male and Female Subjects from each high school

Schools	Females	Males
Ibrahim Turan L.	22	31
Gültepe L.	17	15
Etiler L.	20	13
Beyoğlu A. L.	38	0
Nişantaşı A. L.	17	32
Beşiktaş A. L.	1	34
Özel Selin L.	17	14
Robert L.	14	13
Semiha Şakir L.	23	23
Total	169	175

The final subject population consisted of 344 students, 169 females and 175 males. From low SES schools there were 118 subjects 59 females, 59 males, from middle SES schools there were 122 subjects 56 females, 66 males and from upper middle SES schools there were 104 subjects 54 females and 50 males.

For the reliability study, 76 students were taken from three highschools, each representing one SES, namely Etiler Lisesi, Beşiktaş Anadolu Lisesi and Semiha Şakir Lisesi.

Sample Characteristics

In this section, the findings on the demographic characteristics of the sample will be presented. Among the subject population 12.8% were found to be the only children in their family. Among the rest, 49.7% had two and 37.6 % had three or more children in their family. Table 6 presents the family size of the subject population.

Table 6
Number of Siblings

No of Siblings	N	%
Only Child	44	12.8
Two Siblings	171	49.7
Three Siblings	72	20.9
Four Siblings	35	10.2
Five Siblings	13	3.8
Six Siblings	5	1.5
Seven Siblings	4	1.2
Total	344	100

In terms of level of education of mothers, as can be seen in Table 7, 9.6% of the mothers had no schooling, 24.1% were primary school graduates, 1.5% were junior high school graduates, 30.5% were high school graduates and 34.3% were university and post graduates.

Table 7
Mother Education

Educational Level	N	%
No formal education	33	9.6
Primary school	83	24.1
Junior high school	5	1.5
High school	105	30.5
University	108	31.4
Graduate	10	2.9
Total	344	100

As for the fathers, 2.4% had no schooling, 24.1% were primary school graduates, 1.2 % were junior high school graduates, 14.0% were high school graduates and 58.4% had graduated from university or had a graduate degree (see Table 8).

Table 8
Father Education

Educational Level	N	%
No formal education	8	2.4
Primary school	83	24.1
Junior high school	4	1.2
High school	48	14
University	184	53.5
Graduate	17	4.9
Total	344	100

2. Instruments

In addition to the PARQ child form:

- 1) Demographic Information Questionnaire
- 2) Parental Attitude Research Instrument
- 3) Piers Harris Children's Self Concept Scale
- 4) Trait Anxiety Scale
- 5) Grade Point Averages
- 6) Children's Attributional Style Questionnaire

were used.

1) Demographic Information Questionnaire

This instrument was developed by the researcher to obtain information about the child's sex, age, family background like education of parents and number of siblings (See Appendix B).

2) Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

This inventory was developed by Schaefer and Bell in 1958 to measure the feelings of mothers about their family life and children. The instrument has also been used to measure the individual's perceptions of the other family members' attitudes toward family, such as the child's perceptions of his/her mother's parental attitudes.

It was adapted to Turkish by LeCompte and LeCompte and Özer in 1978. The Turkish form consists of 60 items falling into five factors.

Factor I is the subscale of "extreme mothering or overprotection" consisting of 16 items showing mother's approval of intrusion into child's life and privacy and reinforcement of the

child's dependency on parents.

Factor II is the subscale of "Democracy or Equality" containing 9 items related to the parent's sharing with the child and encouraging self expression.

Factor III is the subscale of "Rejection of Homemaking Role" with 13 items that state the dissatisfaction of woman who is tied down to her home with her children.

Factor IV, "Marital Conflict" consists of 6 items showing tension and quarreling of the spouses.

Factor V is the subscale of "Strict Discipline" consisting of 16 items which involve parental attitudes toward the suppression of responses of children and punishment.

These five factors have test retest reliability ranging between .59 and .90. Construct validity of the instrument was supported by Küçük (Küçük, 1987).

In the present study perceived PARI that aims to assess the children's perception on the above factors, was utilized. (See Appendix C).

3. Piers Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (WIFAM)

The instrument was developed by Piers and Harris in 1969 and was adapted into Turkish by Çataklı and Öner in 1985. The instrument assesses the child's attitudes toward "self".

The test retest reliability coefficients are between .72 and .91 for primary school children and .79 and .98 for junior high

school children over one to seven day intervals. Kuder Richardson 20 reliability coefficient was found to be .87 for primary school children and .86 for junior high school children. The item total correlation coefficients range between .09 and .50. The total median correlation was .30 (Çatakılı, 1985; Ramazan 1988)(See Appendix D).

4. State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)

The inventory was developed by Spielberger in 1970 and was adapted into Turkish by Öner and LeCompte in 1976. STAI consists of two scales made up of 40 items; State Anxiety Scale contains 20 items and it measures the individual's feelings in situational context. On the other hand, Trait Anxiety Scale which also contains 20 items, measures the individual's general anxiety proneness.

Kuder Richardson 20 alpha coefficients for Trait Anxiety Scale was found between .83 and .87, for State Anxiety Scale between .94 and .96. Item remainder correlations for Trait Anxiety Scale ranges between .34 and .72, for State Anxiety Scale between .42 and .85. The test retest reliability coefficients were found to be between .71 and .86 for the State Anxiety Scale and .26 to .68 for the Trait Anxiety Scale.

Various researches supported the construct or criterion validity of the Turkish STAI such as Rüstemli (1975), White (1978), Zulemryan (1979), Kozacıoğlu (1982) (cited in Öner and LeCompte, 1976).

For the purposes of the present study, only Trait Anxiety Scale was utilized (See Appendix E).

5. Academic Achievement

Grade Point Averages for the eighth grade, the grade the subjects were in, were used to measure school achievement.

6. Children's Attributional Style Questionnaire (CASQ)

CASQ was developed by Seligman et al. in 1984. It is a forced choice instrument which contains hypothetical positive or negative events involving the child. Each event is followed by two possible explanations. The child's explanatory style of the causes of events is conceptualized in three dimensions. Global-specific, stable-unstable, internal-external. Attributing the cause of events to external, stable and global factors indicate a helpless explanatory style.

The questionnaire contains 48 items, 16 of them is related to each of the three explanatory dimensions.

The questionnaire was adapted into Turkish by Aydın 1985. The 4 week test retest reliability of the instrument was .83. The mean ratings of the judges who rated the items of the instrument as valid was 96.1% for all items. This gave support for the content validity of the questionnaire (Ramazan, 1988) (See Appendix F).

3. Procedure and Design

The Piers Harris Children's Self Concept Scale, Trait Anxiety Scale of the State Trait Anxiety Inventory, Children's Attributional Style Questionnaire, Parental Attitude Research Instrument and

Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire were administered to Orta II students. According to the class size in each school, one or two classes of students were taken. The administration of the questionnaires was completed in consecutive two or three class periods except in two schools where the assessment was completed in two separate days. PARQ was readministered to 76 students out of the same sample two or three weeks after the first administration, to assess its temporal stability.

At the end of the school year, G.P.A.s of that school year, consisting of two report card averages, were obtained from the administration.

The scores of the students on PARQ were divided into four groups. Lowest score to one standard deviation below the mean, between one standard deviation and the mean, between the mean and one standard deviation above the mean and one standard deviation above the mean to the highest score constituted the low, low moderate, high moderate and high rejection groups, respectively. The different groups of rejection can be seen in Table 9.

Table 9

PARQ Groups

	Low r.	Low moderate r.	high moderate r.	high r.
Score level	below 67	67.01 to 92	92.01 to 117	above 117.01
N	26	191	76	51

The different levels of rejection groups were compared on the identified variables. Rohner originally suggested that there are no sex differences on the children's PARQ results (Rohner, 1980b) and Polat (1988) supported this finding. Thus in the present study, the initial analysis was computed without taking sex as a factor, yet in the ANOVA computed for PARQ by sex, slightly significant sex difference was found ($F=4.616$, $p<.05$). Based on this finding, further analysis was also carried out to investigate the possible effects of sex.

One standard deviation below and above the mean were identified as the extreme groups which were also compared on the related variables. Correlational relationship between the PARQ and other instruments were also investigated. Statistical grouping of the factors was studied as well. The reliability study was carried out.

4. Data Analysis

The scores of the subjects on PARQ and other instruments were computed in terms of mean, standard deviation, median and mode. The relationship of different levels of rejection as measured by PARQ and other variables was computed by one way analysis of variance. Scheffe procedure was used to identify the groups responsible for the significant difference. Two way ANOVA taking four groups of PARQ and sex on each of the other variables was also carried out. Whenever sex factor showed significant difference, t-tests between males and females in the four PARQ groups was carried out.

T tests was also used to compare the extreme PARQ groups on the related variables. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique was utilized to determine the correlations of the different instruments. Analysis of variance was utilized to find out the differing effects of sex and SES on perceived rejection Factor analysis was carried out to explore the factor structure of the Turkish PARQ.

Internal consistency was determined by Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient and the test retest reliability was carried out by the use of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

RESULTS

In this section, means and standard deviations of the scores on each of the instruments, reliability statistics and results on analysis of variance of each scale in relation to differential responses to PARQ will be presented. Two way ANOVA results will only be included in this section if significant relation is found and the other two way ANOVA results will be presented in table form in the Appendix G. When two way ANOVA indicated sex difference to be present, t-test analysis was computed to explore this phenomenon further. The mean and standard deviations of the responses to each of the 60 items are calculated and can be seen in Appendix H. In addition factor analysis results will also be presented.

A. Results on the Construct Validation of the PARQ. ✓

In this section, the mode, median and standard deviation of the scores on the four subscales and the total scale of the PARQ are shown in Table 10. The total mean score was 91.86 and the standard deviation was calculated to be 25.07.

Table 10

The mean, mode, median and standard deviation of the PARQ subscales and the total scale N=344

PARQ SCALES	Mean	Mode	Median	S. D.
Warmth	30.27	25.00	28.07	8.76
Aggression/Hostility	22.86	15.00	20.28	8.10
Indifference/Neglect	22.27	18.00	20.50	6.42
Undifferentiated Rejection	16.47	13.00	15.04	5.19
Total	91.86	72.00	85.12	25.07

Among the 344 subjects, the lowest total score obtained was 61 and the highest total score was 216 while the highest and lowest possible total scores were 60 and 240.

The PARQ scores of the whole sample that was divided into four groups of subjects, constituted the low rejection group, the low and high rejection groups and the high rejection group (See Table 11).

Table 11

Four groups of subjects of PARQ

Groups	Score level	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low R	below 67	26	7.6
2. Low-mod. R.	67.01 - 92	191	55.5
3. High-mod. R	92.01 - 117	76	22.1
4. High R	above 117.01	51	14.8
Total		344	100

Table 11 shows that while only 7.6% perceived low maternal rejection, twice as many children perceived high rejection.

One way analysis of variance was used to find out the variance of the variables that are considered to be related to perceived parental rejection as assessed by PARQ.

The ANOVA results will be presented as it relates to each of the hypotheses of the study along with the means and standard deviations of the scores on the instrument assessing the related variable.

ANOVA results supported the first hypothesis that the children with higher scores on the PARQ are expected to have significantly lower scores on Piers Harris Children's Self Concept Scale (WIFAM) compared to children with lower scores on the PARQ.

Table 12

Means and standard deviations of WIFAM by sex

Sex	N	M	S.D
Males	175	58.07	10.06
Females	169	58.47	10.67
Total	344	58.27	10.34

Table 13

Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on WIFAM

PARQ GROUPS	N	W I F A M	
		MEAN	S.D.
GRP 01	26	65.08	12.50
GRP 02	191	61.15	8.47
GRP 03	76	54.51	9.47
GRP 04	51	49.59	9.71
Total	344	58.27	10.34

In Tables 12 and 13, the self concept scale (WIFAM) means and S.D. of the males and females and the four PARQ groups are presented separately. One way analysis of variance of self concept by rejection shows that there is significant difference of self concept scores in relation to different levels of perceived rejection as can be seen in Table 14 ($F=30.140$, $p<.0001$).

Table 14

One way ANOVA results of WIFAH by four PARQ groups

Source	D. F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between groups	3	7701.9019	2567.3005	30.140*
Within groups	340	28960.7498	85.1787	
Total	343	36662.6484		

*p<.0001

To determine the groups responsible for the significant difference, Scheffe procedure was carried out which indicated that low and low moderate rejection subjects had significantly ($p < .05$) higher self concept scores than high moderate group which in turn was significantly different in terms of level of self concept than the high rejection group (see Table 15).

Table 15

Scheffe Procedure

SUBSET 1			
GROUP	GRP 04		
MEAN	49.59		
SUBSET 2			
GROUP	GRP 03		
MEAN	54.51		
SUBSET 3			
GROUP	GRP 02	GRP 01	
MEAN	61.15	65.08	

P<.05

The second hypothesis put forth that the children who have higher scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly higher scores on the State Trait Anxiety Inventory , Trait Anxiety Scale, compared to the children with lower scores on PARQ. In Tables 16,17, Trait Anxiety means and standard deviations of the males and females and the four PARQ groups are shown respectively.

Table 16
Means and S.D. of Trait Anxiety by sex

Sex	N	M	S.D.
Males	175	40.94	7.58
Females	169	43.39	8.09
Total	344	42.15	7.92

Table 17
Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on Trait Anxiety

PARQ GROUPS	N	TRAIT ANXIETY	
		Mean	S.D.
GRP 01	26	37.50	9.80
GRP 02	191	40.53	7.77
GRP 03	76	44.41	5.67
GRP 04	51	47.18	7.04
Total	344	42.15	7.92

One way analysis of variance of trait anxiety by rejection shows that there is significant difference of trait anxiety scores in relation to different levels of perceived rejection as can be seen in Table 18 ($F=16.525$, $p<.0001$).

Table 18

One way ANOVA results on Trait Anxiety Section by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between groups	3	2736.9848	912.3281	16.525*
Within groups	340	18771.4978	55.2103	
Total	343	21508.4805		

$p<.0001$

Scheffe procedure was run to find out the groups causing the significant difference. It can be seen in Table 19 that low and low moderate rejection subjects had significantly ($p<.05$) lower trait anxiety scores than moderate high and high rejection groups.

Table 19

Scheffe Procedure

SUBSET 1			
GROUP	GRP 01	GRP 02	
MEAN	37.50	40.53	
SUBSET 2			
GROUP	GRP 03	GRP 04	
MEAN	44.41	47.18	

$p<.05$

Table 20

Two way ANOVA results on Trait Anxiety by PARQ groups by sex

Main sources of variation	Sum of squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F
Main Effects	3621.271	4	905.318	17.260*
Rejection	3106.192	3	1035.397	19.740*
Sex	884.335	1	884.335	16.860*
2- WAY Interaction	263.212	3	87.737	1.673
Explained	3884.484	7	554.926	10.580*
Residual	17623.648	336	52.451	
Total	21508.133	343	62.706	

p<.0001

As can be seen in Table 20, there is significant difference between the males and females in the level of trait anxiety, though interaction effect is not seen. Results of t-test analysis can be seen in Table 21.

Table 21

T test results of males and females on four PARQ groups

PARQ groups	sex	N	M	S.D.	t value
Low	Fe	16	40.50	10.15	2.11*
	Ma.	10	32.70	7.30	
Mod. Low	Fe.	100	41.97	7.66	2.72**
	Ma.	91	38.96	7.63	
Mod. High	Fe.	34	45.00	5.44	0.82
	Ma.	42	43.93	5.87	
High	Fe	19	50.42	8.49	2.69**
	Ma.	32	45.25	5.28	

* p<.05

**p<.01

As can be seen in this table, females score significantly higher on trait anxiety than males except in the high moderate group.

The third hypothesis stated that the children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly higher scores on Children's Attributional Style Questionnaire as compared to children who have lower rejection scores. In Tables 22 and 23, Children's Attributional Style Questionnaire(CASQ) mean and standard deviations according to sex and the four PARQ groups are given.

Table 22

Means and S.D. of males and females on CASQ

Sex	N	M	S.D.
Males	175	20.05	4.72
Females	169	20.23	3.94
Total	344	20.14	4.35

Table 23

Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on CASQ

PARQ GROUPS	N	CASQ	
		Mean	S.D.
GRP 01	26	17.62	5.31
GRP 02	191	20.09	4.40
GRP 03	76	20.78	3.88
GRP 04	51	20.65	3.88
Total	344	20.14	4.35

One way analysis of variance on CASQ by rejection indicates that there is significant difference of attributional style scores in relation to different levels of perceived rejection as can be seen in Table 24 ($F=3.798$, $p<.01$).

Table 24

One way ANOVA results on CASQ by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	3	210.0181	70.0060	3.798*
Within Groups	340	6267.2676	18.4331	
Total	343	6477.2852		

* $p<.01$

The group responsible for the significant difference were identified by the use of Scheffe procedure. It was found out that low rejection subjects had significantly ($p<.05$) lower CASQ scores than moderate high and high rejection groups since the low moderate rejection group is included in both of the subsets attained as the result of Scheffe procedure, it can be said that the group responsible for the difference is the low rejection group (Table 25).

Table 25

Scheffe Procedure

SUBSET 1			
GROUP	GRP 01	GRP 02	
MEAN	17.62	20.09	
SUBSET 2			
GROUP	GRP 02	GRP 04	GRP 03
MEAN	20.09	20.65	20.78

$p<.05$

The fourth hypothesis put forth that the children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly higher scores on mother's perceived overprotection as measured by PARI Factor I, compared to children who have lower rejection scores.

Table 26
Means and S.D. of males and females on PARI F1

Sex	N	M	S.D
Males	175	47.14	6.70
Females	169	45.81	8.40
Total	344	46.49	7.60

Table 27
Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on PARI F1

PARQ GROUPS	N	PARI F1	
		MEAN	S.D
GRP 01	26	48.69	8.58
GRP 02	191	46.54	7.70
GRP 03	76	45.20	7.10
GRP 04	51	47.08	7.30
Total	344	46.49	7.60

Tables 26 and 27 present the means and standard deviations of the males and females and the four PARQ groups. As can be seen in Table 28, the ANOVA statistics indicated a variance between the groups only at a significance level of $p < .5$, thus not supporting the hypothesis.

Table 28**One Way ANOVA results on PARI F1 by four PARQ groups**

Source	D. F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between groups	3	271.4362	90.4787	1.574*
Within groups	340	19550.3667	57.5011	
Total	343	19821.8008		

*p<.5

A closer investigation of the means of the four rejection groups listed in Table 27 shows that the subject's perception of overprotection is the highest for the low rejection group which is followed by the high rejection group.

In the fifth hypothesis, the children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly lower scores on mother's perceived democratic behaviour as measured by PARI Factor II compared to those who have lower rejection scores. The results met the expectations. Tables 29 and 30 display PARI F2 means and standard deviations of the sexes and four rejection groups as measured by PARQ.

Table 29**Means and S. D. of sexes on PARI F2**

Sex	N	M	S. D.
Males	175	26.97	4.79
Females	169	27.46	5.16
Total	344	27.21	4.97

Table 30
Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on PARI F2

PARQ GROUPS	N	MEAN	S. D.
GRP 01	26	29.62	9.39
GRP 02	191	27.95	4.18
GRP 03	76	25.70	4.51
GRP 04	51	25.49	4.11
Total	344	27.21	4.97

Analysis of variance on PARI F2 by rejection supports that there is significant difference of mother's perceived democratic behaviour in relation to different levels of perceived rejection ($F=8.306$, $p<.0001$). Table 31 displays these results.

Table 31
One way ANOVA results on PARI F2 by four PARQ groups

Source	D. F.	Sum of squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between groups	3	579.0372	193.0124	8.306*
Within groups	340	7900.3794	23.2364	
Total	343	8479.4141		

* $p<.0001$

Scheffe procedure revealed that moderate high and high rejection groups had significantly ($p<.05$) lower scores on mother's perceived democratic behaviour than the moderate low and low rejection groups. These results can be seen in Table 32.

Table 32
Scheffe Procedure

SUBSET 1		
GROUP	GRP 04	GRP 03
MEAN	25.49	25.70
SUBSET 2		
GROUP	GRP 02	GRP 01
MEAN	27.95	29.62

In the sixth hypothesis it was put forth that the children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly higher scores on perceived mother's rejection of homemaking role which was measured by PARI F3 as compared to children who score lower in perceived rejection. This expectation was also supported by the findings. Tables 33 and 34 present the PARI F3 means and standard deviations belonging to sexes and the four PARQ groups.

Table 33
Means and S. D. of sexes on PARI F3

Sex	N	M	S. D.
Males	175	33.14	6.92
Females	169	31.76	6.71
Total	344	32.46	6.84

Table 34
Means and S. D. of four rejection groups on PARI F3

PARQ GROUPS	N	PARI F3	
		MEAN	S. D.
GRP 01	26	30.27	7.75
GRP 02	191	31.81	6.98
GRP 03	76	32.05	5.58
GRP 04	51	36.63	6.20
Total	344	32.46	6.84

When Analysis of Variance was run to see the relation of the four rejection groups with PARI F3, the results indicated significant difference in perceived mother's rejection of homemaking role in relation to different levels of perceived rejection ($F=8.365$, $p<.0001$) which can be seen in Table 35.

Table 35

One way ANOVA results on PARI F3 by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F Ratio
Between groups	3	1103.4341	367.8113	8.365*
Within groups	340	14949.7817	43.9699	
Total	343	16053.2148		

* $p<.0001$

Utilizing Scheffe procedure, it was found that the low, low moderate and high moderate rejection groups had significantly lower scores on mother's perceived rejection of homemaking role than the high rejection group which was by itself responsible for the significant difference ($p<.05$).

Table 36

Scheffe Procedure

SUBSET 1			
GROUP	GRP 01	GRP 02	GRP 03
MEAN	30.27	31.81	32.05
SUBSET 2			
GROUP	GRP 04		
MEAN	36.63		

The seventh hypothesis stated that the children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to score significantly higher on perceived marital conflict measured by PARI Factor IV as compared to children who score lower in rejection. This hypothesis was also supported. The PARI F4 means and standard deviations of the males and females and the four PARQ groups can be seen in Tables 37 and 38.

Table 37
Means and S.D. of sexes on PARI F4

Sex	N	M	S.D.
Males	175	14.67	4.30
Females	169	13.92	4.96
Total	344	14.30	4.64

Table 38
Means and S.D. of four PARQ groups on PARI F4

PARQ Groups	N	PARI F4	
		MEAN	S.D.
GRP 01	26	12.19	3.79
GRP 02	191	14.16	5.10
GRP 03	76	14.25	3.67
GRP 04	51	15.98	4.04
Total	344	14.30	4.64

The results of analysis of variance on marital conflict by rejection shows significant difference of perceived marital conflict scores in relation to different levels of perceived rejection ($F=4.187, p < .01$). These findings can be seen in Table 39.

Table 39

One way ANOVA results on PARI F4 by four rejection groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F Ratio
Between groups	3	263.3199	87.7733	4.187*
Within groups	340	7127.0769	20.9620	
Total	343	7390.3945		

*p<.01

Scheffe procedure revealed that the low rejection group had significantly ($p<.05$) lower perceived marital conflict scores than the high rejection group since the low moderate and high moderate rejection groups were included in both subsets, it can be concluded that the low and high rejection groups are responsible for the difference (Table 40).

Table 40

Scheffe Procedure

SUBSET 1			
GROUP	GRP 01	GRP 02	GRP 03
MEAN	12.19	14.16	14.25
SUBSET 2			
GROUP	GRP 02	GRP 03	GRP 04
MEAN	14.16	14.25	15.98

*p<.05

It was stated in the eighth hypothesis that the children who score higher on perceived rejection are expected to score either high or low on strict discipline, the strict discipline scores of the subjects were divided into four groups. Lowest score to one

standard deviation, forming the low strict discipline group (group 01), between one standard deviation below the mean and the mean, forming the low moderate strict discipline group (group 02), between the mean and one standard deviation above the mean, forming the high moderate strict discipline group (group 03) and one standard deviation above the mean to highest score, forming the high strict discipline group (group 04). Table 41 shows the different levels of perceived strict discipline and the number of subjects in each group.

Table 41

Strict discipline groups

	low	moderate low	moderate high	high
Score level	below 30	30.01 to 38	38.01 to 46	Above 46
N	54	131	98	61

Table 42 presents the perceived rejection scores of the four perceived strict discipline groups.

Table 42

PARQ scores of the four strict discipline groups

Strict Discipline Groups	N	PARQ	
		Mean	S. D.
GRP 01	54	80.33	14.25
GRP 02	131	92.43	27.21
GRP 03	98	93.76	25.05
GRP 04	61	97.65	25.18
Total	344	91.87	25.07

One way analysis of variance results showed that the four strict discipline groups significantly differed on perceived rejection ($F=5.371$, $p<.001$) (See Table 43).

Table 43

One way analysis of variance on PARQ by PARI F5

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F Ratio
Between groups	3	9759.5146	3253.1714	5.371*
Within groups	340	205917.7734	605.6404	
Total	343	215677.2500		

$p<.001$

When Scheffe procedure was carried out to find out the group responsible for the significant difference, the low strict discipline group was found to perceive significantly ($p<.05$) less perceived rejection than the other groups. These results can be seen in Table 44

Table 44

Scheffe Procedure

SUBSET 1			
GROUP	GRP 01		
MEAN	80.33		
SUBSET 2			
GROUP	GRP 02	GRP 03	GRP 04
MEAN	92.43	93.76	97.85

Accordingly, the hypothesis was rejected.

The relationship of four rejection groups with strict discipline was investigated as well. Tables 45 and 46 list the PARI F5 mean and standard deviation calculations of sexes and the four rejection groups separately.

Table 45
Means and S.D. of sexes on PARI F5

Sex	N	M	S.D
Males	175	38.72	8.09
Females	169	36.33	8.64
Total	344	37.54	8.43

Table 46
Means and SD of four rejection groups on PARI F5

PARQ GROUPS	N	PARI F5 mean	SD
GRP 01	26	36.58	11.37
GRP 02	191	36.43	8.25
GRP 03	76	38.43	7.80
GRP 04	51	40.88	7.44
Total	344	37.54	8.43

One way Analysis of variance on perceived strict discipline by rejection indicates that there is significant difference in perceived strict discipline scores in relation to the level of perceived rejection ($F=4.292$ $p<.01$). These results can be seen in Table 47.

Table 47

One way ANOVA results on PARI F5 by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F Ratio
Between groups	3	890.2287	296.7427	4.292*
Within groups	340	23506.7546	69.1375	
Total	343	24396.9805		

$p < .01$

Scheffe procedure sorted out the groups which caused the significant differences in the scores of perceived strict discipline. It was found that the low, moderate low and moderate high rejection groups and low, moderate high and high rejection groups formed the two subsets, indicating that the groups responsible for the major difference to be the low moderate and high rejection subjects ($p < .05$): These results can be seen in Table 48.

Table 48

Scheffe Procedure

SUBSET 1			
GROUP	GRP 02	GRP 01	GRP 03
MEAN	36.43	36.58	38.43
SUBSET 2			
GROUP	GRP 01	GRP 03	GRP 04
MEAN	36.58	38.43	40.88

Table 49

Two way ANOVA results on PARI F5 by PARQ groups, by sex

Sources of variation	Sum of squares	D.F.	Mean Squares	F
Main effects	1243.125	4	310.781	4.547***
Rejection	750.160	3	250.053	3.659**
Sex	352.886	1	352.886	5.163*
Two way Interaction	189.148	3	63.049	0.922
Explained	1432.273	7	204.610	2.994**
Residual	22964.508	336	68.347	
Total	24396.781	343	71.128	

*p<.05

**p<.01

*** p<.001

As can be seen in Table 49, there is significant difference between the males and females in the level of perceived strict discipline, though interaction effect is not seen. Results of the t test analysis can be seen in Table 5.

Table 50

T test results of males and females on four PARQ groups

PARQ GROUPS	Sex	N	M	S.D.	t Value
Low	Fe.	16	37.69	13.49	0.62
	Ma.	10	34.80	7.10	
Low mod.	Fe.	100	35.05	7.71	-2.45*
	Ma.	91	37.94	8.60	
High mod.	Fe.	34	37.59	8.31	-0.85
	Ma.	42	39.12	7.39	
High	Fe.	19	39.63	8.12	-0.92
	Ma.	32	41.63	7.03	

*p<.01

Table 50 shows that there are no significant differences between males and females in terms of strict discipline except in the low moderate group.

The last hypothesis which put forth that the children who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly lower academic achievement as compared to children who have lower rejection scores, was also supported by the results. The means and standard deviations of the student GPAs in the sexes and the four PARQ groups can be seen in Tables 51 and 52.

Table 51
Means and S.D. of sexes on the G.P.A.

Sex	N	M	S.D.
Males	175	6.23	1.23
Females	169	6.80	1.48
Total	344	6.51	1.39

Table 52
Means and S.D. of four rejection groups on the G.P.A.

PARQ GROUPS	N	MEAN	S.D.
GRP 01	26	6.92	1.86
GRP 02	191	6.72	1.32
GRP 03	76	6.25	1.34
GRP 04	51	5.90	1.18
Total	344	6.51	1.39

One way analysis of variance of academic achievement by rejection reveals that there is significant difference of academic achievement in relation to different levels of perceived rejection ($F=6.784$, $p<.001$). These results can be seen in Table 53.

Table 53

One way ANOVA results of academic achievement by PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F Ratio
Between groups	3	37.3613	12.4538	6.784*
Within Groups	340	624.1907	1.8359	
Total	343	661.5518		

* $p<.001$

According to Scheffé procedure results, the high rejection group had significantly ($p<.05$) lower academic achievement than the moderate low and low rejection groups while the moderate high rejection group was included in both subsets. These results can be seen in Table 54.

Table 54

Scheffe Procedure

SUBSET 1			
GROUP	GRP 04	GRP 03	
MEAN	5.90	6.25	
SUBSET 2			
GROUP	GRP 03	GRP 02	GRP 01
MEAN	6.25	6.72	6.92

Table 55

Two way ANOVA results on academic achievement by four PARQ groups by sex

Sources of Variation	Sum of squares	D.F.	Mean squares	F
Main effects	57.737	4	14.434	8.146**
Rejection	30.151	3	10.050	5.672*
Sex	20.357	1	20.357	11.488*
Two way interaction	8.389	3	2.796	1.578
Explained	66.126	7	9.447	5.331**
Residual	595.404	336	1.772	
Total	661.530	343	1.929	

*p< 001

**p<.0001

As can be seen in Table 55, there is significant difference between the males and females in the level of academic achievement, though interaction effect is not seen. The results of t-test analysis can be seen in Table 56.

Table 56

T test results of males and females on four PARQ groups

PARQ GROUPS	Sex	N	M	S.D.	t Value
Low	Fe.	16	6.73	2.17	-0.67
	Ma.	10	7.24	1.29	
Low mod.	Fe.	100	7.05	1.33	3.72*
	Ma.	91	6.36	1.22	
High mod.	Fe.	34	6.44	1.53	1.13
	Ma.	42	6.09	1.17	
High	Fe.	19	6.17	1.29	1.28
	Ma.	32	5.73	1.11	

*p<.0001

Table 56 shows that there are no significant differences between males and females in terms of academic achievement except in the low moderate group.

For further analyses, only the two extreme groups, namely the low and high rejection groups were compared. To see if the groups differ significantly on the variables, t- test was utilized.

As can be seen in Table 57, group A is the low and group B in the high rejection group. The results showed that the low rejection group had significantly higher self concept ($t=6.00, p<.0001$), perceived their mothers as being more democratic ($t=2.68, p<.01$), as well as having higher academic achievement ($t=2.93, p<.01$) than the high rejection group.

The results also showed that the rejection group had significantly lower negative attributional style ($t=-2.86, p<.01$), lower trait anxiety ($t=-4.98, p<.0001$), perceived their mother as nonrejecting of their homemaking role ($t=-3.91, p<.0001$), perceived less marital conflict ($t=-3.97, p<.0001$) and less strict discipline ($t=-2.00, p.05$) than the high rejection group

Significant difference was not found between the low and high rejection groups in terms of mothers' perceived overprotection ($t=0.86, p<.5$).

Table 57
T-test results of extreme groups

SCALES	Groups		Frequency	Means	S. D.	T Value
WIFAM	Group A	Low R	26	65.08	12.50	6.00***
	Group B	High R	51	49.59	9.71	
CASQ	Group A	Low R	26	17.62	5.31	-2.86**
	Group B	High R	51	20.65	3.88	
STAI	Group A	Low R	26	37.50	9.80	-4.98***
	Group B	High R	51	47.18	7.04	
PARI F1	Group A	Low R	26	48.69	8.58	0.86
	Group B	High R	51	47.06	7.30	
PARI F2	Group A	Low R	26	29.62	9.40	2.68**
	Group B	High R	51	25.49	4.11	
PARI F3	Group A	Low R	26	30.27	7.75	-3.91***
	Group B	High R	51	36.63	6.20	
PARI F4	Group A	Low R	26	12.19	3.80	-3.97***
	Group B	High R	51	15.98	4.04	
PARI F5	Group A	Low R	26	36.58	11.38	-2.00*
	Group B	High R	51	40.88	7.44	
ACHIEVEMENT	Group A	Low R	26	6.92	1.87	2.93**
	Group B	High R	51	5.90	1.19	

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.0001

Pearson Product Correlation coefficients were calculated to investigate the possible correlations between PARQ and the other variables. As can be seen in Table 58, rejection scores obtained from PARQ have a negative correlation of -.52 with self concept ($p < .001$), -.20 with mother's perceived democratic behaviours ($p < .001$) and -.27 with academic achievement ($p < .001$).

On the other the rejection scores showed a positive correlation of .16 with negative attributional style ($p < .001$), .37 with trait anxiety ($p < .001$), .25 with mother's perceived rejection of homemaking role ($p < .001$), .15 with perceived marital conflict ($p < .01$), .17 with perceived strict discipline ($p < .001$).

Table 58

Pearson Correlation Coefficients of PARQ with other variables

	WIFAM	CASQ	STAI	PARI F1	PARI F2	PARI F3	PARI F4	PARI F5	ACHIEVEMENT
PARQ	-.52**	.16**	.37**	-.02	-.20**	.25**	.15*	.17**	-.27**

*P<.01

**P<.001

Apart from the hypothesis testing, factor analysis was carried out to have further information about the conceptual validity of the PARQ. The responses of 344 students were used to explore the comparability with the original study. In the original study two primary factors were obtained, therefore in the present study, the grouping of the items for two factors were initially investigated. The items which had .35 and above correlation were taken into consideration. Table 59 shows the items according to the factors formed based on the present study and the original subscales. As can be seen in this table, Factor I contains the items of the warmth subscale and also seven items from indifference-neglect subscale. On the other hand, Factor II contains almost all of the items belonging to aggression-hostility and undifferentiated rejection subscales while eight of the indifference-neglect items fall under this factor. ^{end}

Table 59
Factor Analysis

	Factor 1	Factor 2	
Sub- Scale 1	1, 5, 8, 12, 15, 19, 22, 26, 29, 33, 36, 40, 43, 47, 50, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60		Items that have below, 35, 50, 28, 4.
Sub- Scale 2	37	2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 20, 23, 27, 30, 34, 41, 44, 48, 51	
Sub- Scale 3	7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42, 49	3, 10, 17, 24, 31, 38, 45, 52	
Sub- Scale 4	4	11, 18, 25, 32, 39, 46, 53, 56, 59	

Subscale 1: Warmth

Subscale 2: Agg./Host.

Subscale 3: Ind./Neg.

Subscale 4: Und. Rej.

B. Results on the reliability and internal consistency:

In this section, findings of test-retest reliability, Cronbach Alpha Coefficients and item total correlations of the PARQ will be presented. As can be seen in Table 60, the test retest reliability calculated by Pearson Product Correlation Coefficient was found to be .70 for the total PARQ, .64 for the warmth subscale, .62 for the aggression/hostility subscale, .64 for the indifference/neglect subscale and .48 for the undifferentiated rejection subscale which

is the lowest among the other subscales. All of the correlations were found to be significant at $p < .001$ level for the 76 students who were administered the test with a two or three weeks interval.

Table 60

The test-retest reliability correlation coefficients for the PARQ subscales and the total scale score

Scales	Correlation Coefficients
Warmth Subscale	.64*
Aggression/Hostility Subscale	.62*
Indifference/Neglect Subscale	.64*
Undifferentiated Rejection Subscale	.48*
Total	.70*

* $p < .001$

Internal consistency was computed in terms of Cronbach Alpha for the 60 items and also for each subscale. These results can be seen in Table 61.

Table 61

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha for PARQ subscales and total scale N:344

Scale	Cronbach Alpha	Standardized Item Alpha
Warmth	.89	.90
Agg./Host.	.90	.90
Ind./Neg.	.83	.84
Und.Rej.	.78	.78
Total Scale	.95	.95

The total scale Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be .95 while standardized item alpha was .95.

Further support for the internal consistency came from the corrected item total statistics which can be seen in Table 62, item subscale correlations which are calculated in terms of Pearson Correlation Coefficient which can also be seen in Table 63.

Table 62
Corrected item total correlation coefficients of the PARQ items
N:344

Item No	Corrected Item Total Cor.
1	.49
2	.54
3	.55
4	.43
5	.52
6	.35
7	.67
8	.42
9	.55
10	.50
11	.35
12	.49
13	.62
14	.58
15	.45
16	.61
17	.41
18	.52
19	.34
20	.62
21	.49
22	.66
23	.64
24	.40
25	.60
26	.45
27	.64
28	.08
29	.56
30	.66
31	.52
32	.35
33	.44
34	.59
35	.59
36	.42
37	.49
38	.42
39	.60
40	.43
41	.54

Item No	Corrected Item Total Cor.
42	.60
43	.60
44	.61
45	.54
46	.53
47	.49
48	.56
49	.61
50	.21
51	.52
52	.39
53	.40
54	.63
55	.42
56	.49
57	.57
58	.66
59	.57
60	.64

Table 63

Item-Subscale Correlation Coefficients N: 344

Scales	Average Item-Subscale Correlation
Warmth	.58*
Agg./Host.	.64*
Ind./Neg.	.55*
Und Rej.	.57*

p < .001

As can be seen in Table 62, corrected item total correlation coefficients which are in the form of item remainder correlations, except for item 28, are greater than or equal to .21. These coefficients provide evidence for the internal consistency of the

PARQ (Nunnally, 1967, p.285). The subscale-total correlation for the warmth subscale is .87, for the aggression-hostility subscale it is .90, for the indifference-neglect subscale it is .90 and for the undifferentiated rejection subscale it is .85 (See Table 64).

Table 64

Subscale and subscale total correlation coefficients for the PARQ

	W	A/H	I/N	R	Total
W	1.00				
A/H	0.63	1.00			
I/N	0.78	0.72	1.00		
R	0.56	0.82	0.69	1.00	
Total	0.87	0.90	0.90	0.85	1.00

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to establish the reliability and validity of the Turkish version of the Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ). The construct validation of the PARQ was accomplished through hypothesis testing and factor analysis.

Based on the studies that show the inverse relationship of self concept and perceived rejection or abuse (Rohner, 1980; Polat, 1988) the first hypothesis stated that the children who perceive higher rejection were expected to have lower self concept than those who perceive lower rejection. This expectation was supported by the ANOVA findings ($F=30.140, p<.0001$).

The second hypothesis put forth that the children who perceive higher parental rejection were expected to have higher trait anxiety than those who perceive lower rejection. This expectation was supported by the ANOVA findings ($F=16.525, p<.0001$). This finding was also supported by the study of Aber and Zigler (1981) which reported abused children to be anxious, aggressive and hostile (cited in Garbarino et al., 1986). Females were found to have more trait anxiety than the males.

The third hypothesis was based on the studies of Barahal et al. (1981) and Rohner (1980). The children who perceive higher rejection were expected to be attributing the cause of events to external sources and have a helpless explanatory style more than those who perceive lower rejection. This hypothesis was supported as well ($F=3.798, p<.01$).

The fourth hypothesis was constructed based on the Western studies which conceptualize overprotection or overly nurturant behaviours as rejecting the child's individuality and fostering dependent behaviours such as Newell (1934, 1936) and Knight (1933) studies (cited in Radke, 1945). Studies in Turkey also showed positive relationship of maternal overprotection with dependency and anxiety (Peker, 1985; Kozacıoğlu, 1982) as well as negative relationship with self concept (Odabaş, 1985). Accordingly it was hypothesized that the children who perceive higher maternal rejection were expected to perceive more overprotection than those who perceive lower rejection. This expectation was not met by the results of ANOVA which showed no significant differences as well as the Pearson Product results which showed no correlations between those constructs. This results can be explained by the findings of the Turkish VOC study (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982) which indicated that dependent, obedient behaviours were rewarded whereas self reliant and independent behaviours were punished by the Turkish parents. As reported by Fişek (1982) Turkish family is authoritarian and protective, in accordance with these, overprotective parenting was not necessarily perceived as rejecting, but was an expected behaviour of the parents.

The fifth hypothesis which stated that the children who perceive higher rejection were expected to perceive less democratic attitude compared to those who perceive lower rejection was also supported ($F=8.306, p<.0001$).

The sixth hypothesis put forth that the children who perceive higher rejection were expected mor maternal rejection of homemaking

role as compared to those who perceive lower rejection. This expectation was met by the ANOVA results ($F=8.365$, $p<.0001$) as well.

The seventh hypothesis stated that the children who perceive higher rejection were expected to perceive more marital conflict in their parents than those who perceive less rejection. This hypothesis was supported as well ($F=4.187$, $p<.01$). This result is supported by the findings of Smith (1975) and Young (1964) which indicate the existence of marital discord and spousal disputes in abusing families (cited in Berger, 1983b).

The eighth hypothesis was based on the relationship of warmth and control in Turkish families. Kağıtçıbaşı (1970) reports that control is not perceived as parental rejection in Turkey, because in Turkey love and control go together in contrast to Western societies where love accompanies permissiveness and the use of control implies lack of affection. Consequently the children who perceive lower rejection were expected to perceive some degree of control whereas highly rejected children were expected to perceive either too low or too high strict discipline. This expectation was not met by the findings. ANOVA results showed that the children who perceive higher rejection were perceiving higher strict discipline as well ($F=5.371$, $p<.001$). So the relationship was found to be a rather linear one, just like in the western findings, instead of being curvilinear as hypothesized. This finding might suggest the greater need in children for more flexibility and democracy in their lives. Slight sex difference was found in the perception of strict discipline. The males who perceived low moderate rejection were found to be

perceiving more strict discipline. This can be due to different treatment received by boys and girls (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982; Zeytinoğlu and Kozcu, 1987).

The last hypothesis stated that the children who perceive higher rejection were expected to have lower academic achievement than those who perceive lower rejection was supported as well ($F=6.784, p<.001$). This result is congruent with the findings of Lynch (1978) and Starkey's results (cited in Rohner, 1980) which state that rejected or abused children to be underachieving at school.

Factor analysis which was used in the construct validation yielded two factors as found in the original study (Rohner, 1980). Factor 1 contained the items of warmth subscale and half of the indifference-neglect subscale whereas Factor 2 contained aggression hostility and undifferentiated rejection subscales. When the items in the factors are closely investigated, it can be concluded one factor represents warmth and the other rejection like Rohner's findings.

The relationship of sex with rejection yielded conflicting results in the literature. In the research conducted by Rohner (1980) no significant sex difference was found. Polat's (1988) and Erkman and Alantar's (1989) findings supported this result in Turkey whereas Erkman (1989) in her study with Turkish remigrants found males to perceive more maternal rejection. In the present study, males were found to be perceiving more maternal rejection than the females ($F=4.616, p<.05$).

These results can be seen in Appendix I in table form. According to Ohlson- Prather (1978) in the Turkish family infants and small children are indulged, but by the age of six or seven when the child starts primary school, expectations and the use of physical punishment increase. Kağıtçıbaşı (1982) reports that the main targets of these expectations are males as they are expected to maintain the family name and constitute an old age security for the parents. In addition, Zeytinoğlu and Kozcu (1987) found male children to receive more physical punishment than the girls.

The SES variable was also one that always gave conflicting results in the literature. Rohner (1980) found no social class differences, whereas Polat's (1988) findings revealed that the upper middle class children were perceiving more acceptance than their lower class counterparts. Therefore in the present study, three highschools from each SES were taken. The low SES children, like in Polat's study, were found to perceive more rejection ($F=13.028$, $p<.00001$). These results can be seen in Appendix J in table form.

The test retest reliability was not calculated in the studies of Rohner (1980) or Polat (1988). In the present study the test retest reliability coefficients of the subscales ranged between .48 to .64 one a two or three week period and it was .70 for the total score. The reliability coefficients are rather modest, this may be due to the sample size which was made up of only 76 subjects or the fact that there were more males than females in that group of 76 subjects.

The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the subscales ranged between .72 and .90 in the original study. In Polat's study, it was found to range between .76 and .89. In the present research, it ranged between .78 and .89. The alpha coefficient was found to be .95 for the total scale. The item remainder correlations ranged between .34 and .67. Items 28 and 50 had low correlations and are accordingly recommended to be deleted from the questionnaire.

The subscale total correlations ranged between .85 and .90 in the present study, these correlations ranged between .73 and .90 in Polat's study. As can be seen, the results of internal consistency are very congruent with Polat's and Rohner's findings. In the light of these evidence, it can be concluded that Turkish PARQ is made up of homogeneous items that have internal consistency and moderate stability over time. The undifferentiated rejection subscale was found to have .48 correlation coefficient in the test retest reliability study and .78 Cronbach's alpha coefficient which are the lowest among the results of the other subscales. In future research, it is recommended to go over the items of this subscale and work on the structure of the statements.

These results including other usages of PARQ supports that PART is an emotional abuse theory.

Limitations and recommendations

One of the limitations of the study is related to the time intervals in relation to testing the stability of PARQ. As the administration of the questionnaires was achieved towards the end of the academic year, it was not possible to obtain test retest scores for longer time periods including the whole sample group.

The subjects were selected from some schools in Istanbul and random sampling could not be achieved for practical reasons.

It is suggested for future researchers that the reliability and validity of PARQ should be replicated on a larger random sample and further investigation on the undifferentiated rejection subscale is recommended.

REFERENCES

- Alantar, H., Erkman F. (1989, September). Psychological maltreatment its definition by experts and its assessment among a group of adolescents in Turkey. Paper presented at the VII. International Congress of Child Abuse and Neglect, Rio De Janeiro, Brasil.
- Augoustinos, M. (1987). Developmental effects of child abuse: Recent findings. Child Abuse and Neglect, 11, 15-27.
- Bailey, T.F., Bailey, W.H. (1986). Operational definitions of child emotional maltreatment. Augusta, Maine.
- Balaman, A.R. (1986, July). The enculturation process in rural area of Turkey. Paper presented at 8th International Congress of Cross Cultural Psychology, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Barahal, R.M., Waterman, J., Martin, H.P. (1981). The social cognitive development of abused children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49 (4), 508-516.
- Belsky, J. (1980). Child maltreatment: An ecological integration. American Psychologist, 35 (4), 320-335.
- Berger, A.M. (1983a). The child abusing family II. child and child rearing variables, environmental factors and typologies of abusing families. Family Studies Review Yearbook, 1, 265-281.
- Berger, A.M. (1983b). The child abusing family: Methodological issues and parent related characteristics of abusing families. Family Studies Review Yearbook, 1, 251-264.
- Bower, E.M. (1972). Education as a humanizing process and its relationship to other humanizing processes. In S.E. Golann, C. Eisdorfer (Eds.), Handbook of community mental health (pp.37-49). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Brassard, M.R., Germain, R., Hart, S.N. (Eds.) (1987). Psychological maltreatment of children and youth. New York: Pergamon Press.

- Browne, K., Saqi, S. (1989). Parent-child interaction in abusing families: Its possible causes and consequences. In P. Maher (Ed.), Child abuse: The educational perspective (pp.77-103). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Çataklı, M. (1985). Transliterated equivalence and reliability of the Turkish children's self concept scale. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Erbaş, N. (1983). The relationship between perceived child rearing attitudes, ego strength and socio economic status. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Erkman, F. (1989, July). The experience of psychological maltreatment of remigrant adolescents. Paper presented at the 2nd Regional Conference of the International Association for Cross Cultural Psychology, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Finkelhor, D., Korbin, J. (1988). Child abuse as an international issue. Child Abuse and Neglect, 12, 3-23.
- Fişek, G. (1982). Psychopathology and the Turkish family: A family systems theory analysis. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), Sex roles, family and community in Turkey (pp.295-321). Indiana: Indiana University Turkish studies 3.
- Garbarino, J., Guttman, E. Seeley, J. (1986). The psychologically battered child: Strategies for identification, assessment and intervention. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Garbarino, J. Vondra, J. (1987). Psychological maltreatment: Issues and perspectives. In M.R. Brassard, R. Germain, S.N. Hart (Eds.), Psychological maltreatment of children and youth (pp. 25-43). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Garrison, Greenberg, E. (1987). Psychological maltreatment of children. American Psychologist, 42 (2), 157-159.

- Gleason, G. (1989, June). The child caring/care, neglect/abuse continuum: A pragmatic guide to judge policies, programmes and impact in child survival and development. Paper presented at the Congress on Child Abuse and Child Labour, Ankara, Turkey.
- Haque, A. (1987). Social class differences in perceived maternal acceptance-rejection and personality dispositions among Pakistani children. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), Growth and progress in cross cultural psychology (pp. 189-194). Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V.
- Herzberger, S.D., Potts, D.A., Dillon, M. (1981). Abusive and nonabusive parental treatment from the child's perspective. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49 (1), 81-90.
- Hjelle, L.A., Ziegler, D.J. (1981). Personality theories: Basic assumptions, research and applications (2nd ed.). Tokyo: McGraw Hill.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1970). Social norms and authoritarianism: A Turkish American comparison. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16 (3), 444-451.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1982). Sex roles, value of children and fertility. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), Sex roles, family and community in Turkey (pp. 151-180). Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies 3.
- Kitahara, H. (1987). Perception of parental acceptance and rejection among Swedish university students. Child Abuse and Neglect, 11, 223-227.
- Kozacıoğlu, G. (1982). Cocukların anksiyete düzeyleri ile annelerin tutumları arasındaki ilişki. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Istanbul University, Istanbul.
- Kuçuk, Ş. (1987) The validity of the Turkish for the PARI subscales II, III, IV. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

- Lynch, M.A. (1978). The prognosis of child abuse. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 19, 175-180.
- Lynch, M.A. (1985). Child abuse before Kempe: A historical literature review. Child Abuse and Neglect, 9, 7-15.
- Ney, P.G., Moore, C., McPhee, J., Trought, P. (1986). Child abuse: A study of the child's perspective. Child Abuse and Neglect, 10, 511-518.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1967). Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Odabaş, S. (1985). The impact of maternal democratic v.s. domineering child rearing attitudes on the self concept of preschool children. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Ohlson-Prather, E. (1978, November). Socio-economic and psycho-cultural contexts of child abuse and neglect in Turkey. Paper presented at the meeting of the Anthropological Association 77th Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, U.S.A.
- Öner, N., LeCompte, A. (1983). Durumluk-sürekli kaygı envanteri el kitabı. Istanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Peker, N. (1985). The relationship between parental child rearing attitude, anxiety and dependency behaviour of 4 to 6 year old Turkish preschoolers. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Polat, A.S. (1988). Parental acceptance rejection. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Radbill, S.X. (1987). Children in a world of violence: A history of child abuse. In R.E. Helfer, R.S. Kempe (Eds.), The battered child (pp. 3-22). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Radke, M.J. (1946). The relation of parental authority to children's behaviour and attitudes. New York: Greenwood Press.

- Ramazan, O. (1988). Survey for a source book on psychological tests used in Turkey. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Rappaport, J. (1977). Community Psychology: Values, research and action. Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Rohner, R.P. (1975). They love me they love me not: A worldwide study of the effects of parental acceptance and rejection. New Haven: HRAF Press.
- Rohner, R.P. (1980a). **Worldwide tests of parental acceptance rejection theory**. Behaviour Science Research, Whole issue.
- Rohner, R.P. (1980b). Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection. Centre for the Study of Parental Acceptance and Rejection. University of Connecticut.
- Rohner, R. P. (1986). The warmth dimension: Foundations of parental acceptance-rejection theory. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Rosenberg, M.S. (1987). New directions for research on the psychological maltreatment of children. American Psychologist, 42(2), 166-171.
- Rosenberg, M.S., Germain, R.B. (1987). Psychological maltreatment: Theory, research and ethical issues in psychology. In M.R. Brassard, R. Germain, S.N. Hart (Eds.), Psychological maltreatment of children and youth (pp.243-251). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Salama, H. (1987). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and personality dispositions among college students in Egypt. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), Growth and progress in cross cultural psychology (pp. 181-188). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger B. V.
- Stern, C. (1989). The recognition of child abuse. In P. Maher (Ed.), Child abuse. The educational perspective (pp. 35-59). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Strickland, B.R. (1989). Internal-external control expectancies: From contingency to creativity. American Psychologist, 44 (1), 1-12.
- Trickett, K.P., Susman, J.E. (1989). Perceived similarities and disagreements about childrearing practices in abusive and non abusive families: Intergenerational and concurrent family processes. In D. Cicchetti, V. Carlson (Eds.), Child maltreatment: Theory and research on the causes and consequences of child abuse and neglect (pp.280-301). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yörüklüoğlu, A. (1982). Çocuk Ruh Sağlığı. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Zeytinoğlu, S. (1988, September). The opinions of Turkish professionals about child abuse. Paper presented at the meeting of the Seventh International Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil.
- Zeytinoğlu, S., Kozcu, Ş. (1987, April). A Study of child abuse in Turkey. Paper presented at the meeting of the First European Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect, Rhodes, Greece.

APPENDIX A

İsım: _____

Tarih: _____

Elinizdeki ölçekte anne-çocuk ilişkisini içeren ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Bu ifadelerin annenizin size olan davranışlarına uygun olup olmadığını düşünün.

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

Örneğin:

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
Hemen		Hiçbir	
hemen		zaman	
her		Nadiren doğru	
zaman	Bazen	Doğru	değil
()	()	()	(X)

1. Annem ben hiç yokmuşum
gibi davranır.

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen Her Zaman	Bazen	Nadiren Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
1. Annem benim hakkında güzel şeyler söyler.	()	()	()	()
2. Annem kötü davrandığı zaman beni küçümseyerek azarlar.	()	()	()	()
3. Annem ben hiç yokmuşum gibi davranır.	()	()	()	()
4. Annem beni gerçekten sevmez.	()	()	()	()
5. Planlarımız hakkında benimle konuşur ve söyleyeceklerimi dinler.	()	()	()	()
6. Onun özünü dinlemediğim zaman beni başkalarına şikayet eder.	()	()	()	()
7. Benimle candan ilgilenir.	()	()	()	()
8. Arkadaşlarımı eve getirmem için beni cesaretlendirir, onların hoş vakit geçirmesini sağlar.	()	()	()	()
9. Beni küçük düşürür ve benimle alay eder.	()	()	()	()
10. Onu rahatsız etmediğim sürece beni bilmezlik gelir.	()	()	()	()
11. Kızdığı zaman bana bağıırır.	()	()	()	()
12. Benim için önemli olan şeyleri ona anlatmamı kolaylaştırır.	()	()	()	()
13. Bana çok sert davranır.	()	()	()	()
14. Onun yanında olduğumdan hoşlanır.	()	()	()	()
15. Bir şeyi iyi yaptığım zaman gurur duymamı sağlar.	()	()	()	()
16. Hak etmediğim zaman bile bana vurur.	()	()	()	()
17. Benim için yapması gereken şeyleri unuttur.	()	()	()	()
18. Beni büyük bir baş belası olarak görür.	()	()	()	()

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen Her Doğru	Bazen	Nadiren Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
19. Beni başkalarına över.	()	()	()	()
20. Kızdığı zaman beni çok sert bir şekilde cezalandırır.	()	()	()	()
21. Benim gerekli gıdayı almam için gayret eder.	()	()	()	()
22. Benimle sıcak ve sevgi dolu bir şekilde konuşur.	()	()	()	()
23. Bana hemen hiddetlenir.	()	()	()	()
24. Benim sorularıma cevap vermemek için işi olduğumu söyler.	()	()	()	()
25. Benden hoşlanmıyor gibi	()	()	()	()
26. Hakettiğim zaman bana güzel şeyler söyler.	()	()	()	()
27. Çabuk kızar ve hiddetini benden çıkarır.	()	()	()	()
28. Arkadaşlarımla kim olduğumu merak eder.	()	()	()	()
29. Yaptığım şeylerle gerçekten ilgilenir.	()	()	()	()
30. Bana kırıcı şeyler söyler.	()	()	()	()
31. Yardıma ihtiyacım olduğunda beni duymazlıktan gelir.	()	()	()	()
32. Başım deritte olduğunda hatayı bende bulur.	()	()	()	()
33. Bana istenildiğimi ve ihtiyaç duyulduğumu hissettirir.	()	()	()	()
34. Sınırına dokunduğumu söyler.	()	()	()	()
35. Beni çok önemser.	()	()	()	()
36. İyi davrandığı zaman benimle gurur duyduğunu söyler.	()	()	()	()

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Her Zaman	Bazen	Nadiren Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
37. Beni kırmak için elinden geleni yapar.	()	()	()	()
38. Onun hatırlaması gerektiğini düşündüğüm şeyleri unuttur.	()	()	()	()
39. Kötü hareket ettiğimde artık sevilmediğimi hissettirir.	()	()	()	()
40. Yaptığım şeyin önemli olduğunu bana hissettirir.	()	()	()	()
41. Kötü davranmadığım zaman beni korkutur veya tehdit eder.	()	()	()	()
42. Zamanını benimle geçirmekten hoşlanır.	()	()	()	()
43. Üzüldüğüm veya canım sıkıldığında bana yardım etmeye çalışır.	()	()	()	()
44. Kötü davrandığım zaman arkadaşlarımla önünde beni utandırır.	()	()	()	()
45. Benden uzak kalmaya çalışır.	()	()	()	()
46. Beni şikayet eder.	()	()	()	()
47. Ne düşündüğümü merak eder ve o konuda benimle konuşmayı sever.	()	()	()	()
48. Ne yaparsam yapayım başka çocukların benden iyi olduğunu söyler.	()	()	()	()
49. Plan yaptığı zaman benim istediğim şeylere dikkat eder.	()	()	()	()
50. Önemli olduğunu düşündüğüm şeyleri onun için uygun olmasa bile yapmama izin verir.	()	()	()	()
51. Başka çocukların benden daha iyi davrandıklarını söyler.	()	()	()	()
52. Beni başkalarının bakımına bırakır.	()	()	()	()
53. İstenmediğimi bilmemi sağlar.	()	()	()	()

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen her Zaman	Bazen	Nadiren Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
54. Yaptığım şeylerle ilgilenir.	()	()	()	()
55. Canım acıdığı zaman veya hasta olduğum zaman kendimi daha iyi hissetmem için gayret eder.	()	()	()	()
56. Kötü davrandığım zaman benden utandığını söyler.	()	()	()	()
57. Beni sevdiğini söyler.	()	()	()	()
58. Bana nazik ve yumuşak davranır.	()	()	()	()
59. Kötü davrandığım zaman beni utandırır ve suçlu hissettirir.	()	()	()	()
60. Beni mutlu etmeye çalışır.	()	()	()	()

APPENDIX B

ADINIZ, SOYADINIZ:

KOD NO

1. Cinsiyetiniz: Kız () Erkek ()
2. Sınıfınız _____
3. Doğum Tarihiniz: Gün _____ Ay _____ Yıl _____
4. Doğum Yeriniz: _____
5. Şu anda oturduğunuz semt: _____
6. Kaç kardeşsiniz ? _____
7. Kardeşlerden kaçıncısınız ? _____
8. Anneniz ve Babanız

ANNE	Öz ()	Üvey ()	Sağ ()	Ölü ()
BABA	Öz ()	Üvey ()	Sağ ()	Ölü ()
9. Anne ve Babam
 - a. Beraberler
 - b. Boşandılar
 - c. Ayrı yaşıyorlar
 - d. Annem ve/veya babam hayatta değil
10. Anne ve Babanızın öğrenim durumu

	ANNE	BABA
Okuma yazması yok	()	()
Sadece okuma bilir	()	()
Okula gitmemiş okur yazar	()	()
İlkokulu bitirmiş	()	()
Liseyi bitirmiş	()	()
Yükseköğrenimi bitirmiş	()	()
DİĞER (Lütfen belirtiniz)	_____	
11. Anne ve Babanızın iş durumu ?

	ANNE	BABA
Çalışmıyor	()	()
İş arıyor	()	()
Yarı gün çalışıyor	()	()
Tam gün çalışıyor	()	()

APPENDIX C

AİLE HAYATI VE ÇOCUK YETİŞTİRME TUTUMU ANKETİ*
(KISALTIILMIŞ FORMU)

1. Çocuk, yorucu veya zor işlerden korunmalıdır.
2. Anne ve babalar çocuklarını dertlerini anlatmaya teşvik ederler. Fakat bazen çocukların dertlerinin hiç açılmaması gerektiğini anlayamazlar.
3. Çocuk boşa geçen dakikaların bir daha hiç geri gelmeyeceğini ne kadar çabuk öğrenirse, kendisi için o kadar iyi olur.
4. Bir anne çocuğunun düş kırıklığına uğramaması için elinden geleni yapmalıdır.
5. Çocuk ne kadar erken yürümeyi öğrenirse, o kadar iyi terbiye edilebilir.
6. Çocuk yetiştirmek sinir bozucu, yıpratıcı bir iştir.
7. Çocuğun hayatta öğrenmesi gereken o kadar şey var ki, zamanını boşa geçirmesi affedilemez.
8. Babalar, biraz daha şefkatli olsalar, anneler çocuklarını daha iyi yönetebilirler.
9. Çocuk yetiştirmenin kötü taraflarından biri de anne ya da babanın istediğini yapabilmesi için yeterince özgür olmamasıdır.
10. Sıkı kurallarla yetiştirilen çocuklardan en iyi yetişkinler çıkar.
11. Bir anne çocuğunun mutluluğu için kendi mutluluğunu feda etmesini bilmelidir.
12. Daima koşuşturan, hareketli bir çocuk büyük bir olasılıkla mutlu bir insan olacaktır.
13. Büyükler çocukların şakalarına güler, onlara eğlendirici öyküler anlatılırsa, evdeki düzen daha iyi, daha ahenkli olur.
14. Çocuğun en gizli düşüncelerini kesinlikle bilmek, bir annenin görevidir.

* Kısaltılmış deneysel (PARI) formu, Güney LeCompte, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Psikoloji Bölümü (1978).

Bu form sadece araştırmalarda kullanılmak üzere hazırlanmış olup, izinsiz çoğaltılamaz, kopya edilemez ve kullanılamaz. İzin için B.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümüne yazabilirsiniz.

15. Anne-babalar çocuklarına, sorgusuz sualsiz kendilerine sadık kalmalarını öğretmelidirler.
16. Bütün genç anneler, bebek bakımında beceriksiz olacaklarından korkarlar.
17. Hangi anne olursa olsun, eğer bütün gününü çocuklarla geçirmek zorunda kalırsa sonunda çocuklar sinirine dokunur.
18. Anne ve babalar her zaman çocuklarının kendilerine uymasını beklememeli, biraz da kendileri çocuklarına uymalıdır.
19. Eğer anneler dileklerinin kabul edileceğini bilselerdi, babalarının daha anlayışlı olmalarını isterlerdi.
20. Bir çocuğa, ne olursa olsun, doğuzmekten kaçınması gerektiği öğretilmelidir.
21. Çocuklar bencil olduklarında, hep birşeyler istediklerinde, annenin tepesinin atması çok normaldir.
22. Eğer çocuklar ailedeki kuralları uygun bulmuyorlarsa, bunu anne-babalarına söylemeleri hoş karşılanmalıdır.
23. Anneler çoğu zaman çocuklarına bir dakika daha dayanamayacakları duygusuna kapılırlar.
24. Çocuğu sıkı terbiye ederseniz sonra size teşekkür eder.
25. Küçük bir çocuk, cinsiyet konusundan sakınmalıdır.
26. Bir annenin, çocuğunun hayatı hakkında herşeyi bilmesi hakkıdır. Çocuğu onun önemli parçasıdır.
27. Uyanık bir anne-baba çocuğunun tüm düşüncelerini öğrenmeye çalışmalıdır.
28. Çocuklar, anne babalarının kendileri için neler feda ettiklerini düşünmelidirler.
29. Eğer çocukların dertlerini söylemelerine izin verilirse büsbütün şikayetçi olurlar.
30. Sıkı terbiye, sağlam ve iyi karakter geliştirir.
31. Genç bir kadın henüz gençken yapmak istediği pek çok şey olduğu için, anne olunca kendisini tutuklanmış duygusuna kaptırır.
32. Anneler, çocukları için hemen hemen bütün eğlencelerini feda ederler.
33. Babalar, daha az bencil olsalar, kendilerine düşen görevi yaparlardı.
34. İyi bir anne çocuğunu ufak tefek güçlüklerden korunmalıdır.
35. Bir çocuğa anne ve babasını herkesten üstün görmesi öğretilmelidir.

36. Çocuk hiçbir zaman ailesinden sır saklamamalıdır.
37. Çocuklardan sık sık ödün vermelerini, anne-babaya uymalarını istemek doğru değildir.
38. Çoğu anneler bebeklerine bakarken onu inciteceklerinden korkarlar.
39. Bir çocuğa başı derde girdiğinde, doğuşmek yerine, büyüklere başvurması öğretilmelidir.
40. Anne-baba arasındaki bazı konular küçük bir tartışma ile çözümlenemez.
41. Ev bakımında ve idaresinde en kötü şeylerden biri de, kişinin kendi evinde tutuklanmış gibi hissetmesidir.
42. Hiçbir kadından yeni doğmuş bir bebeğe tek başına bakması beklenmemelidir.
43. Oğlan ve kız çocukları soyunurken birbirlerini görmemelidir.
44. Çocukların sorunlarına eğilirseniz, sizi oyalamak için çeşitli masallar uydururlar.
45. Eğer anne babalar çocukları ile şakalaşıp beraber eğlenirlerse, çocuklar onların öğütlerini dinlemeye daha istekli olurlar.
46. Anneleri kendileri yüzünden zorluk çektiği için çocuklar, onlara karşı daha anlayışlı olmalıdırlar.
47. Bir çocuk eninde sonunda anne-babasından akıllı olamayacağını öğrenir.
48. Eğer bir anne çocuklarını iyi yetiştiremiyorsa belki de bu, babanın kendine düşen görevi iyi yapmamasından ileri geliyordur.
49. Genç bir anne için ilk bebeğin bakımı sırasında yalnız kalmaktan daha kötü bir şey olamaz.
50. Bir çocuğun diğer bir çocuğa vurması hiçbir şekilde hoşgörülle karşılanamaz.
51. Anne-babalar çocuklarına hayatta ilerleyebilmeleri için hep birşeyler yapmaları ve boşa zaman geçirmemeleri gerektiğini öğretmelidirler.
52. Akıllı bir kadın, yeni bir bebeğin doğumundan önce ve sonra yalnız kalmamak için elinden geleni yapar.
53. Evde olup bitenleri sadece anne bildiği için ev hayatını onun planlaması gerekir.
54. Kendi haklarına sahip olabilmesi için, bazen bir kadının kocasını terslemesi gerekir.
55. Bütün zamanını çocuklarıyla geçirme, bir kadına kanadı kopmuş kuş duygusu verir.

56. Eđer anne kollarını sıvar, bütün yükü sırtına alırsa bütün aile rahat eder.
57. Anne babalar çocuklarını kendi kendilerine oluřturdukları güveni sarsabilecekleri bütün güç işlerden sakınmalıdır.
58. Çocuklar, aslında, sıkı disiplin içinde mutlu olurlar.
59. Çocukların arkadaşlıkları ve sosyal hayatlarıyla yakından ilgilenen anne babalar onların iyi yetişmelerine sağlarlar.
60. Anne ve babaya sadakat herşeyden önce gelir.

**AİLE HAYATI VE ÇOCUK YETİŞTİRME TUTUMU ANKETİ
(KISALTIKLIŞ FORMU)**

CEVAP KAĞIDI

Anketi Dolduranın

1. Adı, Soyadı: _____
 2. Cinsiyeti : K () E ()
 3. Yaşı : _____

Aşağıdaki soruları anne ve babanızın tutum ve davranışları nasıl olduğunu düşünerek yanıtlayınız.

Soru formundaki ifadeleri okuyup görüşünüzü (1) Çok Uygun Buluyorum; (2) Oldukça Uygun Buluyorum; (3) Biraz Uygun Buluyorum; (4) Hiç Uygun Bulmuyorum seçeneklerinden birini daire içine alarak belirtiniz. Bu ifadelerde doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur, sadece kendi görüşünüzü işaretlemeniz istenmektedir. Araştırma için, bütün soruların cevaplandırılması çok önemlidir. Bazı ifadeler birbirlerine benzer gibi görünse de her birini cevaplandırmanızı rica ederiz.

	<u>Çok Uygun Buluyorum</u>	<u>Oldukça Uygun Buluyorum</u>	<u>Biraz Uygun Buluyorum</u>	<u>Hiç Uygun Bulmuyorum</u>
1.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
5.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
6.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
7.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
8.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
9.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
10.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
11.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
12.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
13.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
14.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
15.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
16.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
17.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
18.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
20.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
21.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
22.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
23.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
24.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
25.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
26.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
27.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
28.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
29.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
30.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

	<u>Çok Uygun Buluyorum</u>	<u>Oldukça Uygun Buluyorum</u>	<u>Biraz Uygun Buluyorum</u>	<u>Hiç Uygun Bulmuyorum</u>
31.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
32.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
33.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
34.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
35.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
36.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
37.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
38.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
39.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
40.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
41.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
42.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
43.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
44.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
45.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
46.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
47.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
48.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
49.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
50.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
51.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
52.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
53.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
54.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
55.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
56.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
57.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
58.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
59.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
60.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

APPENDIX D

Adı, Soyadı: _____
Okulu : _____

KENDİM HAKKINDA DÜŞÜNCELERİM

AÇIKLAMA: Aşağıda 30 cümle var. Bunlardan sizi tanımlayanları **evet**, tanımlayanları ise **hayır** ile cevaplandırın. Bazı cümlelerde karar vermek zor olabilir. Ama lütfen bütün cümleleri işaretleyin. Unutmayın, cümledeki ifade genellikle sizi anlatıyorsa evet, genellikle sizi anlatmıyorsa hayır şeklinde işaretleyeceksiniz. Cümlelerin size uygun olup olmadığını en iyi siz bilebilirsiniz. Bunun için kendinizi gerçekten nasıl görüyorsanız, öyle cevaplandırın

Evett Hayır

1. İyi resim çizerim.	()	()
2. Okul ödevlerimi bitirmem uzun sürer.	()	()
3. Ellerimi kullanmada becerikliyimdir.	()	()
4. Okulda başarılı bir öğrenciyimdir.	()	()
5. Aile içinde önemli bir yerim vardır.	()	()
6. Sınıf arkadaşlarım benimle alay ediyor.	()	()
7. Mutluyum.	()	()
8. Çoğunlukla neşesizim.	()	()
9. Akılliyim.	()	()
10. Öğretmenler derse kaldırıncaya heyecanlanıyorum.	()	()
11. Dış görünüşüm beni rahatsız ediyor.	()	()
12. Genellikle çekingenim.	()	()
13. Arkadaş edinmekte güçlük çekiyorum.	()	()
14. Büyüdüğümde önemli bir kimse olacağım.	()	()
15. Aileme sorun yaratıyorum.	()	()
16. Kuvvetli sayılırım.	()	()
17. Sınavlardan önce heyecanlanıyorum.	()	()
18. Okulda terbiyeli, uyumlu davranırım.	()	()
19. Herkes tarafından pek sevilen biri değilim.	()	()
20. Parlak fikirlerim vardır.	()	()
21. Genellikle kendi dediklerimin olmasını isterim.	()	()
22. Birşeyden kolayca vazgeçebilirim.	()	()
23. Müzikte iyiyim.	()	()
24. Hep kötü şeyler yaparım.	()	()
25. Evde çoğu zaman huysuzluk ederim.	()	()
26. Sınıfta arkadaşlarım beni sayarlar.	()	()
27. Sinirli birisiyim.	()	()
28. Gözlerim güzeldir.	()	()
29. Sınıfta derse kalktığımda bildiklerimi sakılmadan anlatırım.	()	()

*Bu envanterin Türkçe uyarlaması üzerine yapılan çalışmaların ilk aşaması Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümünde Prof. Dr. Necla Öner'in danışmanlığı ile Helike Çataklı'nın master tezi olarak yürütülmüştür. Envanter bu şekliyle yalnızca araştırma amacıyla kullanılabilir. Yazarların izni olmadan çoğaltılamaz ve hiçbir şekilde kullanılamaz (1989).

	Evet	Hayır
30. Derslerde sık sık hayal kurarım.	()	()
31. (Kardeşleriniz varsa) Kardeş(ler)ime sataşırım	()	()
32. Arkadaşlarım fikirlerimi beğenir.	()	()
33. Başım sık belaya girer.	()	()
34. Evde büyüklerimin sözünü dinlerim.	()	()
35. Sık sık üzülür, meraklanırım.	()	()
36. Ailem benden çok şey bekliyor.	()	()
37. Halimden memnunum	()	()
38. Evde ve okulda pek çok şeyin dışında bırakıldığımı sanıyorum.	()	()
39. Saçlarım güzeldir.	()	()
40. Çoğu zaman okul faaliyetlerine gönüllü olarak katılırım.	()	()
41. Şimdiki halimden daha başka olmayı isterdim.	()	()
42. Geceleri rahat uyurum.	()	()
43. Okuldan hiç hoşlanmıyorum.	()	()
44. Arkadaşlar arasında oyunlara katılmak için iyi bir seçim yapılırken en son seçilenlerden birisiyim.	()	()
45. Sık sık hasta olurum.	()	()
46. Başkalarına karşı iyi davranmam.	()	()
47. Okuldaki arkadaşlarım iyi fikirlerim olduğunu düşünürler.	()	()
48. Mutsuzum.	()	()
49. Pek çok arkadaşım var.	()	()
50. Neşeliyim.	()	()
51. Pek çok şeye aklım ermez.	()	()
52. Yakışıklıyım (güzelim).	()	()
53. Hayat dolu bir insanım.	()	()
54. Sık sık kavgaya karışırım.	()	()
55. Erkek arkadaşlarım arasında sevilirim.	()	()
56. Arkadaşlarım bana sık sık sataşırlar.	()	()
57. Ailemi düş kırıklığına uğrattım.	()	()
58. Hoş bir yüzüm vardır.	()	()
59. Evde hep benle uğraşırlar.	()	()
60. Oyunlarda ve sporda başı hep ben çekerim.	()	()
61. Ne zaman birşey yapmaya kalksam herşey ters gider.	()	()
62. Hareketlerimde sakarım.	()	()
63. Oyunlarda ve sporda, oynamak yerine seyredirim.	()	()
64. Öğrendiklerimi çabuk unuturum.	()	()
65. Herkesle iyi geçinirim.	()	()
66. Çabuk kızarım.	()	()
67. Kız arkadaşlarım arasında sevilirim.	()	()
68. Çok okurum	()	()
69. Bir grupla çalışmaktansa, tek başına çalışmaktan hoşlanırım.	()	()
70. (Kardeşleriniz varsa) Kardeş(ler)imi severim.	()	()
71. Vücutça güzel sayılırım.	()	()
72. Sık sık korkuya kapılırım.	()	()
73. Her zaman birşeyler düşürür ve kırarım.	()	()
74. Güvenilir bir kimseyim.	()	()
75. Başkalarından farklıyım.	()	()
76. Kötü şeyler düşünürüm.	()	()
77. Kolay ağlarım.	()	()
78. İyi bir insanım.	()	()
79. İşler hep benim yüzümden ters gider.	()	()
80. Şanslı bir kimseyim.	()	()

APPENDIX E

KENDİNİ DEĞERLENDİRME ANKETİ

C.D. Spielberg, R.L. Gorsuch ve R. Luhene tarafından İngilizce olarak geliştirilmiş ve Hacettepe Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü'nde Necla ÖNER ve Ayhan LECOMPTE tarafından Türkçeye adapte edilmiştir.

STAI FORM TX-I

İsim _____ Cinsiyet _____ Yaş _____ Meslek _____ Tarih _____

YÖNERGE: Aşağıda kişilerin kendilerine ait duygularını anlatmada kullandıkları bir takım ifadeler verilmiştir. Her ifadeyi okuyun, sonra da **genel** olarak nasıl hissettiğinizi ifadelerin sağ tarafındaki parantezlerden uygun olanını karalamak suretiyle belirtin. Doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur. Herhangi bir ifadenin üzerinde fazla zaman sarfetmeksizin **genel** olarak nasıl hissettiğinizi gösteren cevabı işaretleyin.

	Hemen Hiç	Bazen	Çok Zaman	Her Zaman
1. Genellikle keyfim yerindedir.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2. Genellikle çabuk yorulurum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3. Genellikle kolay ağlarım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4. Başkaları kadar mutlu olmak isterdim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
5. Çabuk karar veremediğim için fırsatları kaçıırırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
6. Kendimi dinlenmiş hissederim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
7. Genellikle sakın, kendime hakim ve soğukkanlıyım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
8. Güçlüklerin yenemeyeceğim kadar biriktiğini hissediyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
9. Önemsiz şeyler hakkında endişeleniyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
10. Genellikle mutluyum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
11. Herşeyi ciddiye alır ve etkilenirim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
12. Genellikle kendime güvenim yoktur.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
13. Genellikle kendimi emniyette hissederim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
14. Sıkıntılı ve güç durumlarla karşılaşmaktan kaçınırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
15. Genellikle kendimi hüzünlü hissederim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
16. Genellikle hayatımdan memnunum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
17. Olur olmaz düşünceler beni rahatsız eder.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
18. Hayal kırıklıklarını öylesine ciddiye alırım ki hiç unutmam.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19. Akli başında kararlı bir insanım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
20. Son zamanlarda kafama takılan konular beni tedirgin eder.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

APPENDIX F

ÇOCUKLARDA ÖĞRENİLMİŞ ÇARESİZLİK ÖLÇEĞİ

Adı, Soyadı : _____
 Sınıfı : _____
 Kız-Erkek : _____
 Yaş : _____

Sevgili Öğrenciler,

Elinizdeki anket, ortaokul öğrencilerinin bazı konulardaki düşüncelerini öğrenmek için hazırlanmıştır. Anketin her sorusunda bir olay anlatılmış ve bu olay karşısında kalan bir kişinin seçebileceği a ve b harfleri ile gösterilen iki seçenek verilmiştir. Siz böyle bir olayla karşılaşıyorsanız, bu seçeneklerden hangisini seçerdiniz ? Düşününüz ve eğer a seçeneği sizin düşüncenize daha uygun ise a'yı, b seçeneği sizin düşüncenize uygun ise b'yi yuvarlak içine alınız. Unutmayın, bu bir doğru-yanlış testi değildir. Önemli olan sizin gerçek düşüncenizi belirtmenizdir. Sizin düşüncenize hangi seçenek uyuyorsa onu işaretleyiniz.

ÖRNEK

Balık tutmaya gittiniz ve hiç balık tutmadınız.

- Balık tutmayı bilmediğim için tutamadım.
- Avlandığım yerde balık az olduğu için tutamadım.

1. Bir testte en yüksek puanı aldınız.
 - a. Ben her testte başarılı olduğum için yine en yüksek puanı aldım.
 - b. Bu test benim en iyi bildiğim konuda olduğu için en yüksek puanı aldım.
2. Birkaç arkadaşınızla birlikte bir oyun oynadınız ve siz kazandınız.
 - a. Birlikte oynadığım arkadaşlar bu oyunu iyi oynayamadıkları için ben kazandım.
 - b. Bu oyunu iyi oynadığım için ben kazandım.
3. Bir arkadaşınızın evine konuk gittiniz ve çok iyi bir gün geçirdiniz.
 - a. Arkadaşım o gün bana candan ve yakın davrandığı için iyi bir gün geçirdim.
 - b. Arkadaşımın ailesindeki herkes bana candan ve yakın davrandığı için iyi bir gün geçirdim.
4. Bir grup arkadaşınızla geziye gittiniz ve çok eğlendiniz.
 - a. Ben neşeli olduğum için eğlendik.
 - b. Birlikte gittiğim arkadaşlar neşeli olduğu için eğlendik.
5. Tüm arkadaşlarınız grip oldu, bir tek olmadınız.
 - a. Son zamanlarda sağlığım yerinde olduğu için gribe yakalanmadım.
 - b. Her zaman sağlıklı olduğum için gribe yakalanmadım.
6. Beslediğiniz bir hayvanı araba ezdi.
 - a. Ben ona iyi bakmadığım için ezildi.
 - b. Şoförler dikkatsiz olduğu için ezildi.
7. Tanıdığınız bazı çocuklar sizi sevmediklerini söylediler.
 - a. O çocuklar bana kötü davrandıkları için böyle söylemişlerdir.
 - b. Ben o çocuklara kötü davrandığım için böyle söylemişlerdir.
8. Derslerinizden çok iyi not aldınız.
 - a. Dersler kolay olduğu için iyi notlar aldım.
 - b. Çok çalıştığım için iyi notlar aldım.
9. Bir arkadaşınızla karşılaştınız ve size sevimli görüldüğünüzü söyledi.
 - a. O gün arkadaşıma herkes sevimli görüldüğü için böyle söylemiştir.
 - b. Arkadaşım her zaman başkalarına sevimli göründüklerini söylediği için bana da öyle demiştir.
10. En iyi arkadaşlarınızdan biri sizden nefret ettiğini söyledi.
 - a. O gün arkadaşımın huysuzluğu üzerinde olduğu için öyle söylemiştir.
 - b. Ben arkadaşıma o gün iyi davranmadığım için öyle söylemiştir.
11. Anlattığınız fıkraya hiç kimse gülmedi.
 - a. Ben hiç iyi fıkra eltemediğim için kimse gülmez.
 - b. Fıkraya herkes bildiği için kimse gülmedi.

12. Öğretmenizin derste anlattığı konuyu anlayamadınız.
 - a. O gün hiç bir şeye dikkatimi veremediğim için dersi anlayamadım.
 - b. Öğretmen anlatırken dikkatli dinlemediğim için dersi anlayamadım.
13. Öğretmenizin uyguladığı bir testte başarısız oldunuz.
 - a. Öğretmenimiz her zaman zor testler uyguladığı için başarısız oldum.
 - b. Son birkaç haftadır öğretmenimiz zor testler uyguladığı için başarısız oldum.
14. Kilo aldınız ve oldukça şişman görünmeye başladınız.
 - a. Yemek zorunda olduğum yemekler şişmanlatıcı olduğu için şişmanladım.
 - b. Ben şişmanlatıcı yemekleri sevdiğim için şişmanladım.
15. Birisi paranızı çaldı.
 - a. Dürüst olmayan birisi paramı çalmıştır.
 - b. İnsanlar zaten dürüst değildir.
16. Yaptığınız bir şey için anne-babanız sizi ödüllendirdi.
 - a. Ben bazı şeyleri iyi yaptığım için ödüllendirildim.
 - b. Annem babam yaptığım bazı şeyleri beğendikleri için beni ödüllendirirler.
17. Bilya oyununda tüm masketleri kazandınız.
 - a. Herşeyde şanslı olduğum için bilya oyununda da kazandım.
 - b. Oyunlarda şanslı olduğum için bilya oyununda da kazandım.
18. Denizde yüzerken neredeyse boğulacaktınız.
 - a. Her zaman dikkatsiz olduğum için az daha boğulacaktım.
 - b. Bazı günler dikkatsiz olduğum için az daha boğulacaktım.
19. Pek çok arkadaşınız sizi yağşünü partisine çağırıyor.
 - a. Son zamanlarda arkadaşlarım beni cana yakın buldukları için yağşünlerine çağırıyorlar.
 - b. Son zamanlarda ben arkadaşlarıma yakın davrandığım için yağşünlerine çağırıyorlar.
20. Büyüklerinizden birisi size bağırdı.
 - a. İlk rastladığı insan ben olduğum için öfkesini benden çıkarmıştır.
 - b. O gün herkese bağırmıştır.
21. Bir grup arkadaşınızla bir çalışma yaptınız ve başarısız oldunuz.
 - a. O gruptaki kişilerle iyi anlaşamadığım için başarısız oldum.
 - b. Grup çalışmalarında hiçbir zaman iyi olmadığım için başarısız oldum.
22. Yeni bir arkadaş edindiniz.
 - a. İyi bir insan olduğum için arkadaş edinebilirim.
 - b. Karşılaştığım çocuklar iyi insan olduğum için arkadaş oluyorlar.
23. Ailenizdeki kişilerle iyi geçiniyorsunuz.
 - a. Ailedeki kişilerle her zaman iyi geçinirim.
 - b. Ailedeki kişilerle kimi zaman iyi geçinirim.

24. Çiklet satmayı denediniz ama kimse almadı.
- Son zamanlarda çocuklar o kadar çok şey satıyorlar ki, artık insanlar çocuklardan birşey almak istemiyor.
 - İnsanlar genellikle çocuklardan birşey satın almaktan hoşlanmıyor.
25. Bir oyunda siz kazandınız.
- Özellikle oyunlarda başarılı olmak için çok çaba gösterdiğim için ben kazandım.
 - Hemen her konuda başarılı olmak için çok çaba gösterdiğim için ben kazandım.
26. Düşük bir not aldınız.
- Akılsız olduğum için düşük not aldım.
 - Öğretmenler düşük not veriyorlar.
27. Kapıya çarptınız ve burnunuz kanadı.
- O anda önüme bakmadığım için kapıya çarptım.
 - Son zamanlarda çok dikkatsiz oldum.
28. Top oynarken bir hata yaptınız ve takımınız kaybetti.
- O gün iyi oynamak için fazla uğraşmadım.
 - Top oyunlarında iyi oynamak için fazla uğraşmam.
29. Beden eğitimi dersinde ayağınızı burktunuz.
- Son haftalarda beden eğitimi dersinde tehlikeli hareketler yaptığımız için burkuldu.
 - Son haftalarda beden eğitimi dersinde beceriksiz olduğum için burkuldu.
30. Anne babanız sizi deniz kıyısına götürdü ve çok iyi vakit geçirdiniz.
- O gün herşey çok güzel olduğu için iyi vakit geçirdim.
 - O gün hava güzel olduğu için iyi vakit geçirdim.
31. Sinemaya gitmek için bineceğiniz otobüs gecikti ve filmi kaçırdınız.
- Otobüsler zamanında gelmiyor.
 - Zaten otobüsler hiçbir zaman zamanında gelmez.
32. Anneniz en sevdiğiniz yemeği pişirdi.
- Annem her zaman beni mutlu etmek için çalışır.
 - Annem beni mutlu etmek için çok az şey yapar.
33. Oynadığınız takım bir oyunu kaybetti.
- Takımdaki oyuncular hiçbir zaman anlaşamadıkları için oyunu kaybettik.
 - Takımdaki oyuncular o gün anlaşamadıkları için oyunu kaybettik.
34. Ev ödevlerinizi çabucak bitirdiniz.
- Son zamanlarda herşeyi çabucak yaptığım için erken bitirdim.
 - Son zamanlarda ev ödevlerimi çabucak yaptığım için erken bitirdim.
35. Öğretmeniniz bir soru sordu ve siz yanlış cevap verdiniz.
- Bana soru sorulduğunda hep heyecanlandığım için yanlış cevap verdim.
 - O gün heyecanlandığım için yanlış cevap verdim.

36. Yanlış otobüse bindiniz ve kayboldunuz.
 a. O gün çevreme dikkat etmediğim için kayboldum.
 b. Genellikle çevreme dikkat etmediğim için kayboldum.
37. Lunaparka gidip çok eğlendiniz.
 a. Genellikle lunaparkta çok eğlenirim.
 b. Genellikle her yerde eğlenirim.
38. Sizden büyük bir çocuk sizi çok dövdü.
 a. Kardeşiyle alay ettiği için dövmüştür.
 b. Kardeşi ona "benimle alay etti" dediği için dövmüştür.
39. Yaş gününüzde istediğiniz tüm oyuncaklar armağan edildi.
 a. Yakınlarım yaş günümde hangi oyuncakları istediğimi doğru bilirler.
 b. Bu yaş günümde hangi oyuncakları istediğimi doğru bilirler.
40. Tatilde bir köye gidip çok iyi vakit geçirdiniz.
 a. Köy yaşamak için güzel bir yer olduğu için iyi vakit geçirdim.
 b. Köy bu mevsimde güzel olduğundan iyi vakit geçirdim.
41. Komşu çocuklar sizi yemeğe çağırdılar.
 a. İnsanlar bazen nazik oluyolar.
 b. İnsanlar her zaman naziktirler.
42. Öğretmeninizin yerinde bir başka öğretmen geldi ve sizden hoşlandı.
 a. O gün sınıfta her zaman uslu olduğum için benden hoşlandı.
 b. Sınıfta her zaman uslu olduğum için benden hoşlandı.
43. Birlikte gezdiğiniz arkadaşınız sizinle birlikte çok iyi vakit geçirdiğini söyledi.
 a. Her zaman neşeli bir insan olduğum için iyi vakit geçirmiştir.
 b. O gün neşeli olduğum için iyi vakit geçirmiştir.
44. Bakkal size bir şeker ikram etti.
 a. O gün bakkala kibar davrandığım için bana şeker ikram etti.
 b. O gün bakkala iyiliği üzerinde olduğu için bana şeker ikram etti.
45. Gittiğiniz bir kukla tiyatrosunda kuklacı sizden yardım istedi.
 a. Gözüne ilk ben iliştiğim için benden yardım istedi.
 b. Benim oyunla gerçekten ilgilendiğimi anladığı için benden yardım istedi.
46. Bir arkadaşınızı sizinle birlikte sinemaya gitmek için kandırmaya çalıştınız ama gelmedi.
 a. O gün canı hiçbirşey yapmak istemediği için gelmedi.
 b. O gün canı sinemaya gitmek istemediği için gelmedi.
47. Uzun süredir samimi olan iki arkadaşınız birbirine küstüler.
 a. Arkadaşlıkta geçinmek zor olduğu için küstüler.
 b. Onların geçinmeleri zor olduğu için küstüler.
48. Bir çocuk klübüne üye olmaya çalıştınız ama sizi almadılar.
 a. Hiçbir çocukla iyi geçinemediğim için alınmadım.
 b. O klüpteki çocuklarla iyi geçinemediğim için alınmadım.

APPENDIX G

Table 1

Two way ANOVA on WIFAM by PARQ groups, by sex

Main sources of variation	Sum of squares	D.F.	Mean squares	F
Main Effects	7760.6808	4	1940.170	22.778*
Rejection	7747.000	3	2582.333	30.317*
Sex	58.837	1	58.837	0.691
Two way interaction	281.945	3	93.982	1.103
Explained	8042.625	7	1148.946	13.489*
Residual	28619.688	336	85.178	
Total	36662.313	343	106.887	

* $p < .0001$

Table 2

Two way ANOVA on CASQ by PARQ groups, by sex

Main sources of variation	Sum of squares	D.F.	Mean square	F
Main Effects	219.980	4	54.995	2.966*
Rejection	217.215	3	72.405	3.905**
Sex	9.980	1	9.980	0.538
Two way interaction	26.547	3	8.849	0.477
Explained	246.527	7	35.218	1.899
Residual	6230.496	336	18.543	
Total	6477.023	343	18.883	

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 3

Two way ANOVA on PARI F1 by PARQ groups by sex

Main sources variation	Sum of squares	D. F.	Mean squares	F
Main Effects	449.549	4	112.387	1.957
Rejection	296.965	3	98.988	1.724
Sex	178.232	1	178.232	3.104
Two way interaction	78.253	3	26.084	0.454
Explained	527.805	7	75.401	1.313
Residual	19293.586	336	57.421	
Total	19821.391	343	57.788	

Table 4

Two way ANOVA on PARI F2 by PARQ groups, by sex

Main sources of variation	Sum of squares	D. F.	Mean squares	F
Main Effects	581.535	4	145.384	6.188**
Rejection	560.884	3	186.961	7.958**
Sex	2.442	1	2.442	0.104
Two way interaction	3.456	3	1.152	0.049
Explained	584.992	7	83.570	3.557*
Residual	7894.195	336	23.495	
Total	8479.188	343	24.721	

*p<.001

**p<.0001

Table 5

Two way ANOVA on PARI F3 by PARQ groups, by sex

Main sources of variation	Sum of squares	D.F.	Mean squares	F
Main Effects	1185.321	4	296.330	6.768*
Rejection	1023.053	3	341.018	7.789*
Sex	81.853	1	81.853	1.870
Two way interaction	156.826	3	52.275	1.194
Explained	1342.148	7	191.735	4.379*
Residual	14710.809	336	43.782	
Total	16052.957	343	46.802	

*p<.0001

Table 6

Two way ANOVA on PARI F4 by PARQ groups, by sex

Main sources of variation	Sum of squares	D.F.	Mean squares	F
Main Effects	288.834	4	72.209	3.418**
Rejection	241.054	3	80.351	3.804**
Sex	25.514	1	25.515	1.208
Two way interaction	3.791	3	1.264	0.060
Explained	292.629	7	41.804	1.979*
Residual	7097.547	336	21.124	
Total	7390.176	343	21.546	

*p<.05

**p<.01

APPENDIX H

Table 7
Means and Standard Deviations for the 60 items
of PARQ

Item Number	Mean	Standard Dev.
1	1.42	0.63
2	1.91	0.99
3	1.26	0.69
4	1.19	0.66
5	1.59	0.86
6	1.66	0.93
7	1.33	0.70
8	1.72	0.94
9	1.24	0.67
10	1.47	0.87
11	2.53	0.98
12	1.65	0.89
13	1.43	0.78
14	1.35	0.68
15	1.31	0.66
16	1.26	0.68
17	1.66	0.92
18	1.35	0.78
19	1.94	0.83
20	1.46	0.80
21	1.15	0.53
22	1.34	0.66
23	1.64	0.86
24	1.56	0.86
25	1.33	0.82
26	1.37	0.75
27	1.63	0.94
28	1.88	0.90
29	1.48	0.76
30	1.44	0.78
31	1.29	0.70

Item No	Mean	Standard Dev.
32	1.99	0.99
33	1.68	0.88
34	1.43	0.84
35	1.52	0.77
36	1.44	0.74
37	1.27	0.71
38	1.81	0.96
39	1.61	0.94
40	1.51	0.78
41	1.38	0.79
42	1.61	0.78
43	1.30	0.65
44	1.36	0.75
45	1.23	0.66
46	1.55	0.85
47	1.61	0.85
48	1.84	1.02
49	1.72	0.88
50	2.14	0.93
51	1.82	0.96
52	1.35	0.78
53	1.43	0.93
54	1.44	0.68
55	1.25	0.67
56	1.72	0.95
57	1.34	0.69
58	1.41	0.72
59	1.72	0.95
60	1.25	0.63
Total	91.86	25.07

APPENDIX I

Table 8
Means and S. D. of sexes on PARQ

Groups	N	Mean	S. D.
Females	169	88.93	25.74
Males	175	94.71	24.15
Total	344	91.86	25.07

Table 9
One way ANOVA on PARQ by sex

Source	D. F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	2871.9348	2871.9346	4.616*
Within Groups	342	212802.5000	622.2295	
Total	343	215674.3750		

*p<.05

APPENDIX J

Table 10
Means and S. D. of the SES groups on PARQ

GROUPS	N	PARQ	
		Mean	S. D.
Low SES	118	101.10	28.43
Middle SES	122	87.00	19.14
Upper Middle SES	104	87.10	24.42
Total	344	91.86	25.07

Table 11
One way ANOVA on PARQ by SES groups.

Source	D. F	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	2	15310.5474	7655.2734	13.028*
Within Groups	341	200367.0820	587.5867	
Total	343	215677.6250		

*p < .00001

Table 12
Scheffe Procedure

SUBSET 1		
GROUP	Middle SES	Upper Middle SES
MEAN	87.00	87.10
SUBSET 2		
GROUP	Low SES	
MEAN	101.10	

p < .05