

CONGRUENCE OF PARENT AND CHILD PERCEPTIONS OF
PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION

AYŞEN YILDIRIM EKMEKÇİ

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2008

CONGRUENCE OF PARENT AND CHILD PERCEPTIONS OF
PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Educational Sciences

by
Ayşen Yıldırım Ekmekci

Boğaziçi University

2008

Thesis Abstract

Ayşen Yıldırım Ekmekci, “Congruence of Parent and Child Perceptions of Parental Acceptance-Rejection”

The purpose of this study was to establish the reliability of the Parent Psychological Adjustment Questionnaire (Parent PAQ) and to explore the congruence between the parents’ and children’s perceptions regarding the psychological adjustment of the child. Secondly, the purpose was to explore the level of agreement (congruence) between the perceptions of parents and children on the four dimensions of the parental acceptance-rejection and perceived control, and whether the level of agreement (congruence) varied significantly in loving families versus less than loving families.

The participants in the current study consisted of 185 sixth and seventh grade students and their parents. The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) and the Psychological Adjustment Questionnaire (PAQ) were the measures of the study.

The findings indicated that the Parent PAQ was a reliable questionnaire for the assessment of the psychological adjustment of children by their parents. Overall, the children and their parents reported more acceptance than rejection. However, the children found their mothers to be less accepting and less controlling, their fathers were more accepting and more controlling, and this differed from the parents’ reports. Although the children perceived themselves as being psychologically well-adjusted on average, they perceived themselves to be psychologically less adjusted than their parents reported. The children from the more loving families found their parents more accepting than the parents had reported, and the children from less than loving families thought their parents were less accepting. Another finding was that when the children perceived more parental rejection and control, they perceive more negative psychological adjustment.

Tez Özeti

Ayşen Yıldırım Ekmekci, “Çocukların ve Ebeveynlerin Algıladıkları Ebeveyn Kabul veya Reddi arasındaki Uyum”

Bu araştırmanın amacı ebeveynlerin çocuklarının psikolojik uyumlarını nasıl algıladıklarını ölçmekte kullanılacak Kişilik Değerlendirme Ölçeği (KİDÖ) Ebeveyn formunun güvenilirlik çalışmasını yaparak, çocukların psikolojik uyumları üzerinde, kendilerinin ve ebeveynlerin algıları arasındaki benzerliğe bakmaktır. İkinci amaç, çocukların ve ebeveynlerinin kabul veya reddin dört boyutu ve kontrol algıları arasında benzerliği (uyumu) ve bu benzerliğin (uyumun) seven ve daha az seven ailelerde anlamlı bir farklılık gösterip göstermediğini araştırmaktır.

Bu araştırmaya 185 altıncı ve yedinci sınıf öğrencisi ve bu öğrencilerin aileleri katılmıştır. Araştırmanın araçları Ebeveyn Kabul-Red Ölçeği (EKRO) ve Kişilik Değerlendirme Ölçeğidir (KİDÖ).

Araştırmanın sonucunda KİDÖ Ebeveyn formunun ebeveynlerin çocuklarının psikolojik uyumlarını ölçmede güvenilir bir araç olduğu bulunmuştur. Çocuklar ve anne babalar, genel olarak, reddin çok kabul algıladıklarını bildirmişlerdir. Ama, çocukların, annelerini daha az kabul ve daha az kontrol eden olarak algıladıkları, babalarını ise daha fazla kabul ve daha fazla kontrol eden olarak algıladıkları ve bu durumun ebeveynlerin bildirdiklerinden farklı olduğu görülmüştür. Çocuklar, ortalamada, psikolojik uyumlarını iyi olarak algıladıklarını bildirmelerine rağmen, çocukların ailelerine oranla daha düşük psikolojik uyum algıladıkları görülmüştür. Çocuklar. Seven ailelerde çocukların ebeveynlerine oranla daha fazla kabul algıladıkları, daha az seven ailelerde ise bu durumun tersi ortaya çıkmıştır. Diğer bir bulgu ise, çocukların anne ve babalarından algıladıkları red ve kontrol arttıkça daha olumsuz psikolojik uyum algıladıklarıdır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to give my special thanks to my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Fatoş Erkman, who guided me on the long and challenging path of this thesis process with her experience, warmth and understanding. I am grateful to her for both her emotional and academic support. It would have been very difficult for me to have completed this thesis without her encouragement, lovely smiling face and positive attitude towards me.

I also would like to thank my committee members Dr. Ayşe Caner and Assis. Prof. Özlem Ünlühisarcıklı for their support and valuable contributions toward this thesis. Their understanding and positive attitudes helped me throughout this process. My special thanks go to Ayşe Sim Diri for helping me in the statistical analyses of my study.

Yasemin Çetingöz did her best by helping me with the data entry. I also wish to thank Başak Yılmaz and Pınar Yavuz for their support and making everything easier for me during this process.

I am grateful to administrators, counselors, students, and parents for participating in this research project. My dear students in Cemal Diker Primary School and counselor friends in different schools made it easier for me to collect data.

I am deeply thankful to my friend Nannette Kalman, not only for editing my thesis but, for also being on my side whenever I asked for help.

I am also grateful to my friend Ece Merdivan, not only for her help with my thesis writing process but also for her support and understanding in sharing her similar experiences with me.

A special friend, F. Hande Bakır, played a most important role during my thesis process by being by my side at all times. She increased my motivation, gave me feedback on my thesis, and helped me in every step of this thesis process. Most importantly, she has been with me through all the sleepless and hopeless nights as my close friend, has given me the hope that I have needed all the time, and has shared my tears and smiles throughout the years we shared. My thanks to her would not be enough to express my gratitude.

I wish to thank my dear family for their generous love, support and warmth throughout my life. I would especially like to heartfully thank a very important person in my life, whose identity has given me the highest motivation throughout my life, and who has also been the sunlight for me in darkness, my dear sister, Serap Yıldırım.

Last, but not least, my special thanks go to my dear husband, Kaan Ekmekci, who has held my hand through these stressful and difficult times. He has supported me in every respect being on my side at all times, everytime I have needed him. Without his love and understanding I would never have been able to complete this project.

Thanks to every single person for their contributions to my life...

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Significance of the Study.....	4
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory.....	6
Research on Parental Acceptance- Rejection.....	16
Research on Parental Acceptance- Rejection in Turkey.....	18
Research on Agreement between the Children’s and Parents’ Perceptions	23
Statement of the Problem.....	28
Research Questions.....	28
CHAPTER 3: METHOD.....	33
Participants.....	33
Instruments.....	38
Procedure.....	49
Design	50
Data Analysis.....	50
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	51
Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables.....	51
Results according to the Research Questions.....	55
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	80
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....	90
Purpose of the Study.....	90
Review of the Findings.....	91
Implications of the Study	92
Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research.....	94
APPENDICES.....	95
A. Parent Information Form (PIF).....	96
B. Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire /Control (PARQ/C).....	98
C. Psychological Adjustment Questionnaire (PAQ).....	113
D. Official Consent.....	122
E. Descriptive Statistics of PARQ/C and PAQ for Children.....	124
F. Descriptive Statistics of PARQ/C and PAQ for Mothers.....	129
G. Descriptive Statistics of PARQ/C and PAQ for Fathers.....	134
REFERENCES.....	139

TABLES

1. Sample Distribution according to Schools	34
2. Sample Distribution in terms of Gender, Age and Grade Level	34
3. Distribution of the Parent Sample in terms of level of Education	35
4. Distribution of the Parent Sample in terms of Working Status.....	36
5. Distribution of the Parent Sample in terms of Occupation	36
6. Distribution of the Parent Sample in terms of Number of Children in the Family and the Birth Order of the Target Child	37
7. Distribution of the Families in terms of indicated Income Level	37
8. Cronbach Alpha values for the Turkish version of the PARQ/C.....	43
9. Corrected Item-Total Correlations of the Parent PAQ.....	45
10. Corrected Item-Subscale Correlations of the Parent PAQ.....	47
11. Cronbach Alpha Values of the Turkish Parent PAQ	48
12. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Parental Acceptance-Rejection	51
13. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Psychological Adjustment.....	52
14. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PARQ/C.....	53
15. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PAQ	54
16. Paired Samples Tests for the PARQ Total.....	56
17. Congruence of the Mothers', Fathers' and Children's PARQ Total Scores	57
18. Paired Samples Tests for Warmth/Affection Subscale	58
19. Congruence of Mothers', Fathers' and Children's Scores on the Warmth/Affection Subscale	59
20. Paired Samples Tests for the Hostility/Aggression Subscale	60
21. Congruence of Mothers', Fathers' and Children's Scores on the Hostility/Aggression Subscale	61
22. Paired Samples Tests for the Indifference/Neglect Subscale.....	62
23. Paired Samples Tests for the Undifferentiated Rejection Subscale	64
24. Congruence of the Mothers', Fathers' and Children's Scores on the Undifferentiated Rejection Subscale.....	65
25. Paired Samples Tests for the Control Scale	66
26. Congruence of the Mothers', Fathers' and Children's Scores on the Control Subscale.....	67
27. Paired Samples Tests for the PAQ Child and PAQ Parent (Mother).....	68
28. Paired Samples Tests for the Child PAQ and Parent PAQ (Father)	69
29. Paired Samples Tests for the Mothers' and Fathers' Scores on PAQ.....	69
30. Congruence of the Mothers' and Children's Scores on the Psychological Adjustment Questionnaire.....	70
31. Congruence of the Fathers' and Children's Scores on the Psychological Adjustment Questionnaire.....	71
32. Congruence of the Mothers' and Fathers' Scores on the Psychological Adjustment Questionnaire.....	71
33. Level of Agreement between the Children's and Mothers' Perceptions of Maternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the Cutpoint Scores	72
34. Level of Agreement between the Children's and Fathers' Perceptions of Paternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the Cutpoint Scores	73

35. Level of Agreement between the Children's and Mothers' Perceptions of Maternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the top and bottom 25 %	74
36. Level of Agreement between the Children's and Fathers' Perceptions of Paternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the top and bottom 25 %	74
37. Congruence of the Children's and Mothers' Perceptions of Maternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the Cutpoint Scores.....	75
38. Congruence of the Children's and Mothers' Perceptions of Maternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the top and bottom 25 %	76
39. Congruence of the Children's and Fathers' Perceptions of Paternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the Cutpoint Scores.....	76
40. Congruence of the Children's and Fathers' Perceptions of Paternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the top and bottom 25 %	77
41. Correlations between the Childrens' Perceptions of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Control and the Psychological Adjustment.....	79

APPENDICES TABLES

E1. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Maternal Acceptance-Rejection/Control in terms of Gender	125
E2. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Paternal Acceptance-Rejection/Control in terms of Gender	125
E3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Maternal Acceptance-Rejection/Control in terms of Age	125
E4. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Paternal Acceptance-Rejection/Control in terms of Age	126
E5. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Maternal Acceptance-Rejection/Control in terms of Grade Level	126
E6. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Paternal Acceptance-Rejection/Control in terms of Grade Level.....	126
E7. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Psychological Adjustment in terms of Gender.....	127
E8. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Psychological Adjustment in terms of Age.....	127
E9. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Psychological Adjustment (PAQ) in terms of Grade Level.....	128
F1. Means and Standard Deviations of the PARQ/C by the Mothers' Education ...	130
F2. Means and Standard Deviations of the PARQ/C by the Mothers' Employment Status.....	130
F3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Maternal PARQ/C by the Number of Children in the Family	130
F4. Means and Standard deviations of the Maternal PARQ/C by the Birth Order of the Target Child.....	131
F5. Means and Standard Deviations of the Maternal PARQ/C by the Perceived Income.....	131
F6. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PAQ by the Mothers' Education	131

F7. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PAQ by the Mothers' Employment Status	132
F8. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Mother) PAQ by the Number of Children in the Family	132
F9. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Mother) PAQ by the Birth Order of the Target Child	133
F10. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Mother) PAQ by the Perceived Income.....	133
G1. Means and Standard Deviations of the PARQ/C by the Fathers' Education....	135
G2. Means and Standard Deviations of the PARQ/C by the Fathers' Employment Status.....	135
G3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Paternal PARQ/C by the Number of Children in the Family	135
G4. Means and Standard Deviations of the Paternal PARQ/C by the Birth Order of the Target Child.....	136
G5. Means and Standard Deviations of the Paternal PARQ/C by the Perceived Income.....	136
G6. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PAQ by the Fathers' Education	136
G7. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PAQ by the Fathers' Employment Status.....	137
G8. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Father) PAQ by the Number of Children in the Family	137
G9. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Father) PAQ by the Birth Order of the Target Child.....	138
G10. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Father) PAQ by the Perceived Income.....	138

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The family is the major institution of society that provides an important role in the development of children, hence it has the responsibility to raise citizens who maintain the social order (Lerner, 2002). The main aim of the family is to promote children's welfare by meeting the survival needs of children. Survival needs are not only the physical ones such as food, warmth and shelter, but also emotional needs such as unconditional love and care (Hoghughi & Long, 2004).

In the early adolescent period, the relationship between parents and adolescents changes dramatically. As it is a period of great transition, early adolescents experience tremendous fluctuations in their emotions. Because of their emotional ups and downs their emotions can sometimes be misjudged by the parent (Caissy, 1994). Another characteristic of early adolescence is that they begin to spend less time with their parents as they feel less emotionally attached to them (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995). By psychologically separating themselves from their parents, early adolescents achieve a sense of self and attain independence (Caissy, 1994). They are no longer admitting to their parents' authority without questioning it. Thus, they become more likely to criticize and disagree with their parents (Kimmel & Weiner, 1995).

It is important for parents to be warm, nonhostile, and close to their children in order to maintain positive parent-adolescent interaction. The behaviors of parents that emphasize support, warmth, and positive emotions will result in psychologically and socially healthy outcomes for adolescents (Lerner, 2002).

The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory) underlines the importance of parental acceptance, love and positive response for children from the people most significant to them (Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005). In other words, having a positive response, feeling comfortable, supported, cared by, and of concern to the people most important to them for the length of their lives is an essential emotional need for all human beings for their psychological health (Rohner, et.al., 2005). Parents can be referred to as the most important people in children's lives, not only because they have a long-lasting emotional tie with their children, but also because they are not interchangeable with anyone else.

Thus, the quality of the relationship between parents and children is very important to meet the emotional needs of children. As Khaleque (2002) stated if parents do not meet this emotional need, children tend to report themselves as hostile, aggressive, dependent, and impaired in self-esteem and self-adequacy, emotionally unresponsive, emotionally unstable and having a negative worldview. Khaleque and Rohner (2002) reported a meta-analysis study about the correlation between parental acceptance and psychological adjustment by drawing together the findings of forty-three cross cultural and intracultural studies. The results of the study, as predicted by PARTheory, revealed that perceived parental acceptance-rejection was associated with psychological (mal)adjustment among children universally, regardless of their gender, race, language, and culture. Approximately 26% of the variance in children's self-reported psychological adjustment is affected by the idea that they perceived themselves to be accepted or rejected by their parents. In childhood the variance is somewhat higher than it is in adulthood. As discussed in Khaleque and Rohner's (2002) study, the reason for it might be that children are influenced by their parents' love or love withdrawal more often than adults.

