

PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION

(Psikoloji Master Tezi)

A.Siren Polat

Bogazici University Library



39001100319428

14

Boğaziçi University

Bebek, Istanbul, Turkey

August, 1988

Anne ve Babam'a sevgiyle.



C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
A. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND	3
B. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM	6
C. SOCIO ECONOMIC FACTORS	10
D. MATERNAL EMPLOYMENT	11
E. CONTROL AND WARMTH	12
F. FAMILY STRUCTURE CHILD REARING AND WOMEN'S WORK IN TURKEY	14
G. HYPOTHESES	17
METHOD	
A. DESIGN	20
B. SUBJECTS	20
C. MATERIALS	25
D. RELIABILITY OF ASSESSMENT	26
E. PROCEDURE	28
RESULTS	30
DISCUSSION	39
REFERENCES	49
APPENDIX 1	56
APPENDIX 2	60
APPENDIX 3	63
APPENDIX 4	65
APPENDIX 5	68

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1- Internal Consistency of PARQ and its subscales	27
Table 2- Internal consistency of PAQ and its subscales	28
Table 3- Values of simple correlation between PARQ and subscales of PARQ	30
Table 4- Intercorrelation of scales with the negative self-evaluation subscale of PAQ	31
Table 5- Means and standard deviations for PARQ and its subscales	31
Table 6- Means and standard deviations for PAQ and its subscales	32
Table 7- Comparison of child PARQ in different social classes	33
Table 8- Two way analysis of variance showing the effect of social class and maternal employment on perceived acceptance	34
Table 9- T-Test results showing the difference between boys and girls in perceived acceptance score	35
Table 10- The effect of social class and maternal employment on perceived rejection	36
Table 11- T-Test results showing the difference between boys and girls in perceived rejection score	37
Table 12- T-Test results showing the difference between upper middle class and lower class children in perceived control	38

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor Prof.Dr.Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı for her patient guidance throughout my working as a master student. Her great help, and comments have made it possible for me to continue my researches up from the beginning till the acceptance of my thesis.

I am also deeply thankful to Doç.Dr.Diane Sunar who supported me throughout my studies and my worries during the many months required for the preparation of my thesis. Her belief in the success of my thrivings has been the best reward in my student life.

I would like to thank also Dr.Falih Köksal for the friendly help he gave me in the solution of many problems during the preparation of my thesis.

I owe many thanks to Erkan Akten who cooperated in the computer search and has been my greatest help during this part of the study.

I would like to thank the teachers of the Elementary Schools: Levent İlkokulu and Seyrantepe İlkokulu.

I also appreciate the kindness of the people in "Sürat Daktilo" who typed the manuscript in a short time.

Last but not least. I would like also to thank my parents who showed patience, support and understanding during the whole process and without whose help I would have been unable to continue my research.

A B S T R A C T

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between maternal acceptance-rejection and self-evaluation and the relation between acceptance-rejection and perceived control of the child in Turkish children. Maternal employment, social class and sex difference were also considered in order to gain deeper knowledge of the perceived maternal acceptance-rejection and perceived maternal control of the child.

One hundred and twenty elementary school students constituted the sample of this study. The sample were divided into two groups according to the social class (upper middle vs. lower class) and the employment status of the mothers (working vs. non working). The subjects also were matched for sex.

Rohner's(1983) Parental Acceptance Rejection questionnaire (Child PARQ) was used in order to measure perceived acceptance-rejection.

Rohner's(1983) Personality Assessment Questionnaire was used to measure self-evaluation of the child. Only the negative self-evaluation subscale of PAQ was considered in our investigation.

Perceived control of the child was measured by Rohner's (1978) parental acceptance-rejection interview schedule. Only the control subscale was considered in testing the hypotheses related to the control dimension.

The results indicate that the children of upper-middle class status scored higher in perceived acceptance and scored lower in perceived rejection than the lower class children. Mother's working state had no effect on perceived acceptance-rejection. Sex difference did not play any role in the perceived acceptance-rejection of the child.

Control was perceived as greater in the upper-middle class samples whereas control was perceived as more lax in the lower class families. Mother's working state had no effect on perceived control.

Pearson product moment correlations between perceived acceptance rejection of the child and self-evaluation of the child and perceived control of the child were carried out. Data analyses showed that warmth had a strong inverse relationship with negative self-evaluation.

It is also found that there is no significant correlation between perceived acceptance-rejection and perceived control of the child.

I N T R O D U C T I O N

Parental acceptance-rejection theory (PART) is a theory of socialization that attempts to explain and predict major antecedents and correlates of the rejection problem between parents and their offspring throughout the world. The theory tries to explain and discover why, and under what conditions, parents all around the world are most likely to accept or reject their children. How, for example does the social environment influence the way parents treat their children?

PART predicts that parental rejection is universally associated with a specific cluster of traits, including hostility and aggression, dependency, low self-evaluation, emotional instability, emotional unresponsiveness and negative world-view.

Rohner(1984) puts forth the "phylogenetic perspective" that is related mainly to the evolutionarily acquired, potentials and dispositions of the species. From an evolutionary standpoint, the phylogenetic perspective implies that human kind has phylogenetically acquired biological potential for certain kinds of behavior. Actualization of these potentials, however, may be altered by experience (Ginsburg and Laughlin, 1971).

This line of argument is relevant to parental acceptance-rejection theory by making the assumption that humans everywhere have a fundamental need for positive response coming from the people considered most important to them.

According to Rohner, the phylogenetic perspective gives sufficient conceptual and methodological rationale to begin effective anthropological research. It is useful in discovering species-wide regularities (universals) in children and adult responses to the perception of parental acceptance-rejection.

Parental acceptance-rejection or in other words the warmth dimension, is a bipolar dimension. Rejection or the absence of warmth and affection stands at one pole of the scale in opposition to acceptance at the other pole. All human beings can be placed somewhere along this continuum because each of us has received more or less warmth and affection from the persons we appreciate most and who, generally are our parents.

The salience of the warmth dimension has been indicated by many researchers. The results of the studies are mixed and sometimes inconsistent. This is due to the fact that major concepts are sometimes defined, operationalized and measured in different ways. In addition, many studies rely on a single measure of process rather than utilizing a multimethod research strategy to help control for possible error introduced by a single measurement procedure.

The present study deals with the correlates and consequences of parental acceptance-rejection in the Turkish community by adapting PART methods and instruments into the Turkish context.

The major focus of the present investigation is to make comparisons using Rohner's PART method and instruments over working and nonworking mothers in Turkey in order to observe if there is any difference in the perception of their children on the subject of maternal acceptance-rejection and control. In addition, we also investigate the effect of parental acceptance-rejection on the self-evaluation of the child considering the socio-economic differences.

This presentation aims to convey a general portrayal of the overall investigation. It gives a narrative account of the conceptual background of the problem, characteristics of the samples studied, the method of the study, basic results, and conclusions.

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

In parental acceptance-rejection theory, conceptually, parental acceptance and rejection forms a bipolar dimension in which rejection or the absence of parental warmth and affection stands at one pole of the scale in opposition to acceptance at the other pole.

Accepting parents are defined in PART as parents who show their love or affection toward children either physically (kiss, hug) or verbally (praise, compliment). In contrast, rejecting parents are defined as those who withdraw their warmth, affection or love from their children.

Rejection takes three major forms, according to Rohner: hostility and aggression, indifference and neglect, and what is called "undifferentiated rejection".

Hostility and indifference are internal, psychological feelings within the individual.

Hostility includes feelings of anger, resentment, enmity and ill-will towards the child. Indifference, on the other hand, is simply a lack of concern for the child.

Aggression and neglect are for the most part behavioral manifestations of these internal states. Aggression refers to behaviors that have as their intention the physical or psychological harm of the other person.

For the most part, hostility may be the real motive for aggression. Indifference is only one possible motive for neglect: One of the best single indicators of neglect is physical or psychological non-availability. Psychological non-availability is subtle; the parent may be there physically but he/she may be inattentive to the child's request for help when the child is in need. In contrast, differentiated rejection may be observed behaviorally as either aggression or neglect.

Finally the word "rejection" does not refer to its negative semantic implication, although it seems so. "Rejecting parents" are not necessarily bad parents in PAR theory, since rejection is experienced by the child himself.

Like the acceptance-rejection dimension of parental behavior, autonomy-control also represents a continuum. Extreme parental permissiveness is at one end of the continuum and parental restrictiveness at the other. Control refers to the extent to which parents place restrictions or limits on children's behavior, and the extent to which these restrictions are enforced. The principal concern in assessing parental control is to determine the frequency with which the rules are actually enforced. Parents who control the behavior of their children only infrequently may be regarded

as (sometimes extremely) permissive and enforcing low control.

PART's "Personality Theory" focuses on personality dispositions that seem to characterize rejected children and adults the world over. These dispositions include dependence or defensive independence, according to the degree and form of rejection, emotional unresponsiveness, hostility, aggression, passive aggression, negative self-adequacy, negative world-view and emotional instability.

Since the above personality dispositions are central to PART's "personality theory," it is important to explain, define and describe what they mean within the context of the theory.

Dependence is the emotional reliance of one person on another for approval, guidance, support, reassurance or decision making. Independence is essential freedom from such emotional reliance.

Emotional responsiveness refers to a person's ability to express freely and openly his or her emotions, for example feelings of warmth or affection toward another person. In contrast, emotionally unresponsive people are emotionally isolated from others. They have restricted and often only defensive emotional involvement with others. Aggression is defined as the intention to hurt someone, something or oneself. Passive aggression is a less direct expression of aggression. It takes such forms as sulking or passive obstructionism. People sometimes have conscious or unconscious difficulties when coping with or managing their feelings of anger, hostility or resentment and have trouble in expressing their feelings. People who have trouble in expressing their hostility and aggression often reveal overtly their anger in

disguised and symbolic forms.

Self-evaluation consists of two feelings: one is the attitude toward oneself and the second the perception of oneself. Self-evaluation consists of two related dimensions: self-esteem and self adequacy. Self-esteem is a global, emotional evaluation of oneself in terms of worth. Feelings of negative self-esteem imply that one perceives oneself to be worthless or condemned.

Self-adequacy on the other hand refers to the judgement we make about our own competence. Feelings of positive self-adequacy imply that one views oneself as capable of dealing satisfactorily with problems. On the other hand, feelings of negative self-adequacy are feelings of incompetence.

The world-view in question refers to a person's (often un verbalized) overall evaluation of life, of the universe, of the very essence of existence, positively or negatively.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Historical Antecedents

Although systematic research on parent-child relations began in the 1890's (Stogdill, 1937), it was not until the 1930's that a substantial body of empirical work appeared regarding the antecedents and especially the effects of parental acceptance-rejection and parental control. Much of the impetus for this early work came from psychoanalytic theory and from clinical settings where disturbed children were treated.

Bender and Yarnell (1941), studying 250 children from 1-5 years of age with analytic and follow-up techniques, concluded that to insure normal development, the child must have a unified and a continuous home environment for the first years of his life. The child could be abused by parents and still recover. No institution can satisfy the need for a dull child. Bright children from rejecting parents have a chance to respond to therapy.

Bowlby (1941) investigating children separated from mothers for long periods of time during the first five years of life, came to the conclusion that many children who were unwanted had anxious and unstable mothers. Mother had shown unconsciously a certain hostility towards her child.

Levy (1943), using 2000 case records, discussed the dynamics of overprotection, which include maternal rejection, parental roles, sibling rivalry, marital relations and behavior problems. He concluded that family life, school experiences, and infantile experiences affect the shaping of the personality.

A major program of research that included the warmth dimension during the 1930's came from the Fels Research Institute, where in 1937, Chapney developed the Fels Parent Behavior Rating Scales. These scales were used extensively from the 1930's to the 1960's.

Baldwin et al. (1945), using 125 families with the method of "Syndrome Analysis" of parental behavior, discussed three syndromes: (1) democracy (2) acceptance and (3) indulgence.

All correlated positively with each other especially

on the negative end of the scale.

Becker (1960) suggested that parental rejection, withdrawal, inconsistency and aggression were related to child aggression and conduct problems. Becker found that parental (especially father) role and behavior were important in relationships between parents and child. Hostility and social withdrawal in father were associated with the child's personality.

Symonds (1939) published an important book-length conceptualization of parental acceptance-rejection and parental control in which he reviewed the existing literature regarding the then-current-thinking and research on acceptance-rejection and parental control and their effects on children's behavior.

Symonds (1949) was convinced that the child's personality reflects various distortions of parents' attitudes towards children. Symonds also argued that good parents are well-adjusted and sincere, have common sense and are able to identify themselves with their children. They can understand their feelings and act frankly and honestly in their emotional responses. Furthermore, they are capable of showing affection, firm and quiet control with consistency in discipline. Those parents are dependable and orderly in necessary routine in making their demands and providing social contacts.

A major results of this early work was the documentation of the wide variety of personalities as well as behavioral problems associated with parental rejection.

The work of Schaefer and his associates is worthy of consideration. Schaefer formulated and documented an important conceptual framework for understanding parental behavior.

For example in Bayley and Schaefer's (1960) work it was found that higher status mothers grant their infant sons greater autonomy whereas their daughters get less autonomy compared to the lower-status mother's children. Loving mothers have calm happy sons with positive behavior, whereas hostile mothers have excitable and unhappy sons.

More specifically, Schaefer showed clearly the salience of the warmth and control dimension of parenting, Schaefer's programme of research using the children's Report of Parent's Behavior Inventory was continued into the 1970's and 1980's by Schluderman and Schluderman (1970, 1971, 1983) who found three meaningful factors: acceptance-rejection, psychological autonomy vs. psychological control and firm controls versus lax control by using Factor Analysis of Canadian adolescents' responses to the Children's Report of Parental Behavior (CRPBI).

Schluderman (1971) studied 182 Hutterite adolescent boys and girls and analyzing adolescents' factor scores, showed that in relation to girls, boys described both parents as exercising higher and firm control, while girls described by girls (but not boys) as being more accepting than fathers, and exercising more psychological control.

Also noteworthy from the 1960's onward is Siegelman's research dealing with effects of perceived parental acceptance-rejection and perceived parental control on children's and youth's behavioral dispositions. Siegelman

discusses that introversion in children is related to punishing and low-loving parental behavior.

Coleman (1956) claimed that rejected children tended to be more hostile and aggressive and to have more negative worldviews than accepted children. Conducting a small holocultural study using 19 societies scattered widely around the world Rohner noticed that the results were not only true in the US, but that they were acceptable throughout the different communities in the world (Rohner, 1960).

SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

Hurley (1955) found parental rejection to be associated with lower socio-economic status. However, more recent studies indicate that the warmth-hostility dimension in parental behavior is probably not directly related to economic factors, although economic hardships may place an additional burden on the parent-child relationship. Apalacia, Polonsky et al (1972) found that child neglect may be associated with poverty, but that poverty is not the only explanation. Poor child rearing may be a response to specific economic pressures or may reflect a total configuration of crippled personality.

The bulk of evidence suggests that parents in the various social classes do not vary significantly in terms of warmth but they do tend to vary in terms of parental control. Working class parents are more likely to use forms of physical coercion and punishment to assure compliance. On the other hand, middle class parents are often more permissive and more likely to use psychological techniques of control such as love withdrawal, guilt, shame and disapproval (Bronfenbrenner, 1958, Cecas and Nye, 1974). Social class differences in warmth and control will be considered again in cross-cultural comparisons later.

MATERNAL EMPLOYMENT

Maternal employment has become an increasingly common phenomenon and great numbers of studies are being directed toward the effect of maternal employment on children.

Siegel and Haas (1963) and Siegal et al (1963), reviewing research related to the working mother and her family, found no significant difference in maternal acceptance or rejection or on other child-rearing variables between working and non-working parents. Radke (1961) reported parallel results where working or non-working status of the parents made little difference in child-rearing, if working is the preferred role of the mother.

Woods (1972), investigating 108 fifth grade children of employed mothers, found that the quality of the already existing mother-child relationship and the mother's attitude toward employment were the most important variables affecting the mother-child relationship.

Hoffman (1961) found that mothers who like to work, reflect positive feelings toward the child and that the child is non-assertive. If the mother dislikes work, then she is less interested in her child, who becomes hostile and aggressive.

Another finding related to maternal employment is found by Steward (1973) who said that working mothers who enjoy their work use greater authority in control compared to non-working mothers who enjoy staying at home. Both are affectionate to their children.

Yarrow et al (1962) found that college-educated professional mothers spent as many hours with their children

as did full-time home-makers. However, other comparisons indicate that non-working women spent more time in total child care (Robinson, 1971; Walker and Woods, 1972, Suvanathat, 1981).

CONTROL AND WARMTH

The control dimension has been found in many studies to be independent of the warmth or hostility dimension. Both dimensions are significant in predicting the child's behavior but generally it is not possible to predict one dimension from the other. Kagan and Moss (1961) indicated that the two dimensions, love-hostility and autonomy-control, are important in the parent-child relationship, but that the two dimensions are uncorrelated. Knowing how a parent behaves in relation to discipline gave them no information about the warmth of the parents. Also Kağıtçıbaşı (1970) found that family control does not exclude love and that warmth and control form two independent dimensions.

However, some other studies suggest that parental acceptance-rejection is not altogether independent of parental permissiveness-restrictiveness. Helman and Rohner (1972) found that autonomy-control is correlated significantly but weakly with parental acceptance-rejection.

Research on negative self-evaluation suggests that one's self evaluation is established early in life, probably before middle childhood, and that it remains relatively constant over time (Coopersmith, 1967).

Mead (1934) argued that if the child feels accepted he/she has more positive self-evaluation than the child who feels rejected. If our parents, who are most significant,

reject us during our childhood, we are likely to define ourselves as unworthy of love and as a result unworthy and inadequate human beings.

Wolberg's (1944) early research also found that rejected and unloved, unwanted and neglected children have feelings of low self-esteem.

Medinnus (1965) studied forty-four college freshmen, utilizing a series of measures of self-acceptance and personal adjustment, perceived acceptance by the parent and other measures of parent-child relationships. Adolescents who measured high in self-esteem on these scales perceived their parents as warm and loving. Sears (1970) also found that for both sexes, high self-concept was significantly associated with high parental warmth.

Rosenberg (1963) on the other hand, found that low self-esteem associated with extreme parental indifference and with punitive parental reactions implicated the warmth dimension of parentign rather than the control dimension in the etiology of self-esteem.

Kawash (1985) found that the combination of parental acceptance, lax discipline and autonomy leads to the highest level of self-esteem among boys. Parental acceptance, firm discipline and autonomy appear to be the optimal combination for girls. Results affirm that variations in levels of children's self-esteem can be reliably related to variations in their perceptions of parental behavior.

Litowsky (1985), using the children's Report of Parental Behavior Invertory (CRPBI) and Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) investigated the relationship between aspects of child-rearing and adolescent self-concept. Results indicate that

correlations between SEI scores and the psychological autonomy/psychological control dimension of CRPBI were negative. It was also found that high self-esteem samples perceived their parents as more accepting and using less psychological control as well as being not firm in making and enforcing rules and regulating the children's behavior.

FAMILY STRUCTURE, CHILD REARING AND WOMEN'S WORK IN TURKEY

It is important to consider family structure and child rearing practices in Turkey in order to fully understand the relation between perceived parental acceptance-rejection, mother's employment and its effects on the child's self-evaluation. The different studies show that basically, there are four types of family structure in Turkey. These are the following: (1) Nuclear family: Husband-wife and unmarried children in the family. (2) Patriarcially extended family: Married couple living with the husband's parents. (3) Transitional extended family: The aged parents moving into married children's home for protection. (4) Broken family: Family where husband or wife or both do not exist. Also widowed mother and unmarried grandchildren live together.

Timur (1972) showed that in Turkey, the majority of the families are nuclear. However, it is interesting to note that, even though the nuclear family is in the majority, the idealized and desired family type is the extended family in Turkey. Research shows that the authority is in the hands of the father in extended families; and the husbands plays the same role in the nuclear family.

Another point to be noted is the importance of the social environment where the child grows up, and the attitude of parents to child-rearing.

According to Kağıtçıbaşı the most important value of children is the child's psychological value to insure the spouse's closeness and secure the balance of the family life. And the second value of children is the economic value, meaning the probability of being helped by one's children later when the parents get aged and need to be sustained.

The social atmosphere of the family where the child grows up determines his/her personality characteristics and it influences the development of his/her personality.

According to Kağıtçıbaşı (1981), the parents expect their children to be obedient which affects the child's personality. Boys receive more attention and care compared to girls because they are considered to be a guarantee for the social status of family and are valued more.

Parents expect their daughters to be good house-wives and mothers. Because of extreme control, girls are more dependent, more traditional and more conservative in Turkey (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1972).

It is also important to give information about the status of Turkish woman working outside the home.

Studies have shown that the Turkish women's participation in the labor force is inversely related to her socio-economic status (Kazgan, 1979).

Social division of labor by sex is a reality in Turkey, where only 37.8% of the entire active female population and 11% of the urban female population in the three largest metropolitan areas are actually employed, excluding the unpaid family workers in the rural sector (70% of the rural

labor force)(Kazgan, 1979). Service occupations and unskilled, semi-skilled labor in light industry are the categories with the highest concentrations of female labor, changing between 25-35%. Among economically active women, 4% are in light industry and 8% are in service occupations.

Female employment is generally low paid in almost all areas, so that the "middle class" finds very little motivation for work if there is no urgent economic necessity. In Turkey women's work is considered as a source of extra income and when there is no economic necessity it loses its attraction.

According to the 1973 Hacettepe survey, 60% of working married women between the ages of 15-49 stated that their work was their only economic means. 8% of them said that they were working because they like to work. When the question "would you go on working, if you did not have any economical need" was asked, a positive answer was given by 33% of the same women. The obtained percentage shows clearly that two thirds of the above women would prefer not to work, if they did not meet economical urgencies.

The proportion of women leaving work after getting married is significant. Statistical results show that 35% of women quit work after marriage and 18% do so when they become mothers. Those women belong to the urban area. Generally, it has been observed that marriage and child-rearing are the dominant reasons for working women to leave their jobs. As long as the obligations of marriage and child rearing are not shared by the state or the husband, the above reasons for leaving work are bound to prevail. Kağıtçıbaşı, in her research on the "value of children" has studied the correlation between the status of the women in the family on and in her own profession. In order to clarify the matter she has categorized the levels of the different professions taken up by working

women. This categorization involved farm laborers, farmer, unskilled workers, skilled workers (crafts), clerical/civil servant, professional or managerial. The findings have shown a heightening of the status of working women in the frame of the family life. As the importance of her profession increased the male authority at home decreased and cooperation between husband and wife increased. According to Kağıtçıbaşı (1981) positive state in the relations of the family was based on the prestige of the woman's profession and she indicated that as the women's status was heightened her right to decide on family matters increased.

HYPOTHESIS

The purpose of the present research is to investigate the relation between perceived acceptance-rejection, perceived control, and negative self-evaluation of the child; social class differences, whether mothers were working or not, and sex difference are also considered.

1- Acceptance

Hypothesis 1: There is a social class difference in the child's perceived acceptance. Lower class children perceive less acceptance compared to middle class children. Studies concerning the relationship between social class and acceptance give conflicting results. In Turkey, considering economic disadvantage and poor child rearing in the lower class, the above hypothesis is stated.

Hypothesis 2: There is no difference in perceived acceptance between working mothers' and non-working mothers' children. This hypothesis is formulated on the basis of the argument that the quality of time the mother spends with children is more important than its quantity. Woods (1972) also argues

that the quality of mother-child relationship is a very important variable.

Hypothesis 3: Boys feel more accepted compared to girls. This hypothesis is based on the findings of Kağıtçıbaşı (1981) that boys receive more attention and care compared to girls, because of differential value attributed to them.

Hypothesis 4: There is a positive relation between perceived acceptance and the self-evaluation of the child. The higher the perceived acceptance, the higher is the self-evaluation. This hypothesis is formulated on the basis of argument parental-acceptance rejection theory of that there is a relation between high warmth and self-evaluation.

2- Rejection

Hypothesis 5: There is a social class difference in the child's perceived rejection. Lower class children perceive more rejection compared to middle class children. As In Hypothesis 1, economic disadvantage, and poor child rearing are considered in formulating this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 6: There is no difference in perceived rejection between working mothers' children and non-working mothers' children. As indicated in Hypothesis 2, the quality is more important than the quantity (time spent together) of the child-mother relationship.

Hypothesis 7: Boys perceive less rejection compared to girls. This is again based on the findings of Kağıtçıbaşı (1981) that boys perceive more attention and care compared to the girls.

Hypothesis 8: There is a negative relation between rejection and self-evaluation of child. The higher the perceived

rejection, the lower the self-evaluation of the child is expected to be.

3- Control Dimension

Hypothesis 9: There is no relation between warmth and control. This hypothesis is based on the findings of Kağıtçıbaşı (1972) and other research results showing that family control does not exclude love and that warmth and control form two independent dimensions.

Hypothesis 10: Middle class children perceive more control compared to lower class children. This hypothesis is based on the suggestion that middle class families are more concerned with their children's success and social performance.

METHOD

DESIGN

In our survey study there were two independent variables: social class status (upper-middle vs lower class) and whether mother was working outside the home.

Four dependent variables were studied. They were the following: Perceived acceptance, perceived rejection, perceived control and self-evaluation.

The effects of the two independent variables on perceived acceptance, perceived rejection and perceived control were studied in our design.

SUBJECTS

School children aged 10-11 attending the 5th grade of primary school constituted the sample. In the total of 120 school children 62 belonged to upper-middle class and the second part of group belonged to the lower social class.

Also in the total of 120 school children, 59 of the children's mothers are non-working and the rest are working mothers. The sex of the children are almost evenly distributed.

The decision to study preadolescents was based on several considerations. These children are still highly dependent on their parents and are likely to employ the familial context and its values to judge their own worth. By the age of 10, the individual appears to have sufficient experience and ability to think abstractly, so that he can make general assessments over his power.

In our research, we consider the importance of the mother to preadolescent boys and girls even though those children are more independent and better able to take care of themselves than younger children. Children of school age still need mother's and father's expression of love toward them.

THE STUDENT SAMPLES

The two groups of the students were chosen from two different Primary Schools in Istanbul. The first criterion of the choice demanded that the two groups be of different socio-economic level living in different sections of the city. The second criterion was based on information about the family's income, education and occupation.

The first group was attending Levent Primary School. In spite of its being a public school it was stated that its students belonged to a rather high socio-economic level and it was chosen because parents had a higher standard of living. It was proved during the research that the parents were traders, doctors, engineers, private sector employees, and administrators or executives in the private sector. All those qualifications were indicative of an upper middle class status.

The second primary school (Seyrantepe İlkokulu) was located in

an shanty town area. The group represented the working class level. The result obtained by the answers to the questionnaire showed clearly a low social status with poor education, poor income, low paying occupations customary to the level of the blue-collar workers.

It was impossible to get the correct answer about the amount of their income.

In both school groups, no great differences were detected as to the fundamental principles current in the daily life of the samples. In both groups, the nuclear family type prevailed so that a large part of the answers proved to be similar in both student groups.

Since official permission was given by authorities, it was possible to carry out the research without any difficulty in the above schools.

The Mother Sample

The four sample groups consisted of (a) working upper middle-class mothers; (b) non-working upper middle-class mothers; (c) working lower-class mothers and (d) non-working lower-class mothers.

The education level of the mothers showed that 15% had no education at all, 10% were literate, 25% had finished primary school, 2.5% had left school after three years of high school attendance, 30.8% had graduated from high school (Lyceum) 15.8% had university education and only 0.8% of them had Master Degrees.

Working upper class mothers had at least a high school (Lyceum) diploma and were working as professionals in their

jobs. The majority had graduated from different colleges. Among them we met teachers, dentists, bank employees, accountants and so on. Between the upper middle class working mothers and non-working mothers, there is a definite difference in the level of education.

Among non-working upper middle class mothers the majority's educational level was not more than high school.

The majority of working upper-middle class mothers who had a university education declared that they preferred to work.

Most of the lower class mothers had only a primary school education. There was no educational difference in this category between working and non-working mothers. The latter were domestics or workers at factories and got low wages. They declared that their working was compulsory as they had no other means to earn their living.

The responses of the mother to the questionnaire: 32% claim that they are very much involved in the upbringing of their children at home and in school. 63% of the mothers said that father also cooperated in the upbringing of the child. 2.5% said that the grandmother was responsible for the child's care. 1.6% of the mothers stated that there was some one at home with whom they shared the child's care.

To the general question of whether she left her child to the care of a second person. 83.2% answered negatively, 16.8% answered in a positively.

When asked who took care of the child during her absence from home, 30.4% of the working mothers said the father did, 15.2% named the grandmother and, 19.6% named older

siblings. 4.3% said that relatives looked after the child, 26.1% non-relative named non-relative care takers, and 2.2% said they left the child by him/herself.

76% of the working mothers stated that the reason for their going to work originated from economical causes. 10% said that they preferred to work rather than be housewives. 3% admitted being drawn to work for both above reasons. 1% confessed that they wanted to work for the upkeep of their social status.

Among the fathers, 4.2% had no education at all, 2.5% were literate without schooling, 38.7% had primary school education, 5% had junior high school education, 10% had a high school diploma, 30% had graduated from college, and 6.4% had master's degrees.

37% of fathers worked in private enterprises, 23% were civil servants and, 32% of them were blue-collar workers, and the rest did not state their occupations.

M A T E R I A L S

In the present research Rohner's (1983) Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ), and Interview were used.

PARQ is a self-report questionnaire to which a child 7-12 of age responds regarding his/her perception of the way his/her mother treats him/her in terms of four scales. All four scales of PARQ, with a total 60 items, was used in our study. The subscales measure parental warmth and affection (20 items), parental hostility and aggression (15 items), parental neglect and indifference (15 items) and parental rejection (10 items).

The PAQ measures the way children from 7-12 perceive their own personality/behavioral dispositions. The subscales measure hostility and aggression (6 items), dependency (6 items), neative self-esteem (6 items), negative self-adequacy (6 items), emotional unresponsiveness (6 items), emotional instabilty (6 items), and negative worldview (6 items).

On both self-report questionnaires, items are scored on a 4-point Likert scale with "Almost Always True" assigned a score of 4, and "Almost Never True" assigned a score of 1. In order to avoid response set bias, some items on both questionnaires are keyed in the opposite direction and then

these oppositely keyed items are reversely scored.

The child version of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Interview Schedule (PARIS) was also used in order to measure the control dimension of parental acceptance-rejection. The Child PARIS is designed to be used with children seven years of age and older (up to adulthood). The interview is divided into four sections. Two deal with the child's perception of mother's and father's behavior in terms of parental warmth (acceptance-rejection) and control (permissiveness-strictness). The sections used in the present study deal with only mother's behavior.

The adaption underwent a prework phase and the questionnaire has first translated into Turkish. Later it was translated into English in order to make sure that no lapse of meaning had been overlooked. As no meaning loss was detected, the translation was accepted as identical to the original text. As some parts of the questionnaires proved difficult for little children to understand they were rewritten in more simple sentences.

RELIABILITY OF ASSESSMENT

In the next section, the correlation of each item with the total score of the scale is presented. The correlation of the total score of each scale with the total PARQ score was also computed (Table 3 shows the result).

Cronbach's coefficient alpha, which is the measure of internal consistency of items within a scale, was also used as a measure of reliability to indicate that all items in a scale are sampling the same content area. The alpha coefficient of the Turkish version of the PARQ scale ranged from .76 to .84. The PARQ reliability alpha is .80.

All items were found to be significantly correlated ($\bar{p} < .001$) and not a single item was rejected ($n=120$).

Correlations of items with the total score of the perceived warmth/affection scale ranged from .38 to .74 ($p < .001$). Within the neglect/indifference scale, item-total scale correlations ranged from .40 to .62 ($p < .001$). Within the undifferentiated rejection scale, item-total scale correlations ranged from .44 to .71 ($p < .001$).

Since our main focus is self-evaluation in PAQ, we shall be concerned only with the self evaluation scale. correlations of items with the total score of the self-evaluation scale ranged from .22 ($p < .008$) to .60 ($p < .001$; $n=120$).

TABLE I
Internal Consistency of PARQ

Scale	Cronbach Alpha PARQ (Turkish Version)	Cronbach Alpha PARQ (American Version)
1- Warmth	.89	.90
2- Aggression/Hostility	.86	.87
3- Neglect/indifference	.79	.77
4- Rejection (undifferentiated)	.76	.72

TABLE 2
Internal Consistency of Items within the PAQ Scale

Scale	Cronbach Alpha
1- Hostility-aggression	.65
2- Dependence	.50
3- Negative self-esteem	.46
4- Negative self-adequacy	.52
5- Emotional unresponsiveness	.39
6- Emotional instability	.44
7- Negative world-view	.58
8- Self-evaluation	.66

The reliability alpha of the Turkish version of the self-evaluation scale is .66.

PROCEDURE

In our investigation the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), the Personality Assessment Questionnaire, and an interview were used. The above instruments were applied to 120 elementary school children half of them from the upper-middle class and the rest from the lower class.

Following a purposive selection of two elementary schools, appointments with the directors of those schools were made. During the initial visit the school qualifications were thoroughly observed by the investigator in order to be able to choose the schools meeting the requirements for the investigation.

During the second visit the purpose and the procedure of the project were explained to the above mentioned directors. With the approval of every class head teacher the

subjects were selected from the class lists provided by the directors in accordance with the age of the subjects and their parents' educational and occupational level.

The sample was divided according to social class and mother's working state into two closely similar distributed groups for each school.

The names of the children who satisfied the criteria of the study were placed in each of the two groups according to sex and age of the child and a stratified random sample was drawn.

The instruments were applied and interviews were carried out by the investigator in both of the elementary schools. The questionnaire and interview were applied to the children during breaks.

The child PARQ was applied first. The form takes about 15 minutes to be filled out by the child. Next, the PAQ took the same amount of time for its completion. In the end, the interview took place between the investigator and the sample child. The interview needed about 10 minutes at the most. During the whole of the research, the children were monitored so as to be able to get a stable conviction about the sincerity of their answers.

Later, a form was given to the child to be taken to his/her mother. The form was filled out by the mother and returned in due time. This form contains two main sections, one to be completed by or about the child's mother and one to be completed by or about the child's father. The above form was used to collect basic social-demographic data such as the educational attainment, occupation and employment status of mothers and fathers.

RESULTS

The relation between perceived acceptance-rejection as measured by the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire and self evaluation was tested by means of the Pearson Product-moment correlation. The results are presented in Table 4. The relations between PARQ and its subscales are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Values of Simple Correlation Between PARQ and Subscales of PARQ

Subscale	PARQ	P Value
Hostility Agression	.8343	.0001
Neglects Indifference	.9024	.0001
Undifferentiated Rejection	.7826	.0001
Warmth (Reverse Scored)	.7350	.0001

Since our research focused only on the negative self-evaluation of the child, we shall only stress the negative self-evaluation. As negative self-esteem and negative self-adequacy together constitute negative self-evaluation, we merged the two scales and developed a new scale, a negative self-evaluation scale. Intercorrelations of scores on the child PARQ and the negative self-evaluation subscale of PAQ are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Intercorrelation of Scales on Children PARQ and Children's
PAQ in Turkish Sample (n=120)
(Only Negative Self-Evaluation Scale was Considered)

	Warmth	Hostility	Indifference	Rejection	PARQ
Negative Self-Evaluation	-.44 P=.0001	.43 P=.0001	.49 P=.0001	.43 P=.0001	.56 P=.0001

The means and standard deviations of the parental acceptance-rejection questionnaire and personality assessment questionnaire and their subscales were also computed. Table 5 shows means and standard deviations for PARQ and the subscales, and Table 6 shows means and standard deviations for the PAQ and its subscales.

TABLE 5

Means and Standard Deviations for PARQ and its Subscales

Scale	Mean	SD	Subject Response		Possible Response	
			High	Low	Hig'	Low
Warmth (Reverse Scored)	33.14	9.6	64	20	80	20
Aggression/Hostility	26.24	8.46	53	15	60	15
Neglect/Indifference	26.22	6.9	43	15	60	15
Rejection (Undifferentiation)	19.5	5.76	35	10	40	10
PARQ	105.1	24.8	166	64		

TABLE 6
Means and Standard Deviations for the PAQ and its Subscales

Scale	Mean	SD	Subject Response	
			High	Low
Hostility/Aggression	11.9	3.66	20	6
Dependency	17.41	3.31	24	8
Self-evaluation	23.40	4.93	36	13
Emotional Response	12.69	2.8	21	6
Emotional Instability	15.14	2.9	21	7
Negative World-View	11.1	3.08	17	6
PAQ	91.69	11.58	124	60

For further analyses, correlations were completed between (1) acceptance as defined by the total score of the warmth scale on the PARQ; (2) rejection as defined by the sum of perceived aggression/hostility, perceived neglect and perceived rejection scales; and (3) negative self-evaluation, that is the sum of negative self-esteem and negative self-adequacy as measured by PAQ.

The control dimension was measured by questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Interview Schedule (PARIS). That items were found to be significantly correlated with the total score of the control scale correlations ranging from .25 to .54; ($p < .001$) and not a single item was rejected.

Another section of PARIS concerns the method of rule-enforcement. Three forms of rule-enforcement were singled out in the interview: (a) reasoning; (b) physical punishment; (c) verbal punishment. Those types of rule-enforcement were in our research without any kind of former prediction. See Table 7 for the results of T-Test of the differences between class groups on subscales of the child PARQ.

TABLE 7
Comparison of Child PARQ in Different Social Class

Child PARQ Subscales	Upper-Middle (n=59)		Lower (n=61)		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Low warmth	30.06	8.23	36.11	9.95	3.63	.001
Aggression/hostility	22.23	5.67	30.11	8.94	5.78	.001
Neglect/indifference	22.44	4.8	29.88	6.6	7.04	.001
Rejection	17.22	4.07	21.70	6.3	4.64	.001

As shown in the above table, the upper-middle class child perceives his/her mother to be significantly less in low warmth ($t=3.63$) that is as being warmer, less aggressive ($t=5.78$) and less neglecting ($t=7.04$) ($p=.001$) less rejecting compared to the lower class children in the Turkish sample.

To test the hypothesis stating that there would be a social class difference in perceived acceptance and to test hypothesis 2 stating that there would be no difference between working and non-working mothers' children in perceived acceptance a two-way analysis of variance was conducted (Table 8).

TABLE 8

Analysis of Variance Showing the Effect of Social Class and Maternal Employment on perceived acceptance

	Upper-Middle	Lower	Total
Non-working	70.37 (n=30)	66.09 (n=33)	68.13 (n=63)
Working	66.27 (n=26)	61.46 (n=26)	65.37 (n=52)
TOTAL	9.86 (n=56)	64.05 (n=59)	66.88 (n=115)

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	p
Main effect	1208.275	1	604.138	7.447	.001
Mother's work	239.684	1	239.684	2.95	.08
Social class	991.02	1	991.02	12.215	.001
Interaction Effect	88.749	1	88.749	1.09	.29

As seen from Table 8 social class made a difference on perceived acceptance. The middle class children perceived more acceptance compared to the lower class children.

The relation between mother's employment and perceived acceptance was not significant, and no interaction effect was detected, which means that particular combinations of mother's employment status and social class have no effect on perceived acceptance. These results provide support to Hypotheses 1 and 2.

In order to test Hypothesis 3, which stated that there would be a sex difference in perceived acceptance, a T-test analysis was conducted.

TABLE 9
Comparison of Boys' and Girls' Perceived Acceptance

Acceptance	Boys		Girls			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
Acceptance	70.19	7.17	69.64	9.39	.25	.80

As seen from Table 9, the result revealed no significant difference in perceived acceptance between boys and girls.

To test Hypothesis 4, which stated that there would be a relation between perceived acceptance and the (negative) self-evaluation of the child, a Pearson product-moment correlation was computed and the r was found to be $-.45$ ($p < .001$). This shows clearly that perceived parental acceptance is positively associated with self-evaluation.

Hypothesis 5 stated that the upper-middle class children perceive less rejection compared to the lower class children, and Hypothesis 6 stated that there would be no difference between working and non-working mothers' children in perceived rejection.

To test these hypothesis, a two-way analysis of variance was conducted where maternal employment status and social class are the independent variables and rejection is dependent variable.

TABLE 10

The Effect of Social Class and Mothers' Work on Perceived Rejection

	Upper-Middle	Lower	Total
	X	X	X
Non-working	61.27 (n=30)	81.97 (n=33)	72.11 (n=63)
Working	62.81 (n=26)	83 (n=26)	72.9 (n=52)
TOTAL	61.98 (n=56)	82.42 (n=59)	72.47 (n=115)

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	p
Main effect	12051.913	2	6025.956	22.398	.00
Maternal employment	46.658	1	46.658	.173	0.678
Social class	12034	1	1204.011	44.730	0.000
Interaction	1.856	1	1.856	.007	.934

Table 10 shows that social class made an overall difference in the subjects' mean score on perceived rejection. Lower class children perceived more rejection compared to the upper-middle class children. Whether mother works or not made no overall difference on perceived rejection and the particular combinations of maternal employment and social class did not have an effect on perceived rejection. These results are parallel to those on perceived acceptance.

To test Hypothesis 7, which stated that boys perceive less rejection compared to girls, T-test analysis was conducted.

TABLE 11

	Boys		Girls		T	DF	P
	X	SD	X	SD			
Rejection	83.54	19.88	79.80	18.97	.75	59	.45

The table revealed no sex difference in perceived rejection.

To test Hypothesis 8, which predicted a direct relation between perceived rejection and negative self-evaluation of the child, a Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated and the r was found to be .51 ($p < .001$). This shows clearly that perceived parental rejection is associated with self-evaluation.

Hypothesis 9, which stated no relationship of warmth and control was tested by means of Pearson-product-moment correlation and the r was found to be .056 ($p < .05$). This shows that perceived parental control is only slightly associated with perceived acceptance.

As seen from Table 11, the results revealed no significant relation between perceived acceptance (warmth) and mother's frequency of control, So our hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 10 which deals with middle class children perceiving more control compared to the lower class children was tested by conducting t-Test analyses.

TABLE 12

Perceived Control	Upper Middle Class		Lower Class		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Perceived Control	9.98	1.60	9.27	1.54	2.45	0.01

As seen from Table 12 upper-middle class children scored higher in perceived control compared to the lower class children which means that upper-middle class children perceived more control compared to the lower class children. The direction of differences for two social class supports our hypothesis.

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1, stating that upper-middle class children perceive more acceptance compared to lower class children, was supported. Hypothesis 5, stating that lower class children perceive more rejection compared to the lower class children was also supported.

Before evaluating social class differences we should mention that in both social classes children reported a substantial amount of maternal acceptance. The difference between the classes may be due to the fact that the upper-middle class and the lower class have different levels of education and income. The families of the lower class children came from a rural background even though they were living in urban surroundings.

Kağıtçıbaşı (1981) found that the greater the extent of rural-urban mobility, the more salient is the "love and companionship" value of the children. She explained this phenomenon saying that the emotional support, love and companionship that children provide appear to assume a greater significance in the insecure and stressful conditions originating from moving from the village into the metropolitan centres. As long as the general socio-economic state and educational level of the mother shows improvement the psychological value of the child reaches a higher level, so that

the upper-middle class child feels more valued and therefore more accepted.

Another reason for the above difference may be found in the stressful and difficult conditions of lower class life style. Because, in the lower class, both mother and father have to work in order to make a living and support their children, children may find themselves without care. Another explanation may be that there are some indications that large family size is conducive to parental rejection or at least that it reduces warmth. Nuttal and Nuttal (1971) utilized Schaeffer's (1965) Parental Behaviour Inventory to obtain data on 5370 students for both boys and girls, and the mothers and the fathers acceptance decreased as the number of children increased. In our investigation lower class family size is larger than middle class family size. It may also affect the fact that lower class children feel less accepted and more rejected compared to the middle class children. They have to share parents' attention with more siblings.

Additional economic factors, limitation of space and unavailability of alternate care-takers in the lower class may affect the above phenomenon.

The middle class children, having more educated mothers and fathers, are growing up in a different type of social environment. The middle class mother, because of her education level, may use more rational child-rearing practices. In fact our research findings reveal that middle class mothers use reasoning more, compared to lower class mothers ($F=9.26$, $p=.003$). Our findings also shows that the child associates reasoning with warmth. Middle class mothers use verbal and physical punishment less frequently than lower class mothers ($F=9.26$, $p=.003$). This fact may affect the child's perception of acceptance-rejection.

In the light of cross-cultural comparisons, the studies concerning the relationship between socio-economic status and parental warmth give conflicting results. The larger part of the disagreement may stem from the use of incomparable measures of socio-economic levels and from the influence of intervening variables.

American studies related to parental acceptance-rejection indicate no social class difference in the mainstream working class versus middle class America (e.g. Rohner Roll & Rohner, 1980). Perceived acceptance does vary in different social classes among some ethnic minorities. For example, working class Korean-American children perceived their parents to be less warm, more neglecting, more rejecting than did middle class Korean-American children (Rohner et al., 1980). Differences between the two social class groups in family work schedule and language fluency were considered more salient than institutionalized value differences from the U.S. middle class families. In a Mexican sample, however, middle class children perceived their parents to be less warm, more aggressive, more neglecting than did their working class counterparts.

In India, there are sometimes caste differences in perceived acceptance-rejection of children. In a Bengali sample the higher the caste, the less maternal warmth and the more maternal neglect perceived (Unpublished CSPAR data).

Haque (1981) reports that in Pakistan there are no social class differences in children's perceptions of maternal warmth. The results obtained in this study are similar to those obtained with American children (Rohner, Roll and Rohner, 1980).

In our investigation, it was found that there was an effect of social class on perceived control of the child.

Middle class children perceived more control compared to the lower class children. The reason may be that lower class families which have changed their rural way of life by becoming urban control their children less compared to middle class parents (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1973). Another reason may be that middle class families are more concerned with their children's success and social performance and put greater pressure on them to do their home work etc. The sample of ten year-olds reflect this tendency.

In our research, mother's work also was studied in general and it was found that there was no difference between working mothers' children's perception of acceptance-rejection and perceived control. The explanation may be found in fact that the quality of time spent with the children is more important than its quantity. It may be said that it is not the amount of time a mother spent with her children which is important, but the quality of interaction that takes place in the time spared with previous research results which were discussed before.

A strong influence of social class on perceived acceptance-rejection of the child was also found in working vs. non-working mother's children. Upper-middle class working mother's children perceive more acceptance less rejection compared, to the lower class working mothers' children ($F_{acc} = 10.18, p = .002$)($F_{rej} = 22.45, p < .001$). we conclude

We conclude the strong pervasive social class effect hides other factors' effects that our findings based on social class neutralize when other factors enter the scene. Here the factor is whether the mother works or not. Working does not affect lower class mother's status positively since she is deprived of a required level of education, and it makes no difference in her child-rearing attitude. For middle

class mothers who are better educated, their working does not affect their child-rearing negatively. The fact that the lower class mother is obliged to work whereas the upper-middle class mother generally works more willingly may also be a factor.

Here, it is important to mention that even though both types of mothers are working, the lower class working woman's lower level of education and less skilled occupation may affect her attitude to her child negatively. Her dual role also may affect her attitude towards her child. Because those mothers are overloaded with financial burdens and feel too exhausted to treat their children in a more amiable way.

On the other hand, the middle class working mother's education and profession in her job and her working state does not affect her relation with her child negatively. Because they have economical possibilities less burdens in daily life and they can afford to be more comprehending towards their children.

No sex difference in perceived acceptance-rejection was found. This finding does not support our hypothesis based on the belief that boys perceive more acceptance and less rejection compared to girls. Following Kağıtçıbaşı's (1981) finding of boy preference, we assumed that boys would perceive more acceptance, less rejection compared to girls. However, apparently this is not reflected in boys' and girls' perception of acceptance and rejection.

She also found that women's status and preference for sons were negatively correlated, which goes along with increased woman's status being associated with decreased preference for sons. Our findings related to middle class mothers seem to be supported by Kağıtçıbaşı's findings. For

the educated mother who lives in developed urban areas, a maternal discrimination between sons and daughters is not observed.

In the lower class context we can not give the above reason, but we may suggest a shift that occurs during the transplant of the rural family into urban surroundings followed by the loss of certain values attached to rural life. Thus, the preference of boys may change and mother may not discriminate according to sex in her children.

In this context an interesting finding should be mentioned it was found that physical punishment was related to feelings of rejection ($r=.31$, $p<.001$) and boys perceive more physical punishment than girls. A two-way ANOVA showed that there was a main effect for sexes on physical punishment score ($F=9.30$, $p=.003$). Boys scored higher than girls. Since no sex difference was found in perceived acceptance-rejection we may conclude that physical punishment does not affect their perception of acceptance-rejection. We may explain this phenomenon by the social comparison process that the physical punishment may not be a painful experience for the child, because the child will not perceive himself as the only person singled out for physical punishment in a community where most boys are punished physically.

American studies of the parental acceptance-rejection dimension indicate no sex differences in children's perceptions of maternal warmth. Boys in the U.S. do not generally report being more or less accepted than girls.

Nigerian college students also show no sex difference in perceived rejection (Unpublished data CSPAR).

Korean-American boys perceive themselves to be

slightly but significantly more accepted than do Korean-American girls (Unpublished data CSPAR).

India is a complex nation with respect to sex difference in perceived acceptance. It is found that children in Southern India tend to experience differences in acceptance-rejection according to sex (Unpublished data CSPAR), but as one moves further north, boys appear to become increasingly important in rural areas. In West Bengal for instance they tend to perceive slightly more maternal warmth than do girls (as measured by PARQ, Rohner and Chaki-Sircar).

In Pakistan, boys perceive more rejection compared to girls; gender differences in maternal acceptance rejection are explained in terms of parental assertion techniques used by mothers in regulating their son's behavior when they are disobedient (Haque, 1985).

Following Mead (1934), parental acceptance-rejection theory assumes that all of us tend to view ourselves as we imagine significant others view us and if our parents, who are the most significant others rejected us as children, we are likely to define ourselves as unworthy of love, and therefore unworthy and inadequate human beings. In this way we develop a sense of overall negative self-evaluation, including feelings of negative self-esteem and negative self-adequacy.

Acceptance-rejection theory predict that parental acceptance is universally associated with a specific cluster of traits including negative self-evaluation. Our results also supported the prediction that there is negative correlation between perceived rejection the child and self evaluation which means the higher the perceived rejection of the child the lower is the self-evaluation of the child (See Table 4).

In our investigation, middle class children's negative self-evaluation score was lower than lower class children's negative self-evaluation score ($T=5.53$, $df=118$, $p<.001$). This can be explained by the social differences in perceived acceptance-rejection. Middle class children score high in perceived acceptance and low in perceived rejection compared to the lower class. As a result of this phenomenon, the negative self-evaluation score of middle class children is lower than the lower class children's negative self-evaluation score ($T=5.53$, $df=118$, $p<.001$).

When the correlation between warmth and control is considered, it is found that the child does not associate warmth with control by the mother. In this context it should be mentioned that in our sample, 96 of 120 children perceived moderate control ($r=.095$, $p=.17$).

Based on Kağıtçıbaşı's (1984) findings that children's obedience to parents was valued most and being "independent and self-reliant" least was valued low socio-economic and agricultural traditional groups with closely-knit family system, we may conclude that strict control is perceived to be natural by the child. Because of this and because of its prevalence, it does not affect the child's perception of the acceptance. Social comparison process again plays a role here. Kağıtçıbaşı (1972) also found that family control does not exclude love.

Studies on parental acceptance-rejection carried out in relation to parental discipline showed that the cultural context is very important in understanding the relation between perceived acceptance and rejection and perceived control. It is found that in the cultural context where strict parental discipline is prevalent and therefore is perceived as normal by the children, it is not perceived as

rejection but rather associated with parental warmth.

In Korea, (Rohner and Rettengil, 1985) and Japan (Trommsdorf, 1985; Kornadt, 1983; Kornadt and Trommsdorf, 1984) as strict parental discipline is prevalent and therefore perceived as normal by the children, it is associated with acceptance rather than rejection.

On the other hand, in countries where permissive parental control is prevalent, strict control is perceived by children and adolescents as rejection. For example in the U.S. among American and Korean-American children (Pettengil and Rohner, 1985) and in Germany (Pettengil and Rohner) a significant negative correlation between perceived mother's control and warmth is found.

The above results clearly show that the context of socialization has an important effect on the perception of acceptance-rejection in line with cultural values affecting parents as well as offspring.

To recapitulate, we have found a social class effect on children's perception of acceptance-rejection, perceived control and negative self-evaluation of the child. We found no difference in children's perception of acceptance-rejection by working and non-working mothers. A strong influence of social class was also seen in working mothers' children's perceptions of acceptance-rejection. We explained it with the different status of the mothers.

No difference was found between boys and girls in perceived acceptance and rejection. This was explained also by different type of mothers and cultural values.

A negative relation was found between warmth and

negative self-evaluation and a positive relation between rejection and negative self-evaluation was explained in terms of the perceived acceptance-rejection theory's assumption.

No correlation between perceived warmth and perceived control was detected, and this finding is explained by different cultural values in cross cultural context.

We are hoping that our investigation will serve to play a part in the context of cross-cultural investigation of the subject.

R E F E R E N C E S

- Armentrot,C.J. (1970) Relationships Among Preadolescents Reports of Their Parents Child-Rearing Behaviours. Psychological Reports 695-700.
- Braner Charles (1971) Personal Warmth and Perception on One's Parents. Rational Living 1969, 4:17-19.
- Becker,W.C. (1964) Consequences of Different Kings of Parental Discipline. Review of Child Development Research.
- Bronfenbrenner (1958) Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space. In. E.E.
- Bronfenbrenner (1958) Toward a theoretical Model for Analysis of Parent-Child Relationships in a Social Context. In Parental Attitudes and Child Behaviour. J.C.Glidwell Ed.Springfield Charles L.Thomas.
- Bowlby,J.C. (1965) Childcare and the Growth of Love (Ed.) New York, Penguin Books.
- Chapney,H. (1941) "The Measurement of Parent Behaviour". Child Development. 12: 131-166.

- Coopersmith (1967) The Antecedent of Self-esteem. San Francisco. W.H.Freeman.
- Devereux,E. (1970) Socialization in Cross-Cultural Perspective. Comparative Study of England, Germany and the United States in R.Hill and R.Koonig eds. Families East and West. The Haque Nouton, pg:72-106.
- Festinger,L. (1954) "A Theory of Social Comparison". Human Relations. 7:177-140.
- Haque,Abdul "Social Class Differences in Perceived Maternal Acceptance-Rejection and Personality Dispositions among Pakistani children in Hyderabad", unpublished paper (1985).
- (1961) Effects of Maternal Employment on Child. Child Development 32:187-197.
- (1962) Variations in the Parent Role as a Function of the Parent's Sex and the Child's Sex and Age. Menil-Palmer Quart 8:1-11.
- Levinson,D. (ed) (1977) A Guide to Social Theory.
- World wide Cross-Cultural Tests,
New Haven, CT.
- Human Relations Area Files and Martin J.Malone (1980). Toward Explaining Human Culture. New Haven, CT: Human Relations Area Files.

7 30 22
1975

- Kagan, J. and H. Moss (1961) Personality and Social Development Family and Reer Influences-Fels Research Institute Yellow Spring, Ohn.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1970) Social norms and Authoritarianism. Journal of Personality and social Psychology, Vol.16, No:3, 444-451.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1981) Çocuğun Değeri. Türkiye'de Değerler ve Doğurganlık (Value of the Child, Values and Fertility in Turkey). Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Maccoby, T.M., Newcomb and E.L.Hartley, eds. Reading in Social Psychology, New York. Henry and Co. (3rd ed.) Pg:400-445.
- Narrol, Raol, Gary, L.Michic, and Frada Narrol (1976):
- World wide Theory Testing. New Haven, CT
 - Human Relations Area Files
 - (1980) "Holo-cultural Research Methods" pp.476-521 in H.C. Triandis and J.W.Beny (eds.) Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology (VO/2) Boston. Allyn and Bacon.
- Nuttal and Nuttal (1971) Effects of Size or Family on Parent Child Relationships. Reprint of the Proceedings. 79th Annual Convention A.P.A.
- Rohner, R. (1980) Handbook for the Study of Parental Acceptance and Rejection. Centre for the Study of Parental Acceptance and Rejection. University of Connecticut.

- Rohner, R.P. (1975) *They Love Me, They Love Me Not: A Worldwide study of the Effects of Parental Acceptance and Rejection.* New Haven: HRAF Press.
- Rohner, R.P. and Rohner, E.C. (1980) *Worldwide Tests of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory.* Special Issue, *Behaviour Science Research* (whole issue).
- Rohner, R.P. (1986) *The Warmth Dimension: Foundations of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory,* Beverly Hills Ca: Sage Publications.
- Rohner, R.P. and Chaki Sircar, M. Palasphur: *Family Interaction and Child Socialization in a West Bengal Village* (under review for publication).
- Rohner, R.P. and Pettengil, S.M. (1985) *Perceived Parental Acceptance Rejection and Parental Control Among Korean Adolescents* *Child Development*, 56:524-528.
- Radke, M. (1961) *Maternal Employment and Child-Rearing Children* 9(6):223-28 U.S. Government Publication.
- Schaefer, E.S. (1959) *A Circumplex Model for Maternal Behaviour,* *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 59:226-235.
- (1965) *Children's Report of Parental Behaviour on Inventory.* *Child Development* 36:413-424.

- Schludermann and Schludermann, E. (1971) Adolescent Perception of Parental Behaviour. (CRPBI) In Huterite Communal Society. Journal of Psychology 19:29-39.
- Sears, R.R. (1961) Transcultural Variables and Conceptual Equivalence. In Bert Kaplan (ed.) Studying Personality Cross-Culturally, Evenston, IL. Row, Peterson.
- Siegelman, M. (1965) College Student Personality Correlates of Early Parent Child Relationships. Journal of Consulting Psychology. 29:558-564.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1937) Survey of Experiments of Children's Attitudes Toward Parents 1894-19346. Journal of Genetic Psychology 51:293-303.
- Symonds, P.M. (1939) The Psychology of Parent Child Relationships New York. Appleton-Century.
- Suls, J.M. and R.L. Miller (1977) Social Comparison Processes. Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Siegel, A., Kaas, M. (1963) The Working Mother. A Review of Research. Child Development 34: 513-42.
- Timur, S. (1972) Türkiye'de Aile Yapısı, Ankara Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, D.15.

Trommsdraf,C. (1983)

Value Change in Japan. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 7:337-360.

Woods,M. (1972)

The Unsupervised Child of the Working Mother. Developmental Psychology 6:14-25.

A P P E N D I C E S

Appendix 1- Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire

Appendix 2- Personality Assessment Questionnaire

Appendix 3- Parental Acceptance-Rejection Interview Schedule

Appendix 4- Background Data Schedule

Appendix 5- Scoring Sheet of Child PARQ

APPENDIX 1- Child PARQ

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen Her Zaman	Bazen	Nadiren Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
1- Annem benim hakkımdan güzel şeyler söyler	_____	_____	_____	_____
2- Annem kötü davrandığım zaman beni küümseyerek azarlar.	_____	_____	_____	_____
3- Annem ben hiç yokmuşum gibi davranır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4- Annem beni gerçekten sevmez.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5- Planlarımız hakkında benimle konuşur ve söyleyeceklerimi dinler.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6- Onun sözünü dinlemediğim zaman beni başkalarına şikayet eder.	_____	_____	_____	_____
7- Benimle candan ilgilenir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
8- Arkadaşlarımı eve getirmem için beni cesaretlendirir, onların hoş vakit geçirmesini sağlar.	_____	_____	_____	_____
9- Beni küçük düşürür ve benimle alay eder.	_____	_____	_____	_____
10- Onu rahatsız etmediğim sürece beni bilmezlikten gelir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
11- Kızdığı zaman bana bağırır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
12- Benim için önemli olan şeyleri ona anlatmamı kolaylaştırır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
13- Bana çok sert davranır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
14- Onun yanında olmamdan hoşlanır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
15- Bir şeyi iyi yaptığım zaman gurur duymamı sağlar.	_____	_____	_____	_____

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen			Hiçbir
	Hemen			Zaman
	Her		Nadiren	Doğru
	<u>Zaman</u>	<u>Bazen</u>	<u>Doğru</u>	<u>Değil</u>
16- Haketmediğim zaman bile bana vurur.	_____	_____	_____	_____
17- Benim için yapması gereken şeyleri unuttur.	_____	_____	_____	_____
18- Beni büyük bir baş belası olarak görür.	_____	_____	_____	_____
19- Beni başkalarına över.	_____	_____	_____	_____
20- Kızdığı zaman beni çok sert bir şekilde cezalandırır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
21- Benim gerekli gıdayı almam için gayret eder.	_____	_____	_____	_____
22- Benimle sıcak ve sevgi dolu bir şekilde konuşur.	_____	_____	_____	_____
23- Bana hemen hiddetlenir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
24- Benim sorularıma cevap vermemek için işi olduğunu söyler.	_____	_____	_____	_____
25- Benden hoşlanmıyor gibi.	_____	_____	_____	_____
26- Hakettiğim zaman bana güzel şeyler söyler.	_____	_____	_____	_____
27- Çabuk kıza ve hiddetini benden çıkarır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
28- Arkadaşlarımla kim olduğunu merak eder.	_____	_____	_____	_____
29- Yaptığım şeylerle gerçekten ilgilenir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
30- Bana kırıcı sözler söyler.	_____	_____	_____	_____
31- Yardımına ihtiyacım olduğunda beni duymamazlıktan gelir.	_____	_____	_____	_____

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen Her <u>Zaman</u>	<u>Bazen</u>	Nadiren <u>Doğru</u>	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru <u>Değil</u>
32- Başım dertte olduğunda hatayı ben- de bulur.	_____	_____	_____	_____
33- Bana istenildiğimi ve ihtiyaç du- yulduğunu hissettirir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
34- Sinirine dokunduğumu söyler.	_____	_____	_____	_____
35- Beni çok önemser.	_____	_____	_____	_____
36- İyi davrandığım zaman benimle gurur duyduğunu söyler.	_____	_____	_____	_____
37- Beni kırmak için elinden geleni yapar.	_____	_____	_____	_____
38- Onun hatırlaması gerektiğini dü- şündüğüm önemli şeyleri unutturur.	_____	_____	_____	_____
39- Kötü hareket ettiğimde artık se- vilmediğimi hissettirir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
40- Yaptığım şeyin önemli olduğunu ba- na hissettirir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
41- Kötü davrandığım zaman beni korku- tur veya tehdit eder.	_____	_____	_____	_____
42- Zamanını benimle geçirmekten hoş- lanır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
43- Üzüldüğüm veya canım sıkıldığında bana yardım etmeye çalışır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
44- Kötü davrandığım zaman arkadaşla- rımın önünde beni utandırır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
45- Benden uzak kalmaya çalışır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
46- Beni şikayet eder.	_____	_____	_____	_____
47- Ne düşündüğümü merak eder ve o ko- nuda benimle konuşmayı sever.	_____	_____	_____	_____

	<u>BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU</u>		<u>BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL</u>	
	<u>Hemen</u>	<u>Bazen</u>	<u>Nadiren</u>	<u>Hiçbir Zaman</u>
	<u>Her Zaman</u>		<u>Doğru</u>	<u>Değil</u>
48- Ne yaparsam yapayım başka çocukların benden iyi olduğunu söyler.	_____	_____	_____	_____
49- Plan yaptığı zaman benim istediğim şeylere dikkat eder.	_____	_____	_____	_____
50- Önemli olduğunu düşündüğüm şeyleri onun için uygun olmasa bile yapmama izin verir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
51- Başka çocukların benden daha iyi davrandığını söyler.	_____	_____	_____	_____
52- Beni başkalarının bakımına bırakır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
53- İstenmediğimi bilmemi sağlar.	_____	_____	_____	_____
54- Yaptığım şeylerle ilgilenir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
55- Canım acıdığı zaman veya hasta olduğum zaman kendimi daha iyi hissetmem için gayret eder.	_____	_____	_____	_____
56- Kötü davrandığım zaman benden utandığını söyler.	_____	_____	_____	_____
57- Beni sevdiğini söyler.	_____	_____	_____	_____
58- Bana nazik ve yumuşak davranır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
59- Kötü davrandığım zaman beni utandırır ve suçlu hissettirir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
60- Beni mutlu etmeye çalışır.	_____	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX 2- Child PAQ

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen Her Zaman	Bazen	Nadiren Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
1- Döğüşmek ve kötü huylu olmak aklımdan geçiyor.	_____	_____	_____	_____
2- Hasta olduğum zaman annemin bana acımasından hoşlanırım.	_____	_____	_____	_____
3- Kendimi severim	_____	_____	_____	_____
4- İstediğim şeyleri başkaları kadar becerebilirim.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5- Hislerimi başkalarına göstermekte zorluk çekerim.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6- Bir şeyi deneyip de yapamıyorsa kendimi çok kötü hisseder ve kızarım	_____	_____	_____	_____
7- Bana göre hayat hoştur.	_____	_____	_____	_____
8- İçimden birine veya bir şeye vurmak gelir.	_____	_____	_____	_____
9- Anne ve babamın bana pek çok sevgi göstermelerinden hoşlanırım.	_____	_____	_____	_____
10- İşe yaramadığımı ve hiçbir zaman yaramayacağımı düşünürüm.	_____	_____	_____	_____
11- Ben hiç bir şeyi iyi yapabildiğime inanmıyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
12- Anne ve babama karşı sevgi dolu olmak benim için kolay	_____	_____	_____	_____
13- Ortada sebep yokken kendimi keyifsiz ve huysuz hissederim	_____	_____	_____	_____
14- Hayatı tehlikelerle dolu görüyorum	_____	_____	_____	_____

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Her Zaman	Bazen	Nadiren Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
15- Kızınca birşeyleri atıp kırarım	_____	_____	_____	_____
16- Mutsuz olduğum zaman problemlerimi kendim halletmekten hoşlanırım.	_____	_____	_____	_____
17- Tanımadığım biriyle karşılaşınca o insanın benden üstün olduğunu düşürüm.	_____	_____	_____	_____
18- İstedğim şeyler için başarılı bir şekilde mücadele ederim	_____	_____	_____	_____
19- Dostluk kurmakta ve dostluklarımı sürdürmekte zorluk çekerim.	_____	_____	_____	_____
20, İşler kötü gidince çok üzülüyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
21- Dünyanın iyi ve mutlu bir yer olduğunu düşünüyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
22- Saçma şeyler yapan insanlarla alay ederim.	_____	_____	_____	_____
23- Annemin benimle çok ilgilenmesinden hoşlanıyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
24- İyi bir insan olduğumu düşünüyor ve başkalarının da öyle düşünmesini istiyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
25- Başarısız bir insan olduğumu düşünüyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
26- Aileme onları sevdiğimi göstermek benim için kolaydır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
27- Bir an keyifli ve neşeli, bir an ke- derli ve mutsuz oluyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
28- Benim için dünya mutsuz bir yer.	_____	_____	_____	_____
29- Kızdığım zaman surat asıyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	<u>Zaman</u>	<u>Bazen</u>	<u>Nadiren Doğru</u>	<u>Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil</u>
30- Zorlandığım zaman başkalarının beni cesaretlendirmesinden hoşlanırım.	_____	_____	_____	_____
31- Kendimden oldukça memnunum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
32- Yapmayı denediğim birçok şeyi yapmadığımı hissediyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
33- Sevdiğim birine karşı hislerimi göstermek bana zor geliyor.	_____	_____	_____	_____
34- Kolay kolay kızmam veya üzülmem	_____	_____	_____	_____
35- Dünyayı tehlikeli bir yer olarak görüyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
36- Hiddetimi kontrol etmekte zorluk çekiyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
37- Canım acıdığı veya hasta olduğumda anne babamın üstümde titremelerinden hoşlanırım.	_____	_____	_____	_____
38- Kendimden memnun değilim.	_____	_____	_____	_____
39- Yaptığım şeylerde başarılı olduğumu hissediyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
40- Dostlarıma onları gerçekten sevdiğimi göstermek benim için kolaydır.	_____	_____	_____	_____
41- Zor problemler karşısında kolaylıkla huzursuz oluyorum.	_____	_____	_____	_____
42- Hayat benim için iyi bir şey.	_____	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX 3- Görüşme

A. Anne Kuralları

Annenizin size koyduğu kurallar ve kısıtlamalar hakkında, size yapmanıza müsaade ettiği ve etmediği şeyler üzerine fikir edinmek istiyorum.

- 1- Annenizin size bir şey yapmanızı söylediği zaman bu söylenen şeyi yapmak zorunda mısınız, değil misiniz?
 1. Hemen hemen hiç (Nadiren veya hiç bir zaman)
 2. Bazen ama sık değil (arada bir)
 3. Hemen hemen her zaman, genellikle veya her zaman
- 2- Anneniz sizi her akşam zorla eve sokuyor mu veya zorla her gece aynı saatte yatağa yatırıyor mu ?
 1. Hemen hemen hiç (veya hiç bir zaman)
 2. Bazen ama sık değil (arada bir)
 3. Hemen hemen her zaman, genellikle veya her zaman
- 3- Anneniz size evde zorla işler yaptırıyor mu? (Örneğin çöp dökme, odanızı temizleme gibi)
 1. Hemen hemen hiç (nadiren veya hiç bir zaman)
 2. Bazen ama sık değil (arada bir)
 3. Hemen hemen her zaman
- 4- Anneniz yemekte tabağınızdaki her şeyi bitirmenizi zorluyor mu?
 1. Hemen hemen hiç (nadiren veya hiç bir zaman)
 2. Bazen ama sık değil (arada bir)
 3. Hemen hemen her zaman
- 5- Anneniz sizin kardeşlerinizle (erkek veya kız), arkadaşlarınızla konuşmanıza izin veriyor mu?
 1. Hemen hemen hiç (nadiren veya hiç bir zaman)
 2. Bazen ama sık değil (arada bir)
 3. Hemen hemen her zaman

6- Anneniz evde gürültü yapmanıza izin veriyor mu, verir mi?

751488
P75

1. Hemen hemen hiç (nadiren veya hiç bir zaman)
2. Bazen ama sık değil (arada bir)
3. Hemen hemen her zaman (genellikle veya her zaman)

B. Kuralı Zorlamak İçin Metod

Şimdi size bu kuralları uyguladığınız zaman annenizin ne yaptığını sormak istiyorum.

7- (Sebep) Yapmanız gerektiği şeyi size açıklamayı deniyor veya onu yapmanızı zorluyor mu?

1. Hemen hemen hiç
2. Bazen ama sık değil (arada bir)
3. Hemen hemen her zaman her zaman

8- Sizden yapılması beklenen şeyi yapmayınca size vurur ya da döver mi?

1. Hemen hemen hiç
2. Bazen ama sık değil (arada bir)
3. Hemen hemen her zaman veya her zaman

9- Sizden beklenen şeyi yapmadığınız zaman sizi küçümseyerek azarlıyor mu?

1. Hemen hemen hiç
2. Bazen fakat sık değil (arada bir)
3. Hemen hemen her zaman veya her zaman

APPENDIX 4- Background Data Schedule

A. Çocuk Hakkında Bilgi

Bu bölüm araştırmaya katılan çocuk hakkında bilgi içindir.

1. İsim:
2. Cinsiyet:
3. Doğum günü: Ay ___ Gün ___ Yıl ___
4. Yaş (Son doğum günündeki yaşı) ___
5. Eğitim: Şu anda kaçınıcı sınıfta (Eğer okumuyorsa son okuduğu sınıf)
___ 1. Birinci
___ 2. İkinci
___ 3. Üçüncü
___ 4. Dördüncü
___ 5. Beşinci
___ 6. Diğer (belirtiniz) ___

B. Anne Hakkında Bilgi

Bu bölüm anne veya birinci sırada gelen kadın bakıcı (eğer varsa) tarafından tamamlanacak.

1. Çocukla olan yakınlığı nedir?
___ 1. Anne
___ 2. Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) ___
2. Doğum Tarihi ___
3. Yaş (Son doğum gününüzde kaç yaşındaydınız?) ___
4. Eğitim: En yüksek okul diplomanız nedir?
___ 1. Eğitim yok
___ 2. Okur-yazar
___ 3. İlkokul Mezunu
___ 4. Orta Okul Mezunu

- _____ 5. Lise ve dengi
_____ 6. Yüksek Okul
_____ 7. Yüksek Lisans ve Üstü

5- İş: Şu anda çalışıyor musunuz?

- _____ 1. Çalışmıyor, iş arıyor
_____ 2. Çalışmıyor, iş aramıyor
_____ 3. Yarım gün çalışıyor
_____ 4. Tam gün çalışıyor
_____ 5. Diğer

(Çalışıyorsa sorunuz)

6- Ne tür bir işte çalışıyorsunuz?

- _____ 1. Serbest
_____ 2. Memur
_____ 3. Emekli
_____ 4. Yarım gün çalışıyorsanız, ne tür bir işde çalışıyorsunuz
(belirtiniz) _____

7- Mesleğinizi belirtiniz (Varsa) _____

8- Niçin çalışıyorsunuz? (belirtiniz) _____

9- Evin toplam üyeleri: Evde beraber yaşadığınız insanların listesini yapın ve sizinle olan bağlarını belirtin.

	<u>İsim</u>	<u>Son Doğum Günündeki Yaşı</u>	<u>Cinsiyet</u>	<u>Size Yakınlığı</u>	<u>Geliri</u>
i)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
ii)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
iii)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
iv)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
v)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

10- Evlilik durumunuzu belirtiniz

- _____ 1. Evli ve kocasıyla yaşıyor
_____ 2. Boşanmış
_____ 3. Dul

11- Kaç çocuğunuz var? _____

12- Çocuğunuzla en çok kim ilgileniyor?

- 1. Sürekli ben ilgileniyorum
- 2. Ben ve babası birlikte ilgileniyoruz
- 3. Büyükannesi ilgileniyor
- 4. Bakıcı ilgileniyor

C. Baba Hakkında Bilgi

Bu bölüm çocuğın babası hakkında bilgi içindir (veya çocuğın hayatındaki önemli erkek kişi)

1- Çocuğın babası veya önemli erkek kişi normal olarak çocukla aynı evde mi oturuyor?

- 1. Hayır
- 2. Evet

2- Eğitim ve Tahsil Derecesi Nedir?

- 1. Eğitim yok
- 2. Okur yazar
- 3. İlkokul mezunu
- 4. Orta Okul Mezunu
- 5. Lise ve dengi
- 6. Üniversite/Yüksek Okul
- 7. Yüksek Lisans ve Üstü

3- Babanın işi: Babanın iş durumunu belirtiniz.

- 1. İşsiz, iş arıyor
- 2. Yarım gün çalışıyor
- 3. Tam gün çalışıyor
- 4. Diğer (belirtiniz) _____

APPENDIX 5- Mother, Child, and Adult Parq Scoring Sheet

Name (I.D.) _____

Date _____

Warmth/Aff	Agg/Host	Neg/Indif	Rej (undif)	
1 _____	2 _____	3 _____	4 _____	
5 _____	6 _____	7* _____		
8 _____	9 _____	10 _____	11 _____	
12 _____	13 _____	14* _____		
15 _____	16 _____	17 _____	18 _____	
19 _____	20 _____	21* _____		
22 _____	23 _____	24 _____	25 _____	
26 _____	27 _____	28* _____		
29 _____	30 _____	31 _____	32 _____	
33 _____	34 _____	35* _____		
36 _____	37 _____	38 _____	39 _____	
40 _____	41 _____	42* _____		
43 _____	44 _____	45 _____	46 _____	
47 _____	48 _____	49* _____		
50 _____	51 _____	52 _____	53 _____	
54 _____				
55 _____			56 _____	
57 _____				
58 _____			59 _____	
60 _____				
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Σ W/A	Σ A/H	Σ N/I	Σ R(u)	**Total PARQ
(61-62)	(63-64)	(65-66)	(67-68)	Score
				(69-71)

* Reverse scoring required

** Total PARQ = sum of all four scales, with entire warmth scale reverse score
(To reverse score the warmth scale, subtract the warmth scale-score from 10)

Note. If more than one version of the PARQ is used, circle on each scoring sheet whether responses there refer to the Mother, Child, or Adult PARQ.