

A STUDY ON THE VALIDITY OF THE SHORTENED
FORM OF THE MINNESOTA COUNSELING INVENTORY
(MCI) IN TURKISH

by

Neylan Pektaş Özdemir

B.A. in Pedagogy, Istanbul University, 1977

Submitted to the Institute for Graduate Students in
Social Sciences in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Educational Sciences

Bogazici University Library



39001100317273

14

Boğaziçi University

1985

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my special thanks to Meral Çulha, my thesis advisor, for her contributions and support throughout the study. Working with her was enriching for me, not only due to her valuable remarks concerning my thesis, but also due to warm understanding that arose between us.

I am also grateful to Necla Öner, my committee member, whose continuous help has really been invaluable. I feel honoured to have had her constructive suggestions, genuine interest and organized assistance.

My sincere thanks to Ali Baykal my committee member, for his assistance, particularly in the statistical organization of the study and for his efforts in the development of a new statistical approach.

I would also like to thank all those at Robert College for their ready help in the application of the study, particularly to my colleagues Bike Edmonds and Nüket Atalay for their genuine assistance during the administration and to my students and teachers for their active participation.

I have also received support from my friends during the study. I want to thank Ozana Ural who has been very helpful in preparing the tables containing additional data necessary for my thesis. I also thank my friends Deniz Kaymak, Dilek Ardaç and Belgin Dölay not only for their help in the development of the thesis, but also for their support and willingness to share my feelings during my studies.

Last but not least I appreciate the patience and understanding I received from my husband and son who had to do without me during my heavy working days throughout my graduate education.

A B S T R A C T

The purpose of the present study was to obtain information on the validity of the shortened form of the Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI) adapted in Turkey. The MCI is an inventory which gives information about the personality structure and problems of American adolescents. It was developed by Berdie and Layton (1957). The Turkish adaptation of the shortened form of MCI in Turkey was accomplished by Akdağ (1979). It has eight sub-scales which are Validity (V), Social Relationships (SR), Family Relationships (FR), Emotional Stability (ES), Conformity (C), Adjustment to Reality (R), Mood (M) and Leadership (L) scales.

In the validation of these scales, teacher nominations, evaluations of the family and the Si scale of the MMPI were used as criterion measures. "Student Evaluation Forms" were developed for family evaluations and teacher nominations. Two "Student Evaluation Forms for Teachers" were established for each of the six scales including the SR, ES, C, R, M and L scales, one containing the descriptions of the negative characteristics of the particular scale, the other the positive characteristics. Using these descriptions, teachers prepared lists of nominations from which two groups (positively/negatively nominated) of students were formed for each scale. The scores of the negatively and positively nominated groups were compared with each other as well as with an independent normal sample obtained from the Education Department of the Boğaziçi University. In the validation of the FR scale, "Student Evaluation Forms for Family" were developed and scores of this form were correlated with the scores of the FR scale.

Correspondance between teacher nominations and student scores on SR, ES, C, R, M and L scales were also investigated and the appropriatness of the scale means in discriminating students was tested. Additionally the SR scale was compared with the Si scale of the MMPI whose validity on the Turkish samples is established.

Findings of this study indicated that the SR, ES, L, R and C scales effectively discriminated between the students of low and high characteristics on these traits. The SR, ES, C, R and L scales were particularly effective in discriminating the students with poor adjustment characteristics while only the SR and ES scales were effective in discriminating the students with poor adjustment characteristics from the normals. The mean scores of four of the scales were found appropriate as critical scores, but not those of the M and R scales. Additional analysis on the SR scale also showed that it measures more or less the same behavior characteristics as the Si scale of the MMPI.

Lack of data on the validity/reliability of the teacher ratings and family evaluation forms including a well administered systematic teacher training for accurate observations constitute a limitation of this study. The other important limitation is related to sampling. Only the ninth graders in a highly selective private high school were included in this study. Cross-Validation and use of different criterion measures were recommended for further research.

Ö Z E T

Bu çalışma Türkiye'de adaptasyon çalışması yapılmış Minnesota Danışma Envanteri Kısaltılmış Deneme Formu'nun (MDE) geçerliliği konusunda veri toplamayı amaçlamıştır. MDE Amerikan gençliğinin kişilik yapısı ile, sorunları hakkında bilgi veren bir envanterdir. Berdie ve Layton (1957) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Türkiye'de kısaltılmış formu ve adaptasyonu Akdağ (1979) tarafından gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu envanterin sekiz alt ölçeği vardır. Bunlar Geçerlilik (GÇ), Sosyal İlişki (SI), Aile İlişkileri (AI), Duygusal Denge (DD), Uyma (U), Gerçekçilik (GR), Anlık Psikolojik Durum (APD) ve Liderlik-dir (L).

Bu ölçeklerin geçerliğini saptamak üzere araştırmacının geliştirdiği öğretmen ve aileler için değerlendirme formları ile Minnesota Çok Yönlü Kişilik Envanterinin Sosyal İçedönüklük ölçeği kullanıldı. Öğretmenlere verilmek üzere SI, DD, U, GR, APD ve L ölçeklerinin herbiri için iki değerlendirme formu hazırlandı. Bir tanesi söz konusu ölçeğin olumsuz, diğeri olumlu özelliklerini yansıtacak şekilde düzenlendi. Bu formlara göre öğretmenlerin olumlu ve olumsuz özelliklere sahip öğrencileri belirlemesi istendi. Böylece iki zıt grup oluştu. Bu grupların puanları hem birbiriyle hem de ayrıca normal bir örneklem grubuyla karşılaştırıldı. Aile ilişkileri ölçeğinin geçerliğinde ise, aileler için geliştirilmiş olan Öğrenci Değerlendirme Formu kriter olarak kullanıldı. Ailelerin bu değerlendirmesinden elde edilen puanlarla öğrencilerin AI ölçeğine verdiği cevaplardan çıkartılan puanlar karşılaştırıldı. Bunun yanısıra SI, DD, U, GR, APD, L ölçeklerinin ortalama puanlarının öğrencileri olumlu ve olumsuz kişilik

Özelliklerine göre ayırd etmedeki uygunluğu öğretmen değerlendirmeleri göz önüne alınarak araştırıldı. Bunlara ek olarak SI ölçeğinin puanları, Türkiye'de geçerliliği saptanmış Minnesota Çok Yönlü Kişilik Envanteri'nin Sosyal İçedönüklük ölçeğindeki puanlarla karşılaştırıldı.

Bulgular SI, DD, L, GR, U ölçeklerinin öğrencileri bu ölçeklerde yansıtılan kişilik özelliklerine göre olumlu ya da olumsuz olarak ayırabildiğini gösterdi. Aynı ölçekler olumsuz kişilik özellikleri olan öğrencileri normal sayılan öğrencilerden ayırmada da etkili bulundu. Ancak yalnız SI ve DD ölçekleri olumlu kişilik özelliklerine sahip grubu normal gruptan ayırd etmede etkili bulundu. Ölçeklerin ortalama puanlarının analizinde DD ve GR dışındaki dört ölçeğin ortalama puanları öğrencileri olumlu-olumsuz kişilik özelliklerine göre ayırd etmede kritik nokta olarak uygun bulundu. Sosyal ilişkiler için yapılan diğer bir analiz de bu ölçeğin Minnesota Çok Yönlü Kişilik Envanteri, Sosyal İçedönüklük ölçeğiyle benzer davranış özelliklerini yansıttığını gösterdi.

Kriter olarak hazırlanan formların geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışmalarının yapılamaması, uygulama da öğretmenlere iyi gözlem yapabilmeleri için sistemli bir özel eğitimin verilememiş olması, kullanılan örneklemin seçici bir lisenin yalnızca dokuzuncu sınıf seviyesini kapsamış olması, araştırmanın kısıtlamalarını yansıtır. İleride yapılacak çalışmalarda bu kısıtlamaların mümkün olduğunca düzeltilmesi; benzer analizlerin geniş çaplı ve seçkisiz örneklemeler kullanarak daha kontrollü kriter ölçümlerinden elde edilen veriler üzerinde gerçekleştirilmesi önerilmiştir.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS-----	iii
ABSTRACT-----	iv
ÖZET-----	vi
LIST OF TABLES-----	x
I. INTRODUCTION-----	1
Purpose of the Study-----	4
II. BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE-----	5
A Description of the Personality Inventories-----	5
Classification of the Personality Inventories-----	6
The Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI)-----	9
Description of the Scales-----	9
Norms-----	11
Reliability-----	12
Validity-----	14
Research Conducted on the Psychometric	
Characteristics of the MCI-----	17
The Adaptation of the MCI in Turkey-----	19
III. METHOD-----	21
Selection of the Sample-----	21
Subjects-----	21
Instruments-----	23
Student Evaluation Forms-----	23
Student Evaluation Form for	
Teachers Nomination-----	23
Student Evaluation form for Families-----	24
The Social Introversion (Si) Scale of	
the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality	
Inventory-----	25
Procedure-----	25
Analysis of Data-----	27
IV. RESULTS-----	30
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS-----	41
Discussion-----	41
Conclusions-----	44
Limitations-----	47
Recommendations-----	49
REFERENCES-----	50

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX A. SHORTENED TURKISH FORM OF THE MINNESOTA COUNSELING INVENTORY (MCI)-----	52
APPENDIX B. ITEMS OF THE MCI ACCORDING TO THE SEVEN SCALES-----	61
APPENDIX C. STUDENT EVALUATION FORMS FOR TEACHERS IN TURKISH AND IN ENGLISH-----	71
APPENDIX D. STUDENT EVALUATION FORM FOR FAMILIES-----	95

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Number of Male and Female Students and Age Groups Represented in Each Section of the ninth grade in Robert Lisesi-----	22
2	Distribution of Ninth Grade Teachers According to Class Sections-----	26
3	The MCI Scale Means and Standart Deviations Obtained From 122 Students-----	31
4	Chi-square Values and Level of Significance Indicating the Agreement Between Teachers' Nominations and Student Scores on the SR, ES, C, R, M, L Scales of the MCI-----	32
5	Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Differences and t-values of Contrasted Groups for the SR, ES, C, R, M, L Scales of the MCI-----	34
6	The Comparison of the Means of a Normal Group With Positively Nominated Group Using Independent Sample t-test on the Six Scales of MCI-----	35
7	Comparison of the Means of a Normal Group With Negatively Nominated Group Using Independent Sample t-Tests-----	36
8	Comparison of Criterion Groups on Six Scales-----	37

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The major concern of counseling is to assist the client to attain greater self-understanding so that he can make better decisions about himself. One of the basic points in these efforts is the assesment of the client as an individual.

In the fields of education and psychology many kinds of assesment techniques are developed. Some of these techniques are rather subjective. They are observation and interview techniques. Others, such as standardized psychological tests, are considered objective. Since World War I, the construction of standardized psychological tests has gained great importance and has become the most widely used technique. However, the psychometric qualities of these tests have not increased parallel to their frequency. In other words, many tests were developed and used no matter how technically adequate they were.

The use of tests without technical psychometric considerations have caused mis-interpretations of these tests, and inadequate assesment of individuals (Anastasi, 1982; Helmstather, 1964). To prevent the detrimental effects of misinterpretation, the professionals in the United States have developed ethical standards for proper use and interpretation of psychological tests. A joint committee consisted of members

from the American Psychological Association (APA), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education recognized the problems inherent in use of technically inadequate tests and reasoned that:

"Psychological and educational tests are used in arriving at decisions which may have great influence on the ultimate welfare of the persons tested, on educational points of view and practices, and on development and utilization of human resources. Test users, therefore, need to apply high standards of professional judgment in interpreting the tests, and test producers are under obligation to produce tests which can be of the greatest possible service" (APA, AERA and National Council on Measurement in Education, 1974).

Psychometricians emphasizing the importance of the validity, reliability and normative information of tests, encourage the professionals to study and collect data on these standards (Messick, in Title, 1982-83; Anastasi, 1982).

Although professionals recognized the psychometric qualities of a test as crucial, inadequate tests are still being used extensively in the United States and in Europe. In the study of Thorlow and Ysseldyke (in Ysseldyke and Marston, 1982), it was found that among 30 tests used in Child Service Demonstration Centers, 83.3 % had inadequate norms, 66.6 % had inadequate reliability and 70 % had inadequate validity.

Similarly in Turkey information about the psychometric characteristics of tests is inadequate. In her study Özge (1981) obtained exhaustive data on the psychological tests used in Turkey. This survey investigated the psychometric characteristics of these tests, whether they were original works developed in Turkey, a translation or an adaptation

of a foreign test. Information were obtained from academic thesis and publications as well as from a questionnaire specifically designed for this purpose and sent to psychological centers in Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir. A total of 126 tests were identified through this procedure. Among those reported in this study, 49 tests had claimed to have at least one of four (reliability, validity, standardization/normatization) psychometric characteristics. 8 % of these tests had data on validity, 26 % on reliability and 28 % on normatization. Among these 49 tests, 94 % of them had data on both validity and reliability/or normatization.

The findings of this study revealed that there are not sufficient number of standardized tests, for use with normal youth in Turkey (Özge, 1981). In reviewing the reported tests only one such personality inventory was identified, the Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI), as being translated into Turkish, and a modified shortened form was developed. This self-report personality inventory is used with adolescents and gives information about problems in seven areas of personality. Test like MCI help to obtain information about the problems of young people, and gives counselors the ✱ opportunity to assist students in achieving an understanding of themselves. Although the reliability of the shortened Turkish form of the MCI was completed (Akdağ, 1979), no data were available on its validity. Currently this test is used in some student counseling settings in Turkey. For adequate and veritable interpretation of scores obtained from this inventory, it needs to be validated. Correctness of the inferences that one makes on the basis of scores is reached when the validity of the scale is proven (Helmstather, 1964; Meehl, 1966 and Anastasi, 1982). Thus the need for research on the validity of the MCI seems unavoidable and necessary. This study is an attempt to fulfill such a need.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the criterion-related validity of the shortened form of the Minnesota Counseling Inventory adapted in Turkey. To achieve this aim the following were explored:

1- The differences between the MCI scores of the two extreme (contrasted) groups identified by teachers.

2- The relationship between the perception of parents and the students' scores on the "Family Relationships" (FR) scale.

3- The relationship between two social skills subscales, namely the "Social Relationships" (SR) scale of the MCI and the "Social Introversion Scale" (Si) of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI).

4- The agreement between teacher nominations and student MCI scores with subscale means used as cut-off scores.

CHAPTER II
BACKGROUND
AND
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, a brief description and classification of personality inventories will be given so that the place of the MCI among them can be seen clearly. Then related literature on the MCI will be reviewed.

A Description of the Personality Inventories

The need of expressing personality observations in terms of quantities stimulated the development of personality measurement techniques (Kleinmuntz, 1967). The self-report personality inventory is one of these techniques.

Personality inventories refer to a list of statements about personal characteristics, and the corresponding behavior that the individual decides on (Aiken, 1971). Among other personality assessment techniques such as observation, interview, and etc, self-report inventories can be readily normed and standardized. They cover a large number of items that relate to the concept or attitude measured (Aiken, 1971).

Classification of the Personality Inventories

Although there exists a multiple approach in the construction of inventories, they are usually classified according to the theory and method used in developing items. These are:

- Content Validated Inventories
- Theory-based Inventories
- Factor Analyzed Inventories
- Criterion-Related Inventories-(Anastasi, 1982; Aiken, 1971).

Content Validated Inventories are those inventories consisting of items that represent the subject matter the test is designed to measure. The procedure is to define characteristics to be measured and then select a representative sample of items from that content (Cronbach, 1960). Woodworth Personal Data Sheet was the first personality inventory developed by the content sampling method. Other examples are Mooney Problem Check List, California Test of Personality, and Omnibus Personality Inventories (Anastasi, 1982; Aiken, 1971).

Theory-based inventories consist of items which reflect a particular personality theory. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule is an example of theory-based inventory. Murray's need-press theory is the basis in the construction of this inventory. Personality Research Form also represents Murray's theory of personality (Anastasi, 1982). Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is based on Carl Jung's theory of personality types (Aiken, 1971).