Rohner and Britner (2002), provide significant evidence on the correlates of parental rejection by exploring cross-cultural and intra-cultural studies on parental acceptance-rejection. The findings of the studies come up with a common statement that behavior problems, depression, conduct disorder, delinquency, and substance abuse are the mental health correlates of parental rejection.

According to the findings of PARTheory, it is a conclusion worth noting that parental acceptance-rejection has an essential variable in children's lives for their psychological well-being. Also, it is important to underline the statement of Kagan here that "parental rejection is not a specific set of actions by parents but a belief held by their children" (1978:61 cited in Rohner, et. al., 2005). Parents should be aware of their children's perceptions of parental behaviors, attitudes, and emotions. The statement claimed by Demo, Small, and Savin-Williams (1987) also confirms the fact that the perceptions of children about parental attitudes and behavior have more impact on children than actual parental attitudes and behavior. Thus, if the parents want the intended consequences of their behavior, they should consider their children's perceptions.

The congruence between parents' and children's perceptions, in other words similar perceptions held by parents and children, can be seen as an essential variable for effective parenting from a developmental point of view (Tein, Roosa & Michaels, 1994). Therefore, when and if the levels of agreement or disagreement between parents' and children's perceptions of parental acceptance-rejection, as well as parental control are identified, the factors, which are responsible for this fact, can be dealt with systematically in counseling and family therapy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find out the reliability of the Parent Psychological Adjustment Questionnaire (Parent PAQ) in order to assess parents' perceptions of their children's psychological adjustment and thereby to find out the congruence between parents' and children's perceptions on psychological adjustment of the child. A second purpose was to find out the level of agreement (congruence) or disagreement (incongruence) between perceptions of mothers and fathers; mothers and children; and fathers and children on the four dimensions of parental acceptance-rejection as well as perceived control. And finally, it was aimed at discovering the level of agreement (congruence) or disagreement (incongruence) between perceptions of mothers and children; and fathers and children found in loving families versus less than loving families.

Significance of the Study

The present study has some important contributions to the existing knowledge of the parental acceptance-rejection area. First of all, for the current study to assess parents' perceptions of their children's psychological adjustment and thereby to find out the congruence between parents' and adolescents' perceptions on PAQ, the Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ), parent form was developed by the present researcher and the thesis advisor. The items for the child version of PAQ were reconstructed with some minor wording changes. A pilot study was conducted by the researcher into the reliability study of the parent version of PAQ. The parents of sixth and seventh grade students, who attended the parents' meeting day, were given the

Parent version of PAQ in the school where the present researcher worked as a counselor. The study was carried out with ninety-two parents for the reliability of measurement. The parent version of PAQ was formed and used for the first time in the current study.

Secondly, most of the studies, which were designed for the relationships between parents and children, assumed that mothers could be the referents for the parents (Lila, Garcia, & Gracia, 2007). It is important to consider perceptions of both mothers and fathers when analyzing parental behavior. By having the responses of multiple family members, mothers and fathers, and children, a more representative view of family life could be obtained (Lila, et. al., 2007; Noller & Callan, 1988). For this reason, the current study included the perceptions of early adolescents and both parents; mothers and fathers, living in the same household.

Thirdly, the current study focused on early adolescence which is a very unique and significant period in human development. Early adolescence is a transitional period characterized by rapid developmental changes (Caissy, 1994). It is important for early adolescents to form their own identities and to attain independence. Early adolescents must psychologically separate themselves from their families in order to attain these two tasks, identity and independence. In this period, adolescents begin to view themselves as entities separate from their parents and families. Hence, the findings for early adolescents are a unique contribution to the literature.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory

Overview of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory

Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory) was developed by Rohner with the contributions of the empirical studies accomplished on parental acceptance-rejection through the 1930s. In light of almost two thousand empirical studies, the PARTheory aims to clarify the reasons and influences of parental acceptance-rejection for the life-span of human development worldwide (Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005).

The theory consists of three subtheories: personality subtheory, coping subtheory and socio-cultural subtheory. Two questions are addressed in the personality subtheory. First, do the children everywhere regardless of their gender, cultural background, race, or ethnicity react in the same way when they perceive themselves as accepted or rejected by their parents? Second, at what levels are the children affected with the childhood rejection throughout their lives (Khaleque, 2002; Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al. 2005)? The coping subtheory attempts mainly to predict and explain the reasons for the resilience that some children and adults possess, that is to cope emotionally more effectively than others with the experiences of childhood rejection. Finally, the sociocultural systems subtheory deals with two different classes of questions. First, what is the reason for some parents to be warm, loving, and accepting while others are cold, aggressive, neglecting, and rejecting?

Second, how does the fact that most parents in the society tend to either accept or reject their children affect the total fabric of a society as well as the behavior and beliefs of individuals in that society (Khaleque, 2002; Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005)?

The Warmth Dimension of Parenting

According to PARTheory, the warmth dimension of parenting consists of: parental acceptance and parental rejection. The theory suggests that every human being has perceived, more or less, love from their parents in their childhood. Therefore, it is noteworthy to conclude that every person can be placed on the platform of the warmth dimension of parenting. (Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005).

Parental acceptance refers to the warmth, affection, care, nurturance, concern, comfort, care, support, or love perceived from major caregivers mostly the parents whereas parental rejection refers to not only the absence of these feelings but also the presence of psychologically or physically hurtful behaviors and emotions. Research throughout the past forty-five years indicates that children and adults appear to organize their perceptions of parental acceptance-rejection around the same four classes of expressions: cold and unaffectionate; hostile and aggressive; indifferent and neglecting; undifferentiated rejecting. (Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005).

Hostility is a feeling of anger, resentment, enmity, ill-will or malice toward the child by the parent, whereas aggression refers to behavior that has intention to hurt the child physically, psychologically or both. Examples of physical hostility and aggression are hitting, biting, scratching, shoving and pinching. Examples of verbal expression of hostility and aggression are cursing, sarcasm, belittling, saying

thoughtless things, being unkind, and being cruel to the child. Indifference refers to lack of concern for the child, whereas neglect is ignoring or failing to provide for the physical, medical, educational, and other needs, wishes, concerns, and interests of the child (Rohner, et. al., 2005).

The last one, undifferentiated rejection, is somehow different from the other three expressions. It is a feeling of being rejected, unloved, unappreciated, or uncared-for even though there might be no observable indicator of rejection (Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005). Conversely, in the other three kinds of expressions stated above, either verbal or physical indicators are accompanying the rejection.

PARTheory mentions two perspectives that one can observe while studying the accepting - rejecting behaviors: phenomenological perspective and behavioral perspective. The phenomenological view refers to what is perceived or subjectively experienced by the individual, whereas the behavioral view refers to what is reported by an outside observer. According to the theory, it is important to consider the discrepancy between the conclusions of these two perspectives. If this is the case, one should pay attention to the information derived from a phenomenological perspective (Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005). It is important to consider the statement of Kagan (1978, p. 61 cited in Rohner, et. al., 2005), “parental rejection is not a specific set of actions by parents, but a belief held by the child”. In addition, Demo (1987) stated that the perceptions of children about parental attitudes and behaviors have more impact on the children than the actual parental attitudes and behavior. Therefore, it is essential to consider the perceptions of the children in order to be aware of their reality.

Moreover, understanding culturally-based interpretations or behavior of individuals, which are symbolic in nature, might be an essential resource in comprehending the parental acceptance-rejection process in that setting or culture.

Parents might express acceptance and rejection in different ways in different cultures depending on their cultural values and sociocultural settings (Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005)

PARTheory's Personality Subtheory

The major assumption underlying PARTheory's personality subtheory is that humans have developed biologically-based emotional needs for positive responses including an emotional wish, desire, or yearning for comfort, support, care, concern, and nurturance from the people most important to them. It is worth saying that parents, having an emotionally long lasting tie with their children, are the most important people for children. Children's need for love, comfort, nurturance, support, care, and so on can be best satisfied by their parents. (Khaleque, 2002; Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005). As the personality subtheory of PARTheory suggests, the quality of the relationship between parents and children is very important since the emotional and psychological status of children depends on this relationship. Therefore, parents should meet the children's needs for positive response in order to positively shape the personality development of children. Inversely, if this need is not adequately met by parents, children are likely to feel anxious, insecure, and dependent (Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005).

According to the theory, the children who perceived themselves as rejected also experienced aggression or passive aggression, problems with the management of hostility, dependence or defensive independence, impaired self-esteem, impaired self-adequacy, emotional unresponsiveness, emotional instability, and a negative worldview depending on the form, frequency, and intensity of rejection (Khaleque, 2002; Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005).

PARTheory's Coping Subtheory

The coping subtheory attempts to find out and predict the reasons for the fact that some children and adults cope more effectively emotionally than others who experienced rejection. As the theory suggests there are two types of copers: affective copers and instrumental copers. The former refers to individuals who are able to decrease the negative effects of rejection, and somehow develop a positive state of mental health despite parental rejection. On the other hand, the latter one refers to individuals who are performing well in their professions but having problems psychologically (Khaleque, 2002; Rohner, 2004; Rohner, et. al., 2005).

To understand the coping process, a multivariate model of behavior, which has three elements; self, other, and context, can be utilized. *Self* characteristics refer not only to mental activities, but also the internal and external characteristics of individuals. *Other* characteristics refer to the personal and interpersonal characteristics of rejecting parents. The form, frequency, duration, and the severity of rejection are the factors that accompany these characteristics. The last ones, *context* characteristics refer to the other significant people in the individual's life, together with the social-situational characteristics of the person's environment (Rohner, et. al., 2005).

It is essential to seek out the sources that could be useful for children and adults to cope more effectively emotionally than others who experienced rejection. Thus, the questions for the coping subtheory can be examined. According to the coping subtheory, these sources are social cognitive capabilities. A clearly differentiated sense of self, self-discrimination and the capacity to depersonalize increase the level of coping capacities of individuals with rejection. Self-determined people believe that

they have control over what happens to them through their effort or personal attributes, not because of fate or chance. Also, individuals who are able to depersonalize are not interpreting the events egocentrically and not taking the events personally. They have the capability to deal in a more positive way with interpersonal ambiguities (Rohner, et. al., 2005).

PARTheory's Sociocultural Systems Subtheory

The PARTheory's sociocultural systems model attempts to find out the reasons for and effects of parental acceptance-rejection, within individuals and whole societies. Social institutions such as the family structure, systems of defense, economical and political organizations all form maintenance systems of the society. According to sociocultural systems subtheory, the maintenance systems have a direct effect on the formation of any specific behavior of parents. In addition, the reciprocal relationship between the behavior of parents and children is seen. Children's personalities develop and their behavior is affected by the parents' accepting-rejecting and other behavior. In turn, personal characteristics and the behavioral dispositions of children are important factors that determine the quality of their parents' behavior toward them.

Children are influenced not only by their parental experiences, but also by the natural environment in which they live in, the maintenance systems of their society, interaction with peers and adults in the society, and the institutionalized expressive systems of their society. What are meant by institutionalized expressive systems are the traditions, behaviors, and preferences of religion, art, music, folklore, and symbolic beliefs of the people in the society. The expressive systems are the creation of people whereby they reflect their innerworlds and psychological states. The change in these

systems is inevitable since people change through time. As sociocultural systems subtheory postulates, when the expressive systems are created and become united within the sociocultural systems, individuals' beliefs, and behaviors are influenced by the specified fact within that society (Rohner, et. al., 2005).

Another factor that should be considered in the sociocultural systems subtheory, with the confirmation of cross-cultural evidence, is that children tend to be rejected in the societies that perceive the supernatural world as malevolent (hostile, destructive, unpredictable, and negative). On the contrary, children tend to be accepted by the societies in which the supernatural world is perceived to be benevolent (warm, supportive, protective, and generous) (Khaleque, 2002; Rohner, et. al., 2005). Moreover, in families, which are not supported economically and socially, children may face rejection. The same result can be true for single parent families if they do not have adequate social and economical support (Rohner, et. al., 2005).

Evidence Supporting the Main Features of PARTheory

The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire-Control (PARQ/Control), and Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ) are used worldwide in research. One of the unique contributions of these studies is that, the experience of parental acceptance or rejection tends to be associated with the form of psychological adjustment or psychological maladjustment. (Rohner & Khaleque, 2002; Rohner, 2004; Rohner et. al., 2005).

Khaleque and Rohner (2002) covering 43 studies between 1977 and 2000, conducted a meta-analysis of cross-cultural and intracultural studies with 7563 respondents using the PARQ and PAQ. The study confirmed the correlation between

perceived acceptance-rejection and psychological (mal)adjustment which was suggested in the personality subtheory. Also, the meta-analysis study indicated that approximately twentysix percent of the variability in children's and twentyone percent of the variability in adults' psychological adjustment is accounted for by parental acceptance-rejection (Rohner & Khaleque, 2002).

A large number of studies including cross-cultural (holocultural), ethnographic case studies, and controlled comparison studies that have been conducted on parent-child relations also confirmed that perceived parental acceptance is associated with the psychological (mal)adjustment of children and adults (Rohner & Khaleque, 2002; Rohner, 2004; Rohner et. al., 2005).

Both the evidence about the universal expressions of acceptance-rejection and the worldwide psychological effects of perceived acceptance-rejection has led Rohner (2004) to formulate the concept of *parental acceptance-rejection syndrome*. This syndrome is composed of two complementary sets of factors. First, the four classes of behavior: warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect, undifferentiated rejection, appear to convey the message that the children tend either to be loved or rejected by the parent. Second, the psychological adjustment of children and adults tends to vary with the extent to which individuals perceive themselves to be accepted or rejected by their parents or by the individual most important to them (Rohner, 2004).

Cross-cultural and intracultural studies of parental acceptance-rejection theory, mostly its personality subtheory, indicates that parental rejection has been associated with different forms of psychopathology, behavior problems, psychological adjustment problems, substance abuse, attachment disorders, academic problems, psychophysiological reactions, and troubled personal relationships. On the other hand, parental acceptance has been associated with positive outcomes, such as the development

of prosocial behavior in children, positive peer relationships in adolescence and overall psychological well-being in adulthood including happiness, life satisfaction, and low psychological distress (Rohner & Britner, 2002). Moreover, the evidence strongly indicates the existence of the correlation between parental rejection and three other mental health issues: unipolar depression and depressed affect; behavior problems, including conduct disorder, externalizing behaviors, and delinquency; and substance abuse (Rohner & Britner, 2002).

For example in terms of depression, both clinical and non-clinical depression is found to be related to parental rejection. Australia, China, Egypt, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Spain, Sweden, and Turkey are the countries where parental rejection has been associated with depression. Moreover, the studies conducted in major ethnic groups in the United States, including Asian-Americans, African-Americans, Mexican-Americans and European-Americans also converge on the same conclusion that, the experience of parental rejection in childhood tends to be associated with the development of depressive symptoms in children, adolescents and adults (Rohner & Britner, 2002). The studies that have examined the influence of both maternal and paternal behaviors indicated that fathers' love related behavior is as significant as mothers' in the background of depressed adolescents and adults (Rohner & Veneziano, 2000).

When it comes to behavioral problems such as, conduct disorders, externalizing behavior, and delinquency, they are seen as the potential correlates of parental rejection. Cross-cultural and intracultural studies conducted in Bahrain, China, Croatia, Egypt, England, Finland, India, Japan, Norway, and Pakistan and among the major ethnic groups of the United States, including African-Americans, Chinese-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and European-Americans also support the conclusion that parental rejection account for the behavioral problems (Rohner & Britner, 2002).

There is also substantial evidence for the worldwide correlation between parental acceptance-rejection and substance abuse coming from studies conducted in Australia, Canada, England, Finland, Hungary, the Netherlands, and Sweden. In addition to these countries, parental rejection is associated with substance abuse in major ethnic groups in the U.S., including African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and European-Americans (Rohner & Britner, 2002).

Implications of PARTheory Evidence

One of the offshoots of the PARTheory is, formulating culture-fair and practical programs, policies, and interventions affecting families and children everywhere with a scientific understanding of the worldwide antecedents, consequences, and other correlates of acceptance-rejection (Rohner, et. al., 2005).

The studies with thousands of individuals in many cultures worldwide indicate two conclusions. First, the same classes of behavior including the perception of warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect, and undifferentiated rejection appear to convey the symbolic message that the children perceive themselves either to be loved, cared for, and wanted or to be not loved, not cared for, and not wanted by their parents. Second, regardless of different culture, ethnicity, social class, race, gender, and other such factors, there is a universal tendency for children and adults everywhere to respond in the same way when they perceive themselves to be accepted or rejected by their parents or by the people most important to them (Rohner, et. al., 2005).

Also, it is important to note that perceived acceptance-rejection appears to account for an average of twenty-five percent of the variance in the psychological

adjustment of adolescents and adults, so other factors such as behavior genetics, sociocultural, and experiential factors should also be researched (Rohner, et. al., 2005).

Research on Parental Acceptance-Rejection

In a study of Rohner, Bourque, and Elordi (1996) the relationships between perceived justness and perceived harshness of corporal punishment, perceived caretaker acceptance-rejection, and children's psychological adjustment were examined. The participants of the study were 281 black and white youths in grades three to twelve in a poor, bi-racial southern community. The results of this study indicated that children perceived their parents as warm and loving. Also, they reported themselves to be relatively well-adjusted. The correlation coefficient for psychological adjustment and parental acceptance-rejection was found to be .50 ($p < .001$). In addition, the findings of the study supported the fact that the perception of love and acceptance from major caregivers was more strongly correlated to the children's psychological well-being than their physical punishment. Physical punishment was correlated with the children's psychological adjustment as it was seen as parental rejection.

In another study that was conducted by Veneziano and Rohner (1998) with twenty-one black and thirty-seven white fathers and their sixty-three children in the bi-racial southern community, revealed that youths perceived much more paternal acceptance than rejection. The youth's felt, on the average, psychologically adjusted. In addition, the perception of paternal acceptance was significantly related to the black and white children's psychological adjustment ($r = .57, p < .01$).

The study of Kim and Rohner (2002), among 245 Korean American adolescents, indicated that they perceived both their mothers and fathers to be warm and loving on average. Both mothers and fathers perceived themselves to be moderate in their behavioral control, however adolescents saw their mothers as significantly more controlling than their fathers. Also, the results of the study revealed that both maternal and paternal acceptance significantly correlated with the academic achievement of the adolescents. On the other hand, maternal as well as paternal control did not relate to the adolescents' academic achievement.

In the study of Cournoyer, Sethi and Cordero (2005) the perceptions of parental acceptance-rejection, parental control and self-concepts among 108 Ukrainian university students were examined. The findings of this study showed that both mothers and fathers were regarded as warm and loving, low in hostility, aggression, neglect and indifference by the majority of students. Both the mothers and fathers were seen as moderate in control by the sample. In addition, most of the students had reasonably positive self-concepts as assessed by PAQ. It is also important to note that the respondents' perceptions of acceptance-rejection, as well as control by mothers and by fathers were significantly correlated ($r=.32, p<.001$; $.28, p<.003$). In addition, the students' psychological adjustment and their perceptions of acceptance-rejection by mothers ($r=.41, p<.001$) and fathers ($r=.25, p<.008$) were correlated. On the contrary, there was no correlation found between the students' psychological adjustment and the control by their mothers or fathers.

Among Korean eleven to fourteen-year-old adolescents Kim (2005) found that they perceived their mothers and fathers as warm and moderately controlling. Similarly both mothers and fathers perceived themselves as warm

and moderately (father) to firmly (mother) controlling. The study also revealed that the perceptions of maternal and paternal behavioral controls positively correlated with the psychological adjustment of adolescents.

In a recent study, Lila, Garcia and Gracia (2007) explored the relationship between perceived paternal and maternal acceptance and children's psychological adjustment in a sample of 234 children and 234 parental figures in Colombia. The findings were similar to the previous ones in the way that the children experienced more maternal and paternal acceptance than rejection. And, the children's self-reported psychological adjustment, which was in a normal range, was related to the perceived maternal and paternal acceptance.

Research on Parental Acceptance-Rejection in Turkey

Research on parental acceptance-rejection started with the study of Polat (1988) in Turkey. The participants of the study were 120, ten to eleven-year-old children. In her study she found that their psychological adjustment significantly and moderately correlated with the subcategories of acceptance-rejection; non-warmth ($r=.44$), aggression-hostility ($r=.43$), indifference-neglect ($.49$), undifferentiated rejection ($r=.43$) for the .001 level.

Erdem (1990) examined the relationship between perceived parental acceptance-rejection and self-concept, anxiety, the attributional style of causality, parenting attitudes, and academic achievement for the construct validation of the child PARQ/Control. The participants of the study were 344 eighth graders coming from different SES in Istanbul. The results of the study indicated that the perceived rejection was significantly and negatively correlated with self-concept and academic

achievement. On the other hand, the perceived rejection was found to be significantly and positively correlated with anxiety and helpless explanatory style of causality.

In another study, Anjel translated the parent version into Turkish, in 1993. The validity studies of PARQ in Turkey have been established in terms of correlation with the Perceived Emotional Abuse Inventory for Adolescents, PEAIFA ($r=.64$, $p<.001$) (Erkman & Alantar, 1988 cited in Erkman, 2003) and with Katz Adjustment Scale-Individual Form (KAS-S) ($r=.27$, $p<.01$) (Kozcu, 1990 cited in Erkman, 2003). The findings of Anjel's study (1993) revealed that the Cronbach Alpha values for the mother form were: .79 for warmth/affection; .80 for hostility/aggression; .64 for neglect/indifference; .57 for undifferentiated rejection which are the subscales of PARQ; and .89 for the total PARQ scale. The findings for the item-total correlation coefficients ranged between .15 to .57 ($p<.001$); and the subscale-total correlation coefficients were .78 for warmth/affection; .86 for hostility/aggression; .77 for neglect/indifference; .75 for undifferentiated rejection for the subscales of PARQ.

Erkman (2003) assessed the relationship of perceived parental acceptance-rejection and psychological adjustment in a sample of 1821 children and youths between the ages of ten to eighteen, in Turkey. The study indicated that, both perception of maternal and paternal rejection correlated significantly with negative psychological adjustment as assessed by the Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ) ($r=.34$, $r=.33$; $p<.0001$, respectively). Also, maternal acceptance correlated strongly with paternal acceptance ($r=.63$, $p<.0001$). Perceived maternal and paternal control significantly correlated with the PAQ total ($r=.19$, $r=.16$; $p<.001$)

Erkman (2004) explored the presence and relationship of Turkish parents' self-declared use of physical punishment to self-reported level of rejection. A total of 462 parents, (75.4 % were mothers and 24.6 % were fathers), completed the Turkish forms

for the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire-Control (PARQ-C) and the Physical Punishment Questionnaire (PPQ). The reliability analyses for the Turkish PARQ-C were analyzed by Cronbach Alpha statistics. The alpha values for the non-warmth, hostility, indifference-neglect, undifferentiated rejection, PARQ total and control subscale were .79, .83, .68, .59, .74 and .69, respectively.

In the same study, both the mothers (Mm=80.65) and fathers (Mf=83.16) perceived themselves on the average as accepting and loving, rather than rejecting. They reported themselves to be firm in their behavioral control (Mm=40.16 and Mf=39.68). However, the study revealed that there were significant differences between the mothers' and fathers' reports on the non-warmth and indifference neglect subscales of PARQ. The mothers perceived themselves to be warmer ($t=-3.21$, $p<.005$) and less rejecting ($t=-4.625$, $p<.0001$) than the fathers.

Erkman (2004) investigated the relationship of self-reported physical punishment with self-reported acceptance-rejection by correlation statistics. The study indicated not only harshness and rejection, but also that the harshness and control significantly correlated ($r=.27$; $p<.001$, $r=.16$, $p<.05$), suggesting that the more harsh the parents the more likely they are to be rejecting and controlling. Moreover, the highest correlation was found between harshness and hostility ($r=.38$, $p<.0001$), followed by undifferentiated rejection and harshness ($.20$, $p<.005$), and the negative correlation of fairness and rejection ($r=.19$, $p<.05$).

Erkman and Varan (2004) reported that children in Turkey perceived both their mothers and fathers as being warm and moderately controlling on the average. Also, they reported themselves as being relatively adjusted psychologically. The perceptions of maternal and paternal behavioral controls were positively correlated with the psychological adjustment of adolescents ($r=.18$; $r=.16$; $p<.0001$). The

respondents' perceptions of acceptance-rejection by their mothers and by fathers significantly correlated ($r=.62$, $p<.0001$). In addition, the children's psychological adjustment and their perceptions of acceptance-rejection by mothers ($r=.33$, $p<.0001$) and fathers ($r=.33$, $p<.0001$) were correlated.

Erkan & Toran (2004) investigated the acceptance and rejection behaviors of mothers who have children at who are five-years-old from the lower socio-economic levels in Diyarbakır, Turkey. One hundred twenty-three mothers completed the mother form of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ). The study revealed that the mothers who graduated from high school had higher acceptance, whereas the non-literate and literate non-graduate mothers had higher rejection for their children. Also, while the age of the mothers increased, their acceptance levels decreased. According to the study, when the number of children, as well as the number of the members in the family increased, the mothers' rejection level also increased, which indicated a positive correlation. The gender of the child was not significantly correlated to the acceptance-rejection level of mothers.

In a recent study conducted by Yener (2005) with 353 fifth, sixth and seventh grade students, she found that the children perceived their mothers and fathers as warm and loving and moderately controlling. The mean scores on the subscales of hostility, neglect and undifferentiated rejection were below the cutoff points, indicating that children perceived their parents as not hostile, neglectful, and rejecting. In addition, their scores on PAQ suggested that they perceived themselves relatively well psychologically adjusted. In the study, the correlation between maternal and paternal acceptance was found to be at moderate levels ($r=.52$). Also the correlations were at moderate levels between maternal acceptance as well as

paternal acceptance and the psychological adjustment of the children ($r=.59$, $r=.52$; $p<.01$).

Çetin (2005) investigated the relationship between maternal and paternal acceptance and the psychological adjustment of eighty-four delinquent and forty-six non-delinquent adolescents with a total number of 130. The participants mean age was 17.42 ranging from fifteen to twenty years. Overall, both of the groups perceived their mothers and fathers as warm and moderately controlling. In addition, the perceived maternal acceptance as well as paternal acceptance was correlated moderately ($r=.49$, $p<.001$ for the delinquent group and $r=.43$, $p<.01$ for the non-delinquent group). The correlations between maternal acceptance and psychological adjustment of the delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents were $r=.49$, $r=.57$; $p<.001$. And, the correlations between paternal acceptance and the psychological adjustment of these two groups were $r=.33$, $p<.01$; $r=.58$, $p<.001$. As can be seen the correlations were higher in the non-delinquent adolescents group.

In another study, Erkman and Rohner (2006) explored the relationship between corporal punishment, parental acceptance-rejection, and psychological adjustment. Four hundred twenty seven Turkish youths between the ages of ten and eighteen responded to the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), Physical Punishment Questionnaire (PPQ) and Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ). The study indicated not only that youths reported both their mothers ($M=104.02$) and their fathers ($M=104.83$) to be warm and accepting overall, but also that youths tended to self report fair psychological adjustment ($M=95.65$), on the average. Both maternal and paternal acceptance were robustly correlated with the youths' psychological adjustment ($r=.51$ and $r=.50$; $p<.001$). When exploring the possible contributions of perceived maternal and paternal acceptance and punishment to youths' psychological adjustment, neither youths'

gender nor age contributed significantly to variations in the youths' psychological adjustment and parental acceptance. Moreover, the authors argued that the harshness of maternal punishment had only an indirect effect on the youths' adjustment.

Research on Agreement between the Children's and Parents' Perceptions

Khaleque, Rohner and Nahar (2006), in their study, explored the relative level of agreement and disagreement between mothers' perceptions and children's perceptions of maternal acceptance-rejection among forty-two Bangladeshi mothers and children living in Bangladesh and among thirty-three Bangladeshi immigrant mothers and children living in the United States. The results indicated that both groups experienced considerable maternal acceptance. The results of this study indicated that Bangladeshi children in Bangladesh ($M=113.41$) perceived significantly less maternal acceptance than reported by their mothers ($M=100.16$), ($t=3.38$, $p<.001$), whereas the perception of maternal acceptance did not differ significantly among Bangladeshi immigrant children ($M=96.97$) and their mothers ($M=94.14$). Additionally, Bangladeshi immigrant children experienced significantly more maternal love than Bangladeshi children in Bangladesh ($t=2.58$, $p<.01$).

Also, the correlation between the children's reports and mothers' reports of maternal acceptance both in loving and less than loving families (as perceived by children; the children who scored between 60 and 124 on the Child PARQ were grouped in the loving category whereas the children who scored 125 and 240 grouped in the less than loving category) was investigated in the study. The results indicated that, the correlation between the children's and mothers' reports of maternal acceptance in loving Bangladeshi families was $.52$ ($p<.02$). Moreover, the

difference in mean scores between the children's ($M=93.00$) and mothers' ($M=88.56$) reports on the maternal acceptance was not statistically significant. On the other hand, the correlation between the children's and mothers' reports of maternal acceptance was very low ($r=-.12$) and insignificant in less than loving Bangladeshi families. Moreover, there was a large and significant difference in mean scores between children's ($M=132.74$) and mothers' ($M=111.16$) in less than loving Bangladeshi families ($t=3.15$, $p<.01$).

Although the correlation between the children's and mothers' reports of maternal acceptance in loving Bangladeshi immigrant families did not achieve statistical significance, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of children ($M=86.04$) and mothers ($M=91.69$) for reported maternal acceptance. On the other hand, there was a huge difference between the mothers' ($M=114.75$) and the children's ($M=162.25$) mean scores of reported maternal acceptance in less than loving Bangladeshi immigrant families ($t=2.74$, $p<.01$). The correlation between the children's and mothers' reports of maternal acceptance was not significant in less-than-loving Bangladeshi immigrant families. Both in less than loving Bangladeshi families and in less than loving immigrant Bangladeshi families the sign on the correlation coefficient was negative, indicating that the children and mothers reported in the reverse manner.

In another study of 144 mother/child dyads, Rohner, Khaleque, Riaz, Khan, Sadeque and Laukka (2005) examined the level of agreement and disagreement between the mothers' reports and the children's reports of maternal acceptance-rejection in Finland and Pakistan. The results of the study indicated that mothers and children in both Finland and Pakistan appear to agree that mothers were quite loving on average. In Finland as well as in Pakistan, the correlation between the children's

and the mothers' reports of maternal acceptance was significant .50 and .34 ($p < .001$), respectively.

According to the study, there were significant differences between the mothers' and the children's reports in loving versus less than loving families (as defined by children). Both in loving Finnish and Pakistani families, mothers self-reported slightly but significantly less acceptance than did their children ($t = 3.01$, $p < .005$ and $t = 4.34$, $p < .001$) even though the scores of both mothers and children were in the accepting range of the PARQ. The correlation between the children's and the mothers' reports of maternal acceptance in loving Finnish families was .41 ($p < .02$) and in loving Pakistani families it was .31 ($p < .004$). On the other hand, in less than loving families, although mothers continued to self-report considerable acceptance, their children reported significant love withdrawal ($t = -5.10$, $p < .001$ in Finnish families and $t = 3.46$, $p < .004$ in Pakistani families). The correlation sign was negative and non-significant between Finnish mothers and their children. On the contrary, the correlation sign was positive and non-significant between Pakistani mothers' and their children in less than loving families.

In a study of 547 Israeli families, Knafo and Schwartz (2003) explored the level of agreement between adolescents' and parents' perceptions of parental values. The results of the study indicated that parental values, namely parental consistency over time in value messages, warmth/responsiveness, parents' actual and perceived value agreement correlated positively with accuracy. On the other hand, the accuracy of the adolescents' perceptions correlated negatively with the parental values, namely perceived word-deed inconsistency, value conflict with parents, autocratic and indifferent parenting, and love withdrawal. In other words, the level of parent-child agreement about parental values correlated negatively with the extent to which adolescents perceived their parents to be indifferent and restrictive/rejecting and autocratic whereas it was correlated

positively with the extent to which the adolescents perceived their parents to be warm and responsive.

In another study, which was carried out by Aquilino (1999), the patterns of agreement and disagreement on the quality of intergenerational relationships were explored with the sample of 1062 parent-child dyads. The results of the study indicated that parents gave more positive reports than their child did on six of the eight relationship indicators, although both parent and child answered identical questions. The study found that twenty-one percent of the children reported slightly more positive relationships with their parents than the parents themselves reported, whereas twenty-five percent of parents reported slightly more positive relationships with their children than the children themselves reported. Correlations between the parent and child ratings ranged from weak ($r = .18$) to modest ($r = .39$). Parents reported higher relationship quality, more ease, and humor in the relationship, less tension, and more shared leisure activities than did their children. Moreover, parents reported significantly higher ratings than did their children in ratings of parental disapproval of the child's decisions and open disagreements. Children, on the other hand, were significantly more likely than parents to report that parents wished for more influence over the child's life and reported more frequent arguments and fights.

In a study of 134 families, Tein, Roosa and Michaels (1994) explored the level of agreement within mother-child and father-child dyads on parenting behaviors and mediators. The results of the study revealed a low degree of agreement between parents and children in reports of parental behavior ($r = .13$ to $r = .36$ for mother-child agreement and $r = .19$ to $r = .31$ for father-child agreement). Although, all children agreed that parents on the average were quite loving and non-rejecting, the results indicated that both mothers and fathers tended to report less rejection than the children reported. The

correlations between mothers' and fathers' parenting behaviors from children's perspectives were moderate to high. Children reported significantly higher scores for mothers' parenting behaviors on Acceptance, Rejection, Inconsistent Discipline and Hostile Control. According to the study, both mothers and fathers were seen as equal in firm control.

In the study of agreement between college freshmen and their parents on subscales of Child's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI), Schwarz, Barton-Henry, and Pruzinsky (1985) found that the correlations between mothers' and children's reports of mothers' behaviors ranged between .30 to .41. On the other hand, the fathers' and children's reports of fathers' behaviors correlated between .19 to .29. On the three dimensions of CRPBI, that is Acceptance, Firm Control, and Psychological Control, children tended to see their mothers and fathers as quite similar (.48, .43, and .56, respectively). The mothers (.36, .38, and .47, respectively) and the fathers (.37, .29, and .42, respectively) saw themselves as somewhat less similar, as did the children. Both mothers and fathers reported themselves as more accepting and more firm in control than they were rated by children.

The study of Demo, Small, and Savin-Williams (1987) examined the effects of parent-adolescent communication. The study revealed that adolescents and their parents have independent but overlapping perceptions of their relationships. The congruence between adolescents' perceptions of the four dimensions of the parent-adolescent relationship was at moderate levels. The reports of adolescents on family relations were more congruent with the reports of mothers than of fathers.

In another study, Phares, Compas, and Howel (1989) investigated the level of agreement between the mothers' and fathers' reports of their children's behavioral problems, and their children's self-reports of their behavior problems. The correlation

between mothers and fathers was strong and significant for the total of behavioral problems ($r=.62, p<.001$), internalizing problems ($r=.58, p<.001$), and externalizing problems ($r=.68, p<.001$). The correlations between the mother and child reports were modest but significant for internalizing ($r=.34, p<.001$), externalizing ($r=.22, p<.020$), and for total problems ($r=.33, p<.001$). And, the correlations between the father and child reports were also significant for internalizing ($r=.37, p<.001$), externalizing ($r=.34, p<.001$), and for total problems ($r=.37, p<.001$).

Statement of the Problem

Based on information obtained from previous research and relevant literature the congruence between parents' and early adolescents' perceptions on the perceived psychological adjustment of the child as well as between perceptions of mothers and fathers; mothers and children; and fathers and children on the four dimensions of parental acceptance-rejection and perceived control was investigated. The level of agreement (congruence) or disagreement (incongruence) between perceptions of mothers and children; and fathers and children in loving families versus less than loving families was also explored.

Research Questions

- 1) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on the perception of acceptance, as assessed by the PARQ total?

1a- Is the child's perceived acceptance congruent with the reported mother acceptance, as assessed by the PARQ total?

1b- Is the child's perceived acceptance congruent with the reported father acceptance, as assessed by the PARQ total?

1c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of the self-reported acceptance of mothers and fathers, as assessed by the PARQ total?

2) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on warmth/affection, as assessed by the PARQ warmth\affection subscale?

2a- Is the child's perceived warmth/affection congruent with the reported mother warmth/affection, as assessed by the PARQ warmth/affection subscale?

2b- Is the child's perceived warmth/affection congruent with the reported father warmth/affection, as assessed by the PARQ warmth/affection subscale?

2c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of self-reported warmth/affection of mothers and fathers, as assessed by the PARQ warmth/affection subscale?

3) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on hostility/aggression, as assessed by the PARQ hostility\aggression subscale?

3a- Is the child's perceived hostility/aggression congruent with the reported mother hostility/aggression, as assessed by the PARQ hostility/aggression subscale?

3b- Is the child's perceived hostility/aggression congruent with the reported father hostility/aggression, as assessed by the PARQ hostility/aggression subscale?

3c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of the self-reported hostility/aggression of mothers and fathers, as assessed by the PARQ hostility/aggression subscale?

4) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on indifference/neglect, as assessed by the PARQ indifference/neglect subscale?

4a- Is the child's perceived indifference/neglect congruent with the reported mother indifference/neglect, as assessed by the PARQ indifference/neglect subscale?

4b- Is the child's perceived indifference/neglect congruent with the reported father indifference/neglect, as assessed by the PARQ indifference/neglect subscale?

4c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of the self-reported indifference/neglect of mothers and fathers, as assessed by the PARQ indifference/neglect subscale?

5) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on undifferentiated rejection, as assessed by the PARQ undifferentiated/rejection subscale?

5a- Is the child's perceived undifferentiated rejection congruent with the reported mother undifferentiated rejection, as assessed by the PARQ

undifferentiated/rejection subscale?

5b- Is the child's perceived undifferentiated rejection congruent with the reported father undifferentiated rejection, as assessed by the PARQ undifferentiated/rejection subscale?

5c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of the self-reported undifferentiated rejection of mothers and fathers, as assessed by the PARQ undifferentiated/rejection subscale?

6) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on control, as assessed by the control scale?

6a- Is the child's perceived control congruent with the reported mother control, as assessed by the control scale?

6b- Is the child's perceived control congruent with the reported father control, as assessed by the control scale?

6c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of the self-reported control of mothers and fathers, as assessed by the control scale?

7) Are there differences between the self-perceived psychological adjustment of the children (as assessed by the Child PAQ) and the perceived psychological adjustment of the children by the parents (as assessed by the Parent PAQ)?

7a- Is the self-perceived psychological adjustment of the child (as assessed by the Child PAQ) congruent with the psychological adjustment of the child perceived by the mother, as assessed by the Parent PAQ?

7b- Is the self-perceived psychological adjustment of the child (as assessed by the Child PAQ) congruent with the psychological adjustment of the child

perceived by the father, as assessed by the Parent PAQ?

7c- Is the psychological adjustment of the child perceived by the mother and father, as assessed by the Parent PAQ congruent with each other?

8) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; and fathers and children on acceptance, as assessed by the PARQ in loving and in less-than-loving families?

8a- Is there congruence between the perceptions of the child and mother on parental acceptance, as assessed by the PARQ in loving and in less-than-loving families?

8b- Is there a congruence between the perceptions of child and father on parental acceptance, as assessed by the PARQ in loving and in less-than-loving families?

9) What is the relationship between the perceived parental acceptance, control, and psychological adjustment by the children?

9a- What is the relationship between the perceived maternal acceptance, maternal control and perceived psychological adjustment as assessed by the children?

9b- What is the relationship between the perceived paternal acceptance, paternal control and perceived psychological adjustment as assessed by the children?

9c- What is the relationship between the perceived maternal and paternal acceptance as well maternal and paternal control as assessed by the children?

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Participants

The participants of the current study consisted of 185 mother/father/children triads. Children were selected based on certain criteria, namely the children having both biological parents and living with both parents in the same household. Having literate parents was another criterion considered during the selection of the subject population.

Ten public secondary level schools where children from middle socio-economic status families attended were determined from the districts of Kadıköy and Beşiktaş. The middle socio-economic status is defined by location of schools and information collected through personal contacts of the researcher from the psychological counselors of the schools. Public schools were preferred because of their heterogeneous formation.

Students from the sixth and seventh grades who matched the criteria were determined for the study. Among these students, 185 volunteer students who wanted to participate in the study and met the criteria were included. The distribution of schools and the number of students from each school are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample Distribution according to Schools

Schools	Students	
	N	%
School 1	55	29.7
School 2	7	3.8
School 3	24	13.8
School 4	16	8.6
School 5	16	8.6
School 6	19	8.7
School 7	16	8.6
School 8	15	8.1
School 9	2	1.1
School 10	16	8.6
TOTAL	185	100

One hundred nineteen female students (64.3%) and sixty-six male students (35.7%) were the participants of the study. The age ranged from eleven through fourteen years with an average of twelve ($M=12.40$) years of age. In terms of grade level, the sample was almost equally represented with ninety-five (51.4%) sixth grade students and ninety (48.6%) seventh grade students as seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Sample Distribution in terms of Gender, Age and Grade Level

	Early adolescents	
	N	%
GENDER		
Female	119	64.3
Male	66	35.7
AGE		
11	12	6.5
12	88	47.6
13	84	45.4

Table 2. continued.

		Early adolescents	
		N	%
AGE			
	14	1	.5
GRADE			
	6 th	95	51.4
	7 th	90	48.6

Demographic characteristics of the parent sample were as follows: mothers ranged in age from twenty-seven to fifty-three years and fathers ranged in age from thirty-one to sixty-one years. The average age of the mothers and fathers was forty ($M=39.5$), and fortyfour ($M=44.23$), respectively. Years of marriage in families ranged from twelve to thirty-five years with a mean of $M=17.25$.

As displayed in Table 3, mothers' and fathers' educational levels varied from primary to graduate school. Approximately, seventy percent of mothers and eighty percent of fathers had high school and post-high school (undergraduate, graduate) education.

Table 3. Distribution of the Parent Sample in terms of level of Education

Education level	Mothers		Fathers	
	N	%	N	%
Primary school degree	34	18.4	13	7
Secondary school degree	18	9.7	27	14.6
High school degree	73	39.5	63	34.1
Undergraduate degree	52	28.1	67	36.2
Graduate or post graduate degree	6	3.2	14	7.6
Unstated	2	1.1	1	.5
Total	185	100	185	100

In terms of the work status of parents, nearly fourthy percent of the mothers and approximately ninety percent of fathers were working in a full time or part-time job as seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Distribution of the Parent Sample in terms of Working Status

Working Status	N	%
MOTHERS		
Not working	88	47.6
Working	76	41.1
Unstated	21	11.4
Total	185	100
FATHERS		
Not working	9	4.9
Working	165	89.2
Unstated	11	5.9
Total	185	100

In terms of the occupation of parents, fourty percent of the mothers and eighty percent of the fathers worked in educational, business, professional and service organizations. Approximately forty-five percent of the mothers were housewives (see Table 5).

Table 5. Distribution of the Parent Sample in terms of Occupation

Occupation	Mothers		Fathers	
	N	%	N	%
Housewife	82	44.3	-	-
Professional	40	21.6	41	22.2
Worker	1	.5	15	8.1
Freelance	7	3.8	47	25.4
Retired	11	5.9	12	6.5
Civil Servant	11	5.9	13	7
Other	13	7	34	18.4
Unstated	20	10.8	23	12.4
Total	185	100	185	100

Analyzing the data in terms of the number of children in the family, it was seen that approximately eighty percent of the parents had one or two children as presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Distribution of the Parent Sample in terms of the Number of Children in the Family and the Birth Order of the Target Child

Number of Children	N	%
One	27	14.6
Two	125	67.6
Three	31	16.8
Four	2	1.1
Total	185	100
Birth order	N	%
First	97	52.4
Second	73	39.5
Third	14	7.6
Fourth	1	.5
Total	185	100

Half of the children designated in the present study were the first-born child. Nearly ninety percent of the families had average and high average income levels as stated by the parents themselves, as displayed in Table 7.

Table 7. Distribution of the Families in terms of indicated Income Level

Income level	f	%
Low income	3	1.6
Low-average income	11	5.9
Average income	124	67
High-average income	42	22.7
High income	5	2.7
Total	185	100

Instruments

In the current study, Parent and Child versions of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire/Control (PARQ/C) Turkish Form, Parent and Child versions of the Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ) Turkish Form, and a demographic form were used for data collection.

Parent Information Form

The Parent Information Form (PIF) was developed by the researcher to define the characteristics of the sample of the current study. PIF included questions about the demographic variables such as age, level of education, years of marriage, number of children in household, and declared economic status of parent respondents (see Appendix A).

Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire/Control (PARQ/C), Turkish Form.

(Ebeveyn Kabul-Red Ölçeği-Kontrol (EKAR-K))

The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire with Control (PARQ/Control), is a 73 item, self-report assessing two major dimensions of parenting: the parental acceptance-rejection (60 item) questionnaire which was designed by Rohner in 1971, and the parental control (13 item) scale which was designed by Rohner, Saavedra, and Granum in 1980 (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) is a 60 item self-report instrument designed to measure individuals' perceptions of parental

acceptance-rejection on a 4-item Likert type scale which are “almost always true (4), sometimes true (3), rarely true (2), and almost never true (1)”. The questions are organized into four scales; warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect, and undifferentiated rejection.

The warmth/affection scale consists of 20 items, which refer to the parent-child relationship where parents are perceived to give love or affection without qualification. The hostility/aggression scale includes 15 items. The perceived hostility scale assesses the conditions where individuals believe their parent is angry, bitter, or resentful toward them, whereas perceived aggression assesses the conditions where individuals believe their parents intend to hurt them, physically and verbally (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). The indifference/neglect scale contains 15 items, assessing conditions where individuals see their parent as unconcerned or uninterested in them. The undifferentiated rejection scale includes 10 items and assesses the child’s feelings of being rejected or unloved, although there may be no observable indicator for rejection (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

In terms of scoring, the sum of all the four scales was calculated after reverse scoring the items on the warmth scale and seven items of the indifference/neglect scale, namely; 7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42, and 49. An overall possible score of perceived acceptance-rejection ranges from a low of 60 (reveals maximum perceived acceptance) to a high of 240 (reveals maximum perceived rejection) (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

Both the parent and child versions of the PARQ, has the same response format and scoring system. The Parent PARQ is nearly identical to the Child version except for minor wording changes such as “My mother does ...” versus “I do ...” The

mother and father versions are identical except for reference to the mother's behavior versus the father's behavior (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

Reliability and validity analysis of the Child PARQ and the Mother PARQ was conducted in 1975 according to the standards of the American Psychological Association's Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests. The internal reliability is shown by the Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the mother version of the Child PARQ ranging from .72 to .90 with a mean reliability of .82 (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

For convergent and discriminant validity of the Child PARQ, the Acceptance, Hostile Detachment and Rejection scales of the Schaefer's Child's Report of Parent Behavior (CRPBI) and the Physical Punishment Scale of the Bronfenbrenner's Parental Behavior Questionnaire (BPB) were used. The correlations between the PARQ and the validation scales ranged from .55 to .83 for the child form (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

The PARQ has been used in more than four hundred studies within the U.S. and internationally (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). A meta-analysis taking into consideration 51 studies, which were conducted between 1977 and 2000. All alpha coefficients for the total PARQ were .89 ($p < .001$). In summary, the results of the meta-analysis confirm that the PARQ is a reliable measure for general use in cross-cultural settings (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

The Control part of the PARQ/Control questionnaire measures individuals' perceptions of the behavioral control they currently experience as children (Child PARQ/Control: Child version) or they enforce on their children as parents (Parent PARQ/Control: Parent version). The control scale item scores are summed after reverse scoring the items 23, 32, 41 and 54. Scores of the control scale range from a

low of 13 to a high of 52. It was designed in a way that scores between 13-26 show that parents rarely try to control their children's behavior, (low/lax control); scores 27-39 mean that parents sometimes or often try to control their children's behavior, (moderate control); scores 40-45 refer to the state when parents usually try to control their children's behavior, (firm control); and scores 46-52 refer to parents who almost always try to control their children's behavior, (strict/restrictive control). Both the child and parent versions of the PARQ/Control are nearly identical except for the referent (mother, father or the children) (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

A meta-analysis of 4203 respondents from Asia, Europe, the West Indies and major U.S. ethnic groups revealed the mean weighted effect size of the coefficient alpha, aggregated across all versions of the PCS, to be .73 ($p < .001$) (Rohner & Khaleque, 2003). The evidence provided by the meta-analysis confirms the conclusion that PCS is a reliable and valid measure that can be used in multi-ethnic and cross-cultural research for assessing the variations in parental control (Rohner & Khaleque, 2003).

In terms of the Turkish version Polat (1988), carried out the initial translation study of the PARQ child form in Turkey. The questionnaire was administered to 120 fifth grade students from upper, middle, and low socio-economic status families. The Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the subscales of the Turkish PARQ ranged from .76 to .89 and the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was found to be .80 for the total scale.

The reliability and validity studies of the Turkish PARQ child form (see Appendix B) were carried out by Erdem (1990) with 344 eight graders coming from different SES in Istanbul. The Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the scale were .95 for the total scale with the subscales ranging between .78 and .90. The test-retest reliability coefficients ranged between .48 to .64 for the subscales and .70 for the

total scale. The factor analysis used in the construct validation yielded two factors namely warmth and rejection as in the original study.

The PARQ, parent version had been translated into Turkish by Anjel and Erkman, in 1993, and by Varan in 2000. Erkman (2003) made a few changes in the instructions and some of the words in the questions for better understanding and transliteral equivalence.

The validity studies of PARQ in Turkey have been established in terms of correlation with the Perceived Emotional Abuse Inventory for Adolescents, PEAIFA ($r=.64$, $p<.001$) (Erkman & Alantar, 1988 cited in Erkman, 2003) and with the Katz Adjustment Scale-Individual Form (KAS-S) ($r=.27$, $p<.01$) (Kozcu, 1990 cited in Erkman, 2003). In terms of reliability analysis, the Cronbach Alpha values were given by Anjel (1993) for the mother form as: .79 for warmth/affection; .80 for hostility/aggression; .64 for neglect/indifference; .57 for undifferentiated rejection for the subscales of PARQ; .89 for the total PARQ scale. The findings for the item-total correlation coefficients ranged between .15 to .57 ($p<.001$); and the subscale-total correlation coefficients were .78 for warmth/affection; .86 for hostility/aggression; .77 for neglect/indifference; and .75 for undifferentiated rejection on the subscales of the PARQ.

Erkman (2003) indicated the Cronbach Alpha values for the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire for the child form were: .91 for maternal, .94 for paternal; .87 for maternal, .91 for paternal; .86 for both maternal and paternal; .81 for maternal, .58 for paternal; .81 for maternal, .85 for paternal for warmth, hostility-aggression, indifference-neglect, undifferentiated rejection subscales and the total scale, respectively.

In addition, in another study by Erkman (2004) the findings revealed that the Cronbach Alpha values for the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire/Control were .79, .68, .68, .59 for the subscales of the PARQ, were .74 for the total PARQ and .69 for the control. The studies mentioned above are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8. Cronbach Alpha values for the Turkish version of the PARQ/C

Scale	Children*		Parent I**	Parent II***
	Mother	Father		
Warmth/Affection	.91	.94	.79	.79
Hostility	.87	.91	.68	.80
Indifference/Neglect	.86	.86	.68	.64
Undifferentiated Rejection	.81	.58	.59	.57
PARQ Total	.81	.85	.74	.89
Control	.74	.76	.69	-

*children data

Erkman, F. (February, 2003) Turkish Children's Perception of Parental Warmth, Corporal Punishment, and Psychological Adjustment, SCCR 32nd Annual Meeting, Charleston South Caroline

**parent I data

Erkman, F. (February, 2004) The Relationship of Self-Reported Physical Punishment to Parental Acceptance-Rejection in Turkish Parents. SCCR 33rd Annual Meeting, San Jose, California.

***parent II data

Anjel, M., & Erkman, F. (1993) The transliteral Equivalence, Reliability and Validity Studies of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) Mother-Form: A Tool for Assessing Child Abuse. International Society for Prevention of Child Abuse & Neglect-Regional Conference, Ankara.

The control scale was translated into Turkish by Varan in 2000. In terms of the reliability studies in Turkey, the Cronbach Alpha values for the control scale obtained by Erkman (2003) are .74 for maternal and .76 for paternal, respectively.

Personality Assessment Questionnaire, Child (PAQ) Turkish Form.

(Kişilik Değerlendirme Ölçeği (KİDO))

The Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ) (see Appendix C) is a self-report questionnaire developed by Rohner in 1997, which assesses respondents' perceptions

of themselves with respect to their psychological adjustment. The PAQ consists of seven scales designed to measure personality dispositions, namely; hostility and aggression, dependency, self-esteem, self-adequacy, emotional responsiveness, emotional stability and worldview (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

The PAQ contains six items per scale for a total of 42 items written in the present tense. Respondents are asked to reflect on their true –not ideal or wished-for – feelings about themselves on a four-point scale, which are “almost always true (4), sometimes true (3), rarely true (2), and almost never true (1)”. The minimum total score of PAQ, which is 42, refers to excellent psychological adjustment whereas the maximum total score of PAQ, which is 168, refers to serious psychological maladjustment (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). Nine studies conducted between 1991 and 2000 were used for the meta-analysis of PAQ. The meta-analysis revealed that the overall mean weighted effect size of the coefficient alpha is .83 ($p < .001$) for the Child PAQ (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

Varan translated the PAQ into Turkish in 2001. Erkman (2003) made some changes in the instructional part of the instrument. The study by Erkman was carried out with 1821 children and youths between the ages of ten and eighteen for the reliability of the measure, and the Cronbach Alpha value for the Turkish version of the Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ) total was found to be .81 ($p < .001$). The Cronbach Alpha values for the subscales of Turkish version of the PAQ were: .73 for hostility/aggression; .51 for dependency; .64 for negative self-esteem; .71 for negative self-adequacy; .61 for emotional unresponsiveness; .62 for emotional instability; .78 for negative worldview (Erkman, 2003). Erkman (2003) showed the validity of the Turkish version of PAQ was shown by the significant positive

correlation with perceived maternal rejection and perceived paternal rejection ($r=.326$, $r=.330$, $p<.0001$, respectively) (see Appendix C).

Personality Assessment Questionnaire, Parent (PAQ) Turkish Form.

(Kişilik Değerlendirme Ölçeği/Ebeveyn (KİDÖ/E))

The Personality Assessment Questionnaire, Parent (PAQ), form was developed by the present researcher and Erkman in order to assess parents' perceptions of their children's psychological adjustment (see Appendix C). The items of the child version of PAQ were reconstructed with some minor wording changes such as "I feel life is nice" versus "My child feels life is nice". A pilot study was conducted by the researcher for the reliability study of the parent version of the PAQ. The parents of sixth and seventh grade students who attended the parents' meeting day were given the Parent version of PAQ in the school where the present researcher worked as a counselor. The study was carried out with ninetytwo parents for the reliability of the measure.

The corrected item-total correlations of the Turkish Parent PAQ ranged between .02 (item 3 and 16) and .51 (item 25 and 32) with an average value of .29. The Cronbach Alpha value for the total Parent PAQ was found to be .80 ($p<.001$).

Table 9. Corrected Item-Total Correlations of the Parent PAQ

Item No	r	Item No	r	Item No	r
1	.22	15	.41	29	.30
2	.17	16	.02	30	.14
3	.02	17	.17	31	.40
4	.33	18	.34	32	.51
5	.16	19	.29	33	.31
6	.10	20	.20	34	.15

Table 9. continued.

Item No	r	Item No	r	Item No	r
7	.32	21	.31	35	.41
8	.42	22	.10	36	.39
9	.15	23	.14	37	.28
10	.38	24	.16	38	.44
11	.40	25	.51	39	.40
12	-.08	26	.24	40	.03
13	.36	27	.47	41	.19
14	.24	28	.49	42	.41

The corrected item-subscale correlations were computed for the seven subscales of the instrument, that is, hostility/aggression, dependency, negative self-esteem, negative self-adequacy, emotional instability, negative worldview, and emotional unresponsiveness.

The corrected item-subscale correlation of the Hostility/Aggression ranged between .25 (item 22) and .52 (item 15) with an average of .37. The Cronbach Alpha value for the hostility/aggression subscale was found to be .63 ($p < .001$). The corrected item-subscale correlation of the dependency ranged between .05 (item 16) and .51 (item 23) with an average of .32. The Cronbach Alpha value for the dependency subscale was found to be .51 ($p < .001$).

The corrected item-subscale correlation of the negative self-esteem ranged between .16 (item 24) and .36 (item 31) with an average of .39. The Cronbach Alpha value for the negative self-esteem subscale was found to be .54 ($p < .001$). The corrected item-subscale correlation of the negative self-adequacy ranged between .37 (item 4) and .56 (item 25) with an average of .46. The Cronbach Alpha value for the negative self-adequacy subscale was found to be .73 ($p < .001$).

The corrected item-subscale correlation for emotional unresponsiveness ranged between .18 (item 12) and .32 (item 19 and 26) with an average of .46. The Cronbach Alpha value for the emotional unresponsiveness subscale was found to be .52 ($p < .001$). The corrected item-subscale correlation for emotional instability ranged between .09 (item six) and .24 (item twentieth) with an average of .28. The Cronbach Alpha value for the emotional instability subscale was found to be .37 ($p < .001$).

The Cronbach Alpha value for the negative worldview subscale was found to be .64 ($p < .001$). The corrected item-subscale correlation of the negative worldview ranged between .28 (item 7 and 14) and .53 (item 28) with an average of .38 (see Table 10).

Table 10. Corrected Item-Subscale Correlation of Parent PAQ

Hostility/aggression	Item No	r	Item No	r
	1	.36	22	.25
	8	.45	29	.30
	15	.52	36	.36
Dependency				
	2	.29	23	.51
	9	.30	30	.31
	16	-.05	37	.45
Negative self-esteem				
	3	.29	24	.16
	10	.35	31	.36
	17	.28	38	.30
Negative self-adequacy				
	4	.37	25	.56
	11	.38	32	.52
	18	.50	39	.45

Table 10. continued.

	Item No	r	Item No	r
Emotional unresponsiveness				
	5	.26	26	.32
	12	.18	33	.30
	19	.32	40	.28
Emotional instability				
	6	.09	27	.23
	13	.22	34	.16
	20	.24	41	.10
Negative worldview				
	7	.28	28	.53
	14	.28	35	.44
	21	.29	42	.46

Table 11 shows the Cronbach Alpha values for the hostility/aggression, dependency, negative self-esteem, negative self-adequacy, emotional instability, emotional unresponsiveness, and negative worldview subscales and the total Parent PAQ.

Table 11. Cronbach Alpha Values of the Turkish Parent PAQ

Scale	Cronbach Alpha
Hostility/Aggression	.63
Dependency	.51
Negative Self-Esteem	.54
Negative Self-Adequacy	.73
Emotional Instability	.52
Emotional Unresponsiveness	.37
Negative Worldview	.64
Total Parent PAQ	.80

Procedure

Permission from the Boğaziçi University Research Ethics Committee was secured. In addition, permission was taken from The Ministry of Education to conduct research in primary schools in Istanbul (see Appendix D). Each school was visited by the researcher. The principal was informed about the study and the questionnaires that were used for the research were provided. During the visits, the appropriate time and classes were arranged with the principal and school counselors to administer the questionnaires. The parents of the students were informed by the researcher, and written consent was prepared for the parents and students to sign.

The current researcher conducted a pilot study for the reliability of the Parent PAQ which was used in the study. The parents of the sixth and seventh grade students who attended the parents' meeting day were given the Parent version of the PAQ in the school where the present researcher worked as a counselor. The study was carried out with 92 parents for the reliability of the measure.

The counselors administered the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire/Control and Personality Assessment Questionnaires to the students during a one-hour class session. The parents were given the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire/Control, the Child Personality Assessment Questionnaire, and Parent Information Form to be responded to. At the beginning of the questionnaires, there were explanations about the purpose of the study. The parents were asked to return the questionnaires to the school's counselors when they were completed. Only the questionnaires that were completed by both of the parents and adolescents were considered for the current study which was 185 triads.

Design

This current study was a correlational-descriptive research which aimed to investigate the congruence among mothers', fathers' and children's perceptions of parental acceptance-rejection/control and child psychological adjustment.

Data Analysis

For data analysis the SPSS 13.0 (Statistics Packages of Social Sciences) computer program was used for the recent study. The means, standard deviations, frequencies and percentiles were computed for descriptive analysis. The analysis regarding the research questions was conducted by Paired-Samples T Test, Independent-Samples T Test, and Pearson Product-Moment correlation. Also, the reliability analysis of the Parent PAQ was conducted by item-total, item-subscale and Cronbach Alpha correlation coefficients.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Chapter 4 includes results of the statistical analyses of the study. Initially, the results of the descriptive statistics in terms of the assessment tools collected from the participants (child, mother, and father) are provided, followed by the results for each research question.

Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables

The mean score of the perceived maternal acceptance assessed by the Child Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire/Control (PARQ/C-Child Form), for the total sample was 85.24 (SD=22.3), and for the control it was 38.48 (SD=6.1); while mean score of perceived the paternal acceptance was 84.50 (SD=20.6), and for control it was 37.64 (SD=5.8) (see Table 12).

Table 12. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Parental Acceptance-Rejection

PARQ/C (child)	Mother (Maternal) (N=185)		Father (Paternal) (N=185)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	28.32	8.3	29.00	8.6
Hostility/Aggression	21.28	7.1	19.49	5.8
Indifference/Neglect	21.18	5.7	22.61	6.3
Undifferentiated Rejection	14.46	4.8	13.45	4.0
PARQ Total	85.24	22.3	84.50	20.6
Control	38.48	6.1	37.64	5.8

The results of the current study revealed that the mean scores of the children for perceived maternal and paternal acceptance were in the normal range, inferring that children experience much more maternal and paternal love than rejection in Turkey. Only 2.7 % of the children for mothers and 1.1 % of the children for fathers scored above the midpoint of 150, indicating that they experience more rejection than acceptance. The children perceived moderate levels of control both from their mothers and fathers. However, they perceived their mothers to be more controlling than their fathers.

The psychological adjustment of the sample was measured by the Child Personality Assessment Questionnaire (Child PAQ). As presented in Table 13, the mean score for the total sample was 89.59 (SD=15.5).

Table 13. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Psychological Adjustment

Self (N=185)		
PAQ (child)	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	11.58	3.7
Dependency	17.75	3.2
Negative Self-Esteem	10.33	3.2
Negative Self-Adequacy	10.89	3.4
Emotional Unresponsiveness	11.61	3.1
Emotional Instability	16.14	3.8
Negative Worldview	11.29	4.0
Total	89.59	15.51

The children on average perceived themselves as being psychologically well-adjusted. Nevertheless, 14.1 % of the participants perceived scores above the midpoint of 105, inferring that they perceived themselves to be less psychologically adjusted. The children received the highest scores on the two subscales of the PAQ:

dependency and emotional instability, suggesting that they perceived themselves as being more dependent and emotionally unstable. All the subscale scores of the children, other than dependency and emotional instability were below the midpoint scores of the subscales as assessed by the Child PAQ.

The parents' perceptions of their own level of acceptance and control were measured by the Parent version of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire/Control (PARQ/C-Parent Form). As seen in Table 14, the mean score of acceptance for the mother sample was 81.20 (SD=13.0), and it was 40.71 (SD=4.1) for the control subscale, while the mean score of acceptance for the father sample was 99.93 (SD=12.4), and for the control subscale it was 34.91 (SD=4.6).

Table 14. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PARQ/C

	Parents			
	Mother (N=185)		Father (N=185)	
PARQ/C (parent)	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	25.60	5.0	28.15	5.8
Hostility/Aggression	22.01	5.4	21.60	5.82
Indifference/Neglect	19.81	4.3	37.25	3.0
Undifferentiated Rejection	13.79	3.4	12.93	3.1
PARQ Total	81.20	13.0	99.93	12.4
Control	40.71	4.1	34.91	4.6

Both of the mothers' and fathers' scores on the parental acceptance were in the loving range, showing that mothers and fathers tended to perceive themselves as being accepting rather than rejecting. However, mothers tended to report themselves as being more accepting than the fathers reported themselves to be. In addition, fathers reported themselves as being moderately controlling, whereas the mothers reported themselves as being firmly controlling.

The psychological adjustment of the children as perceived by parents was measured by the Parent Personality Assessment Questionnaire (Parent PAQ). As displayed in Table 15, the mean scores for the mother and father samples were 86.64 (SD=13.2) and 86.19 (SD=12.6), respectively.

Table 15. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PAQ

PAQ (parent)	Parents			
	Mothers (N=185)		Fathers (N=185)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	11.40	3.3	11.33	3.3
Dependency	19.55	2.8	19.19	3.1
Negative Self-Esteem	9.38	2.4	9.78	2.7
Negative Self-Adequacy	9.96	3.1	9.98	2.9
Emotional Unresponsiveness	10.93	3.3	11.32	3.2
Emotional Instability	16.11	3.5	15.59	3.1
Negative Worldview	9.31	2.8	9.00	2.7
Total	86.64	13.2	86.19	12.6

Both the mothers and fathers reported their children in the normal range, indicating that they perceived their children as being psychologically well-adjusted. The parents received the highest scores on the two subscales of the PAQ: dependency and emotional instability, suggesting that they perceived their children as being more dependent and emotionally unstable compared to the other categories of personality. All of the subscale scores of the parents, other than dependency and emotional instability, were below the midpoint scores of the subscales of the Parent PAQ as assessed by parents.

Results according to the Research Questions

In this section the findings, according to the research questions, are presented. The Paired Samples Statistics were used out to investigate the significant differences among the mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on the PARQ-C and PAQ. Also the Pearson Product Correlation technique was used to examine the correlations among the perceptions of parents and children as well as mothers and fathers.

- 1) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on perception of acceptance, as assessed by the PARQ total?

The findings for the first question indicated that the mean score for the children ($M_c=85.24$) was significantly different from and higher than the score for mothers ($M_m=81.20$) ($t=-2.327$; $p<.05$), indicating that the children perceived more rejection overall than what their mothers claimed. The mean score of the children ($M_c=84.50$) was significantly different from and less than that of the fathers' ($M_f=99.93$) ($t=10.379$; $p<.001$), showing that the children perceived their fathers to be more favorable towards acceptance than the fathers themselves reported. The mean score of the mothers ($M_m=81.20$) was significantly different from and less than that of the fathers ($M_f=99.93$) ($t=-16.958$; $p<.001$), suggesting that the mothers reported themselves being more accepting than what the fathers reported of themselves (see Table 16).

Table 16. Paired Samples Tests for the PARQ Total

	t	df	p
Pair 1 (children/mothers)	-2.327	184	.05
Pair 2 (children/fathers)	10.379	184	.001
Pair 3 (mothers/fathers)	-16.956	184	.001

1a- Is the child's perceived acceptance congruent with the reported mother acceptance, as assessed by PARQ total?

As displayed in Table 17, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique indicated a coefficient of .19 between the children's perceived acceptance and the reported mother acceptance that was significant at the .05 level ($r=.19$; $p<.05$) on the PARQ Total, indicating that there was low agreement between children's and mothers' reports on maternal acceptance.

1b- Is the child's perceived acceptance congruent with the reported father acceptance, as assessed by PARQ total?

The same technique yielded a correlation coefficient of .33 between the children's perceived acceptance and the reported father acceptance; that was significant at the level of .001 ($r=.33$; $p<.001$), suggesting that there was low agreement between the children's and fathers' reports on paternal acceptance (see Table 17).

1c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of self-reported acceptance of the mothers and fathers, as assessed by the PARQ Total?

As seen in Table 17, the correlation coefficient was .30, between the perceptions of the self-reported acceptance of mothers and fathers; that was significant at the level of .001 ($r=.30$; $p<.001$). The correlations were weak on the perceptions of the mothers and fathers regarding parental acceptance.

Table 17. Congruence of the Mothers', Fathers' and Children's PARQ Total Scores

PARQ	Parent(M) PARQ	Parent(F) PARQ	ChildPARQ: Mother	ChildPARQ: Father
Parent(M) PARQ	1	.301****	.187*	
Parent(F) PARQ		1		.330****
ChildPARQ: Mother			1	
ChildPARQ: Father				1

****Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

2) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on warmth/affection, as assessed by the PARQ warmth/affection subscale?

According to the results of the Paired Samples Statistics, the mean score of the children ($M_c=28.32$) was significantly different from and higher than the mothers ($M_m=25.60$) ($t=-4.260$; $p<.001$), showing that the children perceived their mothers as being less warm than what the mothers reported. On the other hand, the mean score of the children ($M_c=28.96$) was not significantly different from that of the fathers ($M_f=28.15$) ($t=-1.281$), suggesting that both the children and their fathers perceived the same levels of paternal warmth. The mean score of the mothers ($M_m=25.60$) was significantly different from and less than that of the fathers ($M_f=28.15$) ($t=-5.044$;

$p < .001$), indicating that the mothers reported themselves as being warmer than what the fathers reported about themselves, as displayed in Table 18.

Table 18. Paired Samples Tests for the Warmth/Affection Subscale

	t	df	p
Pair 1 (children/mothers)	-4.260	184	.001
Pair 2 (children/fathers)	-1.281	184	ns
Pair 3 (mothers/fathers)	-5.044	184	.001

2a- Is the child's perceived warmth/affection congruent with the reported mother warmth/affection, as assessed by the PARQ warmth/affection subscale?

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique indicated a coefficient of .22 between the children's perceived acceptance and the reported mother acceptance that was significant at the .005 level ($r = .22$; $p < .005$) on the warmth/affection subscale. The perceptions of the children and mothers were correlated but at a low level (see Table 19).

2b- Is the child's perceived warmth/affection congruent with the self-reported father warmth/affection, as assessed by the PARQ warmth/affection subscale?

As displayed in Table 19, the same technique yielded a correlation coefficient of .34 between the children's perceived acceptance and the reported father acceptance; that was significant at the level of .001 ($r = .34$; $p < .001$). The paternal warmth perceived by children and fathers correlated at low levels.

2c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of the self-reported warmth/affection of mothers and fathers, as assessed by the PARQ warmth/affection subscale?

The correlation coefficient was .20 between the perceptions of the self-reported acceptance of the mothers and fathers that was significant at the level of .01 ($r=.20$; $p<.01$), indicating that the perceptions of the mothers and fathers were congruent in low levels (see Table 19).

Table 19. Congruence of the Mothers', Fathers' and Children's Scores on the Warmth/Affection Subscale

	Parent(M) PARQ	Parent(F) PARQ	ChildPARQ: Mother	ChildPARQ: Father
Parent(M) PARQ	1	.195**	.221***	
Parent(F) PARQ		1	.	.341****
ChildPARQ: Mother			1	
ChildPARQ: Father				1

****Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).

*** Correlation is significant at the .005 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

3) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on hostility/aggression, as assessed by the PARQ hostility/aggression subscale?

As presented in Table 20, the findings revealed that the mean score of the children ($M_c=21.28$) was not significantly different from that of their mothers ($M_m=22.01$) ($t=1.220$); the mean score of the children ($M_c=19.49$) was significantly different from and less than that of their fathers ($M_f=21.60$) ($t=3.979$; $p<.001$); and the mean score of the mothers ($M_m= 22.01$) was not significantly different from that of the

fathers ($M_f=21.60$) ($t=.881$), as analyzed by the Paired Samples Statistics. These findings suggested that even though both parents reported similar levels of expressed hostility towards their children, the children and mothers perceived themselves similarly, while the children perceived their fathers more positively, namely being less hostile than even what the fathers themselves reported.

Table 20. Paired Samples Tests for the Hostility/Aggression Subscale

	t	df	p
Pair 1 (children/mothers)	1.220	184	ns
Pair 2 (children/fathers)	3.979	184	.001
Pair 3 (mothers/fathers)	.881	184	ns

3a- Is the child's perceived hostility/aggression congruent with the reported mother hostility/aggression, as assessed by the PARQ hostility/aggression subscale?

As displayed in Table 21, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique indicated a coefficient of .20 between the children's perceived hostility and the reported mother hostility that was significant at the .01 level ($r=.20$; $p<.01$) on the hostility/aggression subscale. The perceptions of the children and mothers were congruent in low levels.

3b- Is the child's perceived hostility/aggression congruent with the reported father hostility/aggression, as assessed by the PARQ hostility/aggression subscale?

The same technique yielded the correlation coefficient of .22 between the children's perceived hostility and the reported father hostility that was significant at the .005

level ($r=.22$; $p<.005$) as seen in Table 21. The perceptions of the children and their fathers were congruent at low levels.

3c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of the self-reported hostility/aggression of mothers and fathers, as assessed by the PARQ hostility/aggression subscale?

As presented in Table 21, the correlation coefficient was .39 between the perceptions of the self-reported hostility of mothers and fathers; that was significant at the level of .001 ($r=.39$; $p<.001$), indicating that the perceptions of the mothers and fathers were congruent at moderate levels.

Table 21. Congruence of the Mothers', Fathers' and Children's Scores on the Hostility/Agression Subscale

Hostility	Parent(M) PARQ	Parent(F) PARQ	ChildPARQ: Mother	ChildPARQ: Father
Parent(M) PARQ	1	.387****	.195**	
Parent(F) PARQ		1		.220***
ChildPARQ: Mother			1	
ChildPARQ: Father				1

****Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).

*** Correlation is significant at the .005 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

4) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on indifference/neglect, as assessed by the PARQ indifference/neglect subscale?

The analysis by the Paired Samples Statistics indicated that the mean score of the children ($M_c=21.18$) was significantly different from and higher than that of the

mothers (Mm=19.81) ($t=-2.777$; $p<.01$); the mean score of the children (Mc=22.61) was significantly different from and less than that of the fathers (Mf=37.25) ($t=28.021$; $p<.001$); and the mean score of the mothers (Mm=19.81) was significantly different from and less than that of the fathers (Mf=37.25) ($t=-44.143$; $p<.001$) (see Table 22). The children perceived their mothers as being more indifferent than how the mothers reported themselves to be, while the children perceived their fathers as being much less indifferent than how the fathers reported themselves to be towards their children. The mothers perceived themselves as being less indifferent than the fathers on the indifference/neglect subscale.

Table 22. Paired Samples Tests for the Indifference/Neglect Subscale

	t	df	p
Pair 1 (children/mothers)	-2.777	184	.01
Pair 2 (children/fathers)	28.021	184	.001
Pair 3 (mothers/fathers)	-44.143	184	.001

4a- Is the child's perceived indifference/neglect congruent with the reported mother indifference/neglect, as assessed by the PARQ indifference/neglect subscale?

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique revealed that there was no significant correlation between the children's perceived indifference and the reported mother indifference. The children's and mothers' perceptions on the indifference/neglect subscale were not congruent.

4b- Is the child's perceived indifference/neglect congruent with the reported father indifference/neglect, as assessed by the PARQ indifference/neglect subscale?

The children's perceived indifference and the reported father indifference were not correlated, indicating that the perceptions of the children and the fathers were not congruent.

4c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of the self-reported indifference/neglect of mothers and fathers, as assessed by the PARQ indifference/neglect subscale?

The perceptions of the self-reported indifferences of mothers and fathers on the indifference neglect subscale were not correlated, suggesting that mothers' and fathers' perceptions were not congruent.

5) Are there differences between the perceptions of the mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on undifferentiated rejection, as assessed by the PARQ undifferentiated rejection subscale?

As presented in Table 23, the mean score of the children ($M_c=14.46$) tended to be higher than that of the mothers ($M_m=13.79$), but it was not significantly different than mothers ($t=-1.752$); the mean score of the children ($M_c=13.45$) was not significantly different from that of the fathers ($M_f=12.93$) ($t=-1.592$), while the mean score of the mothers ($M_m=13.79$) was significantly different from and higher than that of the fathers ($M_f=12.93$) ($t=3.070$; $p<.005$). These results indicated that the children and parents see eye-to-eye in terms of undifferentiated rejection, while the mothers found themselves a little more rejecting than the fathers did.

Table 23. Paired Samples Tests for the Undifferentiated Rejection Subscale

	t	df	p
Pair 1 (children/mothers)	-1.752	184	ns
Pair 2 (children/fathers)	-1.592	184	ns
Pair 3 (mothers/fathers)	3.070	184	.005

5a- Is the child's perceived undifferentiated rejection congruent with the reported mother undifferentiated rejection, as assessed by the PARQ undifferentiated rejection subscale?

As seen in Table 24, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique indicated a coefficient of .22 between the children's perceived undifferentiated rejection and the reported mother undifferentiated rejection that was significant at the .005 level ($r=.22$; $p<.005$). The perceptions of the children and the mothers were congruent but only in low levels on the undifferentiated rejection subscale.

5b- Is the child's perceived undifferentiated rejection congruent with the reported father undifferentiated rejection, as assessed by the PARQ undifferentiated rejection subscale?

The same technique yielded a correlation coefficient of .24 between the children's perceived undifferentiated rejection and the reported father's undifferentiated rejection; that was significant at the level of .005 ($r=.24$; $p<.005$) as displayed in Table 24. The children's and fathers' perceptions on the undifferentiated rejection subscale were congruent at low levels.

5c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of the self-reported undifferentiated rejection of mothers and fathers, as assessed by the PARQ undifferentiated rejection subscale?

As seen in Table 24, the correlation coefficient was .32 between the perceptions of the self-reported undifferentiated rejection of mothers and fathers; that was significant at the level of .001 ($r=.32$; $p<.001$), indicating that the perceptions of the mothers and fathers were congruent at low levels.

Table 24. Congruence of the Mothers', Fathers' and Children's Scores on the Undifferentiated Rejection Subscale

Undifferentiated Rejection	Parent(M) PARQ	Parent(F) PARQ	ChildPARQ: Mother	ChildPARQ: Father
Parent(M) PARQ	1	.319****	.220***	
Parent(F) PARQ		1		.244***
ChildPARQ: Mother			1	
ChildPARQ: Father				1

****Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).

*** Correlation is significant at the .005 level (2-tailed).

6) Are there differences between the perceptions of mothers and children; fathers and children; and mothers and fathers on control, as assessed by the control scale?

The mean score of the children ($M_m=38.48$) was significantly different from and less than that of the mothers ($M_m=40.71$) ($t=5.206$; $p<.001$); the mean score of the children ($M_c=37.64$) was significantly different from and higher than that of the fathers ($M_f=34.91$) ($t=-5.557$; $p<.001$); and the mean score of the mothers ($M_m=40.71$) was significantly different from and higher than that of the fathers

($M_f=34.91$) ($t=14.598$; $p<.001$), as displayed in Table 25. These results suggested that the children tended to perceive their fathers as being more controlling than what the fathers reported for themselves, while the opposite was true in terms of their mothers. The children perceived their mothers as being less controlling than how the mothers reported themselves to be. The mothers reported having higher controlling behaviors over their children than that reported by the fathers.

Table 25. Paired Samples Tests for the Control Scale

	t	df	p
Pair 1 (children/mothers)	-5.206	184	.001
Pair 2 (children/fathers)	-5.557	184	.001
Pair 3 (mothers/fathers)	14.598	184	.001

6a- Is the child's perceived control congruent with the reported mother control, as assessed by the control scale?

As presented in Table 26, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique indicated a coefficient of .41 between the children's perceived control and the reported mother control that was significant at the .001 level ($r=.41$; $p<.001$) on the control subscale. The perceptions of the children and mothers correlated moderately.

6b- Is the child's perceived control congruent with the reported father control, as assessed by the control scale?

The same technique yielded a correlation coefficient of .20 between the children's perceived control and the reported father control that was significant at the level of

.01 ($r=.20$; $p<.01$) as seen in Table 26. The perceptions of the children and fathers were congruent, but only at low levels.

6c- Is there a correlation between the perceptions of the self-reported control of the mothers and fathers, as assessed by the control scale?

As displayed in Table 26, the correlation coefficient was .24 between the perceptions of self-reported control of the mothers and fathers that was significant at the level of .005 ($r=.24$; $p<.005$), suggesting that the perceptions of the mothers and fathers were congruent at low levels.

Table 26. Congruence of the Mothers', Fathers' and Children's Scores on the Control Scale

	Parent(M)	Parent(F)	Child: Mother	Child: Father
Control Parent(M)	1	.242***	.406****	
Parent(F)		1		.198**
Child: Mother			1	
Child: Father				1

****Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).

*** Correlation is significant at the .005 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

7) Are there differences between the self-perceived psychological adjustments of children (as assessed by the Child PAQ) and the perceived psychological adjustment of the children by parents (as assessed by Parent PAQ)?

The mean score of the children was significantly different from and higher than that of the mothers on the subscales of negative self-esteem ($M_c=10.33$, $M_m=9.38$) ($t=-3.787$; $p<.001$); the negative self-adequacy ($M_c=10.89$, $M_m=9.96$) ($t=-3.307$;

$p < .005$); the emotional unresponsiveness ($M_c = 11.62$, $M_m = 10.93$) ($t = -2.290$; $p < .05$); the negative worldview ($M_c = 11.29$, $M_m = 9.31$) ($t = -6.462$; $p < .001$) subscales; and the PAQ total ($M_c = 89.59$, $M_m = 86.64$) ($t = -2.326$; $p < .05$), while the mean score of the children was significantly different from and less than that of the mothers on the subscale of dependency ($M_c = 17.75$, $M_m = 19.55$) ($t = 7.272$; $p < .001$). On the other hand, the mean score of the children was not significantly different from that of the mothers on the subscales of hostility/aggression ($M_c = 11.58$, $M_m = 11.40$) and emotional instability ($M_c = 16.14$, $M_m = 16.11$) (see Table 27).

Table 27. Paired Samples Tests for the PAQ Child and the PAQ Parent (Mother)

	t	df	p
Hostility/aggression	-.589	184	ns
Dependency	7.272	184	.001
Negative self-esteem	-3.787	184	.001
Negative self-adequacy	-3.307	184	.005
Emotional unresponsiveness	-2.290	184	.05
Emotional instability	-.076	184	ns
Negative worldview	-6.462	184	.001
PAQ Total	-2.326	184	.05

For the fathers, the findings revealed that the mean score of the children was significantly different from and higher than that of the fathers on the subscales of negative self-esteem ($M_c = 10.33$, $M_f = 9.78$) ($t = -2.001$; $p < .05$); negative self-adequacy ($M_c = 10.89$, $M_f = 9.98$) ($t = -3.095$; $p < .005$); negative worldview ($M_c = 11.29$, $M_f = 9.00$) ($t = -7.023$; $p < .001$); and the PAQ total ($M_c = 89.59$, $M_f = 86.18$) ($t = -2.640$; $p < .01$), while the mean score of the children was significantly different from and less than that of the fathers on the subscale of dependency ($M_c = 17.75$, $M_f = 19.19$) ($t = 5.376$; $p < .001$). On the other hand, the mean score of the children was not significantly different from that of the fathers on the subscales of hostility/aggression, emotional

unresponsiveness (Mc=11.62, Mf=11.32) and emotional instability (Mc=16.14, Mf=15.59) (see Table 28).

Table 28. Paired Samples Tests for the Child PAQ and the Parent PAQ (Father)

	t	df	p
Hostility/aggression	-.763	184	ns
Dependency	5.376	184	.001
Negative self-esteem	-2.001	184	.05
Negative self-adequacy	-3.095	184	.005
Emotional unresponsiveness	-1.011	184	ns
Emotional instability	-1.763	184	ns
Negative worldview	-7.023	184	.001
PAQ Total	-2.640	184	.01

As examined by the Paired Samples Statistics, the mean score of the mothers was significantly different from and higher than that of the fathers on the subscale of emotional instability (Mm=16.11, Mf=15.59) ($t=2.031$; $p<.05$). The mean scores of the mothers and fathers were not significantly different on the subscales of; dependency (Mm=19.55, Mf=19.19); negative self-esteem (Mm=9.38, Mf=9.78); hostility/aggression (Mm=11.40, Mf=11.33); negative self-adequacy (Mm=9.96, Mf=9.98); emotional unresponsiveness (Mm=10.93, Mf=11.32); negative worldview (Mm=9.31, Mf=9.0); and the total PAQ (Mm=86.64, Mf=86.19) (See Table 29).

Table 29. Paired Samples Tests for the Mothers' and Fathers' Scores on the PAQ

	t	df	p
Hostility/aggression	.265	184	ns
Dependency	1.735	184	ns
Negative self-esteem	-1.905	184	ns
Negative self-adequacy	-.064	184	ns
Emotional unresponsiveness	-1.560	184	ns
Emotional instability	2.031	184	.05

Table 29. continued.

	t	df	p
Negative worldview	1.420	184	ns
PAQ Total	.489	184	ns

7a- Is the self-perceived psychological adjustment of the child (as assessed by the Child PAQ) congruent with the psychological adjustment of the child perceived by the mother, as assessed by the Parent PAQ?

As presented in Table 30, the coefficient of .29 between the children’s perceived psychological adjustment and the perceived psychological adjustment of the children by the mothers was significant at the .001 level ($r=.29$; $p<.001$), as analyzed by the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique.

Table 30. Congruence of the Mothers’ and Children’s Scores on the Psychological Adjustment Questionnaire

	Parent(M) PAQ:child	ChildPAQ
Parent(M) PAQ:child	1	.286****
ChildPAQ		1

****Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).

7b- Is the self-perceived psychological adjustment of the child (as assessed by the Child PAQ) congruent with the psychological adjustment of the child perceived by the father, as assessed by the Parent PAQ?

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique indicated that the correlation of .23 between the children’s perceived psychological adjustment and the perceived

psychological adjustment of the children by the fathers was significant at the .005 level ($r=.23$; $p<.005$) (see Table 31).

Table 31. Congruence of the Fathers' and Children's Scores on the Psychological Adjustment Questionnaire

	Parent(F) PAQ:child	ChildPAQ
Parent(F) PAQ:child	1	.233***
ChildPAQ		1

*** Correlation is significant at the .005 level (2-tailed).

7c- Is the psychological adjustment of the child perceived by the mother and father, as assessed by the Parent PAQ congruent with each other?

The correlation coefficient of .52 between the perceived psychological adjustment of the children by the mothers and fathers was significant at the .001 level ($r=.52$; $p<.001$) as the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique was indicated. (see Table 32).

Table 32. Congruence of the Mothers' and Fathers' Scores on the Psychological Adjustment Questionnaire

	Parent(M) PAQ:child	Parent(F) PAQ:child
Parent(M) PAQ:child	1	.517**
Parent(F) PAQ:child		1

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

8) Are there differences between the perceptions of the mothers and children; and fathers and children on acceptance, as assessed by the PARQ in loving versus less than loving families?

The concepts of loving and less than loving families were operationalized in terms of the children's reports of maternal acceptance-rejection. The children who scored between 60-124 on the Child PARQ were grouped in the loving category, whereas the children who scored between 125-240 on the Child PARQ were grouped in the less than loving category (Rohner et. al., 2005; Khaleque et. al., 2006).

When the child population was grouped as loving and less than loving by the cutpoint scores, the findings indicated that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the mothers (Mm=80.90) and the children (Mc=81.10) in the loving families, indicating that Turkish mothers and children in loving families tended to agree on the level of the mothers' acceptance. On the other hand, in the less than loving families, there was a quite large and significant difference ($t=8.427$, $p<.001$) between the reports of the mothers (Mm=85.95) and the children (Mc=150.73) suggesting that mothers tended to report increasing acceptance, whereas their children reported decreasing acceptance (see Table 33).

Table 33. Level of Agreement between the Children's and Mothers' Perceptions of Maternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the Cutpoint Scores

	Child PARQ			Mother PARQ		t	p
	N	M	Sd	M	Sd		
Loving	174	81.10	14.55	80.90	12.97	.138	ns
Less than loving	11	150.73	22.15	85.95	12.61	8.427	<.001

The findings for the fathers in the responses of the children according to the cutpoint scores, revealed that, there were significant differences in the children's versus the fathers' reports on the paternal acceptance-rejection both in loving ($t=-12.480$, $p<.001$) and less than loving families ($t=5.873$, $p<.001$) as seen in Table 34. The

findings suggested that the children and their fathers disagreed on parental acceptance in both kinds of families. However, the disagreement between the fathers and children was different in loving and less than loving families. The children perceived their fathers as being more accepting than how the fathers reported about themselves in the former one, whereas the children perceived their fathers as being less accepting than how the fathers reported themselves to be in the latter one.

Table 34. Level of Agreement between the Children's and Fathers' Perceptions of the Paternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the Cutpoint Scores

	Child PARQ			Father PARQ		t	p
	N	M	Sd	M	Sd		
Loving	174	80.96	15.18	99.37	12.17	-12.480	<.001
Less than loving	11	140.50	11.68	108.77	13.59	5.873	<.001

Due to the small sample size of less than loving families, the groups were also categorized in terms of the highest twentyfive percent and the lowest twentyfive percent of the child population in terms of their assessment of their mothers and fathers. Thus, both the loving and less than loving groups were nearly equally represented in the analysis.

When the highest twenty-five percent as well as the lowest twenty-five percent of the child sample population was taken into consideration in order to categorize the groups, the findings revealed that there were significant differences between the mean scores of the mothers and the children both in the loving ($t=-6.272$, $p<.001$) and less than loving families ($t=7.737$, $p<.001$), suggesting that there was no agreement between the perceptions of the mothers and the children (see Table 35). The disagreement between the mothers and the children appeared in opposite

ways for loving and less than loving families. The children perceived their mothers as being more accepting than what the mothers reported about themselves in the former one, whereas they perceived their mothers as being less accepting than what the mothers themselves reported in the latter one.

Table 35. Level of Agreement between the Children's and Mothers' Perceptions of Maternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the top and bottom 25 %

	Child PARQ			Mother PARQ		t	p
	N	M	Sd	M	Sd		
Loving	46	65.87	2.84	78.04	12.85	-6.272	<.001
Less than loving	46	115.56	24.15	85.08	11.44	7.737	<.001

The findings of the fathers by the children revealed that, in both of the groups, there were significant differences in the children's versus the fathers' reports on the paternal acceptance-rejection, especially in loving families. The disagreement between the fathers and children appeared in different ways for loving and less than loving families. Although the fathers reported themselves as being more rejecting than what their children reported in loving families ($t = -17.993$, $p < .001$), they rated themselves as being more accepting than what their children reported in less than loving families ($t = 3.185$, $p < .005$) (see Table 36).

Table 36. Level of Agreement between the Children's and Fathers' Perceptions of the Paternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the top and bottom 25 %

	Child PARQ			Father PARQ		t	p
	N	M	Sd	M	Sd		
Loving	53	66.37	3.02	95.32	11.32	-17.993	<.001
Less than loving	48	113.45	17.23	103.97	11.32	3.185	<.005

8a- Is there a congruence between the perceptions of the children and mothers on parental acceptance, as assessed by the PARQ in loving versus less than loving families?

When the child population was grouped as loving and less than loving by the cutpoint scores, the findings indicated that there was a low correlation between the children's and mothers' reports of maternal acceptance in the former group ($r=.19$, $p<.05$), whereas there was no significant correlation in the latter one, as displayed in Table 37. To put it in other words, in the loving families, there was a congruence between the perceptions of the mothers and children; there were no congruencies in the less than loving families.

Table 37. Congruence of the Children's and Mothers' Perceptions of Maternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the Cutpoint Scores

	Child PARQ			Mother PARQ		r	p
	N	M	Sd	M	Sd		
Loving	174	81.10	14.55	80.90	12.97	.19	<.05
Less than loving	11	150.73	22.15	85.95	12.61	-.18	ns

When the highest twenty-five percent as well as the lowest twenty-five percent of the sample population were taken into consideration to categorize the groups, the findings revealed that there was no correlation between the children's and mothers' reports of maternal acceptance in both of the groups as presented in Table 38.

Table 38. Congruence of the Children's and Mothers' Perceptions of Maternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the top and bottom 25 %

	Child PARQ			Mother PARQ		r	p
	N	M	Sd	M	Sd		
Loving	46	65.87	2.84	78.04	12.85	.18	ns
Less than loving	46	115.56	24.15	85.08	11.44	-.009	ns

8b- Is there a congruence between the perceptions of the children and fathers on parental acceptance, as assessed by the PARQ in loving versus less than loving families?

When the child population was grouped as loving and less than loving by the cutpoint scores, the findings showed that the correlation between the fathers' and children's reports on paternal acceptance was low in the loving families ($r=.28$, $p<.001$), and it was moderate in levels for less than loving families ($r=.60$, $p<.001$) as seen in Table 39.

Table 39. Congruence of the Children's and Fathers' Perceptions of Paternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the Cutpoint Scores

	Child PARQ			Father PARQ		r	p
	N	M	Sd	M	Sd		
Loving	174	80.96	15.18	99.37	12.17	.28	<.001
Less than loving	11	140.50	11.68	108.77	13.59	.60	<.001

When the highest twenty-five percent as well as the lowest twenty-five percent of the sample population were taken into consideration to categorize the groups, the findings revealed that the correlation between the fathers' and children's reports on

paternal acceptance were insignificant in the loving families, whereas it was moderate in levels for the less than loving families ($r=.33$, $p<.05$), as displayed in Table 40.

Table 40. Congruence of the Children's and Fathers' Perceptions of Paternal Acceptance in Loving versus Less than Loving Families according to the top and bottom 25 %

	Child PARQ			Father PARQ		r	p
	N	M	Sd	M	Sd		
Loving	53	66.37	3.02	95.32	11.32	.15	ns
Less than loving	48	113.45	17.23	103.97	11.32	.33	<.05

9) What is the relationship between the perceived parental acceptance, control, and psychological adjustment by the children?

9a- What is the relationship between the perceived maternal acceptance, maternal control and perceived psychological adjustment as assessed by the children?

The perception of maternal rejection correlated significantly with poor psychological adjustment as assessed by the PAQ ($r=.41$, $p<.01$), indicating that children who perceived higher rejection reported poorer psychological adjustment for themselves.

The perception of the maternal control correlated significantly with the negative psychological adjustment as assessed by the PAQ ($r=.33$, $p<.01$), suggesting that the higher control was perceived from mothers the poorer adjustment the children reported for themselves. Also, the perception of maternal rejection correlated significantly with maternal control, but only at low levels ($r=.26$, $p<.01$) (see Table 41).

9b- What is the relationship between the perceived paternal acceptance, paternal control and perceived psychological adjustment as assessed by the children?

The perception of paternal rejection significantly correlated with negative psychological adjustment as assessed by PAQ ($r=.36, p<.01$), indicating that when the children perceived paternal rejection, they experienced less psychological adjustment. The perception of paternal control correlated significantly, but at a low level with negative psychological adjustment as assessed by the PAQ ($r=.28, p<.01$). The children perceived themselves as being less psychologically adjusted if they assessed their fathers as being rejecting. The findings revealed that the perception of the paternal acceptance was not correlated with paternal control (see Table 41).

9c- What is the relationship between the perceived maternal acceptance and paternal acceptance as well as maternal control and paternal control, as assessed by the children?

The perceptions of the children of maternal and paternal acceptance were moderately correlated ($r=.64, p<.01$), indicating that when the children perceive their mothers as being accepting, they also tended to perceive their fathers as being accepting. The correlation between the perceptions of the children on the maternal and paternal control was moderate ($r=.67, p<.01$), suggesting that the children perceived control from their mothers as well as their fathers in similar ways (see Table 41).

Table 41. Correlations between the Childrens' Perceptions of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Control and Psychological Adjustment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ChildPARQ:Mother					
Control (1)	1		.667**		.332**
ChildPARQ:Mother					
(2)		1		.639**	.413**
ChildPARQ:Father					
Control (3)			1		.276**
ChildPARQ:Father					
(4)				1	.362**
Child PAQ Total					
(5)					1

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The results of the current study revealed that the mean scores of the children for perceived maternal and paternal acceptance were in the normal range, inferring that children experience much more maternal and paternal love than rejection in Turkey. The findings are supported by other studies conducted in Turkey (Çetin, 2005; Erkman & Rohner, 2006; Erkman & Varan, 2004; Yener, 2005). In addition, worldwide studies on parental acceptance and rejection indicated the same result, that children experience more maternal and paternal acceptance than rejection in general (Cournoyer et. al., 2005; Khaleque, et. al., 2006; Kim, 2005; Kim and Rohner, 2002; Lila, et. al., 2007; Rohner, et. al., 1996; Rohner, et. al., 2005; Veneziano & Rohner, 1998). Thus, the findings of this study strongly support the suggestion of the PARTheory that children everywhere experience much more maternal and paternal acceptance than rejection regardless of the culture (Rohner, et. al., 2005).

In the current study, the mean scores for parental rejection were lower than the previous studies conducted worldwide in this area. This finding could be explained by the Turkish family structure. According to Kağıtçıbaşı (1996), the Turkish culture can be seen as a culture of relatedness suggesting that it is a collectivistic culture rather than an individualistic one. In collectivistic cultures, the interests of the family are more important than its members. Also, these cultures are characterized by strong loyalty between family members and intra-family harmony (Sunar & Fişek, 2005). Vardar (1994) stated that warmth with signs of love rather than rejection underline the Turkish family structure. In addition, the Turkish family

favors emotional closeness and support for its members. On the basis of this evidence, it can be concluded that Turkish parents tend to be perceived as warm, loving, and supporting (Sunar & Fişek, 2005).

The children perceived moderate levels of control both from their mothers and fathers. This finding was parallel with previous studies on control (Çetin, 2005; Erkman & Varan, 2004; Kim, 2005; Kim & Rohner, 2002; Yener, 2005). However, the early adolescents in the present study tended to perceive their mothers as being more controlling than their fathers. This finding is supported by the Turkish family structure, where there is a tendency for mothers to be more actively involved with the children since their significant role appears to be as caregiver of the children. Hence, being the significant caregiver of the children, the interactions of the mothers with their children are characterized as more controlling than that of those of the fathers (Fişek, 1995).

The children on the average perceived themselves as being psychologically well-adjusted. The findings were consistent with the previous studies conducted on the psychological adjustment of children (Cournoyer, et. al., 2005; Çetin, 2005; Erkman, 2003; Erkman & Rohner, 2006; Erkman & Varan, 2004; Kim, 2005; Lila, et. al., 2007; Rohner, et. al., 1996; Veneziano & Rohner, 1998; Yener, 2005). Similar to their children, both the mothers and fathers reported the perceived psychological adjustment of their children in the normal range, indicating that they perceived their children as being psychologically well-adjusted.

The children received the highest scores on the two subscales of the PAQ; dependency and emotional instability. The reason for getting higher scores on these two subscales could be attributed to the characteristics that underlie the early adolescence period. Early adolescents experience in their emotions (Caissy, 1994),

their feelings could rapidly change depending on their moods.

In addition, during this period children have to face the struggle of attaining their independence by separating themselves from their parents. Being at the beginning of this process, some children might have higher scores on the dependency subscale of the PAQ. It is important to underline that although Turkish society is being transformed from a traditional society to a modern one, Turkish family relations can still be characterized as authoritarian and patriarchal, which supports dependence rather than the independence of children (Sunar and Fişek, 2005).

Both the mothers' and fathers' scores on parental acceptance were in the loving range, showing that mothers and fathers tended to perceive themselves as accepting rather than rejecting. The results were consistent with the previous studies (Anjel, 1993; Erkan & Toran, 2004; Erkman, 2004; Kim, 2005; Lila, et. al., 2007; Veneziano & Rohner, 1998). This finding could be explained by the characteristics of the Turkish family, emotional closeness, and support for its members (Sunar & Fişek, 2005). However, mothers tended to report themselves as being more accepting than how the fathers reported themselves to be. Sunar (2002) suggested that as the children grow, the relationships with their fathers are marked with authority and respect. During the adolescence period, the children start to develop a distance from their fathers in terms of interaction. Fathers tend to maintain the distance from their children in order to support their superior and authoritarian position in the family (Sunar, 2002). Since fathers have less interaction with their children, they might perceive themselves as being less accepting than the mothers.

Fathers also reported themselves as being moderately controlling, whereas the mothers reported themselves as being firmly controlling. The findings were congruent with the previous study conducted by Kim (2005) in Korea, where the

culture can be considered a collectivistic culture, similar to Turkey's. A possible reason for this finding is supported by the fact that, as Fişek (1991) suggested, in Turkish families, mothers' interactions with their children are characterized by control more than the fathers' interactions. Because of the fathers' limited interactions with their children (Sunar & Fişek, 2005), mothers were playing a crucial role by providing a communication bridge between their children and the fathers. Thus the mothers appeared to be more controlling than the fathers.

One of the most significant findings of the current study was that children perceived their fathers in a more positive way than they for their mothers. They reported their fathers as being less hostile, less indifferent and more accepting than how their fathers reported themselves to be. On the other hand, the children perceived more rejection and less warmth overall, differently from what their mothers claimed. The findings of the current study are supported by the previous research (Erkman, 2003; Erkman & Rohner, 2006; Kim, 2005; Khaleque et. al., 2006; Lila, et. al., 2007; Rohner et. al., 1996; Rohner et. al., 2005).

As Sunar and Fişek (2005) claimed, mothers are the major caregivers for children in Turkey; they spend much more time with the children than the fathers do. Intimate relations with the mothers might cause children to expect much more from their mothers. In other words, they might criticize or even reject their mothers more easily if the children's expectations are not met by them. On the other hand, because of their distant relationships with their fathers, the children might not expect much from them. The children's expectation levels from their mothers could be higher than those of their fathers. The same reason could extend to the finding that mothers perceived themselves as being more accepting and warmer than the fathers did with regard to themselves.

Moreover, the results suggested that the children tended to perceive their fathers as being more controlling, compared to what the fathers reported of themselves. The opposite was true in terms of their mothers. The children perceived their mothers as being less controlling than how the mothers reported themselves report to be. The mothers reported having higher control over their children, compared to what the fathers reported. Sunar and Fişek (2005) suggested that in Turkish families, mothers are the main caregivers for their children and use more control in their interactions with the children. On the other hand, fathers have a certain distance from their children in order to hold on to their superior position (Sunar & Fişek, 2005). This fact could be the possible reason for mothers reporting themselves as being more controlling from the fathers and their children.

Another major finding of the present study was that there were low levels of agreement between the children's and mothers', as well as the children's and fathers' reports. In the related literature exploring the relative level of agreement or disagreement between the mothers' and children's as well as fathers' and children's perceptions, it was found that the agreement level was only in low levels. Thus, it can be concluded that the findings of the current study parallel the previous studies (Aquilino, 1999; Demo, et. al., 1987; Phares, et. al., 1989; Schwarz, et. al., 1985; Tein, et. al., 1994). The mother-child and father-child agreements on reