

**THE TRANSLITERAL EQUIVALENCE,
RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY STUDIES OF THE
PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION
QUESTIONNAIRE (PARQ) MOTHER-FORM: A TOOL FOR
ASSESSING CHILD ABUSE**

BY
MİRYAM ANJEL
B.A. IN PSYCHOLOGY
ISTANBUL UNIVERSITY, 1985

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

Bogazici University Library



39001100130643

14

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY
1993

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor Fatoş Erkman. Being her student is an honour for me. I have enjoyed each moment of our team work which gave me the opportunity to learn from her professional experience, knowledge and pleasant personality. It is hard for me to terminate such an agreeable experience.

I would like to thank to my committee member Necla Öner for her suggestions and support during my studies. I have always admired her discipline, knowledge and style of teaching.

I am grateful to my committee member Norma Razon for letting me share and learn from her experiences in collecting data. She has given me emotional support during my thesis.

My special thanks go to Hülya Karagüven, Emine Erol, Ayşesim Diri and Arif Kubat for their help and patience in the statistical analyses of my study.

I would also like to thank to Necla Erinç for her friendly support throughout my studies in this university.

I am grateful to the administrators, counselors, students and parents of Ayazağa Işık Lisesi, Örnek Lisesi, Etiler Lisesi, Nişantaşı Anadolu Lisesi, Balmumcu Atanur Oğuz Deneme Lisesi and İbrahim Turhan Lisesi for their valuable help in data collection.

I would like to express my appreciation to the personnel of Sürat Daktilo for typing my thesis.

Finally, I want to thank to my dear family for their generous love, support and acceptance throughout my studies.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study is to provide supporting evidence for the translational equivalence, reliability and validity of the Turkish Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) mother-form, which is a self-report tool of mother's interactions with her child. The original instrument was developed by Rohner, Saavedra and Granum in 1980. It includes 60 items in four subscales, namely the warmth-affection, aggression-hostility, indifference-neglect and undifferentiated rejection subscales.

The initial translation of the PARQ mother-form was done by Polat and Sunar (1988). In the present research, after back translation and revision, translational equivalence study was carried out with 40 mothers, who were given different language forms with an interval. As hypothesized, no significant differences were found between the two language forms, while high correlation was established through Anova, t-test and Pearson Product Moment Correlation, respectively. Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged from .45 to .85.

Close investigation of item-total and item-subscale correlation revealed some low figures ($<.20$). The scale was refined further in a pilot study, where 139 mothers from three education levels were administered the PARQ forms. Subscale-total correlations for all education groups (between .63 and .89) and Cronbach α values of the subscales (for total PARQ $\alpha = .90$) were high. Items 18, 21 and 55 had nonsignificant item-subscale and item-total correlations across all groups, while item 52 had no differentiating characteristic for this population. Consequently, these four items were deleted from the Turkish form. Items 32 and 45 were transferred to other subscales, since their correlation was higher.

After these revisions, subscale-total and Cronbach α correlations increased and the face validity of the scale improved.

The construct validity of the Turkish PARQ was investigated through hypothesis testing, using the following instruments: The Family Environment Questionnaire assessing cohesion and control, the State Trait Anxiety Inventory-Trait Anxiety Scale, five factors of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument assessing overprotection, democracy,

rejection of homemaking role, marital conflict and strict discipline.

The instruments were administered to 229 mothers of low-middle-high education levels. Forty-eight mothers were readministered the PARQ for test-retest reliability.

According to the Anova statistics, highly rejecting mothers had lower cohesion scores ($F=6.824$, $p<.001$), higher trait anxiety scores ($F=5.426$, $p<.001$), lower democracy scores ($F=5.485$, $p<.001$), higher rejection of homemaking role scores ($F=2.853$, $p<.05$), higher strict discipline scores ($F=5.797$, $p<.001$) than low rejecting mothers, as hypothesized. However, no significant differences were found between high and low rejection mother groups in terms of control, overprotection and marital conflict and the related hypotheses were rejected.

The hypothesis predicting that the low education mother group will have significantly higher rejection scores than the high education group, was supported ($F=9.104$, $p<.001$).

The results of t-test and Pearson Correlations, comparing low and high rejection groups and investigating their correlations with the above variables were parallel to the results of the hypotheses.

The conceptual validity of the PARQ was tested through factor analysis, where 50 items clustered around one factor, namely the rejection factor.

The test-retest reliability coefficients were not satisfactory, the coefficient for the total score being .46. The scale has low stability over time.

Internal consistency and homogeneity of the scale were tested by Cronbach α and Pearson correlations. Alpha coefficient for the total scale was .90. Subscale-total correlations ranged from .75 to .86. Item-subscale correlations were between .16 and .59 ($p<.001$). Leaving out the items that showed low item-total correlations (items 1,3,24,36,48) an instrument with 51 items, with stronger internal consistency is provided for assessment of parental rejection.

These results support the reliability and the construct validity of the Turkish PARQ mother-form. However, the test-retest reliability should be studied further.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, annenin çocuğunu kabullenme ve reddetme davranışlarına ait algılarını ölçen. Aile-çocuk ilişkileri, anne-formunun dilsel eşitlik, güvenirlik ve geçerliğini destekleyici bulgular sağlamaktır. Özgün form 1980 yılında Rohner, Saavedra ve Granum tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Formda 60 item ve dört alt boyut mevcuttur.

Aile-çocuk ilişkileri ölçeği ilk olarak 1988'de Polat ve Sunar tarafından Türkçe'ye çevrilmiştir. Bu araştırmada, geri çeviri ve revizyon işlemlerini takiben, dilsel eşitlik çalışmasında 40 anne, belirli zaman aralığıyla değişik lisanlarda, ölçeği iki kez yanıtlamışlardır. Farklı lisanlardaki formlar arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmamış; tek yönlü varyans analizi, t-testleri ve Pearson çarpımlar korelasyonu sonucunda yüksek korelasyonlar elde edilmiştir. Cronbach alfa değerleri .45 ve .85 arasında değişmektedir. Böylece, çalışma ile ilgili hipotezler desteklenmiştir.

Madde-toplam ve madde-alttest korelasyon analizinde bazı maddeler düşük korelasyon ($<.20$) göstermişlerdir. Ölçeği daha sağlıklı kılmak amacıyla yapılan pilot çalışmada, üç farklı eğitim düzeyinden seçilen 139 anne ölçeği cevaplamışlardır.

Tüm grup için, alttest-toplam korelasyonları (.63-.89 arası) ve Cronbach alfa değerleri (toplam $\alpha = .90$) yüksek bulunmuştur. 18, 21 ve 55. maddeler, her eğitim grubunda, alttestleri ve toplam puanla düşük korelasyon göstermişlerdir. 52 no.lu maddenin ise bu örneklem grubu için ayırdedici özelliğe sahip olmadığı gözlenmiştir. Bu nedenle söz konusu dört madde ölçekten çıkarılmıştır. 32 ve 45 no.lu maddeler ise, en yüksek korelasyonu gösterdikleri alt-testlere dahil edilmiştir. Bu revizyonların ardından, alttest-toplam ve Cronbach alfa korelasyonları yükselmiş ve ölçeğin görünüm geçerliği gelişmiştir.

Aile-çocuk ilişkileri, Türkçe formunun yapı geçerliliği şu ölçeklerle araştırılmıştır: Aile Ortamı Ölçeği: Birlik-beraberlik ve kontrol boyutları, Sürekli kaygı ölçeği, Aile Hayatı ve Çocuk Yetiştirme Tutumu Ölçeği: aşırı koruyuculuk, demokrasi, annenin ev kadınlığı rolünü reddetmesi, aile içi çatışma ve sıkı baskı ve disiplin boyutları.

Söz konusu ölçekler, düşük, orta ve yüksek eğitim düzeylerine sahip 229 anne tarafından yanıtlanmıştır. Test-tekrar test güvenirliği için 48 anneye Aile-çocuk ilişkileri ölçeği ikinci kez verilmiştir.

Tek yönlü varyans analizlerine göre, aile-çocuk ilişkileri ölçeğinde yüksek reddetme puanına sahip olan anneler, az reddedenlere göre, birlik-beraberlik ve demokrasi alt boyutunda daha düşük puan, sürekli kaygı, ev kadınlığı rolünü reddetme ve sıkı disiplin alt boyutlarında ise, daha yüksek puan almışlardır. Böylece ilgili hipotezler desteklenmiştir. Kontrol, aşırı koruyuculuk ve aile içi çatışma alt boyutlarında ise, çok ve az reddeden anneler arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmamış ve ilgili hipotezler reddedilmiştir. Düşük eğitim seviyeli anneler, yüksek eğitimlilere oranla, anlamlı düzeyde yüksek reddetme puanına ulaşmışlardır. T-testleri ve Pearson çarpım katsayıları da yukarıdaki sonuçları destekler doğrultudadır.

Yapılan faktör analizinde, 50 maddenin tek faktörde kümelendiği ve bunun reddetme faktörü olduğu saptanmıştır.

Test-tekrar test korelasyonunun düşük olması (toplam .46), ölçeğin zaman içinde değişmez olmadığını göstermektedir.

Ölçeğin iç tutarlılığı ve bütünlüğü Cronbach alfa ve Pearson çarpım korelasyonları ile araştırılmıştır. Tüm ölçek için alfa değeri .90 olarak bulunmuştur. Alt-test-toplam korelasyonları .75 ile .86 arasında değişmektedir. Madde-alttest değerleri ise .16 ile .59 arasındadır. Düşük madde-toplam korelasyonu olan maddeler (1,3,24,36 ve 48) ölçekten çıkarılınca iç tutarlılığın arttığı gözlenmiştir.

Elde edilen bulgular, Aile-çocuk ilişkileri anne formunun güvenirlik ve geçerliliğini destekler niteliktedir. Ancak, test-tekrar test güvenirliği üzerinde yeni bir çalışma önerilir.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZET	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND AND SURVEY OF LITERATURE	3
A. PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE	3
B. THE PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION THEORY (PART)	6
1- The Construct of Parental Acceptance-Rejection	6
2- PART As An Emotional Abuse Theory	7
3- Studies conducted on Parents With Regard to Causes of Abuse	8
4- Support for PART in Türkiye	13
C. STUDIES ON CHILD ABUSE AMONG FAMILIES IN TÜRKİYE	14
1- The Turkish family	14
2- Family studies in Türkiye	15
D. ASSESSMENT OF PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION	17
III. ADAPTING THE PARQ MOTHER-FORM INTO TURKISH	19
A. METHOD	19
1- Translation and back-translation processes	19
2- The Transliterated Equivalence Study	19
3- Instrument	20
4- Procedure and Design	20
5- Data Analysis	21

	Page
IV. RESULTS	22
V. DISCUSSION	33
VI. PILOT STUDY	34
A. METHOD	34
1- Subjects	34
2- Instruments	35
3- Procedure and Design	35
4- Data Analysis	37
VII. RESULTS	37
VIII. DISCUSSION OF THE PILOT STUDY	49
XI. THE STUDY PROPER:	
The validity and reliability of the Turkish version of PARQ mother-form	51
A. Statement of the problem	51
B. Hypotheses	51
X. METHOD	53
1- Subjects	53
2- Instruments	54
3- Procedure and Design	57
4- Data Analysis	58
XII. RESULTS	59
XII. DISCUSSION OF THE STUDY PROPER	78
REFERENCES	86
APPENDIX	96
A Aile-Çocuk İlişkileri Formu (Anne) (PARQ mother form)	96
B Anne Bilgi Formu (Demographic Information Questionnaire)	101
C Aile Ortamı Ölçeği (Family Environment Questionnaire)	103
D Kendini Değerlendirme Formu (STAI - Trait Anxiety Scale)	106
E Aile Hayatı ve Çocuk Yetiştirme Tutumu Ölçeği (Parental Attitude Research Instrument)	107

		Page
F	Table 1 Age of mothers	111
	Table 2 Place of birth of mothers	111
	Table 3 Place of residence of mothers	111
	Table 4 Mother education	112
	Table 5 Marital status of mothers	112
	Table 6 Working status of mothers	112
	Table 7 Classification of mothers' work	112
	Table 8 Mother profession	113
	Table 9 Father age	113
	Table 10 Father education	113
	Table 11 Father profession	114
	Table 12 No. of children in the family	114
G	Table 13 Item-subscale and item-total correlation coefficients of the Turkish PARQ mother-form, unrevised	115
H	Table 14 Means and SD's for the 56 items of the revised Turkish PARQ	121
I	Table 15 Item-subscale and item-total correlation coefficients of the revised Turkish PARQ	122
J	Table 16 Age of mothers	124
	17 Place of birth of mothers	124
	18 Place of residence of mothers	124
	19 Mother education	124
	20 Marital status of mothers	125
	21 Working status of mothers	125
	22 Classification of mother's work	125
	23 Mother's profession	125
	24 Father age	126
	25 Father education	126

		Page
	26 Father profession	126
	27 No. of children in the family	126
K	Table 28 Scheffé procedure for Cohesion by PARQ	127
	29 Scheffé procedure for Trait Anxiety by PARQ	127
	30 Scheffé procedure for Democracy by PARQ	127
	31 Scheffé procedure for Rejection of homemaking role by PARQ	127
	32 Scheffé procedure for Strict Discipline by PARQ	128
	33 Scheffé procedure for PARQ by education	128

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1 First administration means and standard deviations of PARQ subscales of four experimental groups	22
2 Second administration means and standard deviations of PARQ subscales of four experimental groups	22
3 Anova for the 1st. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the warmth/affection subscale	23
4 Anova for the 1st. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the aggression/hostility subscale	23
5 Anova for the 1st. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the warmth/indifference subscale	23
6 Anova for the 1st. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the undifferentiated rejection subscale	24
7 Anova for the 1st. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the total scale	24
8 Anova for the 2nd. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the warmth/affection subscale	24
9 Anova for the 2nd. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the aggression/hostility subscale	25
10 Anova for the 2nd. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the neglect/indifference subscale	25
11 Anova for the 2nd. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the undifferentiated rejection subscale	25
12 Anova for the 2nd. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the total scale	26
13 t-tests between 1st. and 2nd. administration of PARQ subscales of four experimental groups	26
14 Pearson Product Moment Cor. Coefficients between 1st. and 2nd. administrations of PARQ subscales of four experimental groups	27

Tables	Page
15 Item-subscale Cronbach α coefficient values of English and Turkish PARQ mother-forms	28
16 Corrected item-subscale and item-total α coefficients of English and Turkish PARQ mother-forms	29
17 Means, SD's, subscale-total correlation coefficients of PARQ subscales and total scale for three education groups	37
18 One-way Anova of the warmth/affection subscale by three education groups	37
19 One-way Anova of the aggression/hostility subscale by three education groups	38
20 One-way Anova of the neglect/indifference subscale by three education groups	38
21 One-way Anova of the undifferentiated rejection subscale by three education groups	38
22 One-way Anova of the total rejection score by three education groups	38
23 Means, SD's, item-subscale and item-total cor. coefficients for three education groups in the Pilot Study	39
24 Cronbach α coefficients for PARQ subscales	45
25 Item-subscale and item-total cor. coefficients of the revised PARQ mother-form	46
26 Subscale-total cor. coefficients of the revised PARQ	48
27 Comparison between Cronbach α cor. coefficient of the revised Turkish PARQ subscales and the total rejection score and of the unrevised Turkish PARQ mother-form	48
28 Subjects from each high-school	53
29 Mean, mode, median and SD's of the PARQ subscales and the total scale	59
30 Four rejection groups on PARQ	60
31 Group means and SD's of the cohesion subscale scores of the FEQ	61

Tables	Page
32 One-way Anova of cohesion by four rejection groups	61
33 Mean, mode, median and SD of the FEQ control subscale scores	62
34 Means and SD's of four rejection groups on the FEQ control subscale	62
35 One-way Anova of Cohesion by four PARQ groups	62
36 Mean, mode, median and SD of Trait Anxiety scores	63
37 Means and SD's of four rejection groups on STAI, A-trait scale	63
38 One-way Anova of Trait Anxiety by four PARQ groups	63
39 Means, modes, median and SD's of PARI subscales	64
40 Means and SD's of four rejection groups on PARI, F1, overprotection	64
41 One-way Anova of PARI, F1, by four PARQ groups	65
42 Means and SD's of four rejection groups on PARI, F2, democracy	65
43 One-way Anova of PARI, F2 by four PARQ groups	65
44 Means and SD's of four rejection groups on PARI, F3, rejection of homemaking role	66
45 One-way Anova of PARI, F3 by four PARQ groups	66
46 Means and SD's of four rejection groups on PARI, F4, marital conflict	67
47 One-way Anova of PARI, F4 by four PARQ groups	67
48 Means and SD's of four rejection groups on PARI, F5, strict discipline	68
49 One-way Anova of PARI, F5 by four PARQ groups	68
50 Means and SD's of three education groups on PARQ rejection	69
51 One-way Anova of PARQ by three education levels	69
52 t-test results of extreme groups	70
53 Pearson Cor. Coefficients of PARQ with other variables	71
54 Factor Analysis with four factors	72

Tables	Page
55 Factor Analysis with two factors	72
56 Test-retest reliability coefficients for the PARQ subscales and the total score	73
57 Test-retest reliability coefficients for the PARQ subscales and the total score among middle and high education groups	73
58 Means and SD's of test-retest correlation coefficients of PARQ subscales and total score	74
59 Cronbach α correlation coefficients for PARQ subscales and total scale	74
60 Corrected item-total correlation coefficients of the PARQ items	75
61 Item-subscale correlation coefficients of PARQ	76
62 Subscale-total correlation coefficient of PARQ	77

I. INTRODUCTION

The ultimate aim of psychological counseling and guidance is the self actualization of the individual (Rappaport, 1977). One important goal is prevention of psychological problems and maladjustment. To serve these goals, the individual has to be taken as the focus of attention from early childhood years on. Even before the child is born, the family has to be seen as a target for intervention for the healthy development of the child.

Family is a social system in which the development and the personality growth of the child and the parent-child relationship take place. Parents are the most significant people during childhood and the child has a need to be loved, valued and cared by them (Hjelle and Ziegler, 1981). Parents vary in their child-rearing attitudes, in the warmth and affection they express towards their children; but the need for positive response does not vary. The withdrawal of affection is sufficient to produce negative effects on the functioning of the individual (Haque, 1987; Rohner, 1975, 1986).

Looking from the negative point of view, child abuse and neglect is one frame which can be utilized in approaching, analyzing, understanding and intervening for change within the family system. Among the negative effects of child abuse and neglect, we can mention a wide range of psychiatric and behavioural disorders, psychosomatic reactions, academic problems, disturbed body image, stuttering, low self-esteem, negative world-view, hostility, aggression, high anxiety, dependency, emotional instability and unresponsiveness, negative self adequacy and lack of security (Rohner, 1991).

In the process of child-rearing, mothers are usually in close interaction with their children. The norms prevalent in the culture show that the way mothers themselves had been brought up as children, their personality characteristics and some environmental factors form their child-rearing methods, which, in turn, effect their children's physical, emotional, social and cognitive development (Yörükoğlu, 1984; Kulaksızoğlu, 1985; Wolfe, 1989).

For the purpose of studying and providing health-inducing interventions using the child abuse and neglect frame in approaching the family, first and foremost, assessment tools are necessary. In studies concerning child abuse and neglect, children's

perceptions of parental behaviour have been emphasized and assessed by some tools. Parental Acceptance - Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) child-form, which was developed by Rohner, Saavedra and Granum in 1980, and which has been adapted for Türkiye by Polat and Sunar (1988) and Erdem and Erkman (1990), is one of these rare tools.

Another way child abuse can be assessed is by focusing on the parent as the abuser (Parke, Collmer, 1975). Parental assessment has taken different forms such as observation, using behaviour checklists, administration of personality tests, etc, as well as assessing parental perception of many facets of his/her interaction with his/her child. Parental Acceptance - Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) mother-form is one such tool.

In an effort to gain such a tool for Türkiye, the present study aimed to provide supporting evidence for the transliteral equivalence, reliability and validity of the PARQ mother-form. This instrument gives information about mother's self-perception of her way of treating her child. The original form of PARQ was constructed on a rational-theoretical basis by Rohner, Saavedra and Granum, in 1980. The child and the mother forms of the instrument can be used together to assess rejection from both child's and mother's point of view. The mother-form can provide a direction for intervention with mothers, in designing prevention programs to increase accepting behaviours and decrease rejecting and neglecting behaviours in parents. Studies conducted using the PARQ mother-form can make contributions to mother-education studies in Türkiye, by emphasizing the major aspects of mothers' interactional behaviour towards their children.

II. BACKGROUND AND SURVEY OF LITERATURE

In this section, psychological abuse, the parental - acceptance rejection theory (PART), the construct of parental acceptance - rejection, PART as an emotional abuse theory, studies conducted on parents with regard to causes of abuse, support for PART in Türkiye, assessment of parental acceptance - rejection, studies on child abuse among families in Türkiye will be reviewed.

A. PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE

Psychological or emotional abuse can be defined as lack of love, care and attention by the parents and the negative behaviour and state of their children resulting from it (Garrison, 1987). Emotional abuse can occur singly or can be accompanied by other forms of abuse, such as physical or sexual abuse.

In the last decade, interest in the issue of abuse has increased as a result of the activities of media, public and professionals in the field. There exists a variety of definitions of abuse, formulated by professionals. One of the most popular definitions belongs to Garbarino and Gilliam (1987). They define emotional abuse as "the acts of omission or commission by a parent or guardian that are judged by a mixture of community values and professional expertise to be inappropriate and damaging" (p.6).

Based on the definitions developed by the International Conference on Psychological Abuse of Children and Youth, acts of maltreatment have been classified as follows:

Rejection: "To refuse to recognize the value of the child, to decline to accept, to discard as useless or unsatisfactory." Example: Actively refusing to help the child, treating a child differently from sibling or peers in ways that show dislike for the child.

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

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

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

Corrupting: "The missocialize, to force the child into antisocial behaviours, to maladapt to social needs." Examples: To reinforce behaviours that degrade other races or ethnic groups; to encourage drug and alcohol use; to teach and reinforce aggressive and delinquent behaviours.

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

Denying Emotional Responsiveness: "Not providing adequate nurturance and affection; failing to provide sensitive, responsive caregiving." Examples: Mechanistic handling of the child, avoiding the child's attempts to interact, denying emotional responsiveness, passively ignoring the child's emotional needs as opposed to active rejecting (Brassard et al., 1987).

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

Bailey and Bailey (1986) conducted a study with 207 protective service practitioners, living in different states in the U.S.A., in order to develop definitions of emotional abuse. The respondents were requested to develop statements of maltreatment, to categorize these statements and to indicate if any psychological or legal service is necessary for that particular parent-child interaction.

The results were translated into specific parental actions stated as follows:

- 1- The parent fails to provide nurturance and attachment.

- 2- The parent treats the child differently from other siblings; consistently punishes, criticizes, gives fewer rewards or praise to him/her.
- 3- The parent has high expectations from the child which are above his/her normal abilities and punishes, criticizes the child when he/she does not meet that level.
- 4- The parent exploits the child by forcing him/her to perform difficult household tasks, and take care of the parent.
- 5- The parent ignores the child's need for physical closeness; expresses no affection.
- 6- The parent confuses the sexual identity of the child by treating or teasing him/her as if s/he were from the opposite sex.
- 7- The parent does not show stability and predictability about what is expected from the child.
- 8- The parent exposes the child to maladaptive influences and forces the child to be involved in it.
- 9- The parent exposes the child to maladaptive influences and allows the child to be involved in it.
- 10- The parent ridicules and belittles the child.
- 11- The parent exposes the child to pornographic materials by force.
- 12- The parent allows the child to watch pornographic materials.
- 13- The parent threatens the child excessively and uses psychological punishment.
- 14- The custodial parent does not allow the child to develop attachment and visit the other parent.
- 15- The parent refuses to have any professional help for the child's problems and forbids the child to receive any counseling services.

In addition to these categories of abuse, theoretical perspectives were developed

(Rosenberg and Germain, 1987). One of these theories is Rohner's Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PART) (Rohner, 1980b).

B. THE PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE - REJECTION THEORY (PART)

PART is a theory of emotional abuse which attempts to explain and predict the major consequences of parental acceptance and rejection for behavioural, cognitive, emotional development of children and for the personality functioning of adults. The theory is based on the phylogenetic perspective which tries to establish empirically derived, universal principles of human behaviour. The main assumption underlying the theory is that human beings are born with a need to receive warmth from people important to them. This is an inherited need, regardless of culture, race, physical type, social class, language, geographic region or other conditions. PART predicts that the withdrawal of parental acceptance will cause negative outcomes (Rohner, 1984, 1991).

1- The Construct of Parental Acceptance-Rejection

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

Parental acceptance can be expressed as physical affection through fondling, kissing, hugging, holding, smiling; or as verbal affection through complimenting, praising, saying nice things. Such behaviours of warmth give the message to a child that s/he is loved and cared for.

On the other hand, **rejection** is defined in the theory as the absence or withdrawal of acceptance and warmth. Rejection takes three forms: hostility-aggression, indifference-neglect and undifferentiated rejection. **Hostility** refers to feelings of enmity, resentment and anger towards the child. It may be expressed in forms of verbal or physical aggression. ^{Aggression} ~~Aggression~~ refers to behaviours that intend to hurt another person physically or psychologically. Physical aggression is expressed in behaviours like pinching, shaking, hitting, pushing, biting, scalding, burning, scratching, tying up and the like. Verbal aggression includes sarcasm, cursing, belittling, scapegoating, denigrating and the like.

Indifference is lack of concern for the child. It can be expressed as behavioural neglect where the parent is physically or psychologically unavailable, unresponsive, distant and fails to fulfill the medical and physical needs of the child.

Undifferentiated rejection is conveying of rejection through actions or attitudes, as well as possible omission of behaviours, rather than commission. The parent perceives himself/herself as benign unloving toward his/her child but does not attribute this to parental active indifference, neglect or overt hostility/aggression (Jordan, 1990).

Parental acceptance-rejection may be viewed from two perspectives; a) as subjectively experienced by the child or subjectively reported by the parent, and b) as externally measured by an outside observer (Rohner, 1991). The first perspective points out to self-perceived acceptance-rejection, whereas the second perspective includes the objectively determined acceptance-rejection. Many researchers believe that it is the child's perceptions of his/her parents' behaviour that effect his/her physical, emotional, psychological and cognitive development (Herzberger, 1985). It is possible for a child to feel "unloved" without observable indicators or parental reports of parental hostility - aggression or indifference - neglect. Similarly, parental aggression may be observed or reported by parents in a family, but the child might not perceive it as anger or rejection directed to him/her. So, the child's interpretation of parental behaviour determines the impact it will have on the child (Ney, Moore, McPhee and Trought, 1986).

2- Part as an Emotional Abuse Theory

Some definitions of psychological child abuse and neglect are included in the concept of parental acceptance-rejection. PART includes the categories of rejecting, degrading, terrorizing, isolating, adultifying and denying emotional responsiveness; leaving exploiting and corrupting out (Rohner, 1984). Definitions of child abuse and neglect may vary from one culture to another; whereas PART has a worldwide approach, trying to establish principles for all human beings.

Research on results of parental rejection and assessment of child abuse and neglect shows similarities. PART emphasizes seven personality characteristics which rejected children develop. These are hostility, dependence, negative self-esteem, negative self-adequacy, emotional instability, emotional unresponsiveness and a negative worldview (Rohner, 1991). These predictions were supported by research findings

(Rohner, 1980b; Salama, 1986; Kitahara, 1987; Polat & Sunar, 1988; Haque, 1987; Erdem & Erkman, 1990; Hart & Brassard, 1986; Alantar & Erkman, 1989; Erkman, 1990; Kozcu, 1990).

Other support in research is cited by Green (1978), who examined 60 abused, 30 neglected and 30 control children. Abused and neglected children were found to have poor impulse control, low self-esteem, aggressive behaviour patterns, school related problems and poor academic performance (cited in Browne & Saqi, 1989).

Martin and Beezley (1977) found that among 50 abused children, more than half had low self-esteem, were hostile and socially isolated (cited in Lynch, 1988).

Aberand and Zigler (1981) and Fontana (1973) report that abused and neglected children frequently become anxious, aggressive and hostile (cited in Garbarino, Guttman-nand Seeley, 1986).

Some definitions of psychological child abuse and neglect rely solely on parental behaviours. PART relies on the subjective perceptions of children, as well as on parental behaviour measured by different instruments and as reported by parents themselves (Rohner, 1991). PART predicts that rejected children grow into adults with strong needs for affection and an inability to return it. Any of these rejected adults who become parents are expected by PART to reject their own children. It can be concluded that many abusive parents were themselves abused, neglected, deprived of warmth and affection in their childhood (Rohner, 1991).

So, in addition to children's subjective perceptions, assessment of parental behaviour in terms of parents' subjective report, is an indispensable source of information for understanding and intervening with emotional abuse.

3- Studies Conducted on Parents with Regard to Causes of Abuse

The causes of child abuse are multidetermined and require an evaluation of social and cultural, as well as psychological forces (Justice and Justice, 1990). In this section, literature on the characteristics of family environment, child-rearing attitudes of mothers, their education and anxiety as a personality trait will be reviewed.

In a psychologically maltreating family, the family climate is often characterized

by tension, stress, conflict, aggressiveness, mistrust, broken communication, chaos or extreme rigidity,, seperatedness or extreme cohesion (Garbarino, 1986). Similarly, physically and sexually abused victims report their families to be lower than families of the nonabused in areas such as cohesion, organization, intellectual, cultural and active recreational orientation (Carnes, Wolf, Lepinski, 1983).

In order to function well, families require satisfactory marital relationships, parental coalition, satisfactory sibling-parent and child relationships, as well as support among family members (Arnon Bentovim, in Maher, 1989). In cohesive and organized families, there is open expressiveness of feelings, communication and mutuality. Structures and rules are clear. When social relations within the family are weak or disorganized, violence may be expected (Levinson, 1989). Amount of time family members spend together, the intensity of their involvement with one another, the number of activities they are involved in, isolation from outside help and high levels of stress are contributing factors to violence within a family (Gelles and Straus, 1979, cited in Levinson, 1989).

Marital relationship, as a contributing factor to family health, has also been investigated. Single parent families are identified as "a group at risk" since the mother bears the burden of child care alone (Rohner, 1986). Satisfactory marital relationships and parental coalition are needed in a family to function well. Marital disputes are situational stressors that may cause abuse (Browne and Saqi, 1989). Dissatisfaction with marriage may lead to family breakdown, which, in turn, may cause neglect and abuse and failure of care in the family (Bentovim, 1984). Young's (1964) and Miller's (1983) studies support these predictions. Young reported marital discord in both abusing and neglecting families. Similarly, Miller found that abusing parents were more dissatisfied with their marriage than the controls.

Demographic and personality characteristics of parents are as important as the family environment characteristics in investigating abuse. Education level of the parents is one demographic factor which effects parental behaviour. Zuckerman (1958) and Küçük and Öner (1987) support this fact by their findings; education of the mother is the most significant variable related to parental attitude, which, in turn, explains abuse and neglect. Wolfe (1989) in his study found low SES and low level of education to be common in abusive families. Such results were found in researches by Zeytinoğlu and Kozcu (1987), Bilir et al. (1991) in Türkiye.

As mentioned above, personality characteristics of parents are determinants of their behaviour towards their children. Research done among abusive families shows that abusing mothers have lower self-esteem, less family satisfaction and higher frustration than nonabusing mothers (Hurley, 1969, cited in Parke et al. 1975). Similarly, abusive parents report elevated physical and emotional symptoms, dissatisfaction, irritation, physical health problems and stress in child-rearing (Conger, Burgess, Barrett, 1979; Lahey et al., 1984; Mash et al., 1983). These findings are supported by evidence of less family satisfaction and less need to give nurturance among abusers in comparison with nonabusers (Rohner, 1975). Rohner (1980) has also found out that abusing mothers have a rejecting attitude towards their home-making role.

Another major personality characteristic which is common among abusing parents is anxiety. Anxiety, stress and conflict in the family can be considered among causes of abuse. Stress does not directly cause child abuse; violence is a form of response to stress (Straus and Kantor, 1986, cited in Helfer and Kempe, 1987). So, abuse is seen as a result of stress and frustration encountered by parents in their attempts to cope with their environment (Molnick and Hurley, 1969, cited in Parke and Collmer, 1975). For example, stress was found to differentiate good care from inadequate care in families in the study of Egeland, Breitenbucher and Rosenberg (1980). Highly stressed mothers who were also anxious and aggressive were more likely to neglect and abuse their infants. According to Garbarino et al. (1980), in abusive families, parent-child relationship is tense, due to the interactional stress environment created by the parent. Such an environment is the result of the lack of ability to cope with crises and stressful conditions (Brandt and Steele, 1986, cited in Helfer and Kempe, 1987). Abusive parents lack impulse control and act out violently under stress or tension (Rohner, 1975). In general, difficulty dealing with aggressive impulses, lack of social skills, low self-esteem, poor self-understanding, lack of attachment to the child, social isolation, inadequate household and child management skills, lack of parenting skills, inconsistent use of discipline, inability to control anger, unmet needs, high anxiety, immaturity, dependency, narcissism and impulsivity are personality characteristics used to define abusive mothers/parents (Molnick and Hurley, 1969, cited in Parke and Collmer, 1975; Steele, 1987; Adelson, 1961; Kelley et al., 1990; Foreward, 1989; Justice and Justice, 1990; Garbarino et al., 1986, Schesingen and Revitch, 1981; Elmer, 1979 in Ammerman and Hersen, 1990; Green, 1978 in Hasselt et al., 1988). Smith, Honigsberger and Smith (1973) also report neurosis with depression and anxiety among the maltreating mother group. In clinical research by

Kaufman and Sandler (1985), Berkowitz (1983) and Vasta (1982), greater levels of anger, anxiety and aggression among abusive parents were seen (cited in Walker et al., 1988). According to Brunnuquell et al. (1981 cited in Wolfe, 1989), mothers at-risk for abuse and neglect during pregnancy lack the knowledge about parent-child relationships and have negative reaction to pregnancy. After the baby is born, mother's anxiety and fear increase in response to the difficulties presented by the baby. So, the mother experiences ambivalence, cannot cope with the demands of this situation and responds to her anxiety and fear by becoming more hostile and suspicious.

In understanding the causes of abuse, there are some intervening variables which need to be investigated, because they determine the type of behaviour parents display towards their children. Along with family environment and the personality characteristics of parents, their child-rearing attitudes also play an important role in understanding abuse and neglect. In analyzing child-rearing attitudes, it is useful to look at Bell and Harper's (1977) and Burgess' (1979) continuum model of parenting behaviour. They claim that at one end of the continuum there is the most severe and abusive behaviour; whereas at the other end, there are methods promoting child's social, emotional and intellectual development. So, every parent can be placed somewhere on this continuum in this model, according to the degree of negative, inappropriate control strategies s/he is using with his/her child. However, it is not enough to place each parent on this continuum; it is important to understand how parents acquire the behaviour they display towards their children. Both abusive and nonabusive parents learn their child-rearing methods from their own parents. There is empirical evidence that abusive parents are more likely to have experienced aggression, physical/emotional maltreatment during their own childhood than nonabusive parents. So, abusive parents cannot show affection to their children since they had not received it from their parents (Rohner, 1980b, 1986, Belsky, 1980; Berger, 1983 a,b; Garbarino et al., 1986; Trickett and Sussman, 1989; Corby, 1987; Wolfe, 1989). Lack of attention is usually accompanied by being unavailable for children's needs, lack of knowledge and skills to meet their needs, setting too many rules, having high expectations or underestimating children's abilities and preventing him/her from actualizing his/her potentials (Garbarino et al., 1986). Parallel to these findings, research by Mac Carthy (1979), Herrenkohl and Herrenkohl and Egolf (1983) and, Reid and Taplin (1976) has revealed that abusive parents do not have adequate parenting skills. They vary in their child-rearing methods frequently, communicate doubt, unpredictability and inconsistency to their children and they lack the knowledge of effective

child management techniques. The importance of child-rearing attitudes can be understood better if we look at the studies that compare abusing and nonabusing parents. For example, Masch et al. (1983) studied the influence of specific child-rearing situations on abusive and nonabusive mothers. When these experimental groups were asked to have their children complete a more demanding task, abusive mothers were more controlling and directive of their children (cited in Wolfe, 1989). Similarly, Susman et al. (1985) studied self-reported child-rearing practices and values of depressed, abusive and normal mothers. High guilt and anxiety, inconsistency, hostility and protectiveness characterized depressed and abusive mothers. Crittenden and Bonvillian's findings (1984) support this research (cited in Wolfe, 1989). They reported abusive mothers to be more active, interfering and occasionally openly hostile against their children when compared with nonabusive mothers. Smith and Hanson (1975, cited in Berger, 1983 b) reported that in abusive families, mothers are overly concerned with some acts of their children but careless about others. Besides this inconsistency, abusive parents usually do not respect their child's personality, thoughts and feelings. They undervalue his/her accomplishments (Belsky, 1980; Berger, 1983b; Garbarino et al., 1986). They also consistently prevent their children from participating in normal childhood activities (Berger, 1983b).

In terms of discipline methods, abusive parents rely on power assertive techniques by using restrictive control of their child. In Wolfe's research (1989), they reported punitive approaches, yelling and threatening regardless of the type of child misbehaviour. Abusive mothers show less maternal warmth and supportiveness when interacting with their children and they do not reason with them (Jones, Alexander, 1986, cited in Helfer and Kempe, 1987). Instead, they are more likely to use power assertive control strategies like threats, negative demands, disapproval rather than more positively oriented approaches like reasoning, cooperation and approval (Walters and Hall, 1986, cited in Ammerman and Hersen, 1990). Garbarino et al. (1986) also mentioned that abusive parents make harsh and destructive responses to the needs of the child, terrorizing, degrading, threatening, exploiting, verbally abusing their child, with no tolerance for his/her misbehaviour. Findings support the existence of authoritarian parenting style among abusive parents. This style is defined to be a rejecting, unresponsive, parent-centered method with restriction of child's ability to assert his/her needs and participate in rule generation and regulation (Wolfe, 1989). Such a parenting style contradicts with the democratic childrearing method. Wolfe (1989) reports that abusive parents are ineffectual in their attempts to teach new behaviour or control undesirable behaviour with their children, failing

to show sensitive and stimulating care to them. They use ineffective punishments and fail to respond to prosocial behaviour. As a result, abusive parents rely on more punitive and/or aversive techniques in interaction with their children and fewer reason-based ones (Reid and Taplin, 1976; Trickett and Kuczynski, 1986). Disbrow et al. (1977) and Vondra (1990) supported these findings by reporting more severe discipline practices, rigidity and authoritarianism among their experimental abusive parent-groups.

4- Support For Part In Türkiye

Several studies conducted in Türkiye assessing abuse and related phenomena present supportive data for PART as an emotional abuse theory.

Initially, Polat and Sunar (1988) studied with 10-11 year-olds and found that perceived warmth had a strong inverse relationship with negative self evaluation, assessed by Rohner's Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ). Polat's study was followed by Erkman and Alantar's work (1988), with findings of positive correlation between Perceived Emotional Abuse Inventory for Adolescents (PEAIFA) and Perceived Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ). This relationship between PARQ and PEAIFA indicated that as perceived rejection increased, perceived abuse increased also.

In other studies (Erkman 1989, 1990), parental rejection in relation to perceived parental abuse, family environment and abuse was investigated among remigrant 16 year old Turkish students, as well as university students of ages 18 to 24, respectively. Results showed that the perception of family cohesion was negatively correlated with maternal non-warmth, aggression, neglect, perceived rejection, anxiety and perceived abuse.

Erdem and Erkman (1990), in their study with 13 and 14 year-olds, investigated the relationship of perceived parental rejection with variables like self-concept, anxiety, attributional style of causality, academic achievement, perceived overprotection, democracy, maternal rejection of homemaking role, marital conflict and strict discipline. Results revealed that the high rejection perceiving group had a more negative Self-concept, a more helpless explanatory style of causality, higher anxiety level and perceived less democracy at home, more marital conflict, more strict discipline, more maternal rejection of homemaking role and had lower achievement in comparison with the low rejection perceiving group.

Kozcu (1990) investigated the relationship of parental acceptance-rejection, perceived emotional abuse, mental health, perceived family attitudes and substance abuse, among 127 university students, ages 17 to 20. Results indicated that subjects perceiving emotional abuse and parental rejection, expressed more mental health problems. Subjects perceiving maternal rejection also perceived emotional abuse. Substance abuse existed more among high emotional abuse perceiving group. Also, students who evaluated their families as uninvolved, had poorer mental health; while those evaluating their families as democratic, had fewer psychological problems and perceived less emotional abuse.

Erkman (1991), reviewing all existing studies in Türkiye, drew the conclusion that PART has strong support based on an emotional abuse theory in addition to having cross-cultural validity, to which Rohner (1991, personal communication) has responded that such research is also supportive of his theory on a wider scale.

C. STUDIES ON CHILD ABUSE AMONG FAMILIES IN TÜRKİYE

The study of child abuse and neglect in Türkiye is a recent phenomena. Roughly it can be said that such an active interest has only started in the 80's. Characteristics of the Turkish culture and family have to be considered in evaluating these studies.

1. The Turkish Family

There are many factors that determine parents' child-rearing attitudes. These are cultural values, satisfaction with parental role, marital adjustment and reasons for having a child (Mussen and Conger, 1956). Although the Turkish society is undergoing change, our culture may still be described as traditional, authoritarian and patriarchal (Fişek, 1982). Respect for authority and for older people is a cultural value (Kâğıtçıbaşı, 1972b, Stirling, 1965). Being the smallest unit of the culture, the Turkish family is generally warm, loving, rather than hostile and rejecting (Ohlson and Prather, 1978; Gleanson, 1989). It is also a suppressing, conservative environment, where the free and independent development of the child is inhibited and a passive, constricted, dependent personality is fostered (Köknel, 1970). Such a child does not have a sense of autonomy and relies on external loci of control. The general attitude in the family is controlling and protecting. Compliance, quiteness, respect are rewarded, whereas curiosity, independency,

initiative are punished (Öztürk, 1969). The mothers of today who were the children of 70's, were raised and educated in conditions stated above. Their child-rearing attitudes now are effected by their parents', so this knowledge belonging to 1970's still holds. High cohesion in the Turkish family is a cultural norm (Fişek, 1983). Common means of discipline are shaming, scaring, beating, while discipline is inconsistent, controlling but warm.

In a typical Turkish family, children are expected to be obedient and dependent on the parents. Children are valued as sources of future economic support and security (Kâğıtçıbaşı, 1982). When they misbehave, physical punishment is used in order to cease the irritation caused by the misbehaviour. Verbal reasoning and longterm discipline goals are not common, so lack of communication among family members develops (Kâğıtçıbaşı, 1990; Yörükoğlu, 1982; Zeytinoğlu and Kozcu, 1987). In contrast to Western families however, strict discipline and control are not perceived as parental rejection, since love and control go together in parent-child interactions (Kâğıtçıbaşı, 1970).

Education level of the mother is an important factor that has an impact on cultural values and child-rearing methods and also the value given to the child (Kâğıtçıbaşı, 1980; Öner, 1984). Öner (1984) describes the educated urban Turkish family as nonpossessionive, nonpunitive, favoring autonomy, tolerance and verbalization in the child. Mothers of such families do not reject their homemaking roles and do not report serious marital conflict. These parents try to nurture independence permissiveness and self-control in their children.

Marital relationship is another factor effecting mother-child relationship. A mother who is dissatisfied with her marriage has more stress, which in turn, has a negative impact on her relations with her child (Selçuk, 1985; Yavuzer, 1986).

2. Family Studies In Türkiye

There are two main studies investigating child abuse in cooperation with experts. Zeytinoğlu (1988) in her study, asked experts to give reasons for child abuse. Forty-nine percent of the experts mentioned the personality characteristics of the parents as a cause for child abuse. These characteristics were considered to be psychological problems, anxiety, lack of self-control, marital conflicts, alcohol abuse and a past of childhood abuse.

Alantar and Erkman (1989) also asked experts to define the behaviours related to child psychological abuse at home and in school: severe authority, physical punishment, overprotection, restriction of social relationships, over-criticism, giving responsibilities which do not fit the child's age and neglect were reported.

Besides receiving experts' definitions and reasons, Zeytinoğlu and Kozcu (1987) investigated the attitudes of the general population towards physical child abuse. Results showed that 66 percent of the sample was against physical abuse. People who physically abuse their children were considered as unhealthy and in need of treatment. Their findings also showed that the majority of the physically abused children were males, older than three years, whose parents were from low educational levels.

A recent extensive study is reported by a group from Hacettepe University. Bilir, Arı, Dönmez and Güneysu (1991) studied 16, 100 children from all over the country. They found that (1) adolescent mothers abused their children more than nonadolescent mothers; (2) as the education level of the mothers decreased, cases of abuse increased; (3) girls were abused more frequently than boys; (4) abuse was more common in large, crowded families than in small families.

The relationship between low education and abuse is supported by other studies, as well. Polat (1988) in her study found that middle SES mothers, due to their educational level, used more verbal reasoning and less physical punishment with their children, in comparison to low SES mothers. Children associate reasoning used by their parents with warmth and acceptance. In a similar study by Le Compte, Le Compte and Özer (1978), low SES mothers tended to favor a demanding, overprotective role, whereas middle and upper SES mothers favored attitudes of verbalization and equality. Erdem and Erkman (1988) also found that low SES children perceived more rejection than high SES children.

One of the rare studies with abusive parents was done by Selçuk (1985). He found that abusive mothers exerted more control over their children than nonabusive mothers, expected obedience from them, wanted to be dominant, favored physical punishments and did not express much love and affection towards their children.

Children working on the street are "a group at risk" to be abused children, who are not accepted by their families and by the society. In her study with children working on the streets, Zeytinoğlu (1991) found that a great percentage of these children comes from poor families, who have immigrated from villages to cities.

D. ASSESSMENT OF PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION

Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire, mother-form (PARQ mother) was developed by Rohner, Saavedra and Granum in 1980 on a rational-theoretical basis (Goldberg 1972). It is a self-report questionnaire which measures the mother's perceptions of how she treats her child.

PARQ also has a child and adult form. PARQ child form measures the child's perceptions of the way s/he is treated by his/her mother. This form has been adapted to Turkish to Polat and Sunar (1988) and Erdem and Erkman (1990). PARQ adult-form measures the adult's perception of the way s/he was treated by his/her mother. The three forms of PARQ are identical except in tense, pronoun and some wording differences.

In the construction of the PARQ, some theoretical factors were taken into consideration. It has been proven cross-culturally that children experience acceptance -rejection at the hands of their parents- the people most important to them. Parental acceptance -rejection is expressed as verbal and/or physical forms of warmth/affection aggression/hostility, neglect/indifference and undifferentiated rejection. Such behaviours may be experientially perceived by the child or objectively determined by the investigator. Recognizing this fact, PARQ items were constructed to measure these manifestations of the warmth dimension of parenting cross-culturally. In order to satisfy these conditions, cross-cultural surveys among different societies and pilot studies were done for the PARQ child and adult forms.

The Acceptance, Hostile Detachment and Rejection scales of the Schaefer's Child's Report of Parent Behaviour Inventory (CRPBI) and the Physical Punishment scale of Bronfenbrenner's Parental Behaviour Questionnaire (BPB) were used to measure the concurrent validity of PARQ scales. The correlations between PARQ and the validation scales ranged from .43 to .90 for the adult and from .55 to .83 for the child form. The reliability of PARQ scales was measured by Cronbach Alpha coefficients. Alpha values in the adult PARQ ranged from .86 to .95 and in the child PARQ from .72 to .90 ($p < .001$).

In the factor analysis of PARQ adult-form, three factors namely rejection, acceptance and physical punishment, emerged and accounted for 75.45% of the variance. In the child version, two factors, namely rejection and acceptance, account for 58.0% of the variance (Rohner, 1991).

In a study conducted by Rohner (1991) among a sample of 15 mothers, the alpha coefficients for Mother PARQ subscales were found to be: warmth-affection. 85, hostility-aggression. 80, neglect indifference. 74 and undifferentiated rejection. 67. Formal validation procedures were only partially applied to the Mother PARQ. The Adult and Mother PARQ are identical except in tense and pronoun. So, preliminary evidence regarding the Mother PARQ suggests that its validity and reliability are adequate.

All versions of PARQ consist of four subscales, with a total of 60 items. The subscales measure:

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

Items are scored on a four-point likert scale with "Almost Always True" assigned a score of 4, "Sometimes True" with a score of 3, "Rarely True" with a score of 2 and "Almost Never True" with a score of 1. Some items are reversely scored. The warmth affection subscale is referred to as the nonwarmth scale. The sum of all the subscale scores gives a total score which is the rejection score. A high score received on PARQ mother-form means a high level of rejection.

Jordan (1990) has studied a different form of the PARQ, Mother PARQ-control, among 91 primary caregivers. He investigated the relationship between parental acceptance-rejection with child competency and psychopathology, as well as the reliability and validity of Mother PARQ-Control. Results indicated that parental acceptance was positively related to social competence for boys and girls, and was significantly negatively related to total behaviour problems of girls. It was also found that parental rejection and control were correlated. In conclusion, Jordan stated that "Mother PARQ-C had significant ($p < .05$) but moderate validity and reliability, with coefficients ranging between .49 and .87." He reported that he carried out convergent, concurrent and discriminant validity studies.

III. ADAPTING THE PARQ MOTHER-FORM INTO TURKISH: THE TRANSLITERAL EQUIVALENCE STUDY

The transliteral equivalence study was done to establish that the translated Turkish form is equivalent to the original English form of the PARQ mother-form.

A. METHOD

There were two steps in this phase:

- 1- translation and back translation of items
- 2- transliteral equivalence of the new form.

1- Translation and Back-Translation Processes

The initial translation of the PARQ mother-form was done by Polat and Sunar (1988). Later, it was reviewed and modified by Erkman and Anjel through the process of back translation. Two bilingual psychologists were asked to back-translate the Turkish items into English. Items no. 4,7,11,16,20,21,24,25, 27,29,37,43,46,48,51,52,55 and 57 were revised in the Turkish version and, two other bilingual university graduates were asked to translate these revised items back to English. When the back translation was found satisfactory, the scale was subjected to a transliteral equivalence test.

2- The Transliterator Equivalence Study

Subjects: The study was conducted with 40 bilingual mothers who were available to the researchers.

Sample characteristics: Ages of the mothers ranged from 26 to 46. Nineteen mothers had one child, 21 mothers had two children. The youngest child was three years-old; the oldest child was 22 years old. In terms of mother education; five mothers were highschool graduates, 25 mothers were university graduates, 10 mothers had M.A.

degrees and above. Five mothers were university students, 19 mothers were working, 16 mothers were housewives. These findings were obtained through personal communication.

3- Instrument

The original English PARQ mother-form was used in this study. In addition to this original English form called form (E), three experimental versions were developed, which were the translated Turkish form (T) and two split-language forms (ET and TE). In these split-language forms, half of the items which were selected randomly were in English, and the other half was in Turkish. The Turkish items in one split-language form (e.g. form ET) were presented in English in the other split-language form (form TE).

4- Procedure and Design

The four forms (E, T, ET, TE) of the questionnaire were administered to four different groups (1,2,3,4) in a counter-balancing design. Mothers responded to the forms at their homes and gave them back to the researcher. Each group responded to the questionnaire twice in a different language each time and within an interval of two to three weeks. The design of the study was:

Group	N	Form Administration	
		1 st.	2nd.
1	10	E	T
2	10	T	E
3	10	ET	TE
4	10	TE	ET
TOTAL	N=40		

The **hypotheses** of the study were:

- 1- There would be no significant differences among four forms, (E, T, ET and TE) of the instrument

2- There would be no significant differences among experimental groups (1,2,3 and 4).

3- The correlations between first and second administrations, using alternate forms, would be significant and high.

5- Data Analysis

The scores of the groups on the first and second administrations of PARQ were computed in terms of means and standard deviations. The hypotheses were tested by oneway Anova, t-tests and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

IV. RESULTS

In this section, means and standard deviations of four experimental groups on the subscales of PARQ in the first and the second administration are presented, together with one-way Anova analyses, t-test results and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients.

The means and standart deviations of four experimental groups on the subscales of PARQ in 1st and 2nd. administrations are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1
First administration Means and Standard Deviations of PARQ subscales of four expiremental groups

Group	N	warmth-affection		hostility-aggression		indif-neglect		undif. reg.	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1 (E)	10	25.70	4.39	27.50	8.29	21.60	3.06	15.80	3.26
2 (T)	10	25.10	2.56	23.10	4.43	21.30	3.53	15.20	2.39
3 (ET)	10	23.70	2.16	23.60	4.58	21.70	3.97	13.90	1.59
4 (TE)	10	25.30	2.36	25.80	2.94	21.00	2.98	14.80	1.69

Table 2
Second administration Means and Standard Deviations of PARQ subscales of four experimental groups

Group	N	warmth-affection		hostility-aggression		indif-neglect		undif. rej.	
		mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.	mean	S.D.
1 (E)	10	24.80	3.43	25.30	8.12	18.80	2.69	14.50	2.92
2 (T)	10	24.60	3.27	23.50	4.69	21.60	2.76	13.80	2.09
3 (ET)	10	22.80	2.74	23.60	4.97	20.40	3.06	14.90	2.69
4 (TE)	10	24.30	3.13	21.70	4.37	19.80	2.66	13.90	1.44

Results of one-way Anova of PARQ subscales for the first and second administration of the four experimental groups are presented in Tables 3 through 12.

Table 3
Anova for the 1st. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the warmth-affection subscale

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	3	22.6962	7.5654	0.837
within groups	36	325.1998	9.0333	
TOTAL	39	347.8958		

Table 4
Anova for the 1st. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the aggression/hostility subscale

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	3	124.5926	41.5309	1.409
within groups	36	1061.3994	29.4833	
TOTAL	39	1185.9919		

Table 5
Anova for the 1st. administration of the PARQ among-four groups for the neglect/indifference subscale

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	3	3.0000	1.0000	0.9673
within groups	36	418.5998	11.6278	
TOTAL	39	421.5996		

Table 6
Anova for the 1st. administration of the PARQ among four groups for the undifferentiated rejection subscale

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	3	19.0751	6.3584	1.170
within groups	36	195.6999	5.4361	
TOTAL	39	214.7750		

Table 7
Anova for the 1st. administration of the PARQ among-four groups for the TOTAL SCALE

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	3	365.4621	121.8207	1.014
within groups	36	4323.8967	120.1082	
TOTAL	39	4689.3555		

Table 8
Anova for the 2nd. administration of the PARQ among-four groups for the warmth-affection subscale

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	3	24.6640	8.2213	0.827
within groups	36	357.6998	9.9361	
TOTAL	39	382.3635		

Table 9
Anova for the 2nd. administration of the PARQ among-four groups for the aggression/hostility subscale

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	3	64.8748	21.6249	0.656
within groups	36	1187.0992	32.9750	
TOTAL	39	1251.9739		

Table 10
Anova for the 2nd. administration of the PARQ among-four groups for the neglect/indifference subscale

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	3	41.0970	13.6990	1.749
within groups	36	281.9998	7.8333	
TOTAL	39	323.0967		

Table 11
Anova for the 2nd. administration of the PARQ among-four groups for the undifferentiated rejection subscale

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	3	8.0750	2.6917	0.485
within groups	36	199.8999	5.5528	
TOTAL	39	207.9749		

RESEARCH INFORMATION

Table 12
Anova for the 2nd. administration of the PARQ among-four groups for the
TOTAL SCALE

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	Fratio
betw. groups	3	95.6750	31.8917	0.268
within groups	36	4289.0977	119.1416	
TOTAL	39	4384.7695		

As can be seen from Tables 3 through 12, there were no significant differences between the first and the second administration scores of the four experimental groups.

Results of the t-tests between first and second administration of PARQ subscales of four experimental groups can be seen on Table 13.

Table 13
T-tests between 1st. and 2nd. administrations of PARQ subscales of four
experimental groups

Subscales	Group 1 (E-T))				Group 2 (T-E)			
	1st. adm.	2st. adm.	t	p	1st. adm.	2st. adm.	t	p
	mean	mean			mean	mean		
non-warmth	25.70	24.80	1.01	0.337	25.10	24.60	0.54	0.605
agg-host.	27.50	25.30	1.74	0.116	23.10	23.50	-0.41	0.689
neg-indif.	21.60	18.80	3.50	0.007	21.30	21.60	-0.54	0.604
undif-rej.	15.80	14.50	1.40	0.196	15.20	13.80	2.49	0.034
TOTAL	91.0	83.40	2.62	0.028	84.70	83.50	0.69	0.506
rejection score								

Subscales	Group 3 (Mix)				Group 4 (Mix)			
	1st. adm.	2st. adm.	t	p	1st. adm.	2st. adm.	t	p
	mean	mean			mean	mean		
non-warmth	23.70	22.80	1.54	0.159	25.30	24.30	1.20	0.259
agg-host.	23.60	23.60	0.00	1.000	25.80	21.70	3.80	0.004
neg-indif.	21.70	20.40	1.57	0.152	21.00	19.80	1.62	0.140
undif-rej.	13.90	14.90	-1.40	0.195	14.80	13.90	2.38	0.041
TOTAL	82.90	81.70	0.98	0.350	86.90	79.70	3.87	0.004
rejection score								

There was a significant difference ($p<.01$) between the 1st. administration the 2nd. administration of group 1 (E-T) in neglect-indifference subscale and also in the total rejection score ($p<.05$).

There was a significant difference ($p<.05$) between the 1st. and the 2nd. administration of group 2 (T-E) in undifferentiated rejection subscale.

There was a significant difference ($p<.005$) between the 1st. and the 2nd. administration of group 4 (split-language) in aggression-hostility subscale, in undifferentiated rejection subscale ($p<.05$) and in the total rejection score ($p<.005$).

The first and second hypotheses, which stated that there would be no significant differences between experimental groups and forms were confirmed except for the above stated incidences.

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between the first and second administrations of PARQ subscales of the four experimental groups are presented on Table 14.

Table 14
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between 1st. and 2nd.
administrations of PARQ subscales of four experimental groups

	Group 1 (E-T) (N=10)		Group 2 (T-E) (N=10)		Group 3 (Mix) (N=10)		Group 4 (Mix) (N=10)	
Subscales	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
non-warmth n=20	0.77	0.005	0.5096	0.066	0.7386	0.007	0.5735	0.042
agg-host. n=15	0.8818	0.001	0.7765	0.004	0.8667	0.001	0.6265	0.026
neg-indif. n=15	0.6209	0.028	0.8702	0.001	0.7506	0.006	0.6589	0.019
undif. rej. n=10	0.5496	0.050	0.6946	0.013	0.5421	0.053	0.7183	0.010
TOTAL rejection score	0.8194	0.002	0.8635	0.001	0.9378	0.001	0.7588	0.005

The correlations between the 1st. and the 2nd. administrations of each experimental group were at a significantly high level, except in the non-warmth subscale of group 2 ($p=.066$). The third hypothesis was confirmed.

Item-subscale Cronbach α Coefficients of English and Turkish PARQ mother-forms were also calculated. These values are presented on Table 15.

Table 15
Item-subscale Cronbach α Coefficient values of English
and Turkish PARQ mother-forms

Subscales	English PARQ	Turkish PARQ
	(n=40) α	(n=40) α
non-warmth	.7600	.5684
aggression-hostility	.7826	.8400
neglect-indifference	.4604	.6034
undif. rejection	.4123	.4526
TOTAL rejection score	.8593	.8503

Alpha Coefficient for the neglect-indifference subscale of the English PARQ (.4604) and α coefficients for the undif. rejection subscale of both English and Turkish PARQ are low (.4123, .4526).

Corrected item-subscale and item-total α coefficients of both the English and the Turkish PARQ mother-forms were also investigated. The results are on Table 16.

Item-subscale correlations for the English PARQ range from -.0156 to .6860, for the Turkish PARQ between .0162 to .6972. Item-total correlations for the English PARQ range between .0301 and .7705 and for the Turkish PARQ between -.0478 and .6276.

Table 16
Corrected item-subscale and item-total α coefficients of English and Turkish
PARQ mother-forms

PARQ	E	T	E	T
Items	I-subscale	I-subscale	I-total	I-total
1. Ben çocuğum hakkında güzel şeyler söylerim. (NW)	.4126	.5057	.4728	.4201
2. Çocuğun kötü davrandığında onu küçümseyerek azarlarım. (AG)	.1887	.6380	.2634	.5687
3. Çocuğuma sanki orada yokmuş gibi davranırım. (NEG)	.0529	.2719	.1387	.4049
4. Çocuğumu gerçekten sevip sevmediğimden şüphe ediyorum. (UR)	-.0944	.0955	.0259	.0787
5. Günlük yaşantımızı çocuğumla tartışır ve fikrini alırım. (NW)	.2888	.1721	.2074	.3542
6. O beni dinlemediği zaman çocuğumu başkalarına şikayet ederim. (AG)	.5381	.4160	.5201	.3602
7. Çocuğumla candan ilgilenirim. (NEG)	.1230	.2164	.2502	.2649
8. Çocuğumu arkadaşlarını eve getirmesi için cesaretlendiririm ve onların iyi vakit geçirmesine gayret ederim. (NW)	.3521	-.0548	.3681	.0852
9. Çocuğumla alay ederim. (AG)	.1296	.5065	.0011	.5618
10. Beni rahatsız tmediği sürece çocuğumun varlığını bilmezlikten gelirim. (NEG)	.2508	.3947	.3494	.3098
11. Kızgın olduğum zaman çocuğuma bağırırım. (UR)	.2270	.1569	.3899	.4242
12. Çocuğumun bana güvenip açılımasını kolaylaştırırım. (NW)	.3969	.4372	.4042	.4227
13. Çocuğuma sert davranırım. (AG)	.4641	.4934	.3825	.2609
14. Çocuğumun etrafımda olmasından hoşlanıyorum. (UR)	.2940	.2028	.3304	.2038
15. Çocuğum bir şeyi iyi yaptığında onun gurur duymasını sağlıyorum. (NW)	.3961	.4573	.1363	.1701
16. Haketmediği zaman bile çocuğuma vururum. (AG)	.3415	.4719	.3828	.4577

Table 16
(Continued)

PARQ	E	T	E	T
Items	I-subscale	I-subscale	I-total	I-total
17. Çocuğum için yapmam gereken şeyleri unutuyorum. (NEG)	.3537	.5985	.3128	.4680
18. Çocuğum benim için bir yük. (UR)	0.403	-.0440	.1790	-.0946
19. Çocuğumu başkalarına överim. (NW)	.4040	.4750	.2343	.3450
20. Kızgın olduğum zaman çocuğumu cezalandırırım. (AG)	.2980	.0240	.2372	.0387
21. Çocuğumun beslenmesi için gerekli gıdayı almasını sağlarım. (NEG)	.2601	.1343	.1822	-.0951
22. Çocuğumla şefkat ve sevgi dolu konuşurum. (NW)	.5053	.3490	.7705	.4713
23. Çocuğuma karşı çok sabırsızım. (AG)	.4202	.4264	.4973	.4515
24. Çocuğumun sorularına cevap veremeyecek kadar meşgulüm. (NEG)	.0320	.2393	.1764	.3989
25. Çocuğuma içerliyorum. (UR)	.1148	.0943	.2722	.3036
26. Çocuğumu hakettiği zaman överim. (NW)	.3532	.0621	.1658	.1651
27. Çocuğum sinirime dokunur. (AG)	.6276	.5186	.5881	.4419
28. Çocuğumun kimlerle arkadaşlık ettiği ile ilgilenirim. (NEG)	.1730	.0948	.1062	-.0928
29. Çocuğumun hayatındaki olaylarla gerçekten ilgilenirim. (NW)	.2921	.0000	.2949	.0000
30. Çocuğumla kırıci konuşurum. (AG)	.6860	.6972	.5854	.5696
31. Çocuğum yardım istediği zaman anlamazlıktan gelirim. (NEG)	.1661	-.0776	.3686	-.1784
32. Çocuğumun başı dertte olduğunda ona karşı anlayışsız davranırım. (UR)	.1832	-.1119	.4391	-.1098
33. Çocuğuma istenilen ve ihtiyaç duyulan bir kişi olduğunu hissettiririm. (NW)	.2882	.1503	.5161	.1152

Table 16
(Continued)

PARQ	E	T	E	T
Items	I-subscale	I-subscale	I-total	I-total
34. Çocuğuma sinirime dokunduğunu söylerim. (AG)	.4258	.5302	.4574	.4866
35. Çocuğuma büyük özen gösteririm. (NEG)	-.0858	.3197	-.0397	.3071
36. Çocuğum iyi davrandığı zaman onunla gurur duyduğumu söylerim. (NW)	.4247	.0910	.1985	-.1014
37. Çocuğumun kalbini kırarım. (AG)	.5788	.5173	.5359	.3592
38. Çocuğumun hatırlamamı beklediği olayları unuturum. (NEG)	.0655	.3700	.1078	.2895
39. Çocuğum yanlış hareket ettiği zaman onu artık sevmediğimi hissettiririm. (UR)	.1244	.3237	.2274	.2790
40. Çocuğuma yaptığı şeyin önemli olduğunu hissettiririm. (NW)	.3026	.2399	.1893	.0665
41. Çocuğum yanlış bir şey yaptığında onu tehdit ediyorum veya korkutuyorum. (AG)	.2428	.5132	.1390	.4017
42. Çocuğumla birlikte vakit geçirmekten hoşlanırım. (NEG)	.4899	.2898	.5913	.4895
43. Çocuğum üzüldüğü, tasalandığı veya korktuğu zaman ona yardım etmeye çalışırım. (NW)	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000
44. Çocuğum kötü davrandığı zaman onu oyun arkadaşlarının yanında küçük düşürürüm. (AG)	.1177	.5326	.2356	.6276
45. Çocuğumun benimle beraber olmasından kaçınırım. (NEG)	.3652	.2161	.3706	.1458
46. Çocuğumdan şikayet ederim. (UR)	.3919	.2864	.4586	.3722
47. Çocuğumun görüşlerine saygı duyarım ve açıkça söylemesi için onu cesaretlendiririm. (NW)	.3454	.3289	.4352	.3332
48. Çocuğumu olumsuz bir şekilde başka çocuklarla kıyaslarım. (AG)	.6612	.4278	.7686	.5191
49. Plan yaptığım zaman çocuğumu da gözönünde bulundururum. (NEG)	-.0156	-.0162	-.0301	-.0478

Table 16
(Continued)

PARQ	E	T	E	T
Items	i-subscale	i-subscale	i-total	i-total
50. Benim için uygun olmasa bile, çocuğumun önemli gördüğü şeyleri yapmasına izin veririm. (NW)	.3090	-.0530	.3111	-.1837
51. Çocuğum kötü davrandığında onu başka çocuklarla haksız bir şekilde kıyaslarım. (AG)	.3959	.4678	.4745	.4948
52. Çocuğumu bir başkasının bakımına bırakırım (akraba, komşu, arkadaş). (NEG)	.0921	.1225	-.0571	-.1703
53. Çocuğuma istenmediğini hissettiririm. (UR)	-.0805	.2392	-.1087	.3332
54. Çocuğumun yaptığı şeylere ilgi duyuyorum. (NW)	.3187	.2257	.2508	.3505
55. Çocuğumun acı çektiği, canı yandığı veya hasta olduğu zaman kendini daha iyi hissetmesini sağlamaya çalışırım. (NW)	-.1080	-.1605	-.1143	-.0951
56. Çocuğum kötü davrandığı zaman ondan utandığımı söylerim. (UR)	.2485	.4135	.3071	.4963
57. Çocuğuma onu sevdiğimi hissettiririm. (NW)	.1335	.2530	.1363	.2733
58. Çocuğuma nazik ve yumuşak davranırım. (NW)	.4691	.3752	.5348	.5051
59. Çocuğum yanlış davranıdığında onu utandırmaya veya suçlu hissettirmeye çalışırım. (UR)	.2646	.4137	.4128	.4830
60. Çocuğumu mutlu etmeye çalışırım. (NW)	.4810	.0000	.4589	.0000

E : English
T : Turkish
NW : nonwarmth
AG : aggression/hostility
NEG : indifference/neglect
UR : undifferentiated rejection

V. DISCUSSION

The first and second hypotheses which stated that there would be no significant differences between experimental forms and groups were supported except for the significant difference between the first and second administrations of the PARQ of group 1 in neglect-indifference subscale and in total rejection; of group 2 in undif. rejection subscale and of group 4 in aggression-hostility, undif. rejection subscale and in total rejection.

The third hypothesis which stated that "the correlations between first and second administrations, using alternate forms, would be high" was confirmed.

As can be followed from Table 16, 21 items of the Turkish PARQ have item - total and item - subscale correlations below .20 (items 4,5,8,11,18,20,21,25,26,28,29, 31,32,33,36,43,49,50,52,55,60). Due to the above pointed out incidences and low item - total, item - subscale correlations, it was concluded that the Turkish PARQ mother-form has to be refined further, in order to be used with Turkish mothers reliably.

VI. PILOT STUDY

Transliteration equivalence is the first step in the adaptation of a scale, but cultural differences are as important as language differences. The purpose of this study was to refine the Turkish form of PARQ in terms of each item's contribution to its subscale and to the total rejection score. Cultural differences and the characteristics of the Turkish family were considered in a further study of the items, where the Turkish PARQ was administered to mothers from different education levels and the similarities and differences between their responses were investigated.

1- Subjects

Hundred and thirty-nine mothers of orta 1 and 2 students in Özel Ayazağa Işık Lisesi (N=66) and Örnek Lisesi (N=73) participated in the pilot study. These schools were chosen because their counselors offered cooperation with the researcher. The subject population chosen from Örnek Lisesi represented the low-education mother group, while Işık Lisesi represented the middle and high education groups.

Sample Characteristics

The findings on the demographic characteristics of the sample will be presented on Tables 1 through 12 in Appendix F. These tables include information about the ages, education levels, marital status, no. of children and profession of the mothers and the fathers and place of birth and residence, working status, type of work of the mothers.

Mostly the mothers are in the 35-39 age group (43.9%), whereas the fathers are in the 40-44 age group (36.7%). 50.3% of the mothers and 34.5% of the fathers are in the low education group, being literate with no school degree and/or primary school graduate 28.8% of the mothers and 27.3% of the fathers belong to the middle education group (secondary and/or high school graduates). 20.8% of the mothers and 38.2% of the fathers are university graduates and/or above and they take place in the high education group. 137 mothers (98.6%) are married and 2 of them (1.4%) are divorced. 79.1% of the mothers is housewife. Among the working mothers (20.8%), there are professionals,

workers, salaried workers, free lancers. Most of the fathers (51.1%) are working free-lance. Mean no. of children in low, middle and high education groups are 3.03, 2.86 and 1.38, respectively. Among working mothers, 31.03% is in the low, 34.48% is in the middle and 34.48% is in the high education group. Among nonworking mothers, 58.18% is in the low, 25.45% in the middle and 16.36% is in the high education group.

2- Instruments

a) Demographic Information Questionnaire: This questionnaire was prepared by the researcher. Information about mother's and father's age, birth-place, place of residence, education, marital status, no. of children, working status and profession was obtained.

b) Turkish PARQ mother-form: This form was developed through the translation and transliteral equivalence processes of the English PARQ.

3- Procedure and Design

The demographic questionnaire and the PARQ mother-forms were sent to the mothers by the counseling services. The administration process was completed in two weeks. The forms were sent to 141 mothers; and 139 forms were received back.

Subjects were divided into three education levels, as:

- 1- the low-education group: consisted of literate mothers with no school degree and/or primary school graduates (N=70).
- 2- the middle-education group: consisted of mothers who were secondary and/or high school graduates (N=40).
- 3- the high-education group: consisted of mothers who were university graduates and/or above (N=29).

The study questions were:

- 1- Do the groups significantly differ from each other?
- 2- How much does each item correlate with the total rejection score received by Turkish mothers?

4- Data Analysis

Means, standard deviations of PARQ subscales and total scores for each education group were calculated. The correlation of each item with its subscale, with the total and with other subscales were investigated. Item-total, subscale-total correlation coefficients, means and standard deviations of each item in three education groups were also calculated. The relationship of rejection with different education levels was computed by one-way Anova. In order to check the internal consistency of each subscale and the total scale, Cronbach α correlation coefficients and item-total, subscale-total correlations were computed.

After the scale was revised, subscale-total, item-subscale, item-total correlation coefficients and Cronbach α correlation coefficients were investigated in order to ensure its reliability.

VII. RESULTS

In this section, means and standard deviations of the PARQ scores for each education group and for each item of PARQ, item-total, item-subscale, subsclae-total correlation coefficients, results of one-way Anova between rejection and education, internal consistency (α values) findings will be presented.

Table 17 shows the means, standard deviations and subscales total correlation coefficients of PARQ subscales and the total score for each education group.

Table 17
Means, SD's, subscale-total cor. coefficients of PARQ subscales and total score for three education groups

Subscale	Low-education			Middle-education			High-education		
	(n=70)			(n=40)			(n=29)		
	mean	S.D.	s-total	mean	S.D.	s-total	mean	S.D.	s-total
non-warmth	28.2857	7.1650	.8483**	26.1000	3.8882	.7469**	26.4483	6.1504	.8043**
agg-hostility	22.3429	6.5184	.8890**	21.9750	4.7636	.8564**	22.4828	4.7406	.8123**
neg-indif.	20.0571	5.2499	.8676**	18.7000	3.1067	.6777**	18.5172	2.7854	.6546**
undif. rejection	15.5429	4.0814	.7459**	14.4500	2.4698	.7464**	15.5517	2.8609	.6283**
total rejection	86.2286	19.4721		81.2250	10.9322		83.0000	12.4183	

* $p < .01$

** $p < .001$

As can be seen from this table, all subscale-total correlations are high for all education groups.

Tables 18 through 22 show the one-way Anova results carried out to find the relationship between rejection and education.

Table 18
One-way Anova of the warmth/affection subscale by three education groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	2	146.5534	73.2767	1.9198
within groups	136	5191.0581	38.1695	
TOTAL	138	5337.6115		

Table 19

One-way Anova of the aggression/hostility subscale by three education groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	2	5.1633	2.5816	.0790
within groups	136	4445.9878	32.6911	
TOTAL	138	4451.1511		

Table 20

One-way Anova of the neglect/indifference subscale by three education groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	2	72.0117	36.0058	1.9623
within groups	136	2495.4128	18.3486	
TOTAL	138	2567.4245		

Table 21

One-way Anova of the undifferentiated rejection subscale by three education groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	2	34.1893	17.0946	1.4383
within groups	136	1616.4438	11.8856	
TOTAL	138	1650.6331		

Table 22

One-way Anova of the total rejection score by three education groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
betw. groups	2	682.8404	341.4202	1.3213
within groups	136	35141.3179	258.3920	
TOTAL	138	35824.1583		

No two education groups were significantly different at $p < .05$ level of significance in any of the subscales and in the total rejection score of the PARQ.

Table 23 presents the means, standard deviations, item-subscale and item-total correlations of three education groups.

Table 23

.Means, SD's, item-subcale (i-s) and item-total(i-t) correlation coefficients for three education group in the Pilot Study

PARQ Turkish- form Items	Low-education group (N=70)				Middle-education group (N=40)				High-education group (N=29)			
	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t
1. Ben çocuğum hakkında güzel şeyler söylerim. (NW)	1.2286	.4559	.3435*	.3662**	1.3250	.4743	.4963**	.2674	1.5172	.5745	.6092**	.5356*
2. Çocuğum kötü davrandığında onu küçümseyerek azarlarım. (AGG)	2.0857	1.0733	.4908**	.4664**	1.6750	.7299	.5212**	.3243	1.8966	.7243	.3895	.3018
3. Çocuğuma sanki orada yokmuş gibi davranırım. (NEG)	1.5000	.8969	.5848**	.4531**	1.1500	.4267	.1122	.1080	1.1379	.5809	.1751	.1139
4. Çocuğumu gerçekten sevip sevmediğimden şüphe ediyorum. (UR)	1.3286	.8801	.4701**	.3533*	1.0500	.2207	.2399	.0909	1.0000	.0000		
5. Günlük yaşantımızı çocuğumla tartışır ve fikrini alırım. (NW)	2.0857	1.0035	.6073**	.5174**	1.7750	.7334	.3498	.3231	1.8276	.9285	.7458**	.5606**
6. O beni dinlemediği zaman çocuğumu başkalarına şikayet ederim. (AGG)	1.4429	.8787	.4944**	.3709**	1.5750	.8738	.5518**	.5096**	1.7241	.8822	.6564**	.5020*
7. Çocuğumla candan ilgilenirim. (NEG)	1.2143	.5619	.5755**	.6723**	1.1500	.5335	.3373	.2491	1.0345	.1857	.3786	.2013
8. Çocuğumu arkadaşlarını eve getirmesi için cesaretlendiririm ve onların iyi vakit geçirmesine gayret ederim. (NW)	1.6000	.8748	.4810**	.4275**	1.4250	.7808	.3235	.2198	1.3793	.6219	.5796**	.5087*
9. Çocuğumla alay ederim. (AGG)	1.1857	.5721	.4995**	.4671**	1.0500	.2207	.0256	.0058	1.0345	.1857	.0210	-.0155

Table 23
(Continued)

PARQ Turkish- form Items	Low-education group (N=70)				Middle-education group (N=40)				High-education group (N=29)			
	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t
10. Beni rahatsız etmediği sürece çocuğumun varlığını bilmez- likten gelirim. (NEG)	1.5143	1.0179	.3850**	.2455	1.1500	.4267	.4604*	.6412**	1.2414	.6895	.5092*	.2670
11. Kızgın olduğum zaman çocuğuma bağırırım. (UR)	2.6429	1.1038	.6420**	.6046**	2.4500	.7828	.4231	.4163*	2.3103	.8495	.2356	.4570*
12. Çocuğumun bana güvenip açılmasını kolaylaştırırım. (NW)	1.4286	.7907	.6227**	.5291**	1.1750	.4465	.5509**	.3647	1.1034	.4093	.8039**	.7098**
13. Çocuğuma sert davranırım.(AGG)	1.8143	.9524	.6874**	.5533**	2.0000	.8473	.2986	.1938	1.7241	.6490	.4976*	.5451*
14. Çocuğumun etrafımda olmasından hoşlanıyorum. (NEG)	1.4714	.8801	.5650**	.5188**	1.1250	.3349	.4066*	.2932	1.2069	.6199	.4736*	.7795**
15. Çocuğum bir şeyi iyi yaptığında onun gurur duymasını sağlıyorum. (NW)	1.2000	.4694	.5602**	.4707**	1.0750	.2667	.5118**	.3634	.1724	.4682	.8280**	.7617**
16. Haketmediği zaman bile çocuğuma vururum. (AGG_	1.1286	.4143	.2518	.3197*	1.0500	.3162	.1370	.1598	1.0000	.0000		
17. Çocuğum için yapmam gereken şeyleri unutuyorum. (NEG)	1.5143	.8804	.6928**	.6457**	1.5750	.8130	.3645	.2707	1.4138	.6823	.6914**	.2993
18. Çocuğum benim için bir yük. UR	1.0429	.2657	.0050	-.0299	1.000	.0000			1.0000	.0000		
19. Çocuğumu başkalarına överim. (NW)	2.5000	1.1132	.3543*	.3036*	2.1000	.8712	.5041**	.4095*	2.0345	.7784	.5188*	.2180
20. Kızgın olduğum zaman çocuğumu cezalandırırım. (AGG)	1.5571	.8620	.3498*	.2867*	1.6750	.8286	.2902	.2630	1.7241	.8408	.5633**	.4071

Table 23
(Continued)

PARQ Turkish- form Items	Low-education group (N=70)				Middle-education group (N=40)				High-education group (N=29)			
	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t
21. Çocuğumun beslenmesi için gerekli gıdayı almasını sağlarım. (NEG)	1.0857	.2820	.2414	.2445	1.0500	.3162	.0679	.1598	1.0345	.1857	-.0357	-.0155
22. Çocuğumla şefkat ve sevgi dolu konuşurum. NW	1.2429	.4319	.7172**	.6654**	1.1500	.3616	.4814**	.3220	1.2069	.4913	.7483**	.5912**
23. Çocuğuma karşı çok sabırsızım. (AGG)	1.8857	1.0973	.6377**	.6300**	1.9750	.7675	.3645	.2329	2.3448	.8975	.5303*	.4422*
24. Çocuğumun sorularına cevap veremeyecek kadar meşgulüm. (NEG)	1.5286	.9589	.6359**	.5919**	1.6000	.9819	.5060**	.1878	1.6897	.9298	.5330*	.4021
25. Çocuğuma içerliyorum. UR	1.6429	.9636	.5033**	.4524**	1.4500	.8149	.5465**	.3251	1.6552	.8975	.2019	-.0320
26. Çocuğumu hakettiği zaman överim. (NW)	1.4429	.8277	.4060**	.3039*	1.5750	.9578	.2734	-.0024	1.3103	.6038	.6825**	.5383*
27. Çocuğum sinirime dokunur. AGG	1.3429	.8321	.5659**	.4495**	1.2000	.5164	.5545**	.5187**	1.1379	.4411	.2744	.1108
28. Çocuğumun kimlerle arkadaşlık ettiği ile ilgilenirim. (NEG)	1.1857	.4598	.4879**	.4727**	1.1000	.4414	.4712*	.6222**	1.1724	.4682	.5317*	.6573**
29. Çocuğumun hayatındaki olaylarla gerçekten ilgilenirim. (NW)	1.2714	.7003	.7352**	.5756**	1.0000	.0000			1.0690	.3714	.7990**	.6660**
30. Çocuğumla kırııcı konuşurum. (AGG)	1.4000	.7102	.6994**	.5760**	1.4000	.6325	.5055**	.2685	1.3793	.6219	.5051*	.6752**
31. Çocuğum yardım istediği zaman anlamazlıktan gelirim. (NEG)	1.1286	.4479	.5947**	.5931**	1.1750	.5943	.3347	.4516*	1.0690	.3714	.0333	.2323

Table 23
(Continued)

PARQ Turkish- form items	Low-education group (N=70)				Middle-education group (N=40)				High-education group (N=29)			
	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t
32. Çocuğumun başı dertte olduğunda ona karşı anlayışsız davranırım. (UR)	1.1000	.4552	.1810	.3080*	1.0500	.2207	.2869	.6222**	1.0000	.0000		
33. Çocuğuma istenilen ve ihtiyaç duyulan bir kişi olduğunu hissettirim. (NW)	1.3857	.8217	.5472**	.3341*	1.2750	.5541	.5701**	.6541**	1.2759	.5276	.6540**	.5124*
34. Çocuğuma sinirime dokunduğunu söylerim. (AGG)	1.5714	.9413	.6502**	.5035**	1.2750	.5986	.4251*	.4056*	.13103	.5414	.3988	.0478
35. Çocuğuma büyük özen gösteririm. (NEG)	1.2429	.6241	.5088**	.4498**	1.0500	.2207	-.1645	.0590	1.0690	.2579	.1474	.1673
36. Çocuğum iyi davrandığı zaman onunla gurur duyduğumu söylerim. (NW)	1.3000	.6670	.6944**	.5637**	1.1000	.3038	.6425**	.5720**	1.2069	.4913	.5001*	.4507*
37. Çocuğumun kalbini kırarım. (AGG)	1.3429	.7200	.6045**	.4543**	1.4000	.6325	.5651**	.4836**	1.5517	.7831	.6087**	.4627*
38. Çocuğumun hatırlamamı beklediği olayları unuturum. (NEG)	1.7714	.9657	.5886**	.4383**	1.6000	.9282	.5620**	.1304	1.5862	.9456	.4367*	.0882
39. Çocuğum yanlış hareket ettiği zaman onu artık sevmediğimi hissettirim. (UR)	1.4000	.8058	.4618**	.2647	1.2750	.5986	.4171*	.3625	1.5172	.8710	.5980**	.0594
40. Çocuğuma yaptığı şeyin önemli olduğunu hissettirim. (NW)	1.3000	.5736	.5219**	.4921**	1.1250	.3349	.5218**	.4263*	1.2069	.4913	.8546**	.7785**

Table 23
(Continued)

PARQ Turkish- form items	Low-education group (N=70)				Middle-education group (N=40)				High-education group (N=29)			
	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t
41. Çocuğum yanlış bir şey yaptığında onu tehdit ediyorum veya korkutuyorum. (AGG)	1.5143	.8804	.4789**	.4478**	1.4750	.7841	.7378**	.7500**	1.4483	.7361	.3759	.3282
42. Çocuğumla birlikte vakit geçirmekten hoşlanırım. (NEG)	1.1714	.4160	.4666**	.4227**	1.1000	.3789	.3746*	.3225	1.0345	.1857	-.1738	-.2168
43. Çocuğum üzüldüğü, tasalandığı veya korktuğu zaman ona yardım etmeye çalışırım. (NW)	1.1143	.4676	.5049**	.3314*	1.0250	.1581	.3295	.4268*	1.0000	.0000		
44. Çocuğum kötü davrandığı zaman onu oyun arkadaşlarının yanında küçük düşürürüm. (AGG)	1.1714	.5891	.4789**	.5575**	1.1750	.5495	.4425*	.4244*	1.1724	.5391	.4554*	.5441*
45. Çocuğumun benimle beraber olmasından kaçınırım. (NEG)	1.1143	.4976	.2305	.2426	1.1500	.5796	.1965	.3385	1.0000	.0000		
46. Çocuğumdan şikayet ederim. (UR)	1.4000	.7499	.6241**	.5723**	1.5250	.7157	.4287*	.2795	1.5862	.6278	.5493*	.6963**
47. Çocuğumun görüşlerine saygı duyarım ve açıkça söylemesi için onu cesaretlendiririm. (NW)	1.3000	.6884	.5965**	.5127**	1.2000	.4641	.5144	.3750*	1.1034	.4093	.8039**	.7238**
48. Çocuğumu olumsuz bir şekilde başka çocuklarla kıyaslarım. (AGG)	1.5571	.8950	.4512**	.4358**	1.6000	.8712	.6216**	.6585**	1.5517	.6859	.7499**	.5157*
49. Plan yaptığım zaman çocuğumu da göz önünde bulundururum. (NEG)	1.2714	.6210	.4011**	.3900**	1.2250	.6975	.4343*	.1344	1.0690	.2579	.1972	.2007
50. Benim için uygun olmasa bile çocuğumun önemli gördüğü şeyleri yapmasına izin veririm. (NW)	1.900	1.0653	.3760**	.2366	1.9750	.8619	.3298	.2754	2.0690	.8422	.2213	.0376

Table 23
(Continued)

PARQ Turkish- form items	Low-education group (N=70)				Middle-education group (N=40)				High-education group (N=29)			
	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t	mean	S.D.	I-s	I-t
50.												
51. Çocuğum kötü davrandığında onu başka çocuklarla haksız bir şekilde kıyaslarım. (AGG)	1.3429	.7592	.5118**	.5348**	1.4500	.8149	.6106**	.4949**	1.4828	.7378	.5947**	.4795*
52. Çocuğumu bir başkasının bakımına bırakırım (akraba, komşu, arkadaş) (NEG)	1.3429	.7399	.3978**	.1856	1.5000	.8473	.3312	.0125	1.7586	.9124	.3038	-.0599
53. Çocuğuma istenmediğini hissettirim. (UR)	1.2857	.8011	.4217**	.2568	1.0000	.0000			1.034	.5571	.1646	.2013
54. Çocuğumun yaptığı şeylere ilgi duyuyorum. (NW)	1.3286	.6962	.4952**	.4466**	1.2750	.5541	.3677	.3070	1.2759	.5914	.7699**	.7683**
55. Çocuğumun acı çektiği, canı yandığı veya hasta olduğu zaman kendini daha iyi hissetmesini sağlamaya çalışırım. (NW)	1.0143	.1195	.2659	.2663	1.0000	.0000			1.0000	.0000		
56. Çocuğum kötü davrandığı zaman ondan utandığımı söylerim. (UR)	1.9714	1.1792	.5393**	.2831*	1.8000	.9392	.6257**	.5289**	2.2414	.9876	.6970**	.2941
57. Çocuğuma onu sevdiğimi hissettirim. (NW)	1.2429	.7310	.6230**	.6059**	1.1250	.5158	.2493	.0995	1.1724	.6017	.4126	.2677
58. Çocuğuma nazik ve yumuşak davranırım. (NW)	1.3429	.6344	.7338**	.7479**	1.3750	.5401	.5190**	.3849*	1.5172	.5745	.5587**	.5306*
59. Çocuğum yanlış davrandığında onu utandırmaya veya suçlu hissettirmeye çalışırım. (UR)	1.7286	1.0484	.5498**	.3012*	1.8500	.8022	.5396**	.2261	2.1379	1.0930	.7629**	.4999*
60. Çocuğumu mutlu etmeye çalışırım.(NW)	1.0571	.2338	.4746**	.6242**	1.0250	.1582	.0792	-.0775	1.0000	.0000		

* p < .01, ** p < .001
 NW : nonwarmth subscale
 AGG : aggression/hostility subscale
 NEG : neglect/indifference subscale
 UR : undifferentiated rejection subscale

As can be seen from Table 23, there are many items having nonsignificant correlations with their subscales and/or with the total rejection score in different education groups. However, items no. 18, 21 and 55 have nonsignificant item-subscale and item-total correlations in all education groups, namely the low, middle and high education.

Item no.52 has nonsignificant correlation with the total score in all education groups, as well. However, in the low-education group, this item has a significant correlation (.3978) at a significance level of .001 with its neglect - indifference subscale. This issue will be referred to in the discussion section.

As will later be discussed, after the data analysis, items no. 18,21,52 and 55 were taken out of the Turkish PARQ mother-form. Also, item no.32 was transferred from the undifferentiated rejection subscale to the warmth/affection subscale; item no.45 was transferred from the neglect/indifference subscale to the hostility/aggression subscale. Following these revisions, item-subscale and item - total correlations of the new Turkish PARQ mother-form were calculated, as presented in Table 15 in appendix I. Also, Table 14 in appendix H shows the means and S.D.'s of the revised PARQ.

Cronbach α coefficients for PARQ subscales of the whole sample are on Table 24.

Table 24
Cronbach α coefficients for PARQ subscales

Subscale	α value
Non-warmth	.8311
Agg-hostility	.7823
Neg-indifference	.6902
Undif. rejection	.5525
TOTAL rejection score	.9015

Alpha values for PARQ subscales range between .55 and .83, the total α being .90.

Table 25 presents the item-subscale and item-total correlations of the revised Turkish PARQ mother-form.

Table 25

Item-subscale and item-total correlation coefficients of the revised PARQ mother-form

item no.	revised item no.	subscale	Item-subscale cor.	Item-total cor.
1	1	non-warmth	.3798**	.3303**
2	2	agg-hostility	.4785**	.4369**
3	3	neglect-indif.	.4999**	.3873**
4	4	undif. rej.	.4095**	.3240**
5	5	non-warmth	.6062**	.4990**
6	6	agg-host.	.5257**	.3877**
7	7	neglect-indif.	.5052**	.5310**
8	8	non-warmth	.4676**	.3998**
9	9	agg-host.	.3832**	.3917**
10	10	neg-indif.	.4217**	.3064**
11	11	undif.rej.	.5391**	.5563**
12	12	non-warmth	.6391**	.5336**
13	13	agg-host.	.5613**	.4575**
14	14	neg-indif.	.5459**	.5426**
15	15	non-warmth	.6192**	.5095**
16	16	agg-host.	.2055*	.2799**
17	17	neg-indif.	.6035**	.5074**
19	18	non-warmth	.4200**	.3261**
20	19	agg-host.	.3667**	.2794**
22	20	non-warmth	.6798**	.5803**
23	21	agg-host.	.5611**	.5121**
24	22	neg-indif.	.5526**	.4511**
25	23	undif.-rej.	.4621**	.3522**
26	24	non-warmth	.3856**	.2532*
27	25	agg-host.	.5245**	.4315**
28	26	neg-indif.	.4745**	.5209**
29	27	non-warmth	.7011**	.5572**
30	28	agg-host.	.6213**	.5190**

Table 25
(Continued)

Item no.	revised Item no.	subscale	Item-subscale cor.	Item-total cor.
31	29	neg-indif.	.4271**	.4675**
32	30	non-warmth	.3295**	.3338**
33	31	non-warmth	.5652**	.4097**
34	32	agg-host.	.5703**	.4510**
35	33	neg-indif.	.4294**	.3986**
36	34	non-warmth	.6594**	.5558**
37	35	agg-host.	.5865**	.4328**
38	36	neg-indif.	.5496**	.3202**
39	37	undif. rej.	.4801**	.2394*
40	38	non-warmth	.5983**	.5354**
41	39	agg-host.	.5197**	.4780**
42	40	neg-indif.	.4089**	.3486**
43	41	non-warmth	.4444**	.3272**
44	42	agg-host.	.4631**	.5124**
45	43	agg-host.	.3124**	.2344**
46	44	undif-rej.	.5470**	.4987**
47	45	non-warmth	.6118**	.5178**
48	46	agg-host.	.5296**	.4731**
49	47	neg-indif.	.3883**	.2993**
50	48	non-warmth	.3217**	.2041*
51	49	agg-host.	.5400**	.4822**
53	50	undif. rej.	.3635**	.2520*
54	51	non-warmth	.5218**	.4662**
56	52	undif.rej.	.5795**	.3217**
57	53	non-warmth	.5306**	.4789**
58	54	non-warmth	.6300**	.6209**
59	55	undif. rej.	.5678**	.2990**
60	56	non-warmth	.3718**	.4727**

* $p < .01$

** $p < .001$

In the revised PARQ mother-form, after the items 18,21 and 55 have been taken out and item 32 and 45 were transferred to different subscales item-subscale correlations range between .2040 and .7011; item-total correlations range between .2041 and .6209. In Appendix I, Table 15, the correlations of all items to all subscales and to the total score can be seen.

In Table 26, subscale - total correlation coefficients of the revised PARQ can be seen.

Table 26.
Subscale - total correlation coefficients of the revised PARQ

Subscale	Subscale-total cor. coef.
Non-warmth	.8359*
Agg-hostility	.8602*
Neg-indifference	.8182*
Undif. rejection	.7035*

* p < .001

Subscale-total correlations range from .7035 to .8602 at p<.001 in the revised PARQ mother-form.

Internal consistency (α values) of PARQ subscales are presented in Table 27.

Table 27
Comparison between Cronbach α cor. coef. of the revised Turkish PARQ subscales and the total rejection score and of the unrevised Turkish PARQ mother-form

Subscale	α of revised PARQ	α of unrevised PARQ
Non-warmth	.8353	.83111
Agg-hostility	.7879	.7823
Neg-indifference	.7096	.6902
Undif. rejection	.5686	.5525
TOTAL rejection score	.9041	.9015

Alpha values of the revised subscales are between .57 and .84, the total α value being .90. Alpha values of the unrevised subscales were between .55 and .83, the total α value being .90.

VIII. DISCUSSION OF THE PILOT STUDY

The pilot study was designed in order 1) to investigate each item's correlation with its subscale and with the total rejection score and 2) to investigate the relation between rejection and education. So, each item was examined in terms of item-subscale and item-total correlation coefficients. Tables 18-22 show that the three education groups do not differ significantly at $p < 0.05$.

Referring to Table 23, we can see that items **no. 18, 21 and 55** have nonsignificant item-subscale and item-total correlations in all three education groups. Also in Appendix G Table 13 these items have nonsignificant correlations with other subscales, as well. Since there is no variance among any groups, it can be concluded that these items do not differentiate between accepting and rejecting behaviours of Turkish mothers. The attitudes which are mentioned by items 21 and 55 are the typical attitudes of Turkish mothers: A Turkish mother nurtures her child first, and then herself. She also shows affection when her child is sick. A Turkish mother never says that her child is a burden for her (item no.18). Such an answer may be due to social desirability. If we take a look at Table 16 of the transliteral equivalence study we can observe that these items had very low item-subscale and item-total α coefficients in the PARQ Turkish form, as well. Accordingly, item no.18 (undifferentiated rejection subscale), item no.21 (neglect-indifference subscale) and item no.55 (warmth-affection subscale) were left out of the Turkish version of PARQ mother form.

Item no.52, which belongs to the neglect-indifference subscale, had nonsignificant item-subscale and item-total correlations in the middle and high education groups. Whereas in the low-education group, it correlated with its subscale (.3978) at .001 level of significance. The item had nonsignificant correlation with the total score in the low-education group as well (Table 23). Item no.52 did not have significant correlations with other subscales, as can be seen in Table 13 in Appendix G in the original version of the PARQ, item 52 states "I leave my child to someone else's care (e.g. a neighbor or relative) (Table 16). In a low SES Turkish family, where mothers are obliged to work because of financial difficulties, grandparents usually take care of the children. If the mother is not working and attending a course (e.g. reading-writing, sewing) in order to educate herself, again she leaves her child with a neighbor or relative. In our culture, there exists a strong support system among family members and/or neighborhood, and a mother can leave her child easily to a neighbor or relative. Low-educated mothers usually belong to low SES families and don't have money to spend for trips, visits, etc. When they do, they take

their children together. In upper-middle SES families, there are maids who take care of the child when the mother is out. In item no.52, however, leaving the child to a maid is not given as a choice. According to PART, indifference is lack of concern for the child and can be expressed as behavioural neglect, where the parent is physically or psychologically unavailable, unresponsive, distant and fails to fulfill the medical and physical needs of the child (Rohner, 1991). Leaving the child to someone else's care temporarily does not indicate neglect or indifference for Turkish mothers. So, this item was also left out of the scale.

Item no. 32 which belongs to the undifferentiated rejection subscale had significant item-total correlations for low and middle education groups, .31 at $p<.01$ and .62 at $p<.001$, respectively (Table 23). When investigated closely (Table 15 in Appendix I), it was seen that item no. 32 had higher correlations with the warmth-affection subscale than with the undifferentiated rejection subscale in low and middle education groups; the correlations being .32 at $p<.01$ and .59 at $p<.001$ respectively. These correlations were higher than .18, which is the item-subscale correlation of this item in the low-education group. In the high education group, correlations were not computed, since all the subjects answered "Almost never true" for this item. Item no.32 states: "I am unsympathetic to my child when s/he is having trouble." In terms of its meaning, this item expresses non-warmth and lack of affection, rather than undifferentiated rejection. As a result of high correlations with the warmth-affection subscale and face validity, item no.32 was taken out of the undifferentiated rejection subscale and was transferred to the warmth-affection subscale.

According to Table 35, **item no.45** which belongs to the neglect-indifference subscale, had nonsignificant item-subscale and item total correlations in all three education levels. However, a closer inspection of Table 15 in Appendix I reveals that this item has higher correlations with the aggression-hostility subscale in the low and middle education groups (.33 and .39 at $p<.01$, respectively). Among the high education mother group, all subjects answered. "Almost never true", so a correlation could not be computed. As a result of significant correlation with the hostility-aggression subscale, item no.45 was taken out of the neglect-indifference subscale and was transferred to the hostility-aggression subscale.

After these revisions of the Turkish PARQ, the new psychometric properties of the scale were investigated, in terms of subscale-total correlations and α coefficients for reliability and consistency. When compared, these values were found to be higher than the correlations on the first unrevised version of the Turkish PARQ (Tables 25,26,27). It can be concluded that the psychometric properties and face validity of the revised Turkish form of PARQ mother have improved.

IX. THE STUDY PROPER: The reliability and validity of the Turkish version of PARQ mother-form

After the transliteral equivalance of the PARQ mother-form was completed, the scale was revised through a pilot study, in order to adapt it for Turkish mothers. The study proper was done with a larger mother-sample from different SES levels, to establish the reliability and validity of the revised Turkish PARQ mother-form for its general use in Türkiye. The construct validity was assessed through the use of other related reliable and valid scales.

A. Statement of The Problem

The purpose of the present study was to provide supporting evidence for the reliability, the construct validity of PARQ mother-form through internal consistency techniques, hypothesis testing and factor analysis, respectively.

B. Hypotheses

1- Mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ mother-form are expected to have significantly lower **cohesion** subscale scores on FEQ as compared to those who have lower rejection scores.

2- Mother who have higher rejection scores on PARQ mother-form, are expected to have significantly lower **control** subscale scores on FEQ as compared to those with lower rejection scores.

3- Mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ mother-form are expected to have significantly higher **trait anxiety** scores on STAI-A-trait as compared to those who have lower rejection scores.

4- Mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ mother-form are expected to have significantly lower **overprotection** (F1) scores on PARI as compared to those

with lower rejection scores.

5- Mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ mother-form are expected to have significantly lower **democracy/equality** scores on PARI (F2) as compared to those with lower rejection scores.

6- Mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ mother-form are expected to have significantly higher scores on the **rejection of homemaking role** subscale (F3) on PARI as compared to those with lower rejection scores.

7- Mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ mother-form are expected to have significantly higher scores on **marital conflict** subscale (F4) on PARI as compared to those with lower rejection scores.

8- Mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ mother-form are expected to have significantly higher scores on **strict discipline** subscale (F5) on PARI as compared to those with lower rejection scores.

9- The low **education** mother group is expected to score significantly higher on rejection measured by PARQ, as compared to the high education mother group.

10- The low and high rejection mother groups will differ significantly on the variables of cohesion, control, overprotection and democracy/equality, in favor of the low rejection group and on the variables of trait anxiety, rejection of homemaking role, marital conflict and strict discipline in favor of the high rejection group.

X. METHOD

1- Subjects

The subject sample consisted of 229 mothers of orta two students. In order to have subjects from different SES levels, schools representing different SES levels were listed. After deciding which schools can cooperate with the researcher, the schools were chosen. Ibrahim Turhan Lisesi represented the low socioeconomic status group; Etiler Lisesi represented both the low and the middle SES group; Balmumcu Atanur Oğuz Deneme Lisesi and Nişantaşı Anadolu Lisesi represented the upper SES groups.

The questionnaires were taken to mothers by their children who were seventh-grade students in these schools. Table 28 shows the number and percentage of mothers from each school.

Table 28
Subjects from each high-school

Schools	N	%
Balmumcu A.O.L.] upper	44	19.2
Nişantaşı A.L.] SES	38	16.6
Etiler L.] Low-middle SES	89	38.9
İbrahim T.L.] low SES	58	25.3
TOTAL	229	100

For test-retest reliability, the Turkish PARQ mother-form was administered to mothers at Nişantaşı Anadolu Lisesi (n=28) and Etiler lisesi (n=20).

Sample characteristics: The demographic characteristics of the sample are described as presented in Tables 16-27 through in Appendix J.

Most of the mothers (39.7%) were in the 35-39 age range.

Place of birth of the mothers was mostly in Marmara region (27.9%) and they mostly lived on the European side of Istanbul (93.4%). In terms of the level of education, 51.9% of the mothers were in the low education group, 30.6% in the middle education group, and 17% in the high education group. Most of the mothers (93.4%) came from two-parent families and they were housewives (74.2%).

Fathers' age ranged between 25-29 and 50+ age groups; 37.1% of the fathers being in the 40-44 age range. As for their education level, 36.3% of the fathers were in the low education group, 26.2% in the middle education group and 31.1% in the high education group; 3.4% of the fathers were illiterate. Most of the fathers (18.9%) were free lancing. As for the number of children, 9.6% had one child, 41.5% of the families had two children, 31% had three children, 17% had four or more.

2- Instruments

The instruments utilized in this study were:

- 1- Demographic Information Questionnaire
- 2- Family Environment Questionnaire (FEQ)
- 3- Trait Anxiety Scale of STAI
- 4- Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)
- 5- The Turkish PARQ mother-form.

1- Demographic Information Questionnaire

This instrument was developed by the researcher to obtain information about the mother's and father's age, education, profession, mother's working conditions, birth place, place of residence, marital status, job and number of children (Appendix B).

2- Family Environment Questionnaire (FEQ)

This questionnaire was developed by Fowler in 1980 and adapted to Turkish by Öner and Usluer in 1989. Its final form consists of 26 items, measuring the dimensions of cohesion and organization-control in the family. Cohesion is a sense of togetherness and belongingness. It can be defined as the extent to which family members actively participate and show emotional concern for each other (Usluer, Öner, 1989). Organization-control items measure family rules, rigidity of family order and overall plan of organization

within the family (Usluer, Öner, 1989). Items are scored on a likert-type scale with "I strongly disagree" assigned a score of 1, "I sometimes agree" a score of 2, "I agree" a score of 3 and "I strongly agree" a score of 4. Cohesion is measured by adding the scores of cohesion items. Control-organization is measured by adding the scores of this subscale items. 10 items belong to the organization-control subscale and 16 items belong to the cohesion subscale. No specific reliability information is available for the original form. Usluer, Öner (1989) investigated the internal reliability of the shortened FEQ and found α coefficient for cohesion to be .82, for organization-control to be .74. Test-retest reliability coefficients were .68 for cohesion subscale and .62 for organization-control subscale (see Appendix C).

3- Trait Anxiety Scale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)

This inventory was developed by Spielberger in 1970 and was adapted into Turkish by Öner and Le Compte in 1976. STAI consists of two scales. State Anxiety (A-State) and Trait Anxiety (A-Trait), made up of 40 items, 20 in each subscale. State anxiety measures the individual's feelings in situational context. Trait anxiety is defined as general anxiety proneness, a vulnerability or predisposition to react to different kinds of stressors with elevations in state anxiety (Öner, Le Compte, 1983). On the trait anxiety scale items are scored on a likert-type scale, "never" assigned a score of 1, "sometimes" a score of 2, "most of the times" a score of 3 and "always" a score of 4. Some items are reversely scored.

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

Various studies supported the construct and criterion validity of the Turkish STAI such as Öner (1977), Spielberger (1976), Rüstemli (1975), White (1978), Zülemyan (1979) and Kozacioğlu (1982) (cited in Öner and Le Compte, 1985).

For the purpose of the present study, only Trait Anxiety Scale was utilized (see Appendix D).

4- Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

This instrument was developed by Schaefer and Bell in 1958 and was adapted to Turkish by Le Compte, Le Compte and Özer in 1978. The Turkish form consists of 60 items falling into five factors, which are:

F1, overprotection subscale: contains 16 items, showing mother's approval of intrusion into child's life and privacy and reinforcement of the child's dependency on parents (Kulaksızoğlu, 1985).

F2, democracy/equality subscale: contains 9 items related to the parent's sharing with the child and encouraging self expression (Küçük, 1987).

F3, rejection of home-making role subscale: contains 13 items which state the dissatisfaction of women, who are tied down to their home with their children (Küçük, 1987).

F4, marital conflict subscale: consist of six items showing tension and quarreling between the spouses.

F5, strict discipline subscale: consists of 16 items which involve parental attitudes toward the suppression of responses of children and punishment.

The items are scored on a likert-type scale with "I strongly disagree", "I disagree", "I agree" and "I strongly agree" assigned scores of 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively.

These five factors have test-retest reliability ranging between .59 and .90. Construct validity of the democracy/equality, rejection of homemaking role and marital conflict factors of the instrument was established by Küçük (1987).

In the present study, PARI was utilized to measure the feelings of mothers about their family life and children (see Appendix E).

5- The Turkish PARQ mother-form

Turkish translation of this 60-item, four-subscale questionnaire was revised by the researchers in a pilot study. This revised form contains 56 items, 20 items in the warmth-affection subscale, 16 items in the aggression-hostility subscale, 12 items in the neglect-indifference subscale and 8 items in the undifferentiated-rejection subscale. (Appendix A). Information about the subscales and scoring is found in previous sections B.1

and C. In terms of its reliability, Alpha correlation coefficients for the subscales were found to be .8352 for warmth-affection, .7879 for aggression-hostility, .7096 for neglect-indifference and .5686 for undifferentiated rejection subscales, the α coefficient for the total rejection scale is .9041.

3- Procedure and Design

The new Turkish version of the PARQ mother-form, Demographic Information Questionnaire, Family Environment Questionnaire, State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-Trait Anxiety Scale and Parental Attitude Research Instrument were sent home by Orta two students in the sample schools for their mothers to fill out. According to the class size and available classes, one or two classes in each school were taken. After the mothers filled out the questionnaires, they were collected from the students by the counselors in the schools and by the researcher. 255 questionnaires were sent and 229 came back. In approximately two to three weeks interval, PARQ mother-forms were readministered to 48 mothers in two schools, in order to assess the test-retest reliability of the questionnaire.

The subjects were divided into four groups according to their total rejection scores on the PARQ mother-form:

- 1- **low rejection group** contains mothers whose scores fall between the lowest and one standard deviation below the mean score.
- 2- **moderately low rejection group** contains mothers whose scores fall between one standard deviation below the mean and the mean score.
- 3- **moderately high rejection group** contains mothers whose scores fall between the mean and one standard deviation above.
- 4- **high rejection group** contains mothers whose scores fall between one standard deviation above the mean and the highest rejection score.

Subjects were also divided into three education levels, as:

- 1- **the low education group**: consisted of literate mothers with no school degree and/or primary school graduates.
- 2- **the middle education group**: consisted of secondary and/or high school graduate mothers.
- 3- **the high education group**: consisted of mothers who were university graduates and/or above.

4- Data Analysis

The scores of the subjects on PARQ mother-form and other instruments were computed in terms of mean, mode, median and standard deviations. The relationship of different levels of rejection and other variables were computed using the one-way Anova. Scheffe procedure was used to identify the groups responsible for the significant difference. T-test were used to compare the extreme PARQ groups (low and high rejection) on the related variables. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique was utilized to determine the correlations of PARQ with the other instruments. Factor analysis was carried out to explore the factor structure of the Turkish PARQ mother-form. Internal consistency was determined by item-total, item-subscale, subscale-total and Cronbach α correlation coefficient. For test-retest reliability, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient technique was used.

XI. RESULTS

In this section, means, modes, medians and standard deviations of the scores on each of the instruments, reliability statistics, analyses of variance of each scale in relation to PARQ, t-test findings of high and low rejection groups on each scale, Pearson Product Moment Correlations of PARQ with other variables, item statistics and factor analysis results will be presented.

Construct validation findings on the PARQ

The obtained mean, mode, median and standart deviation of the four subscale scores and the total PARQ score are shown in Table 29.

Table 29

The mean, mode, median and standard deviation of the PARQ subscales and the total scale (N=229)

PARQ subscales	mean	mode	median	S.D.
warmth/affection	27.43	23.00	26.13	5.87
aggression/hostility	22.88	16.00	21.96	5.85
indifference/neglect	16.23	14.00	15.35	3.83
undif. rejection	12.40	11.00	11.89	3.12
TOTAL rejection scale	78.94	67.00	76.33	14.92

Among the 229 subjects, the lowest and highest total scores obtained for the PARQ were 57 and 150, respectively. The lowest and highest possible total scores for the scale are 56 and 224.

The mother sample scores on the PARQ total rejection were divided into four groups:

- 1- low rejection group: scores from the lowest rejection score to one standard deviation below the mean.
- 2- moderately low rejection group: scores between one S.D. below the mean and the mean.

3- Moderately high rejection group: scores between the mean and one S.D. above the mean.

The four rejection groups are shown in Table 30.

Table 30
Four rejection groups on PARQ

Groups	Score level	Frequency	Percentage
1- low rejection	57.000-65.00	27	11.8
2- moderately low rejection	65.01-79.00	103	45.0
3- moderately high rejection	79.01-94.00	68	29.7
4- high rejection	94.01-150.00	31	13.5
TOTAL		229	100

It can be seen from this Table that 27 mothers (118%) perceived themselves as non-rejecting, 103 mothers (45%) as moderately low rejecting, 68 mothers (29.7%) as moderately high rejecting and 31 mothers (13.5%) as high rejecting according to PARQ scores.

Of the entire mother group, 56.8% fall below and 43.2% fall above the mean on the rejection continuum.

One way analysis of variance was used to investigate the effect of the following variables on parental rejection assessed by the PARQ. These variables are family cohesion and control (FEQ), trait anxiety (STAI), overprotection (PARI, F1), democracy (PARI, F2), rejection of mother's homemaking role (PARI, F3), marital conflict (PARI, F4), strict discipline (PARI, F5) and education. These Anova results will be presented as related to each of the hypotheses of the study along with the means and standard deviations of the scores on the instrument assessing the related variable.

Table 31 presents the total group mean, mode, median, standard deviation and the four rejection group means, standard deviations of the Family Environment Questionnaire, cohesion subscale scores.

Table 31

The group mean, and standart deviation of the cohesion subscale scores of the FEQ (N=120)

PARQ groups	N	mean	S.D.
1	27	49.63	4.54
2	101	47.34	4.69
3	62	46.90	5.07
4	30	43.70	6.52
TOTAL	220	47.00	5.26

Anova results displayed in Table 32 supported the **first hypothesis** that mothers with higher rejection scores on the PARQ are expected to have significantly lower scores on the cohesion subscale of the FEQ, compared to mothers with lower rejection scores.

Table 32

One way Anova results of cohesion by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
between groups	3	525.3363	175.1121	6.824****
within groups	216	5542.5505	25.6599	
TOTAL	219	6067.8867		

**** p <.001

The significant (p<.001) Anova main effect or difference among rejection groups tested by the Scheffé procedure as presented in Table 28 in Appendix K indicated that high rejection subjects had lower cohesion scores (p<.05) than moderately high, moderately low and low rejection groups.

The **second hypothesis** predicted that mothers who have higher rejection scores on the PARQ will have significantly lower control subscale scores on the FEQ, compared to mothers with lower rejection scores. In Tables 33 and 34, the mean, mode, median, S.D. of the FEQ control subscale scores, and the means and S.D.'s of the four rejection groups are shown.

Table 33

Mean, mode, median and S.D. of the FEQ control subscale scores(N=220)

mean	mode	median	S.D.
26.72	29.00	27.00	4.14

Table 34

Means and S.D.'s of four rejection groups on the FEQ. control subscale

PARQ groups	N	mean	S.D.
1	27	27.56	3.98
2	101	26.60	4.09
3	62	26.53	4.31
4	30	26.73	4.16
TOTAL	220	26.72	4.14

Table 35

One way Anova results of cohesion by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
between groups	3	22.4418	7.4806	0.434
within groups	216	3726.1101	17.2505	
TOTAL	219	3748.5518		

One way ANOVA of FEQ control scores yielded nonsignificant differences among rejection groups. Therefore, the second hypothesis was rejected.

The **third hypothesis** stated that mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have higher scores on the A-trait scale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, compared to mothers with lower rejection scores.

In Tables 36 and 37, the mean, mode, median and S.D. of A-trait scores and means and S.D.'s of four rejection groups on trait anxiety scale are given.

Table 36
Mean, mode, median and S.D. of Trait Anxiety scores (N=225)

mean	mode	median	S.D.
42.16	40.00	41.21	7.98

Table 37
Means and S.D.'s of four rejection groups on STAI. A-trait scale

PARQ groups	N	mean	S.D.
1	27	38.67	9.10
2	103	41.47	7.75
3	65	42.66	7.55
4	30	46.57	6.84
TOTAL	225	42.16	7.98

One way Anova of trait anxiety on four rejection groups show a significant difference of A-trait scores, as can be seen in Table 38 (F=5.426, p=0.001).

Table 38
One way Anova of Trait Anxiety by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F ratio
between groups	3	978.0348	326.0115	5.426****
within groups	221	13279.4780	60.0881	
TOTAL	224	14257.5117		

**** p<.001.

The Scheffé procedure revealed that the high rejection group (group 4) had significantly higher trait anxiety scores (p<.05) than the low (group 1) and the moderately low (group 2) rejection groups (Table 29 in Appendix K).

Hypotheses 4,5,6,7 and 8 were related to the five subscales of PARI, which are overprotection (F1), democracy (F2), rejection of mother's homemaking role (F3), marital

conflict (F4) and strict discipline (F5). Means, modes, medians and S.D.'s of PARI subscales are presented in Table 39.

Table 39
Means, modes, medians and S.D.'s of PARI subscales (N=214)

PARI subscales	mean	mode	median	S.D.
F1	48.07	47.00	48.28	8.40
F2	27.51	29.00	28.15	3.79
F3	28.87	25.00	28.23	7.37
F4	14.37	12.00	14.26	3.80
F5	36.49	41.00	36.13	8.74

The **fourth hypothesis** stated that the mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to have significantly lower scores on mother's overprotection as measured by PARI, F1, compared to mothers who have lower rejection scores. Means and S.D.'s of four rejection groups on PARI, F1 are presented in Table 40).

Table 40
Means and S.D.'s of four rejection groups on PARI, F1, overprotection (N=214)

PARQ groups	N	mean	S.D.
1	27	47.81	9.51
2	95	47.58	9.18
3	63	48.03	7.26
4	29	49.97	6.98
TOTAL	214	48.07	8.40

One way Anova statistics (Table 41) of overprotection using the rejection groups indicated nonsignificant main (group) effect, thus not supporting the hypothesis.

Table 41
One way Anova of PARI, F1 by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	Fratio
between groups	3	128.9111	42.9704	0.605
within groups	210	14910.0464	71.0002	
TOTAL	213	15038.9570		

The **fifth hypothesis** stated that the mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to score significantly lower on the democracy subscale of PARI, F2, compared to mothers who have lower rejection scores.

Table 42 presents the means and S.D.'s of four rejection groups on PARI, democracy scale.

Table 42
Means and S.D.'s of the four rejection groups on PARI, F2 democracy (N=214)

PARQ groups	N	mean	S.D.
1	27	28.37	3.28
2	95	28.25	3.52
3	63	27.03	3.79
4	29	25.34	4.25
TOTAL	214	27.51	3.79

Results of the analysis of variance on PARI, F2 using the rejection groups, supported the hypothesis. There is a significant group difference ($F=5.485$, $p=0.0012$) in the democratic attitude of mothers with varying rejection scores. Table 43 gives the Anova results.

Table 43
One way Anova results of PARI-F2 by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	Fratio
between groups	3	222.7560	74.2520	5.485****
within groups	210	2842.7051	13.5367	
TOTAL	213	3065.4609		

**** $p<.001$

The group responsible for this significance as identified by the Scheffé procedure, constituted the high rejection mothers who had lower democracy ($p<.05$) scores than the moderate low and low rejection groups (Table 30 in Appendix K).

In the **sixth hypothesis** it was expected that mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ will have higher scores on the rejection of mother's homemaking role scale, measured by PARI, F3, as compared to mothers who score lower in rejection.

The means and S.D.'s of four rejection groups on PARI, F3 are presented in Table 44.

Table 44
Means and S.D.'s of the four rejection groups on PARI, F3, rejection of home-making role (N=214)

PARQ groups	N	mean	S.D.
1	27	27.41	8.20
2	95	28.04	7.71
3	63	29.22	6.67
4	29	32.21	6.08
TOTAL	214	28.87	7.37

One way Anova statistics indicated significant group difference in rejection of homemaking role ($F=2.853$, $p=.0264$) as presented in Table 45.

Table 45
One way Anova of PARI, F3, by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	Fratio
between groups	3	453.5929	151.976	2.853*
within groups	210	11129.9199	52.9996	
TOTAL	213	11583.5117		

* $p<.05$

The Scheffé procedure was run to find out the group responsible for this significance (Table 31 in Appendix K). This procedure did not result in the identification of any subset as being responsible for the difference. From the means of four rejection groups listed in Table 56 however, a trend from low to high rejection of homemaking role among

the four PARQ groups could be observed. So, the sixth hypothesis was supported.

The **seventh hypothesis** stated that the mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to score higher on marital conflict measured by PARI, F4, as compared to mothers who score lower in rejection.

Means and S.D.'s of four rejection groups on PARI, F4 are presented in Table 46.

Table 46			
Means and S.D's of four rejection groups on PARI, F4, marital conflict scale(N=214)			
PARQ groups	N	mean	S.D.
1	27	14.52	5.27
2	95	14.00	3.86
3	63	14.52	3.09
4	29	15.10	3.43
TOTAL	214	14.37	3.80

The results of one way Anova (Table 47) of marital conflict on rejection groups reveal nonsignificant differences in the marital conflict scores at different levels of rejection.

Table 47				
One way Anova of PARI, F4 by four PARQ groups.				
Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	Fratio
between groups	3	30.6919	10.2306	0.705
within groups	210	3049.1277	14.5197	
TOTAL	213	3079.8196		

So, the seventh hypothesis was not supported.

It was stated in the **eighth hypothesis** that the mothers who have higher rejection scores on PARQ are expected to score higher on the strict discipline scale of PARI (F5), as compared to mothers who hava lower rejection scores.

The means and S.D's of four rejection groups on PARI, F5 are presented in Table 48.

Table 48
Means and S.D's of four rejection groups on PARI, F5 strict discipline scale (N=214)

PARQ groups	N	mean	S.D.
1	27	35.52	10.48
2	95	35.32	8.81
3	63	35.90	7.59
4	29	42.55	6.79
TOTAL	214	36.49	8.74

One way analysis of variance results presented in Table 49 showed that there is a significant difference of strict discipline scores among rejection groups ($F=5.797$, $p=.0008$). So, the eighth hypothesis was supported.

Table 49
One way Anova of PARI, F5 by four PARQ groups

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	Fratio
between groups	3	1243.6473	414.5491	5.797****
within groups	210	15017.7871	71.5133	
TOTAL	213	16261.4336		

**** $p<.001$

The Scheffé procedure (Table 32 in Appendix K) indicated that the high rejection group has significantly ($p<.05$) higher strict discipline scores than the low, moderately low and moderately high rejection groups, thus being responsible for the main effect group difference.

The **ninth hypothesis** stated that the low education mother group will score significantly higher on rejection measured by PARQ, as compared to the high education mother group. The education levels of the subjects were stated in Procedure and Design section (p.59).

Table 50 presents the means and S.D's of the three education groups on PARQ rejection.

Table 50
Means and S.D's of three education groups on PARQ rejection (N=228)

Education groups	N	mean	S.D.
1 low	119	82.89	16.58
2 middle	70	74.49	13.21
3 high	39	75.20	7.87
TOTAL	228	78.99	14.93

One way Anova statistics revealed a significant education main effect on rejection scores ($F= 9.104, p<.0002$). These results are presented in Table 51.

Table 51
One way Anova of PARQ by thre education levels

Source	D.F.	Sum of squares	Mean squares	Fratio
between groups	2	3789.5603	1894.7800	9.104****
within groups	225	46829.1367	208.1295	
TOTAL	227	50618.6953		

**** $p<.001$

Scheffé procedure identified the low education group as responsible for the significant difference, since the highest rejection mean belongs to this group (Table 33 in Appendix K). So, the ninth hypothesis was supported.

The **tenth hypothesis** predicted that the two extreme groups, namely the low and high rejection groups (see section of Procedure and Design) will differ significantly on the variables of cohesion, control, trait anxiety, overprotection, democracy, rejection of homemaking role, marital conflict and strict discipline. T-tests were utilized to compare two extreme groups on these variables, as presented in Table 52.

As can be seen from Table 52, the high rejection group had significantly higher trait anxiety ($t= -367, p<.001$), rejection of homemaking role ($t= -2.47, p<.05$) and strict

discipline scores ($t = -2.96, p < .005$) than the low rejection group.

The low rejection group had significantly higher cohesion ($t = 4.02, p < .001$) and democracy scores ($t = 2.99, p < .005$) than the high rejection group.

Significant differences were not found between the low and high rejection groups in terms of control, overprotection and marital conflict. So, the tenth hypothesis was supported except for the above mentioned variables.

Table 52
t-test results of extreme groups

Scales	Groups	N	means	S.D.	t
FEQ-cohesion	low rejection	27	49.63	4.54	4.02****
	high R	30	43.70	6.52	
FEQ-control	low R	27	27.56	3.98	0.76
	high R	30	26.73	4.16	
STAI-trait anxiety	low R	27	38.67	9.098	-3.67****
	high R	30	46.57	6.84	
PARI, F1	low R	27	47.81	9.51	-0.96
overprotection	high R	29	49.97	6.98	
PARI, F2	low R	27	28.37	3.28	2.99***
democracy	high R	29	25.34	4.25	
PARI, F3	low R	27	27.41	8.20	-2.47*
rej. of homemaking role	high R	29	32.21	6.08	
PARI, F4	low R	27	14.52	5.27	-0.49
marital conflict	high R	29	15.10	3.43	
PARI, F5	low R	27	35.52	10.48	-2.96***
strict discipline	high R	29	42.55	6.796	

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .005$
**** $p < .001$

In addition to the analyses related to the hypotheses, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated to investigate the possible correlations between PARQ and the other variables. Table 53 presents the Pearson correlations.

Table 53
Pearson Correlation Coefficients of PARQ with other variables

	FEQ cohesion	FEQ control	STAI- trait anx.	PARI F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
PARQ	-0.29****	-0.043	0.29****	0.025	-0.26****	0.24****	0.007	0.21****

**** $p<.001$

Rejection scores obtained from PARQ have a negative correlation of .29 with cohesion ($p<.001$) and .26 with democracy ($p<.001$). On the other hand, rejection scores showed a positive correlation of .29 with trait anxiety ($p<.001$), .24 with rejection of home-making role ($p<.001$) and .21 with strict discipline ($p<.001$).

As can be seen in Table 53, rejection is not significantly correlated with control, overprotection and marital conflict as assessed by the PARI.

Factor analysis was carried out to have further information about the conceptual validity of the PARQ mother-form. In the original study, factor analysis was not carried out with PARQ mother-form. Erdem and Erkman (1990) investigated two factors in their study with the Turkish form of PARQ-child and found out that items of warmth-affection subscale and seven neglect-indifference subscale items clustered around F1, while F2 contained almost all items of aggression, hostility and undifferentiated rejection subscales and eight of the indifference-neglect subscale. Rohner (1984) also found two primary factors in his studies with PARQ child-form.

In the present study, exploratory analysis revealed 17 factors. When items were divided into four factors, they clustered mainly around one factor. Table 54 shows the results of the factors analysis with four factor. Table 55 shows the results of the factor analysis with two factors.

Table 54
Factor analysis with four factors

Subscales	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
warmth/ affection	5,8,12,15, 18,20,24,27, 30,31,34, 38,41,45,51, 53,54,56	48	1	
aggression/ hostility	2,6,13,16,19,21,25,28, 32,35,39,42,43,46,49			9
neglect/ indifference	3,7,10,14,17,22,26,29, 33,36,40,47			
undifferentiated rejection	4,11,23,37,50,52	44,55		

As can be seen in Table 55 below, Factor 1 contains 19 items of the warmth subscale, 13 items of the agg/host. subscale, all of indifference/neglect subscale items and six items of the undif.rej. subscale. Factor 2 contains one item of the warmth subscale, three items of the agg./host. subscale and two items of the undif.rej. subscale. It can be concluded that most of the items (50) cluster around Factor 1.

Table 55
Factor analysis with two factors

Subscales	Factor 1	Factor 2
warmth/affection	1,5,8,12,15,18,20,24,27,30,31,34, 38,41,45,51,53,54,56	48
aggression/hostility	2,6,9,16,1,25,32,35,39, 42,43,46,49	13,21,28
neglect/indifference	3,7,10,14,17,22,26,29, 33,36,40,47	
undifferentiated rejection	4,11,23,37,50,52	44,55

B. Test-Retest Reliability and Internal Consistency Findings

In this section, findings of test-retest reliability, Cronbach Alpha Coefficients, item-total, item-subscale and subscale-total correlations of the PARQ are presented.

Forty-eight mothers were readministered the PARQ with a two to three weeks interval. Table 56 shows the test-retest reliability coefficients for the PARQ subscales and the total score.

Table 56

The test-retest reliability correlation coefficient for the PARQ subscales and the total rejection score

Subscales	Correlation coefficients	p
warmth-affection	0.45	.001
aggression-hostility	0.34	.01
indifference-neglect	0.65	.001
undifferentiated rejection	0.40	.005
TOTAL	0.46	.001

Test-retest reliability correlation coefficients were computed again, this time only among middle and high education mother groups (N=29).

Table 57

The test-retest reliability correlation coefficients for the PARQ subscales and the total score among middle and high education groups (N=29)

Subscales	Correlation coefficients	p
warmth-affection	0.22	0.5
aggression-hostility	0.37	0.05
indifference-neglect	0.65	0.001
undifference rejection	0.34	0.05
TOTAL	0.37	0.05

Table 58 shows the means and S.D's of test-retest PARQ subscales and the total score.

Table 58
Means and S.D.S. of Test-Retest correlation coefficients of PARQ subscales and total score

PARQ subscales	mean	mean	mode	mode	median	median	S.D.	S.D.
warmth/affection	27.43	26.96	23	21	26.13	25.21	5.87	5.31
aggression/hostility	22.88	21.25	16	19	21.96	19.90	5.85	5.17
indifference/neglect	16.23	15.56	14	12	15.35	14.20	3.83	4.17
undif.rejection	12.40	12.17	11	10	11.89	11.21	3.12	3.65
TOTAL	78.94	75.94	67	57	76.33	72.50	14.92	15.65

The internal consistency of PARQ was computed in terms of Cronbach alpha coefficient for each subscale and total scale, as presented in Table 59.

Table 59
Cronbach α cor.coef. of PARQ subscales and total scale (N=229)

Subscales	Cronbach α	Standardized item α
warmth-aff. (n=20)	0.79	0.83
agg./host. (n=16)	0.80	0.80
indif/neglect (n=12)	0.64	0.68
undif.rej (n=8)	0.57	0.57
TOTAL	0.89	0.90

Cronbach α coefficients range between .57 and .80, α for the total rejection being .89.

Corrected item-total correlations were investigated as further support for internal consistency. The results are in Table 60.

Table 60
Corrected item-total correlation coefficients of the PARQ items

Item no.	cor.item-total cor.	Item no.	cor.item-total cor.
1	.24	29	.30
2	.33	30	.34
3	.15	31	.31
4	.31	32	.43
5	.32	33	.33
6	.36	34	.35
7	.39	35	.49
8	.36	36	.24
9	.34	37	.38
10	.27	38	.44
11	.34	39	.49
12	.38	40	.52
13	.39	41	.35
14	.33	42	.34
15	.28	43	.38
16	.33	44	.36
17	.27	45	.57
18	.29	46	.44
19	.47	47	.39
20	.47	48	.01
21	.34	49	.40
22	.36	50	.37
23	.31	51	.44
24	.15	52	.38
25	.39	53	.36
26	.43	54	.46
27	.45	55	.25
28	.40	56	.28

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were also computed for item-subscale and subscale-total on PARQ. The results are presented in Tables 61 and 62, respectively.

Table 61
Item-subscale correlation coefficients (N=229)*

WARMTH/AFFECTION SUBSCALE			
Item no.	Item-subscale cor.	Item no.	Items-subscale cor.
1	.31	31	.47
5	.55	34	.54
8	.48	38	.57
12	.57	41	.50
15	.48	45	.69
18	.48	48	.16
20	.59	51	.48
24	.36	53	.45
27	.52	54	.50
30	.34	56	.41
AGGRESSION/HOSTILITY SUBSCALE			
2	.51	28	.60
6	.54	32	.54
9	.34	35	.62
13	.57	39	.61
16	.40	42	.39
19	.59	43	.36
21	.52	46	.48
25	.42	49	.48
NEGLECT/INDIFFERENCE SUBSCALE			
3	.29	26	.50
7	.40	29	.40
10	.44	33	.34
14	.48	36	.47
17	.51	40	.60
22	.58	47	.55
UNDIFFERENTIATED REJECTION SUBSCALE			
4	.36	44	.50
11	.53	50	.41
23	.46	52	.66
37	.49	55	.56

* All items except no. 48 are significant at .001 level, while item 48 is significant at level .01.

Table 62
Subscale-total correlation coefficients of PARQ

Subscales	Subscales-total cor.coefficients
warmth/affection	.78****
aggression/hostility	.86****
indifference-neglect	.77****
undifferentiated rejection	.75****

**** p<.001

XII. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to establish the reliability and validity of the Turkish version of the Parental Acceptance and Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), mother-form. PARQ mother-form measures mother's perceptions of how she treats her child in terms of warmth/affection, aggression/hostility, neglect/indifference and undifferentiated rejection. The concept of parental acceptance and rejection which constitutes the warmth dimension of parenting, has been put forth by Rohner (1980) as a theory of emotional abuse (PART). This theory attempts to explain and predict the consequences of parental acceptance-rejection for behavioral, cognitive, emotional development of children. It assumes that children are born with a need to receive warmth from people important to them and that the withdrawal of parental acceptance will cause negative outcomes (Rohner, 1984, 1991). PART includes the categories of rejecting, degrading, terrorizing, isolating, adultifying and denying emotional responsiveness. These categories also take place in definitions of child abuse and neglect (Rohner, 1984). Research results on parental rejection and child abuse and neglect show similarities. Rejected and abused children develop some personality characteristics such as hostility, dependence, negative self esteem, worldview and self adequacy, emotional instability and unresponsiveness as shown by many studies (Salama, 1986; Kitahara; 1987; Hart and Brassard, 1986; Erkman, 1988, 1990; Kozcu, 1990).

Patterns of behaviour displayed by mothers towards their children are effected by many interwoven factors. Studies conducted in the field of child abuse show that family atmosphere, child rearing attitudes, personality characteristics, marital relationship and education are among these factors (Carnes, Wolf, Lepinski, 1983; Rohner, 1986; Bentovim, 1984; Wolfe, 1989; Kelley et al., 1990). Studies on child abuse with Turkish families also support the relation between the above factors and parental acceptance-rejection (Zeytinoğlu, 1988; Alantar and Erkman, 1989; Polat and Sunar, 1988; Selçuk, 1985).

Turkish cultural norms, values and the characteristics of the Turkish family such as warmth, control, protection, expectation of obedience and dependency of children, cohesion and inconsistent discipline differ from Western cultural norms. Considering our norms and values, the relationship between rejecting attitude of mothers and cohesion,

control in the family, trait anxiety, overprotection, democracy, rejection of homemaking role, marital conflict, strict discipline as perceived by mothers and their education level were investigated through the following hypotheses.

Based on the studies that show the inverse relationship of family cohesion and rejection or abuse (Carnes, Wolf, Lepinski, 1982; Fişek, 1983), the **first hypothesis** stated that mothers with higher rejection scores on the PARQ are expected to have significantly lower cohesion scores. This expectation was supported by the Anova findings ($F=6.824, p<.001$).

The **second hypothesis** predicted that mothers who have higher rejection scores will have significantly lower control scores, than those who score lower in rejection. Anova results did not show any significant difference among the rejection groups. Pearson Product results did not show significant correlation between control and rejection, either. So, the second hypothesis was rejected. Western studies claim that abusive parents impose too many responsibilities on their children; they set too many rules in order to control family life (Garbarino, 1986). However, the general attitude in a Turkish family is controlling and protecting. In contrast to Western families, control is not perceived as rejection, since love and control seem to go together (Kâğıtçıbaşı, 1970). Control and overprotection are considered cultural norms in the Turkish society (Kâğıtçıbaşı, 1990). Low and high rejecting mothers cannot be differentiated in terms of control since they all exert control over their children and there is no variance among their answers. In Table 46, the low rejection group had the highest control mean score, however this was not enough to support the hypothesis.

The **third hypothesis**, stating that highly rejecting mothers will have higher trait anxiety than the low rejection mother group, was based on Western and Turkish similar research findings. Studies showed that highly stressful, anxious mothers were more likely to neglect and abuse their children (Egeland et al., 1980). High anxiety was found to be a common characteristic among abusing mothers (Sandler, 1985; Berkowitz, 1983; Vasta, 1982; Zeytinoğlu, 1988). Anova findings ($F=5.426, p<.001$) supported this hypothesis.

The **fourth hypothesis** put forth that mothers with higher rejection scores will have significantly lower scores on the overprotection subscale of PARI, compared to low rejection mother group. This hypothesis was constructed based on Turkish family values. Turkish mothers are described to be overprotective and repressive; disciplining their chil-

dren inconsistently and expecting obedience from them (Fişek, 1980). Traditional Turkish family dynamics foster the development of passive, dependent children (Fişek, 1982). Mother's overprotection is a cultural norm in Türkiye and in general would not be perceived as rejection. Just like in the second hypothesis related to control, low and high rejecting mothers cannot be differentiated in terms of overprotection, since they are all overprotective and there is no variance in their answers. Accordingly, Anova findings and Pearson Correlations did not support this hypothesis. A closer look at the group means (Table 40) shows a tendency in the opposite direction, with the high rejection group, having the highest overprotection mean score, but this is nonsignificant.

The **fifth hypothesis** was constructed in order to investigate the relation between rejection and democracy. It stated that the mothers with higher rejection scores will score lower on democracy, as compared to mothers who have lower rejection scores. Democracy in a family refers to the attitude of sharing with the child and encouraging him/her to express his/her ideas and feelings (Küçük, 1987). Studies by Erdem (1990) and Alantar (1989) and Erkman show that children perceiving higher emotional abuse and/or rejection also perceive less democracy in their families. These findings support the 5th. hypothesis, together with the Anova findings ($F= 5.485, p<.001$).

In the **sixth hypothesis**, it was expected that mothers who have higher rejection scores will also score high on the rejection of mother's homemaking role, as compared to low rejection mothers. Rohner's (1980) findings on abusing mothers having a rejecting attitude towards their homemaking role, were supported by the study of Erdem and Erkman (1990). They found out that children perceiving high rejection, also perceived more maternal rejection of homemaking role than the low rejection perceiving group. This hypothesis was supported by Anova findings ($F=2.853, p<.05$).

The **seventh hypothesis** stated that the rejecting mothers will score higher on marital conflict, as compared with low rejection mothers. Research findings reveal that abusing parents are more dissatisfied with their marriage than nonabusing parents (Miller, 1983). Young (1964) reported marital discord in abusing and neglecting families, as well as Zeytinoğlu (1988), Selçuk (1985) and Yavuzer (1986) mentioning marital conflict and dissatisfaction with marriage as factors leading to abuse. However, Anova results and Pearson correlations did not support this hypothesis. Yet, in Table 46, it can be seen that the high rejection group has the highest marital conflict mean, as expected. In the study proper, the mother sample ($N=214$) has a marital conflict mean of 14.37 (Table

46). Approximate means were found among other Turkish mother-samples. In her research, Öner (1983) found the marital conflict mean, among a group of mothers (N=50) chosen from low-high education levels, to be 13.50. In another study, she found a marital conflict mean of 4.21 among, high educated 42 mothers, and a mean of 14.64 among low educated 82 mothers (Öner, 1986).

It was stated in the **eighth hypothesis** that high rejection mothers will score higher on strict discipline than low rejection mothers. Anova results supported this hypothesis ($F=5.797$, $p<.001$). Research findings by Wolfe (1989), Garbarino (1986) and Kulaksızoğlu (1991) also reveal that abusing parents suppress the responses of their children and use punitive child-rearing methods and strict discipline.

The **ninth hypothesis** predicted that the low education mother group will score higher on rejection, as compared to the high education mother group. Education of the mother has a great impact on her child-rearing attitude (Küçük, 1987; Selçuk, 1985). Low educated mothers tend to favor physical and abusive means of discipline (Wolfe, 1989). These findings and the Anova results support the 9th. hypothesis ($F=9.104$, $p<.001$).

The **tenth hypothesis** predicted that the low and high rejection mother groups will differ significantly on the variables of cohesion, control, overprotection and democracy in favor of the low rejection group, and on the variables of trait anxiety, rejection of homemaking role, marital conflict and strict discipline in favor of the high rejection group. These predictions, similar to the ones made by the hypotheses no. 1,2,3,4,5,6,7 and 8, were tested by t-tests (Table 52). Significant differences were not found between low and high rejection groups in terms of control, overprotection and marital conflict. So, this hypothesis was partially supported.

Parallel to the above results, Pearson Product Moment Correlations, calculated to investigate the possible correlations between rejection and other variables (Table 53) revealed that rejection was not significantly correlated with control, overprotection and marital conflict.

These results indicate that a highly rejecting mother perceives lower cohesion and democracy in the family, has higher trait anxiety, rejects her homemaking role more and uses more strict discipline when compared with a low -rejecting mother.

Factor Analysis (Tables 54,55 which was used for one kind of conceptual validation of the PARQ yielded two factors, but most of the items (50 items out of 56) clustered around Factor 1. Items no. 13, 21, 28, 44, 48 and 55 constituted Factor 2. Factor Analysis of the PARQ child-form yielded two factors, like the original PARQ child-form. Factor 1 represented warmth and the other rejection (Erdem and Erkman, 1990; Rohner, 1980). However, the Turkish version of the PARQ mother-form is not composed of two factors, namely warmth and rejection, as expected; but rather it is more of one factor which can be called the rejection factor and appears to be quite a homogenous scale. Rohner has not investigated the factor analysis of the English form of Mother PARQ, so there are no means to compare the Turkish form with the original English form.

Test-retest reliability of the original PARQ mother-form was not calculated, so there are no means to compare the present study with the original study. Erdem and Erkman (1990) found the test-retest correlation coefficient of the child PARQ to be .70 ($p < .001$). In the present study, the test-retest reliability coefficients of the subscales (Table 68) ranged between .34 to .65 in two to three weeks interval. For the total score, the reliability coefficient was found to be .46; which is low. In this study, the questionnaires were sent home to be filled out by the mothers. How and by whom they were filled out could not be controlled due to practical reasons. Especially, low-educated mothers could have asked other family members for help and this might have caused a bias. In order to eliminate this effect, the test-retest reliability coefficients of the middle and high education groups ($N=29$) were calculated; leaving the low educated group out (Table 57). The result ($r = .37$ for the total scale) indicated that this assumption was not appropriate because the test-retest reliability decreased. The number of subjects in this group was also very small ($N=29$). It would be desirable to have such an instrument to be more consistent and stable over time.

The **Cronbach alpha coefficients** of the subscales were .85 for the warmth/affection subscale, .80 for the hostility/aggression subscale, .74 for the neglect/indifference subscale and .67 for the undifferentiated rejection subscale in the original study (Rohner, 1991). In the present study, standardized Cronbach alpha values were found to be .83, .80, .68 and .57 for the warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, neglect-indifference and undifferentiated rejection subscales, respectively (Table 59). The alpha coefficient for the neglect-indifference and for the undifferentiated rejection subscales were lower in the Turkish form. However, in both forms (the original and the Turkish PARQ), the lowest α

coefficient belongs to the undifferentiated rejection subscale. Undifferentiated rejection is being unloving towards the child without displaying behaviour such as active indifference, neglect or overt hostility-aggression (Jordan, 1990). As the name implies, the definition of this subscale is not very clear as the other subscales, so this might be a reason why the lowest α coefficient belongs to the undifferentiated rejection subscale. This conclusion is supported by some research findings in Washington in 1975. Three graduate students learned the theoretical definition of the constructs measured by PARQ scales. Then, they were asked to sort 60 Adult PARQ items into four piles, each pile representing one PARQ scale. Although the warmth/affection items were sorted with 100% accuracy and the aggression hostility and neglect/indifference items with 17% error, the raters had a mean error of 40% for the undifferentiated rejection scale. Some of the undifferentiated rejection items were confused with the neglect/indifference and with the aggression/hostility items. The reason for such a result is that the construct "perceived undifferentiated rejection" does not have a conceptual definition which differentiates it from related constructs (Rohner, 1991).

When the results of the study proper are compared with the pilot study, the α coefficients seem to be very similar. In the pilot study, the α coefficients were found to be .84 for the warmth/affection, .79 for the hostility/aggression, .71 for the neglect/indifference and .57 for the undifferentiated rejection subscales (Table 27). In both the pilot study and the study proper, the warmth-affection subscale is the most internally consistent and homogenous subscale, followed by the aggression/hostility, neglect/indifference and the undifferentiated rejection subscales. These results show that the Turkish PARQ mother-form is an internally consistent, homogenous scale for measuring rejection.

Corrected item-total correlations (Table 60) item-subscale (Table 61) and subscale-total (Table 62) correlation coefficients were investigated for internal consistency and homogeneity of the test. Corrected item-total correlations ranged between .01 and .57, with a mean of .35 and a median of .36. Item-subscale correlations ranged from .16 ($p < .005$) to .69 ($p < .001$). The subscale-total correlation coefficients (Table 36) were .78 for the warmth/affection, .86 for the hostility-aggression, .77 for the neglect/indifference and .75 for the undifferentiated rejection subscales, at .001 level of significance. In the pilot study, these correlations were found to be .84, .86, .82 and .70 for the above subscales, respectively (Table 26). In the pilot study, the subscale-total correlation was found to be higher than the study proper in the warmth/affection and the neglect/indifference subscales, but lower in the undifferentiated rejection subscale. The correlation coefficient

was found to be the same (.86) for the hostility/aggression subscale in both studies.

Item no 48 in the PARQ mother-form had a corrected item-total correlation of .01 (Table 60) and an item-subscale correlation of .16 ($p < .001$, Table 61). These correlations are both very low. In the pilot study, the item-subscale correlation to be of item no. 48 was found to be .3217 ($p < .001$) and the item-total correlation to be .2041 ($p < .01$). The mother sample of the pilot study, similar to the study proper, was divided in three groups, namely the low, middle and high education groups (Table 23). Item no. 48 had item-subscale correlations of .3760 ($p < .001$), .3298 and .2213 for these education groups, respectively in the pilot study. Whereas the item-total correlations were found to be .2366, .2754 and .0376 for three education groups, respectively. These correlations were not significant in the pilot study. This item states: "Benim için uygun olmasa bile, çocuğumun önemli gördüğü şeyleri yapmasına izin veririm/I let my child do things s/he thinks are important, even if it is inconvenient for me." It belongs to the warmth-affection subscale and is related to democracy, to respect for the child and his/her needs. High educated mothers are more democratic and show such respect for their children. Such an attitude is socially desirable. In the study proper, most of the high educated mothers gave the answer "Almost Always True" for this item. The variance in their answers is low (variance = 0.657, $N=39$). However, in the low-education mother-group, the variance in their answers is higher (variance = 3.878, $N=119$), since these mothers display less democratic attitudes towards their children and show less respect in comparison to high educated mothers. It can be concluded that item no. 48 can differentiate low educated mothers from high educated ones. Also for low educated mothers this is an item that differentiates between high and low rejecting mothers.

A closer inspection of Table 60 reveals that items no. 1, 3, 24, 36 and 48 have corrected item-total correlations lower than .25. When these items are deleted from PARQ, the new α value for the total scale is .8959 (approximately .90) and the standardized item alpha is .9054 (approximately .91). If these items are included, total α is .89 and standardized item α is .90. Alpha values slightly increase when items, having item-total correlations lower than .25, are deleted. PARQ mother-form can be used as a short form, excluding items 1, 3, 24, 36 and 48.

From the above mentioned results, it can be concluded that the Turkish PARQ mother-form has homogenous, internally consistent items and it is a reliable and valid instrument, however with a low stability over time. This instrument can be utilized in asses-

ing mother's rejection towards her child in the field of child abuse and neglect.

Child abuse and neglect is a relatively new field both abroad and in Türkiye. It is a universally accepted fact that abuse has negative outcomes in the development of the child. In order to foresee and prevent these outcomes, there is a need for assesment tools, such as PARQ child and mother forms. The PARQ child-form has already been proved to be reliable and valid (Polat and Sunar, 1988; Erdem and Erkman, 1990). In the present study, including the transliteral equivalence, reliability and validity studies, the PARQ mother-form is now available to be utilized. It is suggested that in counseling it can be used together with the child PARQ form in order to assess rejection from both the child's and the mother's point of view.

Limitations and Recommendations

In a future study, the test-retest reliability should be reconducted among a larger sample of mothers, from three different SES levels, in order to strengthen the stability of the Turkish PARQ mother-form. However, the administration of the questionnaires should be controlled.

Item no. 48 which has low item-subscale and item-total correlations, should be closely watched in future research.

A wider research with data collected from all over Türkiye is also recommended in order to have a better representation of the mother population and to develop norms.

REFERENCES

- Aber, J.L., Zigler, E. (1986). Developmental Considerations in the Definition of Child Maltreatment. In J. Garbarino, E. Guttman, J.W. Seeley (Eds.). **The psychologically battered child** (p.61) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Adelson, J. (1990). Diagnosed intellectual and emotional impairment among parents who seriously mistreat their children: prevalence, type and outcome in a court sample. **Child Abuse and Neglect** 15(4), 389-401.
- Alantar, M., Erkman, F. (1989, September). **Psychological maltreatment: Its definition by experts and its assessment among a group of adolescents in Turkey.** Paper presented at the 7th. International Congress of Child Abuse and Neglect, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil.
- Bailey, T.F., Bailey, W.H. (1986). **Operational definitions of child emotional maltreatment.** Augusta, Maine.
- Balaman, A.R. (1986, July). **The enculturation process in rural area of Turkey.** Paper presented at the 8th. International Congress of Cross Cultural Psychology, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Bell, R.Q., Harper, L. (1987). Child effects on adults. In A.D. Wolfe (Ed.). **Child Abuse** (p.24). California: Sage Publications.
- Belsky, J. (1980). Child maltreatment: An ecological integration. **American Psychologist** 35(4), 320-335.
- Bentovim, A. (1987). Breakdown of parenting function in abusing families. In P. Maher (Ed.), **Child Abuse: The educational perspective** (pp.59-75). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Berkowitz, L. (1988). Aversively stimulated aggression. In C.E. Walker, B.L. Bonner, K.L. Kaufman (Eds.), **The physically and sexually abused child** (p.68). Great Britain: Pergamon Press.

- Bilir,Ş., Arı,M., Dönmez,N.B. (1991). 4-12 yaşları arasında 16, 100 çocukta örselenme ile ilgili bir inceleme. In E.Konanç, İ.Gürkaynak, A.Egemen (Eds.), **Çocuk İstismarı ve İhmal** (pp.45-55). Ankara: Gözde Repro Ofset.
- Brandt,S. (1987). Reflections on the therapy of those who maltreat children. In R.E.Helfer, R.S.Kompe (Eds.), **The battered child** (pp.382-391). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brassard,M.R., Germain,R., Hart,S.N. (Eds.), (1987). **Psychological maltreatment of children and youth**. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Browne,K., S aqi,S. (1989). Parent-child interaction in abusing families: its possible causes and consequences. In P.Maher (Ed.), **Child Abuse: The educational perspective** (pp.77-103). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Brunquell,D. et al. (1987). Maternal personality and attitude in disturbances of child rearing. In D.A.Wolfe (Ed.), **Child Abuse** (p.689). California: Sage Publications.
- Burgess,R.L. (1987). Social incompetence as a precipitant to and consequence of child maltreatment. In D.A.Wolfe (Ed.), **Child Abuse** (p.25). California: Sage Publications.
- Carnes,P., Wolf,M., Lepinski,S. (1989). Abused adolescen's perceptions of their environment. In S.Usluer, **The reliability and the validity of the Turkish Family Environment Questionnaire** (p.19). Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Conger,R.D., Burgess,R., Barrett,C. (1987). Child abuse related to life change and perceptions of illness. In D.A.Wolfe (Ed.), **Child Abuse** (p.83).California: Sage Publications.
- Corby,B. (1987). **Working with child abuse**. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Crittenden,P.M., Bonvillian,J.D. (1987). The relationship between maternal risk status and maternal sensitivity. In D.A.Wolfe (EEd.), **Child Abuse** (p.79). California: Sage Publications.
- Disbrow,M.A., Doerr,H., Caulfield,C. (1987). Measuring the components of parents' potential for child abuse and neglect. In D.A.Wolfe (Ed.), **Child Abuse** (p.79). California: Sage Publications.

- Egeland,B., Breitenbucher,M., Rosenberg,D. (1987). Prospective study of the significance of life stress in the etiology of child abuse. In D.A.Wolfe (Ed.), **Child Abuse** (p.86). California: Sage Publications.
- Elmer,E. (1990). Research directions related to child abuse and neglect. In R.T.Ammerman, M.Hersen(Eds.), **Children at risk** (pp.18). New York: Plenum Press.
- Erdem,T. (1990). **The validity and reliability study of Turkish form of parental acceptance - rejection questionnaire**. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Erkman,F. (1990, July). **Support for Rohner's PART as a psychological abuse theory in Turkey**. Paper presented at the 10th. International Association of Cross Cultural Psychology Congress, Nara, Japan.
- Erkman,F. (1990, September). **The relationship of parental rejection, emotional abuse and family environment**. Paper presented at the 8th. International Congress on child abuse and neglect, Hamburg, Germany.
- Erkman,F. (1991). Çocukların duygusal ezimi. In E.Konaç, İ.Gürkaynak, A.Egemen (Eds.), **Çocuk istismarı ve ihmali** (pp.163-171). Ankara: Gözde Matbaası.
- Finkelhor,D., Korbin,J. (1988). Child abuse as an international issue. **Child Abuse and Neglect**, 12(1), 3-23.
- Fişek,G. (1982). Psychopathology and the Turkish family: A family system's theory analysis. In Ç.Kâğıtçıbaşı (Ed.), **Sex roles, family and community in Turkey** (pp.295-321). Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies.
- Fontana,V.J. (1986). Somewhere a child is crying: maltreatment-causes and prevention: In J.Garbarino, E.Guttman, J.W.Seeley (Eds.), **The psychologically battered child**, (pp.50-63). San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Foreward,S. (1989). **Toxic parents**. New York: Bantam Books.
- Garbarino,J., Guttman,E., Seeley,J.W. (1986). **The psychologically battered child**. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Garbarino,J., Vondra,J. (1987). Psychological maltreatment: issues and perspectives. In M.R.Brassard, R.Germain, S.N.Hart (Eds.), **Psychological maltreatment of children and youth** (pp.25-43). New York: Pergamon Press.

- Garrison,E.G. (1987). Psychological maltreatment of children. **American Psychologist**, **42**(2), 157-159.
- Gleanson,G. (1989, June). **The child caring/care, neglect/abuse continuum. A pragmatic guide to judge policies, programmes and impact in child survival and development.** Paper presented at the Congress on Child Abuse and Child Labour, Ankara, Turkey.
- Goldberg,L.R. (1991). Parameters of personality inventory construction and utilization. In R.P.Rohner, **Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection.** (p.22). The University of Connecticut: Center for the study of parental acceptance and rejection.
- Green, . (1988). Physical abuse of children. In V.B.Van Hasselt, R.L.Morrison, A.S.Bellack, M.Hersen (Eds.), **Handbook of family violence** (p.125).New York: Plenum Press.
- Haque,A. (1987). Social class differences in perceived maternal acceptance - rejection and personality dispositions among Pakistani children. In Ç.Kâğıtçıbaşı (Ed.), **Growth and progress in cross cultural psychology** (pp.189-194). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger, B.V.
- Herrenkohl,R.C., Herrenkohl,E.C., Egolf,B.P. (1986). Circumstances surrounding the occurrence of child maltreatment. In C.Garbarino, E.Guttman, J.W.Seeley (Eds.), **The psychologically battered child** (pp.51-57). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Herzberger,S.D., Potts,D.A., Dillon,M. (1981). Abusive and nonabusive parental treatment from the child's perspective. **Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology**, **49**(1), 81-90.
- Hjelle,L.A., Ziegler,D.J. (1981). **Personality theories: Basic assumptions, research and applications** (2nd. ed.). Tokyo: McGraw Hill.
- Jones,P.H.D., Alexander,H. (1987). Treating the abusive family within the family care system. In R.E.Helfer, R.S.Kempe (Eds.), **Stress and child abuse** (pp.339-357). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Jordan,F. (1990). **A test of Parental Acceptance - Rejection Theory and Validation and Reliability of Related Measures**. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles.
- Justice,B., Justice,R. (1990). **The abusing family**. New York: Plenum Press.
- Kâğıtçıbaşı,Ç. (1970). Social norms and authoritarianism: A Turkish-American comparison. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 16(3), 444-451.
- Kâğıtçıbaşı,Ç. (1980). **Çocuğun Değeri**. Istanbul: Gözlem Matbaacılık Koll.Şti.
- Kâğıtçıbaşı,Ç. (1982). Sex roles, value of children and fertility. In Ç.Kâğıtçıbaşı (Ed.), **Sex roles, family and community in Turkey** (pp.151-180). Indiana: Indiana University turkish Studies 3.
- Kâğıtçıbaşı,Ç. (1990). **İnsan-aile-kültür**. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, A.Ş.
- Kaufman,K., Sandler,J. (1989). A comparison of abusive and nonabusive mothers within a stress and coping framework. In C.E.Walker, B.L.Bonner, K.L.Kaufman (Eds.), **The physically and sexually abused child** (p.68). Great Britain: Pergamon Press.
- Kelley,M.L., Grace,N., Elliott,S. (1990). Acceptability of positive and punitive discipline methods: Comparisons among abusive, potentially abusive and nonabusive parents. **Child Abuse and Neglect**, 14(2), 219.
- Kitahara,M. (1987). Perception of parental acceptance and rejection among Swedish university students. **Child Abuse and Neglect**, 11, 223-227.
- Kozacıoğlu,G. (1982). **Çocukların anksiyete düzeyler ile annelerin tutumları arasındaki ilişki**. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Istanbul University, Istanbul.
- Kozcu,Ş. (1990). Duygusal istismar: duygusal istismar ve genel ruh sağlığı ilişkisini inceleyen bir araştırma. **Seminer Psikoloji Dergisi**, 5, 1-20.
- Köknel,Ö., (1986). Türk toplumunda bugünün gençliği. In L.Bovete. **Parent effectiveness training: A test of its effectiveness with a Turkish sample** (p.8). Unpublished M.A.thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

- Kulaksızoğlu,A. (1985). **Ergen-aile çatışmaları ile annenin tutumları arasındaki ilişki ve ergenin problemleri**. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Istanbul University, Istanbul.
- Kulaksızoğlu,A. (1992, July). **A study on the maltreatment in families and schools towards children**. Paper presented at the 1st. International School Psychologists Colloquium, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Küçük,Ş. (1987). **The validity of the Turkish form of PARI subscales II, III, IV**. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Lahey,B.B. et al. (1989). Parenting behavior and emotional status of physically abusive mothers. In C.E.Walker, B.L.Bonner, K.L.Kaufman (Eds.), **The physically and sexually abused child** (p.47). Great Britain: Pergamon Press.
- Le Compte,G.K., Le Compte,N.A., Özer,Ş.A. (1978). Üç sosyoekonomik düzeyde Ankaralı annelerin çocuk yetiştirme tutumları: Bir ölçek uyarlama: **Psikoloji Dergisi**, 1, 5-8.
- Levinson,D. (1989). **Family violence in cross-cultural perspective**. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lynch, M.A. (1985). Child abuse before Kempe: A historical literature review. **Child Abuse and Neglect**, 9, 7-15.
- Maher,P. (1989). **Child Abuse: The educational perspective**. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Mash,E.J. (1987). A comparison of the mother-child interactions of physically abused and nonabused children during play and task situations. In D.A.Wolfe (Ed.), **Child Abuse** (p.83). California: Sage Publications.
- Miller,A. (1983). **For their own good**. New York: Free Press.
- Melnick,B., Hurley,J.R. (1987). Distinctive personality attributes of child - abusing mothers. In D.A.Wolfe (Ed.). **Child Abuse** (pp.71-73). California: Sage Publications.
- Mussen, et al. (1986). Child Development and Personality. In L.Bovete, **Parent effectiveness training: a test of its effectiveness with a Turkish sample** (p.6). Unpublished master's thesis. Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

- Ney,P.G., Moore,C., McPhee,J., Trought,P. (1986). Child Abuse: A study of the child's perspective. **Child Abuse and Neglect**, 10, 511-518.
- Ohlson-Prather,E. (1978, November). **Socioeconomic and psychocultural context of child abuse and neglect in Turkey**. Paper presented at the meeting of the Anthropological Association, 77th. Annual Meeting. Los Angeles, U.S.A.
- Öner,N. (1986, July). **Contemporary Patterns of child rearing attitudes of middle class parents in Istanbul**. Paper presented at the 8th. Conference of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Öner,N. (1984-85). Does education make a difference in the child rearing attitudes of parents in Turkey. **Boğaziçi University Dergisi**, 11, 43-54.
- Öner,N., Le Compte,A. (1985). **Süreksiz Durumluk - Sürekli Kaygı Envanterli El Kitabı**. Istanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Öztürk,M.O. (1986). Anadolu kişiliğinde özerklik ve girişme duygularının kısıtlanması. In L.Bovete, **Parent effectiveness training: a test of its effectiveness with a turkish sample** (p.8).Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Parke,R.D., Collmer,C.W., (1987). Child Abuse: an interdisciplinary analysis. In D.A.Wolfe (Ed.), **Child Abuse** (pp.18-23). California: Sage Publications.
- Polat,A.S. (1988). **Parental Acceptance Rejection**. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Rappaport,J. (1977). **Community Psychology: Values, research and action**. Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Reid,J.B., Taplin,P. (1987). A social interactional approach to the treatment of abusive families. In D.A.Wolfe (Ed.) **Child Abuse** (pp.72-83). California: Sage Publications.
- Rohner,R.P. (1975). **They love me, they love me not: A worldwide study of the effects of parental acceptance and rejection**. New Haves: HR.AF. Press.
- Rohner, R.P. (1980a). Worldwide tests of parental acceptance rejection theory. **Behaviour Science Research**, whole issue.

- Rohner,R.P. (1980b, 1984, 1991). **Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection**. Center for the study of parental acceptance and rejection. University of Connecticut.
- Rohner,R.P. (1986). **The warmth dimension: Foundations of parental acceptance rejection theory**. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Rosenberg,M.S., Germain,R.B. (1987). Psychological nontreatment: Theory, research and ethical issues in psychology. In M.R. Brassard,R.Germain,S.N. Hart (Eds.), **Psychological maltreatment of children and youth** (pp.243-251). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Rüstemli,A. (1983). The development and validity of an adjective X-sort to measure the self-concept. In N.Öner, A.Le Compte, **Süreksiz Durumluk/Sürekli Kaygı Envanteri el Kitabı**, (p.18). İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Salama,M., (1987) Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and personality dispositions among college students in Egypt. In Ç.Kâğıtçıbaşı (Ed.), **Growth and Progression Cross Cultural Psychology**. (pp.181-188). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger,B.V.
- Selçuk,Z. (1985). **Türkiye'de Çocuk İstisması ve İhmali**. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Ankara.
- Schesinger,B.B., Revitch,E. (1981). Stress, violence and Crime. In I.L.Kutash,L.B., Schlesinger (Eds.) **Handbook on Stress and Anxiety** (p.176). California: Jossey, Bass Inc. Publishers.
- Smith,Hanson. (1983b). Patterns of child-rearings. In A.M.Berger, **The child abusing family**, (pp.251-264). Family Studies Yearbook Review, 1.
- Smith,S.M., Honigsberger,L., Smith,C.A. (1990). Diagnosed intellectual and emotional impairment among parents who seriously mistreat their children: Prevalence, type and outcome in a court sample. **Child Abuse and Neglect**, 15 (4), 389-401.
- Speilberger,C.D. (1983). Anxiety and behavior. In N.Öner, A.Le Compte, **Süreksiz Durumluk/Sürekli Kaygı Envanteri El Kitabı**. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

- Stirling,P. (1986). Turkish village. In L.Bovetc, **Parent effectiveness training: a test of its effectiveness with a Turkish sample** (p.8). Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Straus, Kantor, (1987). Stress and child abuse. In R.E.Helfer, R.S., Kempe (eds.), **The battered child** (pp.42-57). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Trickett,P.K., Kuzczynski,L. (1987). Children's misbehaviors and parental discipline strategies in abusive and non-abusive families. In D.A. Wolfe (Ed.) **Child Abuse**, (pp.24-39). California: Sage Publications.
- Trickett,P.K., Sussman,E.J. (1987). Child-rearing patterns in depressed, abusive and normal mothers. In D.A. Wolfe (Ed.) **Child Abuse** (pp.83-96). California: Sage Publications.
- Usluer,S. (1989). **The reliability and the validity of the Turkish Family Environment Questionnaire**. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Vasta, R. (1988). Physical child abuse: A dual-component analysis. In C.E. Walker, B.L.Bonner, K.L.Kaufman (Eds.). **The physically and sexually abused child** (p.68). Great Britain: Pergamon Press.
- Vondra,J.I. (1990). Sociological and Ecological Factors. In R.T. Ammerman, M.Hersen (Eds.), **Children at Risk** (pp.). New York: Plenum Press.
- Walters,G.C., Hall,D.K. (1990). Predisposing child factors. In R.T.Ammerman, M.Hersen (Eds.), **Children at risk** (p.209). New York: Plenum Press.
- White,J.B., (1983). Yabancı bir kültürle temasa ilişkin değişkenler: Batı Almanya'daki Türk Kadınları Örneği. In N.Öner, A.Le Compte, **Süreksiz Durumluk/Sürekli Kaygı Envanteri El Kitabı** (p.18). İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Wolfe,D.A. (1989). **Child Abuse**. California: Sage Publications.
- Yavuzer,H. (1986). **Ana-Baba ve Çocuk**. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Young (1983b). Patterns of child-rearing. In A M. Berger, **The child abusing family**. Family Studies Yearbook Review, 1.
- Yörükoğlu,A. (1984). **Değişen toplumda aile ve çocuk**. Ankara: Aydın Kitabevi Yayınları.

- Zeytinoğlu,S. (1988, September). **The epinions of Turkish professionals about child abuse**. Paper presented at the 7th. International Congresson Child Abuse and Neglect, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil.
- Zuckerman,M. and Colleagues (1987). Normative data and factor analysis on the PARI. In Ş.Küçük, **The validity of the Turkish form of the Parı subscales II, III, IV**. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Zülemyan,A. (1983). A comparison of congitive therapy: modified desensitization, cognitive behavior modification and control groups for reducing anxiety. In N.Öner, A.Le Compte, **Süreksiz Durumluk/Sürekli Kaygı Envanterl El Kitabı** (p.19). İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

APPENDIX A

AİLE - ÇOCUK İLİŞKİLERİ FORMU* (ANNE)

KOD

İlişikte annenin çocuğa karşı çeşitli davranış şekillerini içeren ifadeler verilmiştir. Her ifadeyi dikkatle okuyup, kendi davranışınıza ne derece uyduğunu düşününüz. Fazla zaman kaybetmeden ilk düşüncenizi kaydediniz. Eğer ifade sizin için **doğru** ise, hemen hemen, her zaman doğru veya bazen doğru şikkını çarpılamak (x) suretiyle işaretleyiniz. İfade sizin için **doğru değil** ise, nadiren doğru veya hiçbir zaman doğru değil şikkını çarpılayarak işaretleyiniz.

Doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur.Soruları cevaplarken çocuğunuza karşı genelde nasıl davrandığınızı düşününüz. Soruların tamamını dürüst, samimi ve gerçekçi bir şekilde cevaplamanız önemlidir. Soruları bu okulun orta 2 sınıfındaki çocuğunuzla olan ilişkinizi düşüerek yanıtlayınız.

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
Hemen hemen her zaman doğru	Bazen doğru	Nadiren doğru	Hiçbir zaman doğru değil

Örnek:

Çocuğum iyi davrandığı zaman ona sarılır öperim

☒
☐
☐
☐

Çocuğunuz iyi davrandığında hemen hemen her zaman ona sarılıp öpüyorsanız örnekte gösterildiği şekilde işaretleyiniz.

*Bu ölçeğin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümünde Doç.Dr.Fatoş Erkman ile Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi Miryam Anjel tarafından yapılmıştır. Araştırma amacıyla kullanılabilmesi için yukarıda anılan araştırmacılardan izin alınması gerekir.

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen hemen her zaman doğru	Bazen doğru	Nadiren doğru	Hiçbir zaman doğru değil
1. Ben çocuğum hakkında güzel şeyler söylerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Çocuğum kötü davrandığında onu küçümseyerek azarlarım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Çocuğuma sanki orada yokmuş gibi davranırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Çocuğumu gerçekten sevip sevmediğimden şüphe ediyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Günlük yaşantımızı çocuğumla tartışır ve fikrini alırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. O beni dinlemediği zaman çocuğumu başkalarına şikayet ederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Çocuğumla candan ilgilenirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Çocuğumu arkadaşlarını eve getirmesi için cesaretlendiririm ve onların iyi vakit geçirmesine gayret ederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Çocuğumla alay ederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Beni rahatsız etmediği sürece çocuğumun varlığını bilmezlikten gelirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Kızgın olduğum zaman çocuğuma bağırırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Çocuğumun bana güvenip açılmasını kolaylaştırırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Çocuğuma sert davranırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Çocuğumun etrafımda olmasından hoşlanıyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL

Hemen hemen her
zaman doğruBazen
doğruNadiren
doğruHiçbir zaman
doğru değil

15. Çocuğum bir şeyi iyi yaptığında onun gurur duymasını sağlıyorum.

☐☐☐☐

16. Haketmediği zaman bile çocuğuma vururum.

☐☐☐☐

17. Çocuğum için yapmam gereken şeyleri unutuyorum.

☐☐☐☐

18. Çocuğumu başkalarına överim.

☐☐☐☐

19. Kızgın olduğum zaman çocuğumu cezalandırırım.

☐☐☐☐

20. Çocuğumla şefkat ve sevgi dolu konuşurum.

☐☐☐☐

21. Çocuğuma karşı çok sabırsızım.

☐☐☐☐

22. Çocuğumun sorularına cevap veremeyecek kadar meşgulüm.

☐☐☐☐

23. Çocuğuma içerliyorum.

☐☐☐☐

24. Çocuğumu hakettiği zaman överim.

☐☐☐☐

25. Çocuğum sinirime dokunur.

☐☐☐☐

26. Çocuğumun kimlerle arkadaşlık ettiği ile ilgilenirim.

☐☐☐☐

27. Çocuğumun hayatındaki olaylarla gerçekten ilgilenirim.

☐☐☐☐

28. Çocuğumla kırııcı konuşurum.

☐☐☐☐

29. Çocuğum yardım istediği zaman anlamazlıktan gelirim.

☐☐☐☐

30. Çocuğumun başı dertte olduğunda ona karşı anlayışsız davranırım.

☐☐☐☐

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen hemen her zaman doğru	Bazen doğru	Nadiren doğru	Hiçbir zaman doğru değil
31. Çocuğuma istenilen ve ihtiyaç duyulan bir kişi olduğunu hissettiririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. Çocuğuma sinirime dokunduğunu söylerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33. Çocuğuma büyük özen gösteririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34. Çocuğum iyi davrandığı zaman onunla gurur duyduğumu söylerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35. Çocuğumun kalbini kırarım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36. Çocuğumun hatırlamamı beklediği olayları unuturum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37. Çocuğum yanlış hareket ettiği zaman onu artık sevmediğimi hissettiririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38. Çocuğuma yaptığı şeyin önemli olduğunu hissettiririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39. Çocuğum yanlış bir şey yaptığında onu tehdit ediyorum veya korkutuyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40. Çocuğumla birlikte vakit geçirmekten hoşlanırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41. Çocuğum üzüldüğü, tasalandığı veya korktuğu zaman ona yardım etmeye çalışırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42. Çocuğum kötü davrandığı zaman onu oyun arkadaşlarının yanında küçük düşürürüm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43. Çocuğumun benimle beraber olmasından kaçınırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL

Hemen hemen her
zaman doğruBazen
doğruNadiren
doğruHiçbir zaman
doğru değil

44. Çocuğumdan şikayet ederim.

☐☐☐☐45. Çocuğumun görüşlerine saygı
duyarım ve açıkça söylemesi
için onu cesaretlendiririm.☐☐☐☐46. Çocuğumu olumsuz bir şekilde
başka çocuklarla kıyaslarım.☐☐☐☐47. Plan yaptığım zaman çocuğu-
mu da göz önünde bulunduru-
rum.☐☐☐☐48. Benim için uygun olmasa bile,
çocuğumun önemli gördüğü
şeyleri yapmasına izin veririm.☐☐☐☐49. Çocuğum kötü davrandığında
onu başka çocuklarla haksız bir
şekilde kıyaslarım.☐☐☐☐50. Çocuğuma istenmediğini his-
settirim.☐☐☐☐51. Çocuğumun yaptığı şeylere ilgi
duyuyorum.☐☐☐☐52. Çocuğum kötü davrandığı za-
man ondan utandığımı söyle-
rim.☐☐☐☐53. Çocuğuma onu sevdiğimi his-
settirim.☐☐☐☐54. Çocuğuma nazik ve yumuşak
davranırım.☐☐☐☐55. Çocuğum yanlış davrandığında
onu utandırmaya veya suçlu
hissettirmeye çalışırım.☐☐☐☐56. Çocuğumu mutlu etmeye çalışı-
rım.☐☐☐☐

Şimdi başa dönerek, boş bıraktığınız soruları cevaplayınız.

APPENDIX B

ANNE BİLGİ FORMU

KOD

1. Yaşınız:
2. Doğum Yeriniz (Şehir):
3. Oturduğunuz Semt:
4. Eğitim:
 - () 1. Okur-Yazar
 - () a) Okulda öğrendi
 - () b) Kursta veya kendisi öğrendi
 - () 2. İlkokul mezunu
 - () 3. Ortaokul mezunu
 - () 4. Lise ve dengi okul mezunu
 - () 5. Üniversite veya yüksek okul mezunu
 - () 6. Yüksek Lisans ve Üstü
 - () 7. Diğer (belirtiniz)
5. Evlilik durumunuzu belirtiniz
 - () 1. Evli ve kocasıyla yaşıyor
 - () 2. Boşanmış
 - () 3. Dul
 - () 4. Boşanmamış, ayrı yaşıyor
6. Kaç çocuğunuz var?:.....
7. İş: Şu anda çalışıyor musunuz?
 - () 1. Çalışmıyorum (Çalışmıyorsanız 9. soruya geçiniz).
 - () 2. Yarım gün çalışıyorum
 - () 3. Tam gün çalışıyorum
 - () 4. Diğer (Belirtiniz)
8. Ne tür bir işte çalışıyorsunuz?
 - () 1. Serbest
 - () 2. Memur
 - () 3. İşçi
 - () 4. Emekli
 - () 5. Diğer (Belirtiniz)
9. Mesleğinizi belirtiniz:
10. Babanın Yaşı:

11. Babanın Eğitimi

- ☐ 1. Okur-Yazar
 ☐ a) Okulda öğrendi
 ☐ b) Kursta veya kendisi öğrendi
- ☐ 2. İlkokul mezunu
- ☐ 3. Ortaokul mezunu
- ☐ 4. Lise ve dengi okul mezunu
- ☐ 5. Üniversite veya yüksek okul mezunu
- ☐ 6. Yüksek Lisans ve Üstü
- ☐ 7. Diğer (belirtiniz)
- ☐ 8. Okur-Yazar değil

12. Babanın Mesleği Nedir?

- ☐ 1. Serbest
- ☐ 2. Memur
- ☐ 3. İşçi
- ☐ 4. Emekli
- ☐ 5. Diğer (Belirtiniz)

APPENDIX C

AİLE ORTAMI ÖLÇEĞİ

İlişikte aile ortamı ile ilgili ifadeler verilmiştir. Bu ifadeleri okuyup, şu şekilde değerlendiriniz.

Hiç katılmıyorum (1)	Biraz katılıyorum (2)	Katılıyorum (3)	Kuvvetle katılıyorum (4)
----------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------

Görüşünüzü bu sayılardan birini karalayarak bildiriniz. Bu ifadelerde doğru veya yanlış cevap yoktur. Önemli olan kendi görüşünüzü işaretlemenizdir. Araştırma için tüm ifadelerin cevaplanması gereklidir.

	Hiç katılmıyorum	Biraz katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kuvvetle katılıyorum
1. Ailemizde faaliyetler oldukça dikkatli planlanır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Aile üyeleri duygularını açıkça ifade ederler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Ailemizde kurallara uymaya çok önem verilir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Ailemizle ilgili kararlar, daha çok büyükler tarafından verilir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Bizim ailede bireyler, kendi meselelerini kendileri halleder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Bizim evde işler belirli bir düzene göre yapılır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Evde birbirimize kişisel sorunlarımızı anlatırız.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Aile üyelerinin "doğru ve yanlışlar" hakkında kesin düşünceleri var.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Aile üyeleri gerçekten birbirlerine destek olur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Birbirlerimizle konuşurken ne dediğimize dikkat ederiz.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Bizim ailede herkese verilecek bol zaman ve ilgi vardır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Bizim ailede canımız ne isterse yapabiliriz.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Ailemizde birlik, beraberlik duygusu vardır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Ailemizde uyulması gereken kurallar vardır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Ailemizde kararlaştırılmış birşeyin tam zamanında yapılması (dakiklik) çok önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Bizim evde kurallar oldukça katıdır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Ailemizde üyelerin, sormadan karar değiştirmesi olumsuz karşılanır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Hiç katılmıyorum	Biraz katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kuvvetle katılıyorum
18. Aile üyeleri, kızgınlıklarını açıkça gösterir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Ailece temiz ve düzenli insanlarız.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Ailemiz bizi kendi kendimize yeterli olmaya teşvik eder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Ailemizde, sesimizi yükselterek birşey elde edemeyeceğimize inanırız.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Ailemizde her bireyin görevi açıkça belirlenmiştir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Ailemizde bir anlaşmazlık olduğunda, bunu çözümlmek ve huzuru sağlamak için çaba sarfedebiliriz.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. Birbirimizle gerçekten iyi geçiniriz.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. Bizim evde aradığımız bir şeyi, yerinde bulmak zordur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. Aile üyeleri, karşılaştıkları sorunları kendi kendilerine hallederler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Bu ölçeğin Türkçe'ye uyarlaması Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü'nde Prof.Dr.Necla Öner ile Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Sibel Usluer tarafından yapılmıştır. Ölçek bu haliyle yalnızca araştırma amacıyla kullanılabilir. Ancak yukarıda anılan araştırmacılardan izin alınması gerekir.

APPENDIX D

KENDİNİ DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU* STAI FORM TX - 2

KOD

Aşağıda kişilerin kendilerine ait duygularını anlatmada kullandıkları bir takım ifadeler verilmiştir. Her ifadeyi okuyun, sonra da genel olarak nasıl hissettiğinizi, ifadelerin sağ tarafındaki kutulardan uygun olanını karalayarak belirtin. Her ifade için sadece bir tek seçenek işaretlenecektir. Doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur. Herhangi bir ifadenin üzerinde fazla zaman kaybetmeden genel olarak nasıl hissettiğinizi gösteren cevabı işaretleyin. Tüm ifadeleri cevaplayınız.

	Hemen hiçbir zaman	Bazen	Çok zaman	Hemen her zaman
1. Genellikle keyfim yerindedir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Genellikle çabuk yorulurum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Genellikle kolay ağlarım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Başkaları kadar mutlu olmak isterim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Çabuk karar veremediğim için fırsatları kaçıyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Kendimi dinlenmiş hissederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Genellikle sakin, kendime hakim ve soğukkanlıyım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Güçlüklerin yenemeyeceğim kadar biriktiğini hissederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Önemsiz şeyler hakkında endişelenirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Genellikle mutluyum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Herşeyi ciddiye alır ve etkilenirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Genellikle kendime güvenim yoktur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Genellikle kendimi emniyette hissederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Sıkıntılı ve güç durumlarla karşılaşmaktan kaçınırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Genellikle kendimi hüzünlü hissederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Genellikle hayatımdan memnunum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Olur olmaz düşünceler beni rahatsız eder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Hayal kırıklıklarını öylesine ciddiye alırım ki, hiç unutamam.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Akli başında ve kararlı bir insanım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Son zamanlarda kafama takılan konular beni tedirgin eder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*C.D.Spielberger, R.L.Gorsuch ve R.Luhene tarafından İngilizce olarak geliştirilmiş ve Hacettepe Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümünde Necla Öner ve Ayhan LeCompte tarafından Türkçeye adapte edilmiştir.

APPENDIX E

AİLE HAYATI ve ÇOCUK YETİŞTİRME TUTUMU ÖLÇEĞİ*

İlişikte aile hayatı ve çocuk yetiştirme tutumlarıyla ilgili bazı ifadeler verilmiştir. Bu ifadeleri okuyup, şu şekilde değerlendiriniz.

4
Çok uygun
buluyorum

3
Oldukça uygun
buluyorum

2
Biraz uygun
buluyorum

1
Hiç uygun
bulmuyorum

Görüşünüzü bu sayılardan birini daire içine alarak bildiriniz. Bu ifadelerde doğru veya yanlış yoktur. Sadece kendi görüşünüzü işaretlemeniz gerekiyor. Araştırma için bütün soruların cevaplandırılması çok önemlidir. Onun için, bazı ifadeler birbirine benzer dahi olsa, yine de cevaplandırmanızı rica ederiz.

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

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

KOD

1. Çocuk yorucu veya zor işlerden korunmalıdır.	4	3	2	1
2. Anne ve babalar, çocuklarını dertlerini anlatmaya teşvik ederler. Fakat bazen çocukların dertlerinin hiç açılmaması gerektiğini anlayamazlar.	4	3	2	1
3. Çocuk boşa geçen dakikaların bir daha hiç geri gelmeyeceğini ne kadar çabuk öğrenirse, kendisi için o kadar iyi olur.	4	3	2	1
4. Bir anne çocuğunun düş kırıklığına uğramaması için elinden geleni yapmalıdır.	4	3	2	1
5. Çocuk ne kadar erken yürümeyi öğrenirse o kadar iyi terbiye edilebilir.	4	3	2	1
6. Çocuk yetiştirmek sinir bozucu, yıpratıcı bir iştir.	4	3	2	1
7. Çocuğun hayatta öğrenmesi gereken o kadar çok şey vardır ki, zamanını boşa geçirmesi affedilmez.	4	3	2	1
8. Babalar, biraz daha şefkatli olsalar, anneler çocuklarını daha iyi yönetebilirler.	4	3	2	1
9. Çocuk yetiştirmenin kötü taraflarından biri de, anne ya da babanın istediğini yapabilmesi için yeter derecede özgür olmamasıdır.	4	3	2	1
10. Sıkı kurallarla yetiştirilen çocuklardan en iyi yetişkinler çıkar.	4	3	2	1
11. Bir anne çocuğunun mutluluğu için kendi mutluluğunu feda etmesini bilmelidir.	4	3	2	1
12. Daima koşuşturan, hareketli bir çocuk büyük bir olasılıkla mutlu bir kişi olacaktır.	4	3	2	1
13. Büyükler çocukların şakalarına güler, onlara eğlendirici öyküler anlatırsa, evdeki düzen daha düzgün, daha akıcı olur.	4	3	2	1
14. Çocuğun en gizli düşüncelerini kesinlikle bilmek, bir annenin görevidir.	4	3	2	1
15. Anne babalar çocuklarına, sorgusuz sualsiz kendilerine sadık kalmalarını öğretmelidirler.	4	3	2	1
16. Bütün genç anneler, bebek bakımında beceriksiz olacaklarından korkarlar.	4	3	2	1
17. Eğer bütün gününü çocuklarla geçirmek zorunda kalırsa, hangi anne olursa olsun sonunda çocuklar sinirine dokunur.	4	3	2	1
18. Anne ve babalar her zaman çocuklarının kendilerine uymasını beklememeli, biraz da kendileri çocuklarına uymalıdır.	4	3	2	1
19. Eğer anneler dileklerinin kabul edileceğini bilselerdi, babaların daha anlayışlı olmalarını dilerlerdi.	4	3	2	1
20. Bir çocuğa ne olursa olsun doğuşmekten kaçınması gerektiği öğretilmelidir.	4	3	2	1

KOD

21. Çocuklar bencil olduklarında, hep bir şeyler istediklerinde, annenin tepesinin atması çok normaldir.	4	3	2	1
22. Eğer çocuklar ailedeki kuralları uygun bulmuyorlarsa, bunu anne babalarına söylemeleri hoş karşılanmalıdır.	4	3	2	1
23. Anneler çoğu zaman çocuklarına bir dakika daha dayanamayacakları duygusuna kapılırlar.	4	3	2	1
24. Çocuğu sıkı terbiye ederseniz sonra size teşekkür eder.	4	3	2	1
25. Küçük bir çocuk, cinsiyet konusundan sakınmalıdır.	4	3	2	1
26. Bir annenin çocuğunun hayatı hakkında herşeyi bilmesi hakkıdır. Çünkü çocuğu onun bir parçasıdır.	4	3	2	1
27. Uyanık bir anne-baba çocuğunun tüm düşüncelerini öğrenmeye çalışmalıdır.	4	3	2	1
28. Çocuklar, anne babalarının kendileri için neler feda ettiklerini düşünmelidirler	4	3	2	1
29. Eğer çocukların dertlerini söylemelerine izin verilirse büsbütün şikayetçi olurlar.	4	3	2	1
30. Sert terbiye, sağlam ve iyi karakter geliştirir.	4	3	2	1
31. Genç bir kadın henüz gençken yapmak istediği pek çok şey olduğu için, anne olunca kendisini tutuklanmış duygusuna kaptırır.	4	3	2	1
32. Anneler çocukları için hemen hemen bütün eğlencelerini feda ederler.	4	3	2	1
33. Babalar daha az bencil olsalar kendilerine düşen görevi yaparlardı.	4	3	2	1
34. İyi bir anne çocuğunu ufak tefek güçlüklerden korumalıdır.	4	3	2	1
35. Bir çocuğa anne ve babasını herkesten üstün görmesi öğretilmelidir.	4	3	2	1
36. Çocuk hiçbir zaman ailesinden sır saklamamalıdır.	4	3	2	1
37. Çocuklardan sık sık ödün vermelerini, anne babaya uymalarını istemek doğru değildir.	4	3	2	1
38. Çoğu anneler bebeklerine bakarken onu inciteceklerinden korkarlar.	4	3	2	1
39. Bir çocuğa başı derde girdiğinde döğüşmek yerine büyüklere başvurması öğretilmelidir.	4	3	2	1
40. Anne baba arasındaki bazı konular hafif bir tartışma ile çözümlenemezler.	4	3	2	1
41. Ev bakımında ve idaresinde en kötü şeylerden biri de, kişinin kendini evinde tutuklanmış gibi hissetmesidir.	4	3	2	1
42. Hiçbir kadından yeni doğmuş bir bebeğe tek başına bakması beklenmemelidir.	4	3	2	1

KOD

43. Oğlan ve kız çocuklarının birbirlerini soyunurken görmemeleri gerekir.	4	3	2	1
44. Çocukların sorunlarına eğilirsenez sizi oyalamak için birçok masal uydururlar.	4	3	2	1
45. Eğer anne babalar çocukları ile şakalaşıp beraber eğlenirlerse, çocuklar onların öğütlerini dinlemeye daha çok yönelirler.	4	3	2	1
46. Anneleri kendileri yüzünden zorluk çektiği için çocuklar, onlara karşı daha anlayışlı olmalıdırlar.	4	3	2	1
47. Bir çocuk eninde sonunda anne-babasınınkinden daha üstün bir akıla sahip olamayacağını öğrenir.	4	3	2	1
48. Eğer bir anne çocuklarını iyi yetiştirmiyorsa belki de bu, babanın evde kendine düşen görevi iyi yapmasından ileri geliyordur.	4	3	2	1
49. Genç bir anne için ilk bebeğin bakımı sırasında yalnız kalmaktan daha kötü bir şey olamaz.	4	3	2	1
50. Bir çocuğun diğer bir çocuğa vurması hiçbir şekilde hoşgörülle karşılanamaz.	4	3	2	1
51. Anne babalar çocuklarına hayatta ilerleyebilmeleri için hep bir şeyler yapmaları ve boşa zaman geçirmemeleri gerektiğini öğretmelidirler.	4	3	2	1
52. Akıllı bir kadın yeni bir bebeğin doğumundan önce ve sonra yalnız kalmamak için elinden geleni yapar.	4	3	2	1
53. Evde olup bitenleri sadece anne bildiği için ev hayatının onun planlaması lazımdır.	4	3	2	1
54. Kendi haklarına sahip olabilmesi için, bazen bir kadının kocasını terslemesi gerekir.	4	3	2	1
55. Bütün zamanını çocuklarıyla geçirmek, bir kadına kanadı kopmuş kuş duygusunu verir.	4	3	2	1
56. Eğer anne kollarını sıvar, bütün yükü sırtına alırsa tüm aile rahat eder.	4	3	2	1
57. Anne babalar çocuklarını kendi kendilerine oluşturdıkları güveni sarsabilecek bütün güç işlerden sakınmalıdırlar.	4	3	2	1
58. Çocuklar aslında sıkı disiplin içinde mutlu olurlar.	4	3	2	1
59. Çocukların toplantılarıyla, kız-erkek arkadaşlıklarıyla ve eğlenceleriyle ilgilenen anne-babalar onların iyi yetişmelerini sağlarlar.	4	3	2	1
60. Anne ve babaya sadakat herşeyden önce gelir.	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX F

Demographic Information in the Pilot Study

Table 1
Age of mothers

Age Groups	N	%
1 (25-29)	2	1.4
2 (30-34)	38	27.3
3 (35-39)	61	43.9
4 (40-44)	25	18.0
5 (45-49)	10	7.2
6 (≥ 50)	3	2.2

Table 2
Place of Birth of Mothers

Place of birth	N	%
Marmara	45	32.4
Aegean	6	4.3
Mediterranean	0	0
Southern Anatolia	5	3.6
Eastern Anatolia	20	14.4
Inner Anatolia	21	15.1
Black Sea	40	28.8
Abroad	2	1.4

Table 3
Place of Residence of Mothers

Place of residence	N	%
European cost of Istanbul	51	36.7
Anatolian cost of Istanbul	88	63.3

Table 4
Mother Education

Education level	N	%
Literate with no school degree	3	2.1
Primary school graduate	67	48.2
Secondary school graduate	8	5.8
High school graduate	32	23.0
University graduate	28	20.1
Graduate	1	0.7
TOTAL	139	100.0

Table 5
Marital Status of Mothers

Marital status	N	%
Married	137	98.6
Divorced	2	1.4

Table 6
Working Status of the Mothers

Working conditions	N	%
Not working	110	79.1
Part-time	6	4.3
Full-time	17	12.2
Other	6	4.3

Table 7
Classification of Mother's Work

Work	N	%
Housewife	106	76.3
Free	8	5.8
Government employee	8	5.8
Worker	6	4.3
Retired	5	3.6
Other	6	4.3

Table 8
Mother Profession

Profession	N	%
Professional	17	12.2
Worker	6	4.3
Salaried worker	9	6.5
Free	4	2.9
Free lance	5	3.6
Housewife	89	64.0
Volunteer, retired, other	9	6.5

Table 9
Father Age

Profession	N	%
1 (25-29)	0	0
2 (30-34)	9	6.5
3 (35-39)	35	25.2
4 (40-44)	51	36.7
5 (45-49)	29	20.9
6 (≥50)	15	10.8

Table 10
Father Education

Education level	N	%
Literate with no school degree	3	2.1
Primary school graduate	45	32.4
Secondary school graduate	18	12.9
High school graduate	20	14.4
University graduate	45	32.4
Graduate	8	5.8

Table 11
Father Profession

Profession	N	%
Free	71	51.1
Government employee	18	12.9
Worker	28	20.1
Retired	8	5.8
Other	14	10.1

Table 12
No. of children in the Family

No. of children	N	%
1	14	10.1
2	66	47.5
3	29	20.9
≥ 4	30	21.6

APPENDIX G

Table 13

Item-Subscale* and item-total correlation coefficients of the Turkish PARQ-mother-form

Low Education Group (N=70)

item no	warmth/aff.	agression/ hostility	neglect/indif.	undif. rej.	TOTAL
1	<u>.3435**</u>	.3000*	.3699**	.1894	.3662**
2	.3077*	<u>.4908*</u>	.4209**	.3598*	.4664*
3	.3406*	.3396*	<u>.5848**</u>	.2692	.4531**
4	.1366*	.3009*	.3848**	<u>.4701**</u>	.3533*
5	<u>.6073**</u>	.4186**	.3484*	.2857*	.5174**
6	.1776	<u>.4944**</u>	.2741	.3159*	.3709**
7	.6901**	.5455**	<u>.5755**</u>	.3846**	.6723**
8	<u>.4810**</u>	.3116*	.3869**	.1997	.4275**
9	.3758**	<u>.4995**</u>	.3583*	.3100*	.4671**
10	.0332*	.2286	<u>.3850**</u>	.2528	.2455
11	.4510**	.5510**	.4437**	<u>.6420**</u>	.6046**
12	<u>.6227**</u>	.4238**	.4095**	.2277	.5291**
13	.3052*	<u>.6874**</u>	.4195**	.4663**	.5533**
14	.6288**	.2822*	<u>.5650**</u>	.1940	.5188**
15	<u>.5602**</u>	.3515*	.3894**	.1997	.4707**
16	.2609	<u>.2518</u>	.3631*	.1981	.3197*
17	.4703**	.5598**	<u>.6928**</u>	.4697**	.6457**
18	-.0446	-.0755	.0398	<u>.0050</u>	-.0299
19	<u>.3543*</u>	.1019	.4191**	.1244	.3036*
20	.1944	<u>.3498*</u>	.2234	.1805	.2867*
21	.1886	.1888	<u>.2414</u>	.2234	.2445
22	<u>.7172**</u>	.5517**	.4668**	.4339**	.6654**
23	.3858**	<u>.6377**</u>	.5621**	.5868**	.6300**
24	.3954**	.5410**	<u>.6359**</u>	.4478**	.5919**
25	.2249	.4789**	.3851**	<u>.5033**</u>	.4524**
26	<u>.4060**</u>	.1246	.2843*	.1723	.3039*
27	.2361	<u>.5659**</u>	.3173*	.4181**	.4495**
28	.5952**	.2976*	<u>.4879**</u>	.1077	.4727**
29	<u>.7352**</u>	.3603*	.5712**	.1454	.5756**
30	.3788**	<u>.6994**</u>	.4058**	.4440**	.5760**

Table 13 (continued)
Low Education Group (N=70)

item no	warmth/aff.	agression/ hostility	neglect/indif.	undif. rej.	TOTAL
31	.5529**	.4165**	<u>.5947**</u>	.4290**	.5931**
32	.3243*	.2569	.2401	<u>.1810</u>	.3080*
33	<u>.5472**</u>	.1292	.2569	.0966	.3341*
34	.3149*	<u>.6502**</u>	.3012*	.4236**	.5035**
35	.3667**	.3248*	<u>.5088**</u>	.3287*	.4498**
36	<u>.6944**</u>	.3627*	.4627**	.2960*	.5637**
37	.3319*	<u>.6045**</u>	.2440	.3056*	.4543**
38	.2630	.3442*	<u>.5886**</u>	.3224*	.4383**
39	.2109	.1584	.1384	<u>.4618**</u>	.2647
40	<u>.5219**</u>	.3597*	.4659**	.2575	.4921**
41	.3394*	<u>.4789**</u>	.3071*	.3810**	.4478**
42	.4647**	.3200*	<u>.4666**</u>	.0895	.4227**
43	<u>.5049**</u>	.2057	.2630	.0278	.3314*
44	.5514**	<u>.4789**</u>	.4607**	.3345*	.5575**
45	.1370	.3318*	<u>.2305</u>	.0903	.2426
46	.2859*	.6861**	.3954**	<u>.6241**</u>	.5723**
47	<u>.5965**</u>	.4289**	.3882**	.2146	.5127**
48	.3522*	<u>.4512**</u>	.3201*	.3286*	.4358**
49	.3985**	.2997*	<u>.4011**</u>	.1664	.3900**
50	.3760**	.2283	-.0119	.1193	.2366
51	.4746**	<u>.5118**</u>	.4604**	.3086*	.5348**
52	-.0105	.1135	<u>.3978**</u>	.2110	.1856
53	.1017	.1641	.2821*	<u>.4217**</u>	.2568
54	<u>.4952**</u>	.2814*	.3517*	.3597*	.4466**
55	<u>.2659</u>	.2168	.2758	.1027	.2663
56	.1090	.2351	.1899	<u>.5393**</u>	.2831*
57	<u>.6230**</u>	.5115**	.4722**	.3729**	.6059**
58	<u>.7338**</u>	.6861**	.5771**	.4420**	.7479**
59	.1610	.3256*	.0661	<u>.5498**</u>	.3012*
60	<u>.4746**</u>	.5576**	.5641**	.5290**	.6242**

Table 13 (continued)
Middle Education Group (N=40)

item no	warmth/aff.	agression/ hostility	neglect/indif.	undif. rej.	TOTAL
1	<u>.4963**</u>	.1172	.0853	.0689	.2674
2	-.0967	<u>.5212**</u>	.1821	.3535	.3243
3	-.0556	.0776	<u>.1122</u>	.2749	.1080
4	.0239	.0744	-.0150	<u>.2399</u>	.0909
5	<u>.3498</u>	.1305	.3072	.2414	.3231
6	.3449	<u>.5518**</u>	.1785	.4236*	.5096**
7	.4129*	.0721	<u>.3373</u>	-.1109	.2491
8	<u>.3235</u>	.1684	.0539	.0711	.2198
9	.0239	<u>.0256</u>	-.1645	.1458	.0058
10	.5317**	.5696**	<u>.4604*</u>	.3236	.6412**
11	.2460	.3950*	.2151	<u>.4231*</u>	.4163*
12	.5509**	.2794	.1497	.0198	.3647
13	.1634	<u>.2986</u>	-.0779	.1225	.1938
14	.4430*	.0342	<u>.4066*</u>	.0232	.2932
15	<u>.5118**</u>	.0822	.4610*	.0642	.3634
16	.2878	<u>.1370</u>	.0679	-.0952	.1598
17	-.0998	.2819	<u>.3645</u>	.3531	.2707
18	-	-	-	-	-
19	<u>.5041**</u>	.2416	.2577	.2288	.4095*
20	.0422	<u>.2902</u>	.2002	.2863	.2630
21	.2878	.1370	<u>.0679</u>	-.0952	.1598
22	<u>.4814**</u>	.2106	.1096	.1234	.3220
23	-.0249	<u>.3645</u>	-.1215	.5201**	.2329
24	-.0564	.0417	<u>.5060**</u>	.2030	.1878
25	.0664	.3002	.1661	<u>.5465**</u>	.3251
26	<u>.2734</u>	-.0024	-.0784	-.0472	.0632
27	.4240*	<u>.5545**</u>	.3101	.1689	.5187**
28	.5916**	.4890**	<u>.4712*</u>	.2869	.6222**
29	-	-	-	-	-
30	.0250	<u>.5055**</u>	-.0026	.1773	.2685

Table 13 (continued)
Middle Education Group (N=40)

item no	warmth/aff.	agression/ hostility	neglect/indif.	undif. rej.	TOTAL
31	.3362	.3639	<u>.3347</u>	.3468	.4516*
32	.5916**	.4890**	.4712*	<u>.2869</u>	.6222**
33	<u>.5701**</u>	.5564**	.4811**	.3194	.6541**
34	.3184	<u>.4251*</u>	.1282	.3130	.4056*
35	.1434	.1232	<u>-.1645</u>	.0047	.0590
36	<u>.6425**</u>	.4447*	.2499	.3485	.5720**
37	.3274	<u>.5651**</u>	.2453	.2265	.4836**
38	-.0313	-.0777	<u>.5620**</u>	.0693	.1304
39	.2413	.1823	.3626	<u>.4171*</u>	.3625
40	<u>.5218**</u>	.2752	.2341	.2402	.4263*
41	.5055**	<u>.7378**</u>	.4811**	.4959**	.7500**
42	.3759*	.1009	<u>.3746*</u>	.1699	.3225
43	<u>.3295</u>	.4434*	.2245	.2331	.4268*
44	.3757*	<u>.4425*</u>	.1517	.2428	.4244*
45	.1639	.3915*	<u>.1965</u>	.2382	.3385
46	.0267	.3875*	.0150	<u>.4287*</u>	.2795
47	<u>.5144**</u>	.1995	.2383	.1655	.3750*
48	.3906*	<u>.6216**</u>	.5135**	.4552*	.6585**
49	.1711	-.1217	<u>.4343*</u>	.0141	.1344
50	<u>.3298</u>	.0873	.2557	.2102	.2754
51	.1796	<u>.6106**</u>	.2471	.4191*	.4949**
52	-.1245	-.0540	<u>.3312</u>	-.0613	.0125
53	-	-	-	-	-
54	<u>.3677*</u>	.2552	.0194	.2632	.3070
55	-	-	-	-	-
56	.2233	.4459*	.4007*	<u>.6257**</u>	.5289**
57	<u>.2493</u>	.0848	.0240	-.1459	.0995
58	<u>.5190**</u>	.2728	.1299	.1970	.3849*
59	.0954	.1936	-.0494	<u>.5396**</u>	.2261
60	<u>.0792</u>	-.1353	-.0887	-.0952	-.0775

Table 13 (continued)
High Education Group (N=29)

item no	warmth/aff.	agression/ hostility	neglect/indif.	undif. rej.	TOTAL
1	<u>.60922**</u>	.3771	.0947	.2982	.5356*
2	.2192	<u>.3895</u>	.1160	.0802	.3018
3	-.1879	.2084	<u>.1751</u>	.3824	.1139
4	-	-	-	-	-
5	<u>.7458**</u>	.2549	.3119	.1043	.5606**
6	.2540	<u>.6564**</u>	.0165	.5294*	.5020*
7	.1423	.0210	<u>.3786</u>	.1646	.2013
8	<u>.5796**</u>	.2628	.4188	.1191	.5087*
9	-.0140	<u>.0210</u>	-.0357	-.0371	-.0155
10	.1757	.0942	<u>.5092*</u>	.1292	.2670
11	.3142	.5113*	.2316	<u>.2356</u>	.4570*
12	<u>.8039**</u>	.5624**	.2334	.1935	.7098**
13	.3274	<u>.4976*</u>	.5757**	.2773	.5451*
14	.8273**	.5968**	.4736*	.1549	.7795**
15	<u>.8280**</u>	.4922*	.3947	.3264	.7617**
16	-	-	-	-	-
17	.2351	.0244	<u>.6914**</u>	.0801	.2993
18	-	-	-	-	-
19	<u>.5188*</u>	-.1208	.1562	-.1211	.2180
20	.2458	<u>.5633**</u>	.3224	-.0087	.4071
21	-.0140	.0210	-.0357	-.0371	-.0155
22	<u>.7483**</u>	.4003	.1800	.1192	.5912**
23	.1392	<u>.5303*</u>	.5690**	.1875	.4422*
24	.1876	.5133*	<u>.5330*</u>	-.0273	.4021
25	-.1198	.0573	-.1833	<u>.2019</u>	-.0320
26	<u>.6825**</u>	.2453	.3471	.1248	.5383*
27	-.2079	<u>.2744</u>	-.0020	.4752*	.1108
28	.7536**	.3473	<u>.5317*</u>	.1398	.6573**
29	<u>.7990**</u>	.5078*	.2405	.0974	.6660**
30	.5703**	<u>.5051*</u>	.5631**	.3198	.6752**

Table 13 (continued)
High Education Group (N=29)

item no	warmth/aff.	agression/ hostility	neglect/indif.	undif. rej.	TOTAL
31	.1736	.2258	<u>.0333</u>	.2318	.2323
32	-	-	-	-	-
33	<u>.6540**</u>	.3590	.0939	.1322	.5124*
34	-.2900	<u>.3988</u>	.1029	.0700	.0478
35	.2275	-.0866	<u>.1474</u>	.2370	.1673
36	<u>.5001*</u>	.2469	.4410*	.0429	.4507*
37	.2508	<u>.6087**</u>	.1592	.3056	.4627*
38	-.0161	-.0335	<u>.4367*</u>	.0478	.0882
39	-.1782	.0498	-.0406	<u>.5980**</u>	.0594
40	<u>.8546**</u>	.4769*	.4671*	.2970	.7785**
41	.1276	<u>.3759</u>	.0048	.5228*	.3282
42	-.1391	-.1413	-.1738	-.2388	-.2168
43	-	-	-	-	-
44	.6221**	<u>.4554*</u>	.1288	.1445	.5441*
45	-	-	-	-	*
46	.4475*	.7176**	.3310	<u>.5493*</u>	.6963**
47	<u>.8039**</u>	.5256*	.4527*	.1020	.7238**
48	.2102	<u>.7499**</u>	-.0052	.5492*	.5157*
49	.2050	-.0282	<u>.1972</u>	.2854	.2007
50	<u>.2213</u>	-.1786	-.0310	.0133	.0376
51	.3441	<u>.5947**</u>	-.0042	.3600	.4795*
52	-.2410	-.1455	<u>.3038</u>	.2033	-.0599
53	.1423	.0210	.3786	<u>.1646</u>	.2013
54	<u>.7699**</u>	.4604*	.6041**	.3290	.7683**
55	-	-	-	-	-
56	.0345	.2717	.0569	<u>.6970**</u>	.2941
57	<u>.4126</u>	.0574	.0088	.1710	.2677
58	<u>.5587**</u>	.4034	.2286	.2113	.5306*
59	.2136	.3107	.4450*	<u>.7629**</u>	.4999*
60	-	-	-	-	-

* p < .01

** p < .001

* The subscale to which each item belongs is underlined.

APPENDIX H

Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations for the 56 Items of the Revised Turkish PARQ

Item No	Mean	S.D.	Item No	Mean	S.D.
1	1.34	0.53	29	1.20	0.64
2	1.72	0.87	30	1.18	0.63
3	1.31	0.72	31	1.28	0.65
4	1.11	0.50	32	1.34	0.71
5	1.76	0.81	33	1.17	0.44
6	1.58	0.86	34	1.25	0.57
7	1.17	0.48	35	1.38	0.64
8	1.48	0.76	36	1.78	0.97
9	1.08	0.40	37	1.29	0.66
10	1.30	0.75	38	1.26	0.52
11	2.40	0.93	39	1.47	0.82
12	1.31	0.65	40	1.17	0.43
13	1.74	0.84	41	1.08	0.37
14	1.35	0.74	42	1.17	0.55
15	1.18	0.53	43	1.17	0.58
16	1.16	0.59	44	1.51	0.75
17	1.68	0.94	45	1.27	0.57
18	1.99	0.89	46	1.63	0.85
19	1.52	0.79	47	1.29	0.65
20	1.25	0.52	48	1.95	0.91
21	1.78	0.91	49	1.45	0.74
22	1.64	0.92	50	1.14	0.52
23	1.62	0.88	51	1.31	0.62
24	1.73	1.07	52	1.64	0.95
25	1.21	0.65	53	1.21	0.60
26	1.18	0.51	54	1.31	0.55
27	1.21	0.56	55	1.69	0.93
28	1.48	0.73	56	1.07	0.29

APPENDIX I

Table 15

Item-subscale* and item-total correlations of the revised Turkish PARQ mother-form

item no	warmth/aff.	agresion/ hostility	neglect/indif.	undif. rej.	TOTAL
1	<u>.3798**</u>	.2601**	.2056*	.1723	.3303**
2	.2553*	<u>.4785**</u>	.3640**	.3365**	.4369**
3	.2406*	.2761**	<u>.4999**</u>	.2946**	.3873**
4	.1452	.2417*	.3544**	<u>.4095**</u>	.3240**
5	<u>.6062**</u>	.3320**	.3473**	.2562*	.4990**
6	.1969*	<u>.5257**</u>	.1857	.3571**	.3877**
7	.5521**	.3703**	<u>.5052**</u>	.2427*	.5310**
8	<u>.4676**</u>	.2695**	.3306**	.1669	.3998**
9	.3121**	<u>.3832**</u>	.2951**	.2662**	.3917**
10	.1337	.2466*	<u>.4217**</u>	.2559*	.3064**
11	.4050**	.5098**	.3904**	<u>.5391**</u>	.5563**
12	<u>.6391**</u>	.4025**	.3798**	.2021*	.5336**
13	.2616**	<u>.5613**</u>	.3162**	.3450**	.4575**
14	.6562**	.2918**	<u>.5459**</u>	.1881	.5426**
15	<u>.6192**</u>	.3334**	.3962**	.2184*	.5095**
16	.2522*	<u>.2055</u>	.3057**	.1316	.2799**
17	.3121**	.4126**	<u>.6035**</u>	.3723**	.5074**
18	<u>.4200**</u>	.1011	.3810**	.1230	.3261**
19	.2575	<u>.3667**</u>	.2067*	.1586	.2794**
20	<u>.6798**</u>	.4450**	.3476**	.3170**	.5803**
21	.1525*	<u>.5611**</u>	.4084**	.5011**	.5121**
22	.2463*	.4068**	<u>.5526**</u>	.3014**	.4511**
23	.1356	.3686**	.2642**	<u>.4621**</u>	.3522**
24	<u>.3856**</u>	.0975	.1873	.0924	.2532*
25	.2147*	<u>.5245**</u>	.3032**	.3848**	.4315**
26	.6151**	.3484**	<u>.4745**</u>	.1564	.5209**
27	<u>.7011**</u>	.3335**	.5121**	.1489	.5572**
28	.3445**	<u>.6213**</u>	.3329**	.3628**	.5190**
29	.3966**	.3575**	<u>.4271**</u>	.3449**	.4675**
30	<u>.3295**</u>	.2686**	.2722**	.1818	.3338**

Table 15 (continued)

item no	warmth/aff.	agression/ hostility	neglect/indif.	undif. rej.	TOTAL
31	<u>.5652**</u>	.2398*	.2853**	.1428	.4097**
32	.2487*	<u>.5703**</u>	.2771**	.3719**	.4510**
33	.3427**	.2508*	<u>.4294**</u>	.2930**	.3986**
34	<u>.6594**</u>	.3506**	.4420**	.2764**	.5558**
35	.2886**	<u>.5865**</u>	.2029*	.2809**	.4328**
36	.1610	.1786	<u>.5496**</u>	.2235*	.3202**
37	.1251	.1426	.1411	<u>.4801**</u>	.2394*
38	<u>.5983**</u>	.3629**	.4391**	.2745**	.5354**
39	.3232**	<u>.5197**</u>	.3003**	.4175**	.4780**
40	.3756**	.2187*	<u>.4089**</u>	.0797	.3486**
41	<u>.4444**</u>	.2094*	.2625**	.0542	.3272**
42	.5156**	<u>.4631**</u>	.3389**	.2768**	.5124**
43	.1217	<u>.3124**</u>	.2040*	.1058	.2344*
44	.2393*	.6106**	.2752**	<u>.5470**</u>	.4987**
45	<u>.6118**</u>	.3918**	.3813**	.1933	.5178**
46	.3184**	<u>.5296**</u>	.3123**	.3723**	.4731**
47	.3073**	.1414	<u>.3883**</u>	.1253	.2993**
48	<u>.3217**</u>	.1374	.0246	.1163	.2041*
49	.3575**	<u>.5400**</u>	.3164**	.3221**	.4822**
50	.1321	.1269	.2924**	<u>.3635**</u>	.2520*
51	<u>.5218**</u>	.3040**	.3198**	.3354**	.4662**
52	.1109	.2857**	.2007*	<u>.5795**</u>	.3217**
53	<u>.5306**</u>	.3586**	.3419**	.2616**	.4789**
54	<u>.6300**</u>	.5451**	.4125**	.3500**	.6209**
55	.1396	.2918**	.0761	<u>.5678**</u>	.2990**
56	<u>.3718**</u>	.3732**	.4339**	.3795**	.4727**

* p < .01

** p < .001

* The subscale to which each item belongs is underlined.

APPENDIX J

Table 16
Age of mothers

Age Groups	N	%
1 (25-29)	3	1.3
2 (30-34)	40	17.5
3 (35-39)	91	39.7
4 (40-44)	65	28.4
5 (45-49)	23	10.0
6 (≥ 50)	5	2.2

Table 17
Place of birth of mothers

Place of birth	N	%
Marmara	64	27.9
Aegean	12	5.2
Mediterranean	10	4.4
Southern Anatolia	8	3.5
Eastern Anatolia	27	11.8
Inner Anatolia	41	17.9
Black Sea	58	25.3
Abroad	7	3.1

Table 18
Place of residence of mothers

Place of residence	N	%
European cost of Istanbul	214	93.4
Anatolian cost of Istanbul	13	6.0

Table 19
Mother education

Education level	N	%
Literate with no school degree	30	13.0
Primary school graduate	89	38.9
Secondary school graduate	25	10.9
High school graduate	45	19.7
University graduate	31	13.5
Graduate	8	3.5
TOTAL	228	100.0

Table 20
Marital status of mothers

Marital status	N	%
Married	214	93.4
Divorced	5	2.2
Husband died	7	3.1
Living apart but not divorced	2	0.9
TOTAL	229	100.0

Table 21
Working status of the mothers

Working conditions	N	%
Not working	170	74.2
Part-time	13	5.7
Full-time	38	16.6
Other	7	3.1

Table 22
Classification of Mother's work

Work	N	%
Housewife	167	72.9
Free	15	6.6
Government employee	23	10.0
Worker	9	3.9
Retired	7	3.1
Other	7	2.2

Table 23
Mother profession

Profession	N	%
Professional	30	13.1
Worker	6	2.6
Salaried worker	9	3.9
Free	14	6.1
Free lance	4	1.7
Housewife	158	69.0
Volunteer, retired, other	6	2.6

Table 24
Age of father

Age Groups	N	%
1 (25-29)	1	0.4
2 (30-34)	13	5.7
3 (35-39)	38	16.6
4 (40-44)	85	37.1
5 (45-49)	54	23.6
6 (≥ 50)	29	12.7

Table 25
Father education

Education level	N	%
Literate with no school degree	7	3.1
Primary school graduate	76	33.2
Secondary school graduate	32	14.0
High school graduate	28	12.2
University graduate	56	24.5
Graduate	15	6.6
Illiterate	8	3.4

Table 26
Father profession

Profession	N	%
Free	112	48.9
Government employee	34	14.8
Worker	35	15.3
Retired	16	7.0
Other	25	10.9

Table 27
No. of children in the family

No. of children	N	%
1	22	9.6
2	95	41.5
3	71	31.0
≥ 4	40	17.0

APPENDIX K

Table 28
Scheffe Procedure for Cohesion by PARQ

Subset 1		Subset 2			
Group	4	Group	3	2	1
mean	43.70	mean	46.90	47.34	49.63
p < .05					

Table 29
Scheffe Procedure for Trait Anxiety by PARQ

Subset 1			Subset 2		
Group	1	2	3	3	4
mean	38.67	41.47	42.66	42.66	46.57
p < .05					

Table 30
Scheffe Procedure for Democracy by PARQ

Subset 1			Subset 2		
Group	4	3	3	2	1
mean	25.34	27.03	27.03	28.25	28.37
p < .05					

Table 31
Scheffe Procedure for Rejection of Homemaking Rote by PARQ

Subset 1				
Group	1	2	3	4
mean	27.41	28.04	29.22	32.21
p < .05				

Table 32
Scheffe Procedure for Strict Discipline Role by PARQ

	Subset 1			Subset 2
Group	2	1	3	4
mean	35.32	35.52	35.90	42.55
p < .05				

Table 33
Scheffe Procedure for PARQ by education

	Subset 1		Subset 2
Group	2	3	1
mean	74.49	75.21	82.89
p < .05			