In the construction of Factor Analyzed Inventories, items are chosen and scales are determined by the factor analytic method. Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and

Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire are among the inventories constructed by factor analytic method (Anastasi, 1981; Aiken, 1971).

In the Criterion-Related Inventories, after the selection of items from related descriptive statements, scores are correlated with external criteria groups to demonstrate the differential aspects of items (Aiken, 1971). Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) is the most well known of the inventories constructed by this method. Later many other personality inventories were derived from the MMPI. One of them is the Minnesota Counseling Inventory. Among others are the California Personality Inventory (CPI) and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Inventory (MAS).

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory which was recently adapted into Turkish (Savaşır, 1981). It was also used as one criterion in the validation of a scale of the Turkish Minnesota Counseling Inventory. Therefore, some basic peculiarities of this widely-used inventory will be described in detail here.

The MMPI is a self-report instrument designed to provide information on some basic aspects of personality. The inventory is based on studies of personality deviates in mental hospitals. It consists of 550 statements. The items represent a variety of symptoms, traits and personal characteristics, both physical and psychological. It has three validity scales which are concerned with misunderstanding, carelessness, special response sets, and test taking attitudes. It has ten clinical scales. They are, Hypochondriasis, Depression, Hysteria, Psychopathic Deviate, Masculinity-Femininity, Paranoia, Schizophrenia, Hypomania, Psychasthenia, and Social Introversion (Greene 1980).

In the construction of the MMPI scales, answers of the normal population for each scale were compared with the answers of the psychiatric patients in the clinics. Items that best differentiated those groups constituted the scales. Only in the construction of the Social Introversion (Si) scale a different procedure was used. Through an available psychological test two contrasted groups were identified. Items that differentiated these groups best were chosen to constitute the Si scale (Savaşır, 1981).

663 women and 1003 men who were not involved in any psychiatric treatment constituted the Turkish norms. The age range was 16 to 50. The largest group (93.75 %) of subjects fell between the ages of 16 and 30 in this normative sample (Savaşır, 1981). Means and standard deviations of raw scores for each scale were computed according to gender, and these were then converted into standart scores. Means and standard deviations of Turkish norms were compared with the American and Pakistani norms. It was observed that there are more similarities between the American and Turkish norms than the American and Pakistani. In the adolescent group however there is a general increase in the scale means of the Turkish norms compared to American norms (Savaşır, 1981).

Test-retest reliability of the Turkish standardization sample over one week period intervals ranged between .51-.89 (Erol, 1982).

In the validity study (Erol, 1982) of the MMPI the discriminative power of each scale was investigated between the normals and the neurotic, or psychotic, personality disorder, and the borderline groups. A sample from the norm group Constituted the "normal groups". Other samples were chosen from among patinets in the psychiatric clinics of hospitals. Mean differences between normals and patients were significant ($p < .01$) in all the scales.

The Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI)

The MCI was developed by Berdie and Layton in 1953 in the U.S.A. The purpose of the inventory was to provide information about the personality dynamics and the adjustment problems of school age youth in order to understand and assist them in school settings. It was primarily designed for students in grades 9 through 12 (Berdie and Layton, 1957).

The inventory consists of 355 statements. Students are instructed to read each statement and decide whether it is true or false as it applies to the individual. In the administration of the inventory, there is no exact time limit but it is generally completed in 50 minutes.

The MCI is based upon two previously constructed personality inventories, the MMPI and the Minnesota Personality Scale. It has eight scales which are Family Relationships (FR), Social Relationships (SR), Emotional Stability (ES), Conformity (C), Adjustment to Reality (R), Mood (M), Leadership (L), and a Validity scale which helps to detect social desirability. The FR, SR and ES scales were derived from the Minnesota Personality Scale and the remaining five were based on the MMPI. A question score which identifies the omitted number of items is also obtained. The allowed number of items for the question score is 50. The raw scores that are obtained from the scales are converted in standard scores. On all diagnostic scales high scores represent poor adjustment and low scores represent good adjustment.

Description of the Scales

Family Relationships (FR). Scores of this scale give information about the relationship between the student and his family. It tells about the student's feelings toward the

family members —whether or not the student feels affection towards them. It also tells about one's feelings in terms of his parents' demands on him— whether or not they are reasonable.

Social Relationships (SR). Scores of this scale indicate the types of the social skills student has. It gives information about behavior in social settings - whether or not one gets involved in social activities, and interacts with other people.

Emotional Stability (ES). Scores of this scale help to understand the types of emotional behavior the student has developed. It tells about the way the student behaves in emergencies, his self-confidence and whether or not he gets excited easily.

Conformity (C). The scores on this scale indicate the student's behavior towards law and order in the society - whether one adopts himself to the environment and shows responsibility or rebels against the rules and authorities and shows irresponsibility.

Adjustment to Reality (R). Scores of this scale help to understand student's ways of dealing with reality - whether he tries to master the threatening situations and shares feelings with others or has unreal thoughts and feelings, thus avoid reality.

Mood (M). The scores of this scale give information about the morality of the student - whether or not he is cheerful, optimistic and easily recover when depressed.

Leadership (L). Scores of this scale indicate the leadership skills of the individual; and whether or not the

student develops and carries out ideas and shows responsibility in the group, and is recognized by other people for these qualities.

Validity Score (V). The scores of this scale give information about the degree of student's defensiveness in the testing situation. It tells about whether or not he tends to give socially acceptable (desirable) responses at the expense of truthfulness.

Norms

In the normative groups of the MCI scales, 1378 boys and 1562 girls in grades 9 and 10, and 1247 boys and 1256 girls in grades 11 and 12 were included from 25 schools of the states of Iowa and Minnesota. Raw scores for each scale were converted into standard scores and profile sheets were prepared for each sex at each grade.

Two samples of 200 from each sex at each grade level were also drawn from the states, identified as "Phoenix" and "Non-Phoenix" groups. In order to investigate whether the norms can be used in wider geographic regions, the mean tables of the norm groups were compared with the means of the two samples of 200. In this comparison little differences were observed between the means of these groups (Berdie, and Layton, 1957).

The college norms of the MCI were also established after the publication of the manual (Berdie, 1960). Norm groups consisted of 6507 freshmen from all colleges in Minnesota. Raw scores were converted into standard scores for each sex.

Mean scores of freshmen were compared with the high school norm groups. It was found that college freshmen differed significantly from high school students. In all scales, except the Validity scale the high school groups were lower than the college groups.

Reliability

Odd-even and test-retest reliability coefficients were reported in the manual (Berdie and Layton, 1957). Odd-even numbered items of each scale were correlated for each sex in grades 9 and 10, and in grades 11 and 12. Correlation coefficients ranged from .56 to .95 on a sample of 800 cases. In grades 9 and 10 the lowest correlation was in the Mood scale, both for boys (.57) and girls (.62). The highest correlation was in the Social Relations scale. It was .93 for boys and .94 for girls. In grades 11 and 12 the lowest correlation was in the Conformity scale for boys (.56), and in the Mood Scale for girls (.63). The highest correlation was found in the Social Relationships scale for both girls (.95) and boys (.94). Generally high coefficients were found in the Family Relationships scale (ranged from .86 to .93), Social Relationships scale (ranged from .93 to .95), and Emotional Stability scale (ranged from .81 to .86). Mood (ranged from .57 to .66) and Conformity scales (ranged from .56 to .80) had low correlations (Berdie and Layton, 1957).

One-month and three-month interval test-retest reliabilities for boys and girls in grade 12 were obtained. One-month interval test-retest reliabilities ranged from .73 to .93. The lowest correlations were in the Conformity scale for boys, and in the Leadership scale for girls (.73). The highest correlations were in the Social Relationships scale for boys (.86), and in the Family Relationships for girls (.93). Three-month interval test-retest coefficients were

between .56 to .86 for boys and girls, respectively. The lowest correlations were in the Mood Scale (.56) for boys and in the Family Relationships scale (.73) for girls. The highest correlations were in the Social Relationships scale for boys (.82) and girls (.86). Similar to the odd-even reliability coefficients the lowest correlations were observed in the Conformity (ranged from .71 to .78) and Mood Scales (ranged from .56 to .77).

The average test-retest reliability at the Validity scale was .67 for boys, and .64 for girls. No time interval for this was reported in the manual (Berdie and Layton, 1957).

Correlations between scales were also computed for samples of each sex and grade. It was found that the highest correlations existed between the Social Relationships and the Leadership scales (ranged from .80 to .85) as well as between the Emotional Stability and the Reality scales (ranged from .74 to .82). The lowest correlations were between Social Relationships and Conformity (ranged from .04 to .21), Conformity and Leadership (ranged from .12 to .26), Family Relationships and Social Relationships (ranged from .20 to .35), and Family Relationships and Leadership scales (ranged from .25 to .41).

In addition to the one-month and three-month reliabilities in the manual, one-year test-retest reliability was also computed by its authors at a later date (Berdie and Layton 1960). Results showed relative stability of scores on the basic personality variables tapped by the scales. The correlations ranged from .35 (ES) to .80 (FR) in boys, and from .39 (M) to .76 (SR) in girls. The authors concluded that in the measurement of the MCI personality variables, differences between profiles obtained within three months and one year were detectable.

Validity

In the validation of the seven scales of the MCI, ratings of teachers, counselors, school principles and nurses were used as criteria. Teachers identified what is known as the "teacher-nominated groups". They rated the students as either high or low on each of the psychological variables measured by the MCI. Two rating forms for each scale were developed for this procedure, one for negative and one for positive description of the behavior characteristics related to the psychological variable measured by a particular scale. Counselors, school principles and nurses identified what is known as the "Special nomination groups". They nominated the student leaders, delinquents or those with serious family problems for this special group.

Two sample groups of students were studied separately. One included the students used in the original item analysis of the MCI from the high schools in Phoenix, Arizona. The second included the students from nine other states in the U.S.A. This group was named as the "Non-Phoenix" High School sample. Separate analyses were made for boys and girls in grades 9-10 and in grades 11-12, in the "Phoenix", as well as in the "Non-Phoenix" samples.

Different comparisons of mean scores between the contrasted groups nominated by teachers as well as by counselors, school principles, and nurses were conducted. In some scales, scores of teacher nomination groups were compared with the scores of the special nomination groups. When these comparisons were not possible, a sample of 200 students, selected randomly from the total sample, and called the "sample of total population" was used as another comparison group. Means of this group were compared with the means of the teacher nominated groups. Mean differences and critical

ratios of these groups were also obtained. Findings were reported for each scale as follows (Berdie and Layton, 1957).

The Family Relationships (FR) Scale: One comparison was between the students nominated by teachers as having poor family adjustment with the normal sample of 200 students for each sex and grades in Phoenix and Non-Phoenix high schools. The other comparison included the students nominated by counselors as having poor family adjustment with the sample of the total population. Comparisons in grades 9 and 10 showed significant differences for both boys and girls, but not for boys in grades 11 and 12.

The Social Relationships (SR) Scale: Comparisons were made between contrasted groups nominated by teachers as having good social adjustment and poor social adjustment. Each of the contrasted group was also compared with the normal sample of the total population. Comparisons for each sex and grade yielded significant differences between groups. Generally it was seen that this scale clearly differentiated the contrasted groups from each other, as well as each of these groups from the normals.

The Emotional Stability (ES) Scale: Same comparisons were made as in the SR scale. Contrasted group differences were all significant, except for boys in the Phoenix group for grades 9 and 10. Comparisons between the teacher nominated groups and the normal samples were non-significant for both sexes in the Phoenix high schools in grades 9 and 10, as well as for both sexes in grades 11 and 12. Generally this scale differentiated the contrasted groups well. It did not differentiate these groups, however, from the normal sample.

The Conformity (C) Scale: Contrasted teacher nominated groups formed one kind of comparison. The other comparison

included the students identified by school principles as being in trouble with law or school regulations, with the students nominated by teachers as conformists. These two comparisons yielded significant differences between sex, grade and school groups. The comparisons between students nominated by teachers as conformists with the normal sample was non-significant. Generally this scale differentiated the conformists from the non-conformists, and the non-conformists from the normals.

The Adjustment to Reality (R) Scale: Comparisons between the students nominated by teachers as "withdrawing" and the sample of the total population yielded non-significant differences, except for boys in Phoenix high schools, in grades 11 and 12. These results indicate that the scale fails to differentiate the normals from the students having difficulty in dealing with reality.

The Mood (M) Scale: One of the comparisons was between the contrasted groups nominated by teachers as "optimists", and "pessimists". These groups were found to be significantly different from each other for both sexes in all grades and schools, except for 11-12 grade boys in the Phoenix high schools. The other two comparisons included each of the contrasted group separately with the normal sample. The comparison between the "optimists" and the normal sample revealed significant differences only among 9-10th grade boys and 11-12th grade girls in the Phoenix high schools. The differences between the "pessimists" and the normal sample were generally significant. This scale showed to differentiate the pessimists from the optimists, and the pessimists from the normals.

The Leaderships (L) Scale: One comparison included the students nominated by teachers as having leadership

characteristics with the normal sample. The other comparison was between the students nominated by counselors as leaders and the normal sample. All comparisons yielded significant differences between groups, indicating that this scale clearly differentiates the leaders from the normals.

Research Conducted on the Psychometric Characteristics of the MCI

Research conducted after the publication of the manual were reviewed by Berdie and Layton (1960). One of these was on the validity of the Conformity Scale (C). Two different student groups constituted the sample of this study, the "validity" group which was composed of the students participated in the original standardization study of the MCI and the "cross-validity" group which was composed of the students who participated in the study later on. During the standardization of the MCI, some of the students were identified as the "negative conformity nominees", and some as the "positive conformity nominees" by the counselors, teachers and principals depending on their behaviours in school. In this study the two contrasted student groups were used as criterion groups, and their mean scores on the seven scales of the MCI, omitting the V scale, were compared with those of the validity and the cross-validity groups taking sex and grades separately. A total of 56 different comparisons were made, and the most significant differences were found for the C and R scales, beyond the .001 level. It was concluded that the C scale differentiated the positive and negative nominees better than the other scales. This finding was regarded as evidence for differential validity of this scale.

In another study MCI was administered to the Pennsylvania junior Republic School boys, aged 14 to 17, who

were referred by juvenile courts and other community agencies. The mean scores of those students on the Conformity and Mood scales were different from those of the norm groups. The means score on the FR, SR and L scales were close to the averages obtained from the normals (Berdie and Layton 1960). This research also showed that the Conformity scale differentiates the conformists and the non-conformists well.

Brown (1960) studied the validity of the MCI in a college population. Rating scales used in the original validity study of MCI were adopted and given to the dormitory counselors to nominate the students in the same way as reported in the manual. Analyses included the comparison of the two contrasted groups with each other. These groups were also compared with the students who were not nominated. Results showed that the FR, SR, C and L scales significantly differentiated the contrasted groups from each other, and from the not-nominated groups. The ES and M scales differentiated only among the women groups. The Reality scale was found ineffective in almost all comparisons.

Brown (1960) also investigated the relationship between the scores of the MCI and persistence in college. He compared the mean scores of the freshmen with the mean scores of the students who left school for other than academic reason. The results showed that although the mean scores of dropouts raised on several scales, there were sex differences. The males tended to be irresponsible and nonconforming while the females were more withdrawn and depressed than the other students. Brown concluded that the scales of the MCI may help the counselors in understanding the students' persistence in the college.

A similar study was conducted by Scanlon (in Berdie, 1960) on the male freshmen students. He compared the dropouts with the honor list students, and the students with scholastic

difficulties. Poor family relationships were observed in the dropouts. It was concluded that the honor list students were better adjusted as indicated by their low scores on the FR, ES, R and SR scales.

The Adaptation of the MCI in Turkey

The Turkish adaptation of the shortened form of MCI in Turkey was accomplished by Akdağ (1979). After the translation of the items, she administered the MCI scales to 92 boys and 108 girls in the 8th and 9th grades of an Istanbul high school. Then item analyses were conducted for the seven diagnostic scales, but not the validity scale. As a result of the item analysis low discriminative items were eliminated and three shortened forms of the test were developed. They were:

1- Short version I, which consisted of the top two-thirds of the original items of each scale.

2- Short version II, which consisted of the top half of the short version I.

3- Short version III, which consisted of the top one third of the original items of each scale.

For every version of each scale reliability coefficients such as the Spearman Brown split-halves, Kuder-Richardson-20 and Kuder Richardson-21 were computed. These reliability coefficients were compared among versions in order to determine the most appropriate one. The overall results indicated the short version I to be the most reliable with coefficients ranging between .54 and .61. These were similar to the original MCI reliability coefficients which ranged from .50 to .68.

It was also observed that five scales (SR, C, R, M and L) of this short version I had even higher coefficients than the original long version of MCI. The author concluded that "this unusual result may be due to the fact that when the original MCI was shortened, culturally biased items were discarded" (Akdağ, 1981 p.41).

The shortened form of the MCI consists of 212 items (Appendix A and B), and the validity of this form was tested in the present study.

CHAPTER III
METHOD

METHOD

Selection of the Sample

135 students of the ninth grade of Istanbul Amerikan Robert Lisesi participated in this study. This particular high school was selected because of practical reasons. The author had been working in this school as Lycee counselor, and she, therefore, knew the students and their teachers. Thus the communication problems were reduced to a minimum in the administration process.

Istanbul Amerikan Robert Lisesi is a private, foreign operated, and co-educational school. English and Turkish are used as languages of instruction. Students enter this school through central entrance examinations. Due to great demand only those who obtain very high scores in this examination are admitted.

Subjects

All sections of ninth grade were included in the study. These subjects were selected for age and grade equivalency to the original standardized group. Although all of the 135 ninth graders initially participated in this study, the answer sheets of 13 students were eliminated,

because the number of items they did not answer exceeded the upper limit allowed in the manual. Therefore the remaining 122 students were accepted as subjects. Of these students 66 were boys, and 56 were girls. The average age was 15-0. Table 1 shows the number of boys and girls according to their age and grade section.

TABLE 1- Number of Male and Female Students and Age Groups Represented in Each Section of the ninth grade in Robert Lisesi

Age	S e c t i o n s									
	A		B		C		D		Σ	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F		
17-0	4	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	9	
16-0	10	5	5	4	8	6	4	3	45	
15-0	4	8	9	7	9	9	8	10	64	
14-0	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	4	
Σ	18	15	16	13	18	15	14	13	122	

These students participated in the validation of the six scales of MCI which are Social Relationships (SR), Emotional Stability (ES), Conformity (C), Mood (M), Adjustment to Reality (R), and Leadership (L). For the Family Relationships (FR) scale, 64 of the 122 students and their parents formed the subject groups.

In addition to the main sample of the present study, another group of subjects taken from a normatization study of the scale (Öner, 1985) was used for comparative purposes and called as normal sample in this study. These subjects were 343 ninth grade students from several high schools in Istanbul. There were 224 girls, and 96 boys.

Instruments

Two different instruments were used in this study as criterion measures in validating the Turkish experimental short form of the MCI. They were the Student Evaluation Forms and the Social Introversion scale of the MMPI (Si).

Student Evaluation Forms

In the absence of technically adequate criterion measures for the MCI scales, the "nominating technique" was considered useful. This is "a method of studying social structure and personality in which ... group of individuals are asked to indicate the persons with whom they would like to do a certain thing, or the person(s) they feel have certain characteristics" (Aiken, 1971, p.). Previous research with this kind of nominating technique demonstrated success (Kane and Lawler, in Anastasi, 1982).

Two Student Evaluation Forms for teachers and families were developed for this study.

Student Evaluation Form for Teacher Nominations. Two Student Evaluation Forms were developed for each of the six MCI scales (Appendix C). These were Social Relationships (SR), Emotional Stability (ES), Conformity (C), Mood (M), Adjustment to Reality (R) and Leadership (L) scales. One of the two evaluation forms consists of descriptions of poor adjustment characteristics of the trait measured by a particular scale. The other includes descriptions of good adjustment characteristics of that trait. These behavior characteristics were mostly based on the descriptions of scales in the MCI manual. The "Student Evaluation Form" for the Conformity scale in the manual was taken as model in constructing the forms for this study.

In order to improve the accuracy of the nominations, traits were defined in concrete and operational terms. A two-week period of observation was allowed to the teachers. During the process of constructing the forms four faculty members of the Education Department at Bosphorous University were consulted. Then these forms were given to the teachers to fill out. Although a systematic rater training was not carried out, the researcher supervised each teacher individually concerning the nomination process. Instructions were given verbally in detail. The teachers were told to:

- nominate the students in their own classess, only.
- nominate the students who fit the given descriptions most.
- try to nominate five boys and five girls.
- report observations and not personal views or ideas.

Student Evaluation Form for Families. This form was used in the validation of the Family Relationships (FR) scale. The families evaulated the students' perception of their parent-child relationship. This was used as the criterion measure. The FR scale consists of 24 items on the perceptions of students about their relationship with their families. In the construction of the criterion measure, 24 corresponding items to those of the FR scale were developed (Appendix D). It was basically the same items, but worded in such a way as to obtain the parents' perception of children's relationship with them. Again three members of the Education Department at Bosphorus University were consulted in developing and revising these items. An answer key which is parallel to the answer key of FR scale was developed. These evaluation forms were mailed to parents to be filled out and returned.

The Social Introversion (Si) Scale of the Minnesota
Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)

The Si scale of the MMPI measures effectiveness in social adjustment. Items of this scale tap introversion in social relations only. The Turkish adaptation of the MMPI, including the Si scale, has been standardized and validated (Savaşır, 1981). Therefore, it was considered to be an appropriate criterion measure for use in the validation of the Social Relationships scale of the Turkish MCI.

In the validation of the Si scale in Turkey, patients diagnosed as neurotic, psychotic, character disorders and borderline cases were compared with normal groups. Differences between normals and patient groups were found significant at the .001 level. The two-week test-retest reliability of this scale was .89 (Erol, 1982).

Procedure

The Turkish form of the MCI was administered to 135 ninth grade students by this researcher with three counselors assisting her during the guidance counseling hours. After one week of this application, the Si scale of the MMPI was also administered to the same students.

Student Evaluation Forms were given to 11 ninth grade teachers and a counselor. They were asked to nominate the students in their class according to specific written instructions on the forms. Every section of the ninth grade was evaluated by six teachers, independently. The distribution of teachers according to sections is given in Table 2.

TABLE 2- Distribution of Ninth Grade Teachers According to Class Sections

Sections Teachers	A	B	C	D
History	X	X	X	X
Literature I	X			
Literature II		X		
Literature III			X	X
Math I	X		X	
Math II		X		X
Biology I		X	X	X
Biology II	X			
Physical Educ I	X boys	X boys	X boys	X boys
Physical Educ II	X girls	X girls		
Physical Educ III			X girls	X girls
Counselor	X	X	X	X
Σ	6	6	6	6

Although "5 boys and 5 girls" were recommended to be included in the teacher nominations, this number was not strongly imposed in order to obtain valid information. The nomination of three students was the minimum number. When the evaluation forms were collected and found that some of the teachers nominated less than three students, they were returned the evaluation forms, and asked to complete three nominations.

Student Evaluations Forms for families were mailed to parents of 122 students. In a few weeks 52 parents filled out and returned the forms. The follow up resulted in twelve

additional forms. Altogether 64 families responded, and these constituted the data used in the analysis.

Analysis of Data

The data used in validating the seven scales of the Turkish MCI were scores in the Family Relationships (FR), Social Relationships (SR), Emotional Stability (ES), Conformity (C), Mood (M), Adjustment to Reality (R) and Leadership (L) scales; the Si scores of the MMPI, the family evaluation scores and the teacher nominations.

In the validation of the FR scale, scores of the Student Evaluation Forms for families were correlated with the students' scores obtained from the FR scales. The Pearson product moment correlation method was used.

For the analyses of the six MCI scales, two nominee lists were prepared. These were a:

1- List of students nominated by at least two or more teachers for having good adjustment characteristics of a particular trait.

2- List of students nominated by at least two or more teachers for having poor adjustment characteristics of that particular trait.

The students who were nominated as having good adjustment by some of their teachers, but as having poor adjustment by others were not included in these lists. Thus two contrasted (extreme) groups for each of the six scale were established. Data on these nominated groups were analyzed using t-test and Chi-square techniques.

The t-values of each scale were computed to investigate the significance level of the mean differences of the two contrasted groups nominated by teachers. In addition to this analysis, comparisons were made between the contrasted groups, and a sample of normal population obtained from the Education Department of the Bosphorus University (Öner, 1985). The comparison between the contrasted groups and the normal sample was to obtain additional data on the differentiating characteristic of the scales. Such comparisons were also reported in the MCI manual.

Chi-square analyses were used to determine the appropriateness of the mean scale score as the "critical" or the "cutoff" point. Accordingly "all applicants falling below a cutoff score on a criterion are rejected, and all applicants falling at or above the cutoff score are accepted" (Aiken, 1971, p.).

In the preparation of chi-square tables the following procedure was used:

1- Scores of the negatively nominated students (if scores were above the mean) were tallied as "hits".

2- Scores of the negatively nominated students (if scores were below the mean) were tallied as "misses".

3- Scores of the positively nominated students, (if scores were above the mean), were tallied as "misses".

4- Scores of the positively nominated students (if scores were below the mean) were tallied as "hits".

For the chi-square computation of the Conformity scale only, students nominated by one teacher were also included in the lists. This was done to obtain sufficient number of subjects for statistical analysis.

For the validity of the SR scale, the scores obtained from this scale were also correlated with the Si scores of the MMPI.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

RESULTS

The results are presented according to the main areas explored. These are the;

1- Means and standard deviations of the sample used in this study.

2- Correlations between the scores of the FR scale of the MCI and the scores of the student evaluation forms filled out by the family.

3- Agreement between teachers nominations and students' score when the mean of each scale was taken as critical score.

4- Differences between contrasted groups as determined by teacher nominations on characteristics parallel to those included in the SR, ES, C, M, R and L scales of the MCI.

5- Correlations between the SR scale score of the MCI and the Si scale score of the MMPI.

6- Comparisons between the contrasted groups and a sample of independent normal groups.

Although the MCI was administered to all 122 students in ninth grade only those nominated by their teachers were

used in the analysis. For an overall picture, however, the means and standard deviations of the total sample are presented in Table 3. The values for the validity (V) scale are also included in this table, but not used in the analysis anywhere in this study.

TABLE 3- The MCI Scale Means and Standard Deviations Obtained From 122 Students

Scales	V	FR	SR	ES	C	R	M	L
Mean	4.14	7.81	15.63	12.80	7.17	12.52	9.40	9.27
Stan.Dev.	1.90	4.19	8.98	5.43	3.99	6.26	4.35	3.97

The relationship of the FR scores with the criterion measure (obtained from parent evaluation forms) of 64 students, was computed using the Pearson Product Moment correlation method. The correlation coefficient was found to be .39, significant at the .01 level.

The chi-square results for testing the appropriateness of the scale means as critical scores for the SR, ES, M, C, R and L scales are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4- Chi-square Values and Level of Significance
 Indicating the Agreement Between Teachers'
 Nominations and Student Scores on the SR, ES, C, R,
 M, L Scales of the MCI

Scales	Hits	No Hits	Total	Chi-square	p value
SR	≠ 44 % 71	18 29	62	10.62	.01
ES	≠ 33 % 69	15 31	48	7.21	.01
C	≠ 57 % 64	32 36	89	7.11	.01
R	≠ 31 % 56.4	24 43.6	55	0.67	.50
M	≠ 40 % 61.5	25 38.5	65	3.81	.10
L	≠ 48 % 64.9	26 35.1	74	6.55	.025

Correspondance between the students' scores and teacher nominations was significant at the .01 level for the SR, ES and C scales. In the area of social relations teachers nominated 62 students. 71 % of these nominations were in the same direction as the students' scores indicated when the mean was taken as the critical score ($\bar{M} = 15.71$). In the area of Emotional Stability (ES) a total of 48 students were nominated by their teachers as either having favorable emotional adjustment or poor emotional adjustment. 69 % of these nominations (called "hits") were in the same direction as the students' score indicated. The critical score for this scale was 12.81. For the Conformity scale, students nominated by at least one teacher were also included in this list, and accordingly 89 students were nominated. 64 % of these nominations showed correspondance with the students' score. The critical score here was 7.16.

Chi-square results for the Leadership scale was significant at the .025 level. A total of 74 students were nominated by their teachers on this. 65 % of the nominations showed correspondance with the students' score on this scale. The critical score was 9.28.

The significance level was .10 for the Mood Scale. In this area 65 students were nominated by their teachers. 62 % of these students showed correspondance with the scores on the Mood Scale. The critical score was 9.40.

Results of the chi-square for the Adjustment to Reality scale was found significant at the .50 level only, and is the least significant. Of the 55 students nominated, about one half (56.4 %) of them were evaluated in the same direction ("hits") as the students' scale scores indicated.

From Table 4, it is seen that the number of students nominated for positive characteristics ("Hits") are greater than the number of students nominated for negative characteristics ("No Hits") in almost all scales.

t-tests were performed for the mean differences of the two contrasted groups (positively v.s negatively evaluated groups) for each of the six scale of the MCI. Means, standard deviations, mean differences and t-values of these contrasted groups are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5- Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Differences and t -values of the Contrasted Groups for the SR, ES, C, R, M, L Scales of the MCI

Scales	Pozitively Nominated Group (PNG)			Negatively Nominated Group (NNG)			Mean Difference	t -value	p -value
	N	Mean	Sd	N	Mean	Sd			
SR	34	10.74	6.59	28	19.79	9.02	-9.05	4.57	.005
ES	28	12.04	6.36	20	15.2	4.62	-3.16	1.85	.05
C	46	6.11	3.45	14	10.14	4.50	-4.03	3.63	.005
R	28	11.14	7.14	27	14.56	5.83	-3.42	1.48	.05
M	38	8.79	4.4	27	10.41	4.21	-1.62	1.53	.10
L	38	7.63	3.72	36	10.28	3.98	-2.65	3.08	.005

Mean differences between the contrasted groups in the SR, C and L scales were found significant at the .005 level. The t -value was 4.57 for the SR scale, 3.63 for the C scale, and 3.08 for the L scale.

The differences were significant at the .05 level in the ES and R scales. The t -values were 1.85 for the ES scale and 1.98 for the R scale.

The least significant difference was in the M scale ($t=1.53$, $p<.10$).

In an additional analysis for the SR scale, scores of 102 students were correlated with scores obtained from the Si scale of the MMPI. This correlation was found to be .60, significant at the .001 level.

In the comparison of the means of an independent normal group with those of the contrasted groups, firstly, students nominated by their teachers as having good adjustment characteristics were included (Table 6).

TABLE 6- The Comparison of the Means of a Normal Group with Positively Nominated Group Using Independent Sample t-test on the Six Scales of MCI.

Groups Scales	Pozitively Nominated Group (PNG)			Normal Sample			<u>t</u> -valve	<u>p</u> value
	N	Mean	Sd	N	Mean	Sd		
SR	34	10.74	6.59	343	15.16	9.75	2.6	.01
ES	28	12.04	6.36	343	12.57	5.25	2.46	.02
C	46	6.11	3.45	343	6.96	3.98	1.37	.20
R	28	11.14	7.14	343	11.49	2.30	0.60	-
M	38	8.79	4.4	343	9.58	4.77	0.98	-
L	38	7.63	3.72	343	8.11	4.04	0.70	-

In this comparison, the R, M and L scales did not show significant differences, indicating close similarity between students' nominated by teachers as having good adjustment characteristics and a sample of normals. In the SR scale, the two groups differed significantly from each other at the .01 level. In terms of the ES scale the obtained t-value reached significance at the .02 level. For the Conformity scale however, the difference between the two groups could not be considered significant with a p value of .20.

Secondly, students nominated by their teachers as having poor adjustment characteristics were compared with a normal sample group as shown in table 7.

TABLE 7- Comparison of the Means of a Normal Group with Negatively Nominated Group Using Independent Sample t-tests

Groups Scales	Negatively Nominated Group (NNG)			Normal Group (NG)			<u>t</u> -value	<u>p</u> -value
	N	Mean	Sd	N	Mean	Sd		
SR	28	19.79	9.02	343	15.16	9.75	2.42	.02
ES	20	15.2	4.62	343	12.57	5.25	7.80	.001
C	14	10.14	4.50	343	6.96	3.98	2.92	.01
R	27	14.56	5.83	343	11.49	2.30	5.67	.001
M	27	10.41	4.21	343	9.58	3.43	0.87	-
L	36	10.28	3.98	343	8.11	4.04	3.06	.01

The most significant differences between the negatively nominated and the normal groups were found on the ES and R scales ($p < .001$). Differences between these two groups on the C, L and SR scales were also significant but at lower levels with p values of .01 and .02, respectively. On the Mood scale the difference was not significant at all.

Tables 6 and 7 show that almost all (except the M) MCI scales studied here differentiate the students with poor adjustment characteristics from the normal students. These scales do not differentiate students with good adjustment characteristics from the normal students so effectively.

Table 8 is a combination of Tables 5, 6 and 7 and shows various comparisons among the normal and the two contrasted groups. In reviewing this table, each scale is presented separately, and the chi-square results, which are not included in this table, are also considered.

TABLE 8- Comparisons of Criterion Groups on Six Scales

Scales	Criterion Group				Comparison of groups		
		N	Mean	Sd	Groups	t-value	p-value
SR	PNG*	34	10.74	6.59	PNG and NG	2.60	.01
	NNG**	28	19.79	9.02	NNG and NG	2.42	.02
	NG***	343	15.16	9.75	PNG and NNG	4.57	.005
ES	PNG	28	12.04	6.36	PNG and NG	2.46	.02
	NNG	20	15.2	4.62	NNG and NG	7.80	.001
	NG	343	12.57	5.25	PNG and NNG	1.85	.05
C	PNG	46	6.11	3.45	PNG and NG	1.37	.20
	NNG	14	10.14	4.50	NNG and NG	2.92	.01
	NG	343	6.96	3.98	PNG and NNG	3.63	.005
R	PNG	28	11.14	7.14	PNG and NG	0.60	-
	NNG	27	14.56	5.83	NNG and NG	5.67	.001
	NG	343	11.49	2.30	PNG and NNG	1.98	.05
M	PNG	38	8.79	4.4	PNG and NG	0.98	-
	NNG	27	10.41	4.21	NNG and NG	0.87	-
	NG	343	9.58	4.77	PNG and NNG	1.53	.10
L	PNG	38	7.63	3.72	PNG and NG	0.70	-
	NNG	36	10.28	3.98	NNG and NG	3.06	.01
	NG	343	8.11	4.04	PNG and NNG	3.08	.005

* Positively Nominated Group

** Negatively Nominated Group

*** Normal Group

Starting with the first raw in the table, it can be read that the:

Social Relationships (SR) scale discriminates significantly between both of the contrasted groups and the normals, as well as between the positively and the negatively nominated groups. The most significant discrimination was

between the contrasted groups. Items of this scale clearly differentiate the students of good social relations from the students of poor social relations ($p < .005$). It was also found that students who have good social relations are significantly different from the normal sample ($p < .01$). Students with poor social relations also differ significantly ($p < .02$) from the normals. The mean of this scale was found useful as the critical score ($p < .01$). Additional comparisons with a valid test as criterion supported these results. There was positive relationship between this scale with the Si scale of the MMPI which measures the social relations aspects of introversion ($r = .60$).

The Emotional Stability (ES) scale has also proved to be adequately discriminating among the three comparison groups. The most significant comparison was between the negatively nominated and the normal groups ($p < .001$). Differences between the positively nominated and normal groups ($p < .02$) as well as between the two contrasted groups were also significant ($p < .05$). This scale has shown to differentiate the emotionally stable students from the emotionally unstable students. The chi-square analysis also indicated that mean of this scale can be appropriately used as the critical score ($p .01$).

The Conformity (C) scale discriminated the three comparison groups significantly from each other. The most significant comparison was between the two contrasted groups ($p < .005$), indicating that this scale differentiates the students who are responsible and who respect rules and authority, from the students who are irresponsible, impulsive and disrespectful. Comparison between the negatively nominated and the normal groups showed significant differences ($p < .01$), but the positively nominated group was not too different from the normal group ($p < .20$). The chi-square analysis indicated

that the mean of this scale can also be used as a valid critical score ($p < .01$).

The Adjustment to Reality (R) scale proved to discriminate significantly between the two out of three groups. The analysis indicated that this scale differentiates the contrasted groups from each other ($p < .05$), and the negatively nominated from the normal groups ($p < .001$). Non-significant difference between the positively nominated and the normal groups indicates that these two groups are similar and can not be differentiated from each other on the basis of the students' R scores. It can be said that this scale gives critical information only about the students who are not able to deal with reality effectively. The mean of this scale was not found useful as critical score ($p < .50$).

The Mood (M) scale appeared to be the least discriminating scale. None of the differences between groups were significant. The one between the positively nominated and the normal groups somewhat approached significance ($p < .10$). Accordingly then this scale doesn't give good information about the students' states of mind and feelings. Similar results were obtained ($p < .10$) from the chi-square analysis on the appropriateness of the scale mean as a critical score.

The Leadership (L) Scale was found to discriminate the two comparison groups. That is the positively nominated and the negatively nominated groups were different ($p < .005$) from each other on this scale. The negatively nominated and the normal groups also differed significantly ($p < .01$). These results show that this scale discriminates the students who do not possess leadership qualities better than those who do. The mean of this scale was found appropriate, as the critical score, at the .02 level.

The Family Relationships (FR) scale which is not included in Table 8 is validated by a different procedure. The students' FR scores were correlated with the scores obtained from the family evaluation forms which reflected their perception of parent-student relationships. A correlation coefficient of .39 ($p < .01$) was obtained.

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the study was to obtain information about the validity of the scales of the Turkish MCI. For this purpose teacher evaluations were used in identifying the low and high (contrasted) groups according to the characteristics identified by the scales (SR, ES, C, M, R, L) of the MCI. The scores of these nominated (contrasted) groups were compared with each other as well as each with an independent normal sample in order to see how well they discriminate. The means of each scale were also tested for appropriateness as critical scores in discriminating students with high or low characteristics of a given trait. For the validity of the Family Relationships (FR) scale, family evaluations were used as criteria. The Social Relationships (SR) scale was compared with the Si scale of the MMPI whose validity on the Turkish samples is established.

Discussion

Results of the comparisons between contrasted groups as well as between each of the contrasted groups with an independent normal sample will be discussed in this section.

Findings of the contrasted group comparisons indicated that the Social Relationships (SR), Conformity (C) and the

Leadership (L) scales were most effective ($p < .001$) in differentiating the high and low scoring students in terms of the characteristics these scales claim to tap. This is similar to what Berdie (1957) and Brown (1960) observed for the SR and C scales. No analyses for contrasted groups were reported, however, in the above studies for the L scale.

The Emotional Stability (ES) and Adjustment to Reality (R) scales were also found effective ($p < .05$) in differentiating the contrasted groups. In the original study Berdie (1957) found significant contrasted group differences in the ES scale at most of the grade levels. In grades 9 and 10, contrasted group differences among boys were not significant, however. Brown (1960) reported sex differences in the college population for this scale. It differentiated the females more effectively than the males. No information was given by either of these studies on the contrasted group differences for the R scale.

The Mood (M) scale was least effective ($p < .10$) in differentiating the contrasted groups in the present study. This is inconsistent with that of Berdie (1957) who reported significant differences between the contrasted groups. Only boys in grades 11 and 12 showed non-significant differences. In the Brown (1960) study sex differences were significant, with women being more effectively differentiated than men by this scale.

The second type of comparison in this study was between each of the contrasted (positively and negatively nominated) groups and an independent normal sample. The positively nominated groups were found to differ significantly from the normal sample in the SR ($p < .01$), and ES ($p < .02$) scales. Low significance was obtained, however, between these groups for the C scale ($p < .20$). The results on the SR scale were very

similar to those obtained in earlier studies by Berdie (1957) and Brown (1960), but different for the ES and C scales. In the original work on the validation of the MCI, Berdie (1957) obtained non-significant differences between these comparison groups for the ES scale in grades 9 and 10 for boys and girls, and in grades 11 and 12 for boys. In the Brown (1960) study this scale was effective in differentiating the women only. Although the lowest level of significance ($p < .20$) was found for the C scale in the present study. Brown (1960) obtained non-significant differences in the college sample. Berdie (1957) also found non-significant differences in most groups studied.

The L and M scales did not prove effective in discriminating between the positively nominated group and the normal sample in the present study. This is inconsistent with Berdie (1957) and Brown (1960) findings on the L scale, but consistent on the M scale.

The R scale, on which no analyses are reported by previous researchers, proved non-discriminating between the normal and the positively nominated groups.

Comparisons between the negatively nominated and the normal groups yielded results to indicate that the ES and the R scales were most effective ($p < .001$) in differentiating such groups. These scales were non differentiating in other studies (Berdie, 1957; Brown, 1960). They reported sex differences in the ES scale, and it only differentiated the female subjects effectively. Moreover, they found that the R scale was ineffective in differentiating the negatively nominated groups from the normals.

Significant differences between the negatively nominated and the normals were also obtained for the C ($p < .01$), SR ($p < .02$) and L ($p < .01$) scales. These data confirm

the earlier findings on the original SR and C scales. The M scale did not prove effective in discriminating the negatively nominated group from the normals as in the 11 and 12 grades of the Berdie (1957) samples, and in males in the Brown (1960) study.

For the Family Relationships (FR) scale, the obtained correlation between scale scores and family evaluations was low ($r=.39$), indicating that students' perception of family relationships did not correspond so well with the parents' perception of the same relationship. In validating this scale Berdie (1957) used three criterion groups such as the students nominated negatively by (1) teachers and (2) counselors and (3) the "sample of the total population". Students nominated by teachers and counselors were compared with the "sample of total population". He found that these comparison groups were not significantly different from each other in grades 11 and 12 for boys.

Conclusions

The overall results of the study showed that most of the scales of the MCI have as much criterion validity as was reported by Berdie (1957), and Brown (1960) on the original form of the inventory. Similar comparison groups as in the original study were used in the present study. Contrasted groups of each scale, which were nominated by teachers as having poor adjustment and good adjustment characteristics on that scale, were compared with each other as well as between each of the contrasted group with an independent normal sample. In addition, mean score analyses of the scales, and a correlation of the SR scale with the Si scale of the MMPI were conducted by the present researcher.

Findings indicated that the Social Relationships (SR), Emotional Stability (ES), Leadership (L), Adjustment to Reality (R) and the Conformity (C) scales effectively discriminate the students with low or high characteristics on these traits. The SR, ES, C, R and L scales were particularly effective in discriminating the students of poor adjustment characteristics while only the SR and ES scales were also effective in discriminating the students of good adjustment characteristics from the normals. The Mood (M) scale was not effective in discriminating the groups used in this study. Students' scores on the FR scale correlated somewhat moderately low with the criterion measure.

The results of these comparisons were generally similar to those obtained from the original form of the MCI. The comparisons between the two contrasted groups as well as between the negatively evaluated and normal groups in the present study yielded better results on the SR, ES, C and R scales. They were, in fact, more discriminating than the original scales. Similar to previous findings the M scale did not prove to be effective in differentiating the normals from the contrasted groups. This scale does a better job, however, in its English form in discriminating the two extreme (positive and negative) groups.

The mean score analysis, which was not reported previously, indicated that among the SR, ES, C, R, M and L scales, the means of the R and M scales are not effective as cut-off points, and, therefore, can not discriminate among students with varying levels of the characteristics these scales purport to measure.

The additional analysis on the SR scale showed that it measures similar behavior characteristics to the Si scale of the MMPI.

Poor results on the M and FR scales, and inconsistencies in the R, C and L scale findings may be attributed to the inadequacy of teacher and family ratings rather than the test items. Behavior characteristics typical for the M and R scales seem especially difficult to observe and identify by teachers. These are less observable and more complex than characteristics tapped by the otherscales of the MCI. More suitable criterion measures such as peer nominations, psychological tests, etc., may result in better outcome data validating these scales.

In the present study no technically adequate criterion measure such as an all encompassing standardized test was available, hence development of the teacher ratings for student evaluations were carried out as in the original study. For the FR scale a separate Student Evaluation Form (for parents) was constructed. The latter was thought needed as teachers may not be able to effectively evaluate the students' relationship with their parents. Teachers ratings did not seem too appropriate, either, for validating the M and R scales. In absence of more suitable criterion measures, teachers ratings were used for these scales also.

The preparation of these rating scales and teacher supervisions on student evaluations constituted the special projects for the present researcher during the course of this study. In the preparation of the rating scales special care was given to include the behavior characteristics based on the descriptions given in the MCI manual. The traits were defined in concrete and operational terms.

In the supervision of the teachers, it was felt that communication was good. Every teacher was individually supervised and instructed on the evaluation process. They were explained that they try and be objective in reporting their

views and perceptions of student characteristics being evaluated.

An interesting finding of this study was that the scales differentiated the poor adjustment characteristics more effectively than good adjustment characteristics when compared with the average. While only the SR and ES scales differentiated the good adjustment characteristics, the SR, ES, C, R and L scales differentiated the poor adjustment characteristics from the average. In the original study, the difference between normal and poor adjustment characteristics was seen only in the C scale and moderately so in the M scale. This shortened Turkish form of the MCI can be claimed to have better items as they discriminate the poor adjustment characteristics from the average (normal) more effectively than in the original form.

In unstructured interviews with the students following testing where they were reported the MCI results, correspondence between these students scale scores and their observed attitudes were noted particularly for the SR, L, C, M and ES scales. This informal observation was interpreted as additional evidence for the validity of these scales.

Although the objective of the study was largely met, the results must be considered in the context of the following limitations.

Limitations

Limitations of this study are related to sampling, criteria measures used (their development and application), and the exclusion of the V scale from the validation procedures.

The sample of the study is not a good representative of the Turkish population. Only the ninth graders in a private and a highly selective high school were included here.

In previous studies sex differences were found in some scales, indicating that gender is important. In this study gender could not be considered because of the limited number of subjects in the contrast groups. Data on gender would be helpful in interpreting and comparing the results with other studies.

The analysis of the FR scale was based on the responses obtained from parents of 64 students. Thus only 52 % of the sample could be studied.

Another limitation pertains to lack of data on the validity/reliability of the teacher ratings, and family evaluation forms which were used as criteria measures in assessing the validity of the scales. Although these instruments were prepared with utmost care, they were based on judges' evaluations and could not be empirically tested before using them.

In the procedure, systematic training for accurate observation could not be conducted with the teachers because of time limitation and practical inconvenience. Although a two week opportunity to observe students were given to these teachers, longer time intervals with supervision would probably make them more sensitive and careful observers in evaluating the students' behaviors. Boredom and fatigue were observed in some teachers who had to rate the students on six scales in three or four sections of the grade. This was a lot of work, demanding on teachers' time and energy.

The V scale was not included in the analyses of this study as it appeared that the issue of social desirability in the Turkish culture would need to be investigated systematically before going into the validation procedure of such a scale.

Recommendations

This study needs to be replicated and/or cross validated on representative random samples of Turkish students using different measures such as peer nominations, other valid tests, and objective observations. Gender should also be considered.

Systematic rater training and sufficient time for observation should be allowed if evaluation forms are used.

The Validity (V) Scale of the inventory should be assessed systematically for social desirability first, and a criterion score be established for a cut-off point.

This study represents an initial attempt to obtain data on the validity of the MCI in Turkey. Further research will provide more data on and substantiate the validity of those scales and improve the accurateness of the scale interpretations in counseling settings in Turkey.

R E F E R E N C E S

- Aiken, Jr. R. Lewis., Psychological Testing and Assessment., Allyn and Bacon Inc. 1976.
- Annastasi Anne., Psychological Testing., Mac Millian Publishing., New York, 1982.
- Akdağ Fusun., A Preliminary Adaptation of the Minnesota Counseling Inventory., Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis., Boğaziçi University, 1979.
- American Psychological Association., Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests and Manuals., APA. Inc., Washington D.C., 1974.
- Berdie, R.F. and Layton, W.C., Minnesota Counseling Inventory Manual, 1957.
- Berdie, R.F. and Layton, W.C., Research Notes From Here and There., Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7(8).
- Brown, F.G., Identifying College Dropouts with the MCI., Personal and Guidance Journal, 1960, 39.
- Brown, F.G., The Validity of the Minnesota Counseling Inventory in a College Population., Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, p.132-136.
- Cronbach, L.J., Essentials of Psychological Testing., Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1960.

- Erol Nepe., Ülkemizdeki Psikiatrik Hastalarda Minnesota Çok Yönlü Kişilik Envanterinin Geçerlik Araştırması, Psikoloji kürsüsü., Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara University, 1982.
- Greene,R.L., The MMPI: An Interpretive Manual, Cruse and Stratton, Inc New York., 1980.
- Helmstadter,G.C., Principles of Psychological Measurement., Meredith Publishing Company., New York., 1964.
- Kleinmunte,B., Personality Measurement an Introduction., The Dorsay Press-Illinois., 1967.
- Meehl,P.E., Clinical v.s. Statistical Prediction a Theoretical Analysis and a Review of the Evidence., Jones Press Inc. Minneapolis., 1966.
- Megargee,E.L., Research in Clinical Assessment., Harper and Row Publishers Inc., New York., 1966.
- Öner,Necla., Kısaltılmış Türkçe Minnesota Danışma Envanterinin Bazı İstanbul Liselerinde Standardizasyonu., Personal Communication., Boğaziçi University., Istanbul., 1985.
- Özge,Sevgi., Psychological Tests used in Turkey, a Preliminary Survey., Unbulished Master of Arts Project., Education Department., Boğaziçi University, 1981.
- ✓ Savaşır,Işık., Minnesota Çok Yönlü Kişilik Envanteri El Kitabı (Türk Standardizasyonu)., Sevinç Matbaası, Ankara, 1981.
- Title Carol Kehr., Program Evaluation and Guidance., Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance., 1982-83, 15, 22-23.
- Ysseldyke,J.E. and D.Marston., Gathering Decision Making Information Through the use of Nan-Test Based Methods., Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance., 1982, 15, 58-59.

APPENDIX A
SHORTENED TURKISH FORM OF THE MINNESOTA
COUNSELING INVENTORY (MCI)

MİNNESOTA DANIŞMA ENVANTERİ KISALTILMIŞ DENEME FORMU*

Bu kitapçığın gayesi sizin kendinizi daha iyi tanımanıza yardımcı olacaktır. Kendinizi bir kişi olarak daha iyi tanıdıkça daha yararlı planlar yapabilecek ve daha etkin olarak öğrenebileceksiniz. Bu envanteri doldurmanız sonucunda öğretmenleriniz ve danışmanlarınız size daha iyi öğretme ve daha yararlı danışmanlık yapabilme olanağı bulabileceklerdir.

Devam eden sayfalarda kimimiz için geçerli, kimimiz için ise geçerli olmayan cümleler var. Bu cümlelere vereceğiniz cevap sizin kendinizin hakkında daha çok şey öğrenmenize yardımcı edecektir. Bundan dolayı her cümleyi açık kalplilikle ve düşünerek cevaplandırmak sizin yararınıza olacaktır. Doğru veya yanlış cevap yoktur.

YÖNERGE:

Kitapçıktaki ilk cümleyi okuyunca bunun sizin için uygun olup olmadığına karar verin ve cevabınızı ayrı cevap kağıdına işaretleyin. Eğer cümle sizin için uygun veya genellikle uygun ise cevap kağıdında bu maddenin karşılığı olan numaranın yanındaki ve D harfinin altına gelen boşluğu karalayın. Eğer cümle size göre uygun değil ise veya genellikle uygun değil ise, cevapkağıdında bu maddenin karşılığı olan numaranın yanında ve Y harfinin altına gelen boşluğu karalayın.

Aşağıda bir cevap kağıdı örneği verilmiştir. Madde 1'e cevabın "uygun" olduğu kabul edilmiş, 1 rakkamının yanındaki ve D harfinin altına gelen boşluk karalanmıştır. Madde 2'ye cevabın uygun olmadığı belirtilecek şekilde 2 rakkamının yanındaki ve Y harfinin altındaki boşluk karalanmıştır.

Cevap Kağıdının bir kısmı

	D	Y		D	Y
1.	//	//	51.	//	//
2.	//	//	52.	//	//
3.	//	//	53.	//	//

Eğer bir cümle sizin için geçerli değil ise veya kararsızsanız, cevap kağıdına hiç bir işaret koymayın. Cevaplandırabileceğiniz bütün soruları cevaplandırın ve mümkün olduğu kadar az boş bırakın.

* Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bölümü Master Öğrencisi Füsun Akdağ tarafından 1979'da Türkçeleştirildikten sonra bu kısaltılmış deneme formu geliştirilmiştir.

Kendiniz hakkında düşüncelerinizi vermeyi unutmayın. Soruları çabuk cevaplayın ve herhangi bir cümle üzerinde fazla vakit sarfetmeyin.

Cevap kağıdına cevabınızı işaretlediğiniz zaman maddenin numarası ile cevap kağıdındaki numaranın aynı olmasına dikkat edin. Koyu renk kurşun kalem ile işaretleyin ve değiştirmek istediğiniz cevabı tamamen silin.

HER SORUYU CEVAPLANDIRMAYA ÇALIŞIN.

ADINIZIN CEVAP KAĞIDINDA OLMASINA DİKKAT EDİN.

BU KİTAPÇIĞA HİÇ BİR İŞARET KOYMAYIN.

Şimdi sayfayı çevirin ve başlayın.

1. Geçen birkaç yılda sağlığım genellikle iyi idi.
2. Diğer insanlar kadar çabuk arkadaş edinirim.
3. Kolaylıkla heyecanlanırım.
4. Bazen öfkelenirim.
5. Zihnimi bir iş üzerinde tutmak benim için zordur.
6. İlerde olabilecek kötü olayları düşünerek üzülürüm.
7. Bir oyunda kazanmayı kaybetmeye tercih ederim.
8. İnsanlar kolaylıkla sabrımı tüketir.
9. Bir topluluğun neşe kaynağı olmak benim için kolaydır.
10. Ailem sık sık beraber dolaştığım insanlara karşı çıkmıştır.
11. Bazen biraz dedikodu yaparım.
12. Birkaç önemli kişi tanımak isterim, çünkü bu kendimi önemli hissettirir.
13. Eğer bir topluluk sıkıcı ise onu canlandırmakta öncülük ederim.
14. Fikirlerimi kolaylıkla açıklarım.
15. Yeni insanlarla tanışırken utanırım.
16. İlk tepki onlardan gelmezse uzun süredir görüşmediğim kimseleri ya da okul arkadaşlarımı görmemezlikten gelirim.
17. Başkalarına söylemeyi istemeyeceğim bazı şeyleri sık sık rüyamda görürüm.
18. Gürültüler beni kolaylıkla uykumdan uyandırır.
19. Okuldaki düşük notlarımdan dolayı kendimi kötü hissettiğim olmuştur.
20. Kolaylıkla öfkelenirim.
21. Zihnimi tek bir şey üzerinde tutamıyorum.
22. Bazen küfretmek isterim.
23. Kendime olan güvenimi kolaylıkla kaybederim.
24. Bir topluluğun önünde konuşmak benim için çok zordur.
25. Hayatın bana adil davranmadığından eminim.
26. Yaptığım şeylerden pişman olurum.
27. Flört etmeyi severim.
28. Eğer bir sinemaya bilet almadan girebileceğim ve yakalanmayacağıma emin olsam herhalde bunu yapardım.
29. Tanımadığım herkesi sevmem.
30. Başkalarından daha sinirli olmadığımı inanırım.
31. Oyunlar ya da diğer organize faaliyetlere katılmak için gönüllü olduğumda utangaçlık hissederim.

32. Evde iyi huylu davranmak benim için zordur.
33. Sokaktaki insanların beni gözetlediğini sanır ve rahatsız olurum.
34. Eğer bir grup insan arasında bir konuşma başlatmam gerekirse çok tedirgin olurum.
35. Sosyal durumlarda tecrübesiz olduğum için utanırım.
36. Ailem bana karşı bir yetiştikenden çok bir çocukmuşum gibi davranır.
37. Çevremdeki birçokları kadar yetenekli ve zeki olduğuma inanırım.
38. Bir kriz veya zor durumla karşılaşmaktan kaçınırım.
39. İnsanlarla birlikte olsam bile çoğu zaman kendini yalnız hissederim.
40. Dış görünüşüm yüzünden rahatsız olurum.
41. Başına bir iş gelmesin diye hemen herkesin yalan söyleyebileceğine inanırım.
42. Gözlerim ışığa karşı çok hassastır.
43. Kolaylıkla üzülürüm.
44. Sık sık "Keşke yine küçük bir çocuk olsaydım", diye düşünürüm.
45. Arada sırada konuşulmayacak kadar kötü şeyler düşünürüm.
46. Sınıfta derse kalktığım zaman rahatsız olurum.
47. Evdeki sofrada adabım başkalarının yanında olduğum zamanlar kadar iyi değildir.
48. Kimse beni anlamıyor.
49. Hemen her gün beni korkutan bir şey olur.
50. Yabancıların yanında kendimi rahatsız hissederim.
51. Partilerde oldukça iyi vakit geçiririm.
52. Büyüdüğüm halde ailem sık sık kendilerine itaat etmemi bekler.
53. Yabancılarla karşılaşmaktan çekinmem.
54. Birisi benim kötülüğümü istiyor.
55. Sık sık sebepsiz yere cezalandırıldığımı hissederim.
56. Bazen burnuma tuhaf kokular gelir.
57. Küçük düşürücü olaylar beni çok uzun süre üzer.
58. Çoğu zaman kendimi dermansız hissederim.
59. Aşırı derecede sıkılғанım.
60. Sabahları kalktığımda kendimi yorgun hissediyorum.
61. Kolaylıkla ağlarım.
62. Trenlerde, otobüslerde vs. sık sık yabancılarla konuşurum.

63. İşler kötüye gitmeye başlayınca içimden hemen pes etmek gelir.
64. Çoğu zaman hayat benim için zorlukla doludur.
65. Bazen olayların gerçekliğinden şüphe ederim.
66. Bir sorunun cevabını bilmeme rağmen, sorulduğu zaman, sınıf önünde konuşma korkusuyla yanlış cevap verebilirim.
67. Ailem bende gereğinden fazla kusur buluyor.
68. Bazı zamanlar o kadar iyi işitirim ki rahatsız olurum.
69. Eğer fırsat verilse dünya için çok yararlı şeyler yapabildim.
70. Büyük bir gerginlik altında çalışırım.
71. Başkalarının yaşadığını sandığım mutluluğa özen duyarım.
72. Okuduğumu eskisi kadar iyi anlayamıyorum.
73. Bazen bir türlü toparlanıp işlerime bakamadığım öyle dönemler olmuştur ki bunlar günler, haftalar ya da aylarca sürebilir.
74. En zor mücadelelerim kendimle olanlardır.
75. Evde sinirli olurum.
76. Başkaları bakarken elimden gelenin en iyisini yapmak benim için zordur.
77. Kafam düşüncelerle o kadar doludur ki uyuyamam.
78. Bazen kontrol edemediğim gülme ve ağlama krizlerim tutar.
79. Günün sonuna doğru kendimi çok yorgun hissederim.
80. Hayatımı gerektiği şekilde sürdüremedim.
81. Kimse beni anlamıyor.
82. Bazen hiç sebepsiz yere hatta işler yolunda değilken bile kendimi çok mutlu hissederim.
83. Annem veya babam (veya her ikisi) çok sinirlidirler.
84. Bazen soğuk almadığım halde sesim kısılır.
85. Çevremde olanların farkında olmadığım ve yaptığım işin bir an için durduğu kopukluk nöbetleri geçirmişimdir.
86. Arkadaş edinmede ilk adımı atmaktan hoşlanırım.
87. Eleştirilmek beni çok rahatsız eder.
88. Kendimi sinirli addederim.
89. Kolaylıkla cesaretim kırılır.
90. Çoğu zaman ölmek isterdim.
91. Bazen evi terketmeyi çok istedim.
92. Yeni tanıştırıldığım bir kimseyle konuşacak bir konu bulmakta güçlük çekerim.

93. Ailemin fertleriyle çok az kavga ederim.
94. Gazetedeki her makaleyi her gün okumam.
95. Çoğu zaman kendimi üzgün hissederim.
96. Arada sırada bugün yapmam gereken işi yarına bırakırım.
97. Bir işe başlamakta güçlük çekerim.
98. Evden çıktığım zaman kapının iyi kilitlenmemiş ve pencerelerin kapanmamış olduğunu düşünüp üzülmem.
99. Dansa gitmeye bayılırım.
100. Bir grup insanın önünde konuşmak hoşuma gider.
101. Eleştirilmek ya da azarlanmak beni çok kırar.
102. Hiç nöbet ve havale geçirmedi.
103. Görebileceğim tüm ilgiyi görüyorum.
104. Lüzumsuz bir düşünce durmadan aklıma gelip beni tedirgin ediyor.
105. Eğer fırsat verilirse iyi bir lider olabilirim.
106. Oldukça bağımsız ve aile baskısından özgürüm.
107. Çok kuruntu yaparım.
108. Bazı zamanlar kendimi kesinlikle lüzumsuz hissederim.
109. Sağduyum bugünlerde her zamankinden daha iyi.
110. Hislerim kolaylıkla incinir.
111. Benim suçum olmadığı halde işlerim ters gider.
112. Annem-babam artık olgun bir insan olduğumu anlamıyorlar ve bana çocuk muamelesi yapıyorlar.
113. Çoğu kimseyle konuşmakta zorluk çekerim.
114. Diğer evlere oranla bizim evde çok az sevgi ve arkadaşlık var.
115. Çoğu geceler fikirler ve düşünceler beni rahatsız etmeden uyurum.
116. Bir grup insan içinde bildiğim bir konuda konuşma başlatmaktan veya fikrimi söylemekten çekinmem.
117. Günlük yaşantım bana ilginç gelen şeylerle doludur.
118. Çocukken bir ara bazı şeyler çaldım.
119. İnsanlar beni sık sık düş kırıklığına uğratar.
120. Ailem meslek olarak sevdiğim işi veya seçmeye niyetlendiğim işi sevmiyor.
121. Bana zararı dokunmayacağını bildiğim şeyler ve kimselerden korktuğum olmuştur.
122. Ailem benden çok fazla şey bekler.

123. Kendime hiç güvenim yok.
124. Hayal kurarım.
125. Davranışlarım başkaları tarafından kolaylıkla yanlış anlaşılabilir.
126. Sosyal faaliyetlerde herhangi bir insan kadar başarılıyım.
127. Dilencilere sadaka verilmesine karşıyım.
128. Bazen kendimi iyi hissetmediğim zaman aksi olurum.
129. Bazen aşağılık duygusu çekerim.
130. Benim hakkımda konuşulduğuna eminim.
131. Kolaylıkla utanırım.
132. Ailem birlikte gezdiğim arkadaşlara itiraz etmiştir.
133. Bazen şaşırtıcı veya zarar verici bir şeyler yapmak için dayanılmaz bir istek duyarım.
134. Bir grup arasındaki konuşmalarda söylenecek uygun bir laf bulmakta güçlük çekerim.
135. Aşkta düş kırıklığına uğradım.
136. Başkalarının bana kini olmasaydı çok daha başarılı olurum.
137. Hareketlerimi veya konuşmamı kontrol edemediğim fakat etrafımda olup bitenlerin farkında olduğum türden nöbetler geçirdim.
138. İştahım iyidir.
139. Evde diğer yerlerde olduğundan daha az anlayış görürüm.
140. Babam benim için ideal bir insandır.
141. Tanıdığım birinin başarısını duymak benim başarısız olduğumu hissetmeme yol açar.
142. Bir yabancı ile konuşmayı zor bulurum.
143. Ne annem ne de babam kolaylıkla öfkelenir.
144. Topluluklarda kalabalığa katılmaktansa, kendi kendime ya da tek bir kişiyle oturmam daha olağandır.
145. Yabancılarla kolaylıkla tanışırım.
146. Arada sırada ailemin sevdiğim fertlerine karşı bir nefret duyarım.
147. Acaip ve kendime özgü düşüncelerim vardır.
148. Akrabalarımın hemen hemen hepsi bana yakınlık gösterirler.
149. Başkalarının toplanmış ve konuşuyor oldukları bir odaya girmekten çekinmem.
150. Yalnız olduğum zamanlar acaip şeyler işitirim.
151. Ne annem ne de babam istekleri makul olsa da olmasa da itaat etmemde ısrar etmezler.

152. Uykum rahatsız ve intizamsızdır.
153. Meslek seçiminde anne ve babamla aynı fikirde değilim.
154. Sık sık yanlış ve kötü bir şey yaptığım hissine kapılıyorum.
155. Hastalığa yakalanmaktan korkmam.
156. Yeni insanlarla tanışınca konuşacak konu bulmak zoruma gider.
157. Aklımı kaçırmaktan korkuyorum.
158. Bazen sevdiğim insanları incitmekten zevk alırım.
159. Her zaman doğruyu söylemem.
160. Dikkatimi toplamakta başkalarından daha fazla zorluk çekerim.
161. Öyle anlarım olmuştur ki bazı faaliyetlerde bulunduğum halde sonradan ne yaptığımı hatırlayamamışımdır.
162. Bazı şeylerin ve olayların gerçek olmadığı kuşkusundan rahatsız oluyorum.
163. Hayatın bana adil davranmadığından eminim.
164. İyi beceremediğimden bazı oyunları oynamayı reddederim.
165. Herhangi bir hastalık için doktora gitmek zorunda kaldığım zaman korkarım.
166. Başkalarının görüldüğü kadar mutlu olmayı isterdim.
167. Anne ve babam çok modası geçmiş fikirlere sahiptirler.
168. Haftada en az bir kez heyecanlanırım.
169. Annemin, babamın veya her ikisinin beni sinirlendiren kişisel alışkanlıkları var.
170. Bazı konularda o kadar hassasım ki onlardan bahis bile edemem.
171. Beni rahatsız edici gürültü olmamasına rağmen uyumakta güçlük çekerim.
172. Duygularım nedenleri belli olmadan iyiye ya da kötüye yönelir.
173. Anne ve babamdan birisinin davranışları bende büyük korku uyandırmıştır.
174. Yeteneğimi küçümsediğim için bir kaç kez bir şey yapmaktan vazgeçmişimdir.
175. Başım ağrır.
176. Ailemden bazılarının yaptıkları şeyler beni korkutmuştur.
177. Başkalarıyla çabuk ve iyi kaynaşırım.
178. Çoğunlukla başka bir şey yapmaktansa oturup hayal kurmayı yeğlerim.
179. Kolaylıkla sıkılgaşıyorum.
180. Sağlığımı dikkatle izlemek gerektiğini duyuyorum.

181. Açık saçık hikayelerden utanırım.
182. Okulda sınıfın önünde konuşmayı çok güç bulurum.
183. Ev hayatım diğer insanlarınki kadar hoştur.
184. Önemli bir yemekte masadaki bir şeyi uzatmalarını istemek-tense o şaysız yaparım.
185. Başkaları yapmaya değmez derlerse, yapmak istediğim şeyden vazgeçebilirim.
186. Partileri ve toplantıları severim.
187. Başımdan çok acaip ve tuhaf olaylar geçmiştir.
188. Sosyal topluluklarda son derece iyi vakit geçiririm.
189. Çoğu kimsenin yanında tedirgin ve sıkılğan olurum.
190. En çok evimde mutlu ve rahat olurum.
191. Ne annem ne de babam davranışımda bir hata bulmuyorlar.
192. Bir çok arkadaşımın benimkinden daha mutlu bir ev hayat-ları olduğunu hissettim.
193. Karşıcinsle arkadaşlık temaslarında bulunmak benim için kolaydır.
194. Bir partide doğal davranmak benim için kolaydır.
195. İnsanlarla temaslarımda çekingenim.
196. Sosyal ilişkilerin benim hoşlanacağım kadar ciddi olmadı-ğını hissettim.
197. Ne annem ne de babam kolaylıkla kızmaz.
198. Düşünceler açısından bakılırsa ailem ve ben ayrı dünyalar-da yaşıyoruz.
199. Toplantı yada partilerde arka planda kalırım.
200. Ne annemin ne de babamın beni anlamadıklarını hissettim.
201. Umumi bir toplantıya herkes yerini aldıktan sonra girmek-ten utanırım.
202. Gündelik sosyal temaslara karşı kayıtsızım.
203. Partilerdeki eğlenecelerde aktif bir rol alırım.
204. Yakın akrabalarım arasında bir çok münakaşalar olmuştur.
205. Sosyal faaliyetler beni sıkar.
206. Bir grup insanın arasından ayrılmak için izin isterken utanırım.
207. Anne ve babamla evdeki işlerin nasıl yapılması gerektiği konusunda anlaşmazlığımız olmuştur.
208. Bir partide iyi vakit geçirmek benim için kolaydır.
209. Bir odada bir grup insan oturmuş konuşuyorsa tek başıma içe-ri girmekte tereddüt ederim.
210. Ne annem ne de babam beni haksız yere eleştiremezler.
211. Zamanında gereken şeyleri söylemekte güçlük çekerim.
212. Bir öğretmen umulmadık bir anda bana bir şey sorunca telaşlanırım.

APPENDIX B

ITEMS OF THE MCI ACCORDING TO THE SEVEN SCALES

ValiditySoru No

- 4 Bazen öfkelenirim.
- 7 Bir oyunda kazanmayı kaybetmeye tercih ederim.
- 11 Bazen biraz dedikodu yaparım.
- 12 Birkaç önemli kişi tanımak isterim, çünkü bu kendimi önemli hissettirir.
- 22 Bazen küfretmek isterim.
- 28 Eğer bir sinemaya bilet almadan girebileceğime ve yalanlanamayacağıma emin olsam herhalde bunu yapardım.
- 29 Tanıdığım herkesi sevmem
- 45 Arada sırada konuşulmayacak kadar kötü şeyler düşünürüm.
- 47 Evdeki sofra adabım başkalarının yanında olduğum zamanlar kadar iyi değildir.
- 94 Gazetedeki her makaleyi hergün okumam.
- 96 Arada sırada bugün yapmam gereken işi yarına bırakırım.
- 128 Bazen kendimi iyi hissetmediğim zaman aksi olurum.
- 156 Yeni insanlarla tanışınca konuşacak konu bulmak zoruma gider.
- 159 Her zaman doğruyu söylemem.

Family Relationships (FR)

Soru No

- 32 Evde iyi huylu davranmak benim için zordur.
- 52 Büyüdüğüm halde ailem sık sık kendilerine itaat etme-
mi bekler.
- 75 Evde sinirli olurum.
- 83 Annem veya babam (veya her ikisi) çok sinirlidir.
- 112 Annem babam artık olgun bir insan olduğumu anlamıyor-
lar ve bana çocuk muamelesi yapıyor.
- 122 Ailem benden çok fazla şey bekler.
- 132 Ailem birlikte gezdiğim arkadaşlara itiraz etmiştir.
- 139 Evde diğer yerlerde olduğundan daha az anlayıp görü-
rüm.
- 140 Babam benim için ideal bir insandır.
- 143 Ne annem ne de babam kolaylıkla öfkelenir.
- 151 Ne annem ne de babam istekleri makul olsa da olmasa
da itaat etmemde ısrar etmezler.
- 153 Meslek seçiminde anne ve babamla aynı fikirde değilim.
- 167 Anne ve babam çok modası geçmiş fikirlere sahiptirler.
- 169 Annemin babamın veya her ikisinin beni sinirlendiren
kişisel alışkanlıkları var.
- 173 Anne ve babamdan birisinin davranışları ben de büyük
korku uyandırmıştır.
- 190 En çok evimde mutlu ve rahat olurum.
- 191 Ne annem ne de babam davranışlarımda bir hata bulmu-
yorlar.
- 192 Birçok arkadaşımın benimkinden daha mutlu bir ev ha-
yatları olduğunu hissettim.
- 197 Ne annem ne de babam kolaylıkla kızmaz.
- 198 Düşünceler açısından bakılırsa ailem ve ben ayrı dün-
yalarda yaşıyoruz.
- 200 Ne annemin ne de babamın beni anlamadıklarını hisset-
tim.
- 204 Yakın akrabalarım arasında birçok münakaşalar olmuş-
tur.
- 207 Anne ve babamla evdeki işlerin nasıl yapılması gerek-
tiği konusunda anlaşmazlığımız olmuştur.
- 210 Ne annem ne de babam beni haksız yere eleştiremezler.

Social Relationships (SR)Soru No

- 9 Bir topluluğun neşe kaynağı olmak benim için kolaydır.
- 13 Eğer bir topluluk sıkıcı ise onu canlandırmakta öncülük ederim.
- 14 Fikirlerimi kolaylıkla açarım.
- 15 Yeni insanlarla tanışırken utanırım.
- 23 Kendime olan güvenimi kolaylıkla kaybederim.
- 24 Bir topluluğun önünde konuşmak benim için çok zordur.
- 31 Oyunlar ya da diğer organize faaliyetlere katılmak için gönüllü olduğumda utangaçlık hissederim.
- 34 Eğer bir grup insan arasında bir konuşma başlatmam gerekirse çok tedirgin olurum.
- 35 Sosyal durumlarda tecrübesiz olduğum için utanırım.
- 46 Sınıfta derse kalktığım zaman rahatsız olurum.
- 50 Yabancıların yanında kendimi rahatsız hissederim.
- 51 Partilerde oldukça iyi vakit geçiririm.
- 66 Bir sorunun cevabını bilmeme rağmen, sorulduğu zaman sınıf önünde konuşma korkusuyla yanlış cevap verebilirim.
- 76 Başkaları bakarken elimden gelenin en iyisini yapmak benim için zordur.
- 86 Arkadaş edinmede ilk adımı atmaktan hoşlanırım.
- 92 Yeni tanıştığım bir kimseyle konuşacak konu bulmada güçlük çekerim.
- 100 Bir grup insanın önünde konuşmak hoşuma gider.
- 113 Çoğu kimseyle konuşmakta zorluk çekerim.
- 126 Sosyal faaliyetlerde herhangi bir insan kadar başarılıyım.
- 134 Bir grup arasındaki konuşmalarda söylenecek uygun bir laf bulmakta güçlük çekerim.
- 142 Bir yabancı ile konuşmayı zor bulurum.
- 145 Yabancılarla kolaylıkla tanışırım.
- 179 Kolaylıkla sıkılmanlaşırım.
- 184 Önemli bir yemekte masadaki bir şeyi uzatmalarını istemektense o şeysiz yaparım.
- 188 Sosyal topluluklarda son derece iyi vakit geçiririm.
- 189 Çoğu kimsenin yanında sıkılman ve tedirgin olurum.

- 193 Karşı cinsle arkadaşlık temaslarında bulunmak benim için kolaydır.
- 194 Bir partide doğal davranmak benim için kolaydır.
- 195 İnsanlarla temaslarımda çekingenim.
- 196 Sosyal ilişkilerin benim hoşlanacağım kadar ciddi olmadığını hissettim.
- 199 Toplantı ya da partilerde arka planda kalırım.
- 201 Umumi bir toplantıya herkes yerini aldıktan sonra girmekten utanırım.
- 202 Gündelik sosyal temaslara karşı kayıtsızım.
- 203 Partilerde eğlencelerde aktif bir rol alırım.
- 205 Sosyal faaliyetler beni sıkar.
- 206 Bir grup insanın arasından ayrılmak için izin isterken utanırım.
- 208 Bir partide iyi vakit geçirmek benim için kolaydır.
- 209 Bir odada bir grup insan oturmuş konuşuyorsa tek başıma içeri girmekte tereddüt ederim.
- 211 Zamanında gereken şeyleri söylemekte güçlük çekerim.
- 212 Bir öğretmen umulmadık anda bana birşey sorunca telaşlanırım.

Emotional Stability (ES)Soru No

- 3 Kolaylıkla heyecanlanırım
- 6 İleride olabilecek kötü olayları düşünerek üzülrüm.
- 19 Okuldaki düşük notlarımdan dolayı kendimi kötü hissettiğim olmuştur.
- 20 Kolaylıkla öfkelenirim.
- 26 Yaptığım şeylerden pişman olurum.
- 33 Sokaktaki insanların beni gözetlediğini sanırım ve rahatsız olurum.
- 40 Dış görünüşüm yüzünden rahatsız olurum.
- 42 Gözlerim ışığa karşı çok hassastır.
- 43 Kolaylıkla üzülrüm.
- 57 Küçük düşürücü olaylar beni çok uzun süre üzer.
- 60 Sabahları kalktığımda kendimi yorgun hissediyorum.
- 71 Başkalarının yaşadığını sandığım mutluluğa özen duyarım.
- 77 Kafam düşüncelerle o kadar doludur ki uyuyamam.
- 79 Günün sonuna doğru kendimi çok yorgun hissederim.
- 87 Eleştirilmek beni çok rahatsız eder.
- 88 Kendimi sinirli addederim.
- 89 Kolaylıkla cesaretim kırılır.
- 104 Lüzumsuz bir düşünce durmadan aklıma gelip beni terdirgin ediyor.
- 110 Hislerim kolaylıkla incinir.
- 111 Benim suçum olmadığı halde işlerim ters gider.
- 124 Hayal kurarım.
- 129 Bazen aşağılık duygusu çekerim.
- 162 Bazı şeylerin ve olayların gerçek olmadığı kuşkusundan rahatsız oluyorum.
- 165 Herhangi bir hastalık içindoktora gitmek zorunda kaldığım zaman korkarım.
- 171 Beni rahatsız edici gürültü olmamasına rağmen uyumakta güçlük çekerim.
- 172 Duygularım nedenleri belli olmadan iyiye ya da kötüye yönelir.
- 175 Başım ağrır.
- 180 Sağlığımı dikkatle izlemek gerektiğini duyuyorum.

ConformitySoru No

- 5 Zihnimi bir iş üzerinde tutmak benim için zordur.
- 10 Ailem sık sık beraber dolaştığım insanlara karşı çıkmıştır.
- 25 Hayatın bana adil davranmadığından eminim.
- 54 Birisi benim kötülüğümü istiyor.
- 67 Ailem bende gereğinden fazla kusur buluyor.
- 74 En zor mücadelelerim kendimle olanlardır.
- 80 Hayatımı gerektiği şekilde sürdüremedim.
- 81 Kimse beni anlamıyor.
- 91 Bazen evi terk etmeyi çok istedim.
- 93 Ailemin fertleri ile çok az kavga ederim.
- 106 Oldukça bağımsız ve aile baskısından özgürüm.
- 114 Diğer evlere oranla bizim evde çok az sevgi ve arkadaşlık var.
- 118 Çocukken bir ara bazı şeyler çaldım.
- 120 Ailem meslek olarak sevdiğim işi veya seçmeye niyetlendiğim işi sevmiyor.
- 125 Davranışlarım başkaları tarafından kolaylıkla yanlış anlaşılabilir.
- 127 Dilencilere sadaka verilmesine karşıyım.
- 130 Benim hakkında konuşulduğuna eminim.
- 135 Aşkta düş kırıklığına uğradım.
- 136 Başkalarının bana kini olmasaydı çok daha başarılı olurum.
- 148 Akrabalarımın hemen hepsi bana yakınlık gösterirler.
- 154 Sık sık yanlış ve kötü bir şey yaptığım hissine kapılırım.
- 166 Başkalarının görüldüğü kadar mutlu olmayı isterdim.
- 183 Ev hayatım diğer insanlarınki kadar hoştur.
- 187 Başımdan çok acaip ve tuhaf olaylar geçmiştir.

Adjustment to Reality

Soru No

- 17 Başkalarına söylemeyi istemeyeceğim bazı şeyleri sık sık rüyamda görürüm.
- 21 Zihnimi tek birşey üzerinde tutamıyorum.
- 36 Ailem bana karşı bir yetişkinden çok bir çocukmuşum gibi davranır.
- 39 İnsanlarla birlikte olsam bile çoğu zaman kendimi yalnız hissederim.
- 45 Arada sırada konuşulmayacak kadar kötü şeyler düşünürüm.
- 48 Kimse beni anlamıyor.
- 49 Hemen hergün beni korkutan bir şey olur.
- 55 Sık sık sebepsiz yere cezalandırıldığımı hissederim.
- 56 Bazen burnuma tuhaf kokular gelir.
- 64 Çoğu zaman hayatbenim için zorluklarla doludur.
- 65 Bazen olayların geçerliğinden şüphe ederim.
- 68 Bazı zamanlar o kadar iyi işitirim ki rahatsız olurum.
- 72 Okuduğumu eskisi kadar iyi anlayamıyorum.
- 73 Bazen bir türlü toparlanıp işlerime bakamadığım öyle dönemler olmuştur ki bunlar günler, haftalar ya da aylarca sürebilir
- 78 Bazen kontrol edemediğim gülme ve ağlama krizlerim tutar.
- 84 Bazen soğuk almadığım halde sesim kısılır.
- 85 Çevremde olanların farkında olmadığım ve yaptığım işin bir an için durduğu kopukluk nöbetleri geçirmiştir.
- 90 Çoğu zaman ölmek isterdim.
- 95 Çoğu zaman kendimi üzgün hissederim.
- 97 Bir işe başlamakta güçlük çekerim.
- 103 Görebileceğim tüm ilgiyi görüyorum.
- 121 Bana zararı dokunmayacağını bildiğim şeyler ve kişilerden korktuğum olmuştur.
- 133 Bazen şaşırtıcı veya zarar verici bir şeyler yapmak için dayanılmaz bir istek duyarım.
- 137 Hareketlerimi veya konuşmamı kontrol edemediğim fakat etrafımda olup bitenlerin farkında olduğum türden nöbetler geçirdim.

- 146 Arada sırada ailemin sevdiğim fertlerine karşı bir nefret duyarım.
- 147 Acaip ve kendime özgü düşüncelerim vardır.
- 150 Yalnız olduğum zamanlar acaip şeyler işitirim.
- 158 Bazen sevdiğim insanları incitmekten zevk alırım.
- 160 Dikkatimi toplamakta başkalarından daha fazla zorluk çekerim.
- 161 Öyle anlarım olmuştur ki bazı faaliyetlerde bulunduğum halde sonradan ne yaptığımı hatırlayamamışımdır.
- 163 Hayatın bana adil davranmadığından eminim.
- 164 İyi beceremediğimden bazı oyunları oynamayı reddederim
- 168 Haftada en az bir kez heyecanlanırım.
- 170 Bazı konularda o kadar hassasım ki onlardan bahis bile edemem.
- 176 Ailemden bazılarının yaptıkları şeyler beni korkutmuştur.
- 178 Çoğunlukla başka birşey yapmaktansa oturup haya kurmayı yeğlerim.

Mood (M)Soru No

- 1 Geçen bir kaç yılda sağlığım genellikle iyi idi.
- 5 Zihnimi bir iş üzerinde tutmak benim için zordur.
- 16 İlk tepki onlardan gelmezse uzun süredir görüşmediğim kimseleri ya da okul arkadaşlarımı görmemezlikten getiririm.
- 18 Gürültüler beni kolaylıkla uykumdan uyandırır.
- 22 Bazen küfretmek isterim.
- 27 Flört etmeyi severim.
- 30 Başkalarından daha sinirli olduğuma inanırım.
- 37 Çevremdeki birçokları kadar yetenekli ve zeki olduğuma inanırım.
- 58 Çoğu zaman kendimi dermansız hissederim.
- 61 Kolaylıkla ağlarım.
- 70 Büyük bir gerginlik altında çalışırım.
- 72 Okuduğumu eskisi kadar iyi anlayamıyorum.
- 73 Bazen bir türlü toparlanıp işlerime bakamadığım öyle dönemler olmuştur ki bunlar günler, haftalar ya da aylarca sürebilir.
- 82 Bazen hiç sebepsiz yere hatta işler yolunda değilken bile kendimi çok mutlu hissederim.
- 97 Bir işe başlamakta güçlük çekerim.
- 98 Evden çıktığım zaman kapının iyi kilitlenmemiş ve pencerelerin kapanmamış olduğunu düşünüp üzülmem.
- 101 Eleştirilmek ya da azarlanmak beni çok kırar.
- 102 Hiç nöbet ve havale geçirmedi.
- 107 Çok kuruntu yaparım.
- 108 Bazı zamanlar kendimi kesinlikle lüzumsuz hissederim.
- 109 Sağduyum bugünlerde her zamankinden iyi.
- 115 Çoğu geceler fikirler ve düşünceler beni rahatsız etmeden uyurum.
- 117 Günlük yaşantım bana ilginç gelen şeylerle doludur.
- 123 Kendime hiç güvenim yok.
- 138 İştahım iyidir.
- 152 Uykum rahatsız ve intizamsızdır.
- 155 Hastalığa yakalanmaktan korkmam.
- 157 Aklımı kaçırmaktan korkuyorum.
- 166 Başkalarının görüldüğü kadar mutlu olmayı isterdim.
- 177 Başkalarıyla çabuk ve iyi kaynaşırım.

Leadership (L)

Soru No

- 2 Diğer insanlar kadar çabuk arkadaş edinirim.
- 8 İnsanlar kolaylıkla sabrımı tüketir.
- 38 Bir kriz veya zor durumla karşılaşmaktan kaçınırım.
- 41 Başınabir iş gelmesin diye hemen herkesin yalan söyleyebileceğine inanırım.
- 44 Sık sık "keşke yine küçük bir çocuk olsaydım" diye düşünürüm.
- 53 Yabancılarla karşılaşmaktan çekinmem.
- 59 Aşırı derece de sıkılganım.
- 62 Trenlerde, otobüslerde v.s. sık sık yabancılarla konuşurum.
- 63 İşler kötüye gitmeye başlayınca içimden hemen pes etmek gelir.
- 69 Eğer fırsat verilse dünya için çok yararlı şeyler yapabilirdim.
- 84 Bazen soğuk almadığım halde sesim kısılır.
- 99 Dansa gitmeye bayılırım.
- 105 Eğer fırsat verilirse iyi bir lider olabilirim.
- 116 Bir grup insan içinde bildiğim bir konuda konuşma başlatmaktan veya fikrimi söylemekten çekinmem.
- 119 İnsanlar beni sık sık düş kırıklığına uğratar.
- 131 Kolaylıkla utanırım.
- 141 Tanıdığım birininbaşarısını duymak benim başarısız olduğumu hissetmeme yol açar.
- 144 Topluluklara, kalabalığa katılmaktansa, kendi kendime ya da tek kişiyle oturmam daha olağandır.
- 149 Başkalarının toplanmış ve konuşuyor oldukları bir odaya girmekten çekinmem.
- 174 Yeteneğimi küçümsediğim için bir kaç kez bir şey yapmaktan vazgeçmişimdir.
- 181 Açık saçık hikayelerden utanırım.
- 182 Okulda sınıf önünde konuşmayı çok güç bulurum.
- 185 Başkaları yapmaya değmez derlerse, yapmak istediğim şeyden vazgeçebilirim.
- 186 Partileri ve toplantıları severim.

APPENDIX C
STUDENT EVALUATION FORMS
FOR TEACHERS IN TURKISH AND IN ENGLISH

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM
(Social Relationships)

Which of the Lycee L students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student is gregarious, socially mature individual. He/She usually appears to be happy and comfortable when with groups of students or adults. He/She appears to enjoy talking with others and is interested what others say. This student seems to have a genuine liking for others and is well-liked by them. He/She conducts himself/herself appropriately in social situations. For example this student may:

- 1- Easily attend school functions.
- 2- Answer the ques comfortably in class.
- 3- Easily ask questions and express his/her opinions.
- 4- Take the lead in popping the group up, if a group is dull.
- 5- Not be embarrassed to be called upon to start a discussion or give an opinion about something he/she knows well.
- 6- Usually preffers group activities.
- 7- Be comfortable, when he/she meets new people.
- 8- Not have difficalty in starting conversation and making friends.
- 9- Have no dread of going into a room or class by himself/herself where other people have already gathered and are talking.
- 10- Not be embarrassed when he/she has to ask permission to leave a group of people.
- 11- Not get upset when a teacher calls on him/her unexpectedly.
- 12- Volunteer to answer questions in class.

Boys

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Girls

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

(Social Relationships)

Which of the Lycee I students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student is socially inopt or under-socialized person. He/She often seems to be unhappy and uncomfortable when with groups of students or adults. He/She does not enjoy talking or associating with others. He/She has difficulty to be involved in the new social relations. For example this student may:

- 1- Refuse to attend school functions.
- 2- Know the answer to a question, but fail when called upon because of fear of speaking before the class.
- 3- Not ask questions and express ideas easily.
- 4- Find it very hard to talk and to be with others.
- 5- Have difficulty speaking before groups of people.
- 6- Prefer activities he/she can be alone or do alone.
- 7- Not feel comfortable when meets new people.
- 8- Find difficult to start a conversation.
- 9- Hesitate to enter a room or class, when a group of people are sitting around the room talking.
- 10- Be embarressed when must ask permission to leave a group of people.
- 11- Get upset when a teacher calls on him/her unexpectedly.
- 12- Be embarrassed to answer questions in class.

Boys

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Girls

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM
(Emotional Stability)

Which of the Lyceé I students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student is frequently unhappy. In general he/she appears to be emotionally unstable. This student often overreacts emotionally to what appears to be trivial situations. He/she appears tense or anxious. For example this student may.

- 1- Gets exhausted easily.
- 2- Be depressed and cries easily because of getting low marks in the school.
- 3- Worry over humiliating experiences, get discouraged a disappointed easily.
- 4- Be either fearful and timid or overaggressive in new situations.
- 5- Cry under stress or complex situations.
- 6- Not like to be criticized.
- 7- Often complain about physical disturbance.

Boys

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Girls

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM
(Emotional Stability)

Which of the Lyceé I students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student seldom worries. He/she is not likely to be self-conscious or lacking in self-confidence, tends to be calm and relaxed most of the time. Rarely asking advice he/she is capable of making his/her own decisions. For example this student may:

- 1- Not get excited easily.
- 2- Not have been depressed because of low marks he gets in school.
- 3- Not get angry or upset easily. He may not worry too much over the humiliating experiences. He may not get disappointed or discouraged easily.
- 4- Not show fear or aggressiveness in new circumstances or strong situations and usually behaves efficiently in emergencies.
- 5- Not cry easily.
- 6- Be open to criticisms and discussions and these does not disturb him at all.
- 7- Not complain about physical disturbances.

Boys

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Girls

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM
(Emotional Stability)

Which of the Lyceé I students that you know conform best to this description?

This student is reliable and responsible, confirming to rules and behaviour codes even when he/she may not agree with them. Instead of rebelling against such regulations, this student attempts to have them changed through orderly procedures. He/she ordinarily shows respect to persons in authority. Although not necessarily dole nor overly submissive, they understand the need for social organization. This student causes little disturbance in school. For example this student may.

- 1- Not commit the same offense repeatedly.
- 2- Rarely have unexcused absences
- 3- Complete assignments on time.
- 4- Not be noisy and rowdy in class or study hall.
- 5- Behave properly, does not receive warnings.
- 6- Not be sent to the discipline committee.

Boys

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Girls

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

(Conformity Scale)

Which of the Lyceé I students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student is irresponsible and impulsive, perhaps expressing much feeling and evolution but really experiencing very little. He/she is somewhat superficial, learns little from experience, and unreliable. He/she tends to resist conforming to rules and regulations, is rebellious against authority, and is self-centered and individualistic, causing. Difficulty in class and likely to get into frequent trouble. For example, this student may:

- 1- Commit the same offences repeatedly even though verbally acknowledging it is wrong.
- 2- Frequently have unexcused absences.
- 3- Not complete assignments on time, or at all.
- 4- Be noisy and rowdy in class or study hall.
- 5- Be warned frequently by teachers and administration, due to his behaviour.
- 6- Be sent to the principal frequently.

Boys

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Girls

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM
(Adjustment to Reality)

Which of the Lyceé I students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student has difficulty in making friends and establishing relationships with groups. He/she reveals little emotion. He/she is often secretive, withdrawn, shy sensitive and easily embarrassed. He/she withdraws from threatening situations in order to avoid them. He/she may daydream frequently. This student is very often the one who escapes the counselor's or teacher's attention because their withdrawing behavior is inconspicuous and causes little trouble for anyone else. For example this student may:

- 1- Ramble and introduce irrelevant details in speaking.
- 2- Shun competition, although he/she daydreams of success.
- 3- Have more trouble in concentrating than others seem to have.
- 4- Have had blank spells in which his/her activities were interrupted and he/she didn't know what was going on around him/her.
- 5- Write odd themes or work on peculiar inventions or hobbies.

Boys

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Girls

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM
(Adjustment to Reality)

Which of the Lyceé I students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student is able to make friends and establishing relationships with groups. He/she has little difficulty in communicating with others and do not fear sharing his/her emotional experiences. He/she seems to deal rather effectively with reality. For example this student may.

- 1- Not introduce irrelevant details when speaks about a certain topic.
- 2- Frequently wellcome competition.
- 3- Easily concentrate on a subject or a task for a long time.
- 4- Control his/her movements or speech.
- 5- Approaches threatening situations in order to master them.

Boys

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Girls

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM (Mood)

Which of the Lyceé I students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student has poor morale. He/she seems to be depressed and "blue" most of the time. This student lacks self-confidence. For example this student may:

- 1- Not comfortable in his/her relations most of the time.
- 2- Complain of the hopelessness of trying to do things.
- 3- Not persevere with scholastic tasks very long.
- 4- Frequently finds himself/herself worrying about events.
- 5- Become easily discouraged and distracted, he/she lacks hope in the future.

Boys

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Girls

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM
(Mood)

Which of the Lyceé I students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student maintains good or appropriate morale. He/she is cheerful most of the time. Being self-confident, he/she regard the future optimistically and makes long-range plans. Furthermore he/she is enthusiastic and optimistic about the plans of others. For example this student may:

- 1- Quickly recover, when depressed or discouraged
- 2- Frequently smile and laugh.
- 3- Tries to keep high morale even things don't go right.
- 4- Mix with others well and easily.
- 5- Have plans for the future, he/she is an optimist.

Boys

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Girls

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM
(Leadership)

Which of the Lyceé I students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student is often inept in social situations and likely to avoid participation in groups. Even if he/she participates, he cannot show initiative in developing and carrying out ideas.

For example this student may:

- 1- Not initiate conversation in a group.
- 2- Frequently stay in the background at parties or social gatherings.
- 3- Try to avoid difficult situations.
- 4- Apt to pass up something he/she wants to do when others feel that it isn't worth doing.
- 5- Give up easily when things go wrong.

<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM
(Leadership)

Which of the Lyceé I students that you know conforms best to this description?

This student has outstanding leadership skills and in general knows how to work well with others. He/she readily assumes responsibilities in groups to which he/she belongs and shows initiative in developing and carrying out ideas. Other students frequently recognize such qualities placing this student in positions of leadership, such as school activities and activity offices. For example this student may:

- 1- Initiate conversation in a group.
- 2- Be responsible for making plans and directing the actions of other people and friends.
- 3- Overcome the difficulties, give suggestions and persuade other people.
- 4- Not pass up something when others feel that it isn't worth doing.
- 5- Not give up quickly when things go wrong.

Boys

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Girls

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU
(Social Relationships)

Sizce Lise I öğrencileriniz arasından hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en fazla uymaktadır?

Toplulukla birlikte olmayı seven, sosyal bir öğrencidir. Grup içinde de mutlu ve rahattır. Başkaları ile birlikte olmaktan, onlarla sohbet etmekten hoşlanır. Aynı şekilde başkalarının söylediklerine de ilgi duyar, onlar tarafından da aynı şekilde sevilir. Sosyal ilişkilerinde uygun şekilde davranır, girişkendir. Örneğin bu öğrenci:

- 1- Okuldaki grup faaliyetlerine çekinmeden katılabilir.
- 2- Sınıfta soru sorulduğu zaman rahatlıkla cevaplar.
- 3- Kendisi de kolaylıkla soru sorabilir, fikirlerini rahatlıkla ileri sürer.
- 4- Sıkıcı ve durgun bir gruba katıldığı zaman hareket ve canlılık getirebilir.
- 5- Bir topluluk önünde konuşmak onun için kolaydır. Konuşacak konu bulmada güçlük çekmez. Rahatlıkla sohbet başlar ve sürdürür.
- 6- Genellikle grup faaliyetlerini tercih eder.
- 7- Yabancıların ya da yeni tanıdığı kimselerin yanında rahattır.
- 8- Arkadaş edinmede, konuşmaları başlatmada ilk adımı o atabilir.
- 9- Sınıfa veya kalabalkı bir toplantıya herkes yerini aldıktan sonra girdiğinde utangaçlık ve çekingenlik göstermez.
- 10- Sınıftan ya da kalabalık bir toplantıdan ayrılmak için izin isterken de çekingenlik göstermez, rahattır.
- 11- Umulmadık bir anda kendisine bir şey sorulduğunda heyecanlanmaz, çekinmez.
- 12- Sözlü yoklamalarda kendi isteği ile derse kalkar.

Erkek

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Kız

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU

(Social Relationships)

Sizce Lise I öğrencilerinizden hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en fazla uymaktadır?

Sosyal ilişkilerde beceriksizdir. Arkadaş veya büyüklerle beraber olduğu zaman genellikle kendini rahatsız hissederek, olduğu gibi görünmekte zorluk çeker. Grup içinde sohbetlere katılmaz. Çekingendir. Yeni ilişkileri girmekte güçlük çeker. Örneğin bu öğrenci:

- 1- Okulda gruplar halinde yapılan faaliyetlere katılmayı red edebilir.
- 2- Sınıfta kendisine söz hakkı verildiğinde, sorunun cevabını bilse bile cevap vermeye çekinebilir.
- 3- Kendisi de sınıfta rahatça soru soramaz, fikirlerini rahatlıkla ileri süremez.
- 4- Başkaları ile birlikte olmaktan, konuşmaktan kaçınır.
- 5- Bir topluluğun önünde konuşmaktan zorluk çeker.
- 6- Genellikle yalnız başına yapılacak faaliyetleri tercih eder.
- 7- Yabancıların ya da yeni tanıdığı kimselerin yanında rahat değildir.
- 8- Konuşmayı başlatmada ilk adımı o atamaz.
- 9- Sınıfa veya birtoplantıya tek başına içeri girmesi gerektiğinde de çekinir ve tereddüt eder.
- 10- Sınıftan veya bir toplantıdan tek başına ayrılmak için izin istemeğe çekinir ve utanır.
- 11- Umulmadık anda kendisine bir şey sorulduğunda heyecanlanır.
- 12- Sözlü yoklamalarda hazır olsa bile, kendi isteği ile derse kalkmaz.

Erkek

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Kız

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU
(Emotional Stability)

Sizce Lise I öğrencilerinin arasından hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en fazla uymaktadır?

Bu öğrencinin kendisine güveni vardır. Sıkılğan değildir. Çoğu zaman sakin ve rahattır. Ani duygusal değişiklikler göstermez. Mutludur. Çoğunlukla kendi kararlarını kendi verir, başkalarından nadiren yardım ister. Örneğin bu öğrenci:

- 1- Kolay heyecanlanmaz.
- 2- Okulda düşük not aldığı zaman aşırı derecede üzüntüsünü belli etmez, ağlamaz.
- 3- Cesareti kolay kolay kırılmaz, kolay incinip, sinirlenmez. Olayların uzun süre etkisinde kalmaz.
- 4- Acil ve yeni durumlarla karşılaştığı zaman ani korkaklık, ürkeklik ya da saldırganlık göstermez.
- 5- Kolay ağlamaz.
- 6- Eleştiriye açıktır. Eleştirilmek onu rahatsız etmez.
- 7- Sık sık fiziksel rahatsızlıklardan yakınmaz.

Erkek

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Kız

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU

(Adjustment to Reality)

Sizce Lise I öğrencileriniz arasından hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en iyi uymaktadır?

Bu öğrenci bir grupta kişiler arası ilişki kurmada güçlük çekebilir. Duygularını ve düşüncelerini açığa vurmaz. İçine kapanık çekingen, korkak ve utangaç bir öğrencidir. Tehdit edici durumlardan kaçır. Hayal aleminde yaşıyor gibidir. Genellikle öğretmenlerin dikkatinden kaçmayı başarır. Çünkü içine kapanık davranışları ile pek göze çarpmaz. Örneğin bu öğrenci:

- 1- Konuşurken konuyu dağıtır, ilgisiz ayrıntılar üzerinde durur.
- 2- Başarılı olabilme hayallerine karşılık gayret göstermez.
- 3- Bir işe başlamakta ve dikkatini bir iş üzerinde toplamakta zorluk çeker.
- 4- Etrafında olup bitenlerin farkında olmadığı kriz ve nöbetler geçirmiştir.
- 5- Alışılmışın dışında garip görünen konular hakkında fikir yürütür, ya da bu tür konuları kaleme alır.

Erkek

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Kız

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU

(Adjustment to Reality)

Sizce Lise I öğrencileriniz arasından hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en iyi uymaktadır?

Bu öğrenci çevresiyle iyi ilişkiler kurabilir. Duygularını, düşüncelerini açığa vurur, diğerleri ile paylaşır. Gerçek dışı kavram düşünce ve hareketlerle ilgilenmez. Gerçekçidir. Anlamsız, nedensiz korkuları ve endişeleri yoktur. Örneğin bu öğrenci:

- 1- Bir konuda konuşurken o konuyla ilişkisi olmayan detaylara girmez.
- 2- Başarılı olabilmek için gayret eder, başkalarıyla rekabete girmekten kaçınmaz.
- 3- Dikkatini kolaylıkla ve uzun süre bir işin üzerinde tutabilir.
- 4- Hareketlerini ve konuşmasını kontrol edebilir, etrafında olup bitenlerin farkındadır.
- 5- Yıldırıcı ve tehdit edici durumlarda güçlüklerin üstesinden gelmeye çalışır.

Erkek

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Kız

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU
(Mood)

Sizce Lise I öğrencileriniz arasından hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en fazla uymaktadır?

Bu öğrenci iyi bir maneviyat ve moral içindedir, çoğu zaman neşelidir. Çoğu zaman kendine güveni vardır. Geleceğe ve olaylara güvenle ve iyimser olarak bakar. Çevresindekilerin gelecekleri ile de ilgilenmeye heveslidir. Beden ve ruh sağlığının yerinde olduğuna inanır. Örneğin bu öğrenci:

- 1- Kederli ve üzüntülü olduğu zaman veya hayal kırıklığına uğradığı zaman, kolaylıkla eski haline döner, cesareti kolay kırılmaz.
- 2- Güler yüzlüdür.
- 3- İşleri yolunda olmadığı zamanlar bile o-ların üstesinden gelmek için çaba sarfeder, moralini bozmaz.
- 4- Başkaları ile çabuk ve iyi kaynaşır.
- 5- Geleceğe ait planları vardır, iyimserdir.

Erkek

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Kız

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU
(Mood)

Sizce Lise I öğrencileriniz arasından hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en iyi uymaktadır?

Bu öğrenci çoğu zaman canı sıkılmış ve kederli bir haldedir. Neşesizdir. Kendisine güveni yoktur. Örneğin bu öğrenci:

- 1- Başkaları ile çabuk ve rahat ilişki kuramaz.
- 2- Bazı zamanlar bir türlü toparlanıp işleri ve görevleri ile meşgul olamaz.
- 3- Bir işe başlamakta güçlük çeker.
- 4- Olayları çok düşünür ve kuruntu eder.
- 5- Cesareti çabuk kırılır. Gelecekte ümitsizdir.

Erkek

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Kız

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU

(Conformity)

Sizce Lise I öğrencileriniz arasından hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en fazla uymaktadır?

Güvenilir ve sorumlu bir öğrencidir. Kabul etmese bile kurallara ve yapılması gereken davranışlara uyar. Kuralları isyankârlık göstermeden normal bir düzen içinde değiştirmeye çalışır. Saygılıdır. Fazlaca boyun eğen, itaatkâr bir öğrenci olmamakla birlikte, sosyal yaşamdaki kuralların gerekliliklerini ve buna olan ihtiyacı anlar. Onaylamadığı kurallara karşı isyankârlık göstermez, okuldaki otoriteye karşı da saygı gösterir. Okulda sorunlara çok nadir neden olur. Örneğin bu öğrenci:

- 1- Yaptığı bir kusuru veya suçu tekrarlamaz.
- 2- Nadiren özürsüz devamsızlıklar yapar.
- 3- Verilen ödevleri zamanında tamamlar.
- 4- Sınıfta veya çalışma sırasında etrafı rahatsız edici hareketler yapmaz.
- 5- Öğretmenlerinden veya idareden ikazlar almaz.
- 6- Disiplin kuruluna çıkacak davranışlarda bulunmaz.

Erkek

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Kız

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU

(Conformity)

Sizce Lise I öğrencileriniz arasından hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en fazla uymaktadır?

Sorumsuzdur ve düşüncesizce hareket eder. Kayıtsızdır. Yaşadığı tecrübelerden birşey öğrenmez. Güvenilir bir kişi değildir. Düzene ve kurallara uymamaya eğilimlidir. Otoriteye karşı isyankârdır. Hep kendini düşünür, bireyseldir. Sınıfta sık sık zorluklara ve rahatsızlıklara neden olur. Örneğin bu öğrenci;

- 1- Doğruluğunu sözlü olarak kabul etse bile aynı kusuru ya da suçu tekrarlar.
- 2- Sık sık özürsüz devamsızlıklar yapar.
- 3- Verilen ödevleri zamanında yapmaz, ya da hiç yapmaz.
- 4- Sınıfta veya bir çalışma sırasında gürültü yapar ve karışıklık çıkarmaya meyillidir.
- 5- Rahatsız edici davranışları ile sık sık öğretmenlerden veya idareden ikazlar alır.
- 6- Sık sık disipline çıkar.

Erkek

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Kız

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU

(Leadership)

Sizce Lise I öğrencileriniz arasından hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en fazla uymaktadır?

Bu öğrencinin liderlik becerileri vardır ve başkaları ile nasıl çalışılacağını iyi bilir. Ait olduğu grupta sorumluluk almaya hazırdır. Grupta fikirlerin geliştirilmesinde ve yürütülmesinde teşviki edici, başlatıcı rol oynar. Diğer öğrenciler onun bu özelliklerini sayar, kabul eder ve onu idareci durumuna getirirler. Örneğin bu öğrenci:

- 1- Bir grup içinde konuşmayı başlatır.
- 2- Okuldaki sosyal faaliyetlere katılır, hatta bunları organize edip yürütebilir.
- 3- Zor durumların üstesinden gelmeyi becerir. Fikirler ortaya atar, bu fikirlerin yürütülmesinde önderlik eder.
- 4- Başkalarının sözü ile yapmak istediği işten vaz geçmez.
- 5- Başladığı iş kötüye gitse bile hemen pes etmez; uğraşır, üstesinden gelmeye çalışır.

Erkek

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Kız

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

ÖĞRENCİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU
(Leadership)

Sizce Lise I öğrencilerinin arasından hangileri aşağıdaki tarife en fazla uymaktadır?

Bu öğrenci sosyal ilişkilerde beceriksizdir. Gruplara katılmaktan kaçınır. Katılsa bile bir grubun idare edilmesinde, faaliyetlerin planlanıp yürütülmesinde önderlik edemez. Örneğin bu öğrenci:

- 1- Bir grup içinde konuşma başlatmakta öncülük edemez.
- 2- Kalabalık ile birlikte olmak veya bir faaliyete katılmaktansa tek başına ya da bir-iki kişiyle olmayı tercih eder.
- 3- Zor durumlarla karşılaşmaktan kaçınır.
- 4- Yapmak istediği işlerden başkalarının sözü ile ya da kendini yeterli bulmadığı için vaz geçebilir.
- 5- İşler kötüye gitmeye başlayınca hemen pes eder.

Erkek

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Kız

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

APPENDIX D
STUDENT EVALUATION FORM FOR FAMILIES

Sevgili Anne ve Baba

Elinizdeki bu form yapılmakta olan bir araştırmaya hizmet etmek amacıyla hazırlanmıştır. Aşağıdaki maddelerde kimimiz için geçerli, kimimiz içinse geçerli olmayan cümleler vardır. Hiç birinin doğru veya yanlış kesin bir cevabı yoktur. Gerçek görüş ve izlenimlerinizi çocuğunuz yı göz önünde tutarak doldurunuz.

Her bir cümleyi okuduktan sonra, eğer cümle sizin için uygun veya genellikle uygun ise bu cümlelerin yanındaki "Doğru" sütununun altına gelen boşluğu karalayın. Eğer bu cümle size göre uygun değil veya genellikle uygun değil ise bu cümlelerin yanındaki "Yanlış" sütununun altına gelen boşluğu karalayın. Soruları cevapsız bırakmamaya çalışın.

Bir hafta içinde bu formu doldurup bize postalamanız, dolduramayacağınız takdirde bizi haberdar etmeniz araştırmanın sağlıklı yürümesi bakımından önemlidir.

- 1- Çocuğumuz evde iyi huylu davranmakta zorluk çekiyor.
- 2- Çocuğumuz ne kadar büyürse büyüsün onun bize itaatkâr davranmasını bekliyoruz.
- 3- Çocuğumuz evde genellikle sinirlidir.
- 4- Ben ya da eşim evde genellikle sınırlı davranıyoruz.
- 5- Onu bu yaşta henüz olgunlaşmış sayamayız.
- 6- Ondan bir çok beklentilerimiz vardır.
- 7- Çocuğumuzun birlikte gezdiği insanlara itirazımız olmamıştır.
- 8- Çocuğumuz başkalarını bizden daha anlayışlı bulur.
- 9- Onun için ideal bir insan olduğumuzu sanıyoruz.
- 10- Kolay kolay öfkelenmeyiz.
- 11- İsteklerimiz makul olsa da, onu itaat etmeye zorlamayız.
- 12- Meslek seçiminde bizimle aynı yönde düşünmüyor.
- 13- Şimdiki anlayış, düşünce ve fikirleri yadırgıyoruz.
- 14- Bizim bazı kişisel alışkanlıklarımıza sinirleniyor.
- 15- Onda büyük korku uyandıracak davranışlarımız olmuştur.
- 16- Çocuğumuz en çok evimizde mutlu ve rahattır.
- 17- Onun davranışlarında bir hata bulmuyoruz.
- 18- Bir çok arkadaşının kendisinininkinden daha mutlu bir ev hayatı olduğunu düşünüyor.
- 19- Ne ben ne de eşim kolay kolay kızmayız.
- 20- Düşünceler açısından onunla farklı dünyalarda yaşıyoruz.
- 21- Onu anlayamadığımızı zannediyor.
- 22- Zaman zaman aile içinde münakaşalarımız olmuştur.
- 23- Bazen evdeki işlerin yapılması konusunda onunla anlaşmazlığa düştüğümüz olur.
- 24- Onu haksız yere eleştirmeyiz.

Bu form kim tarafından doldurulmuştur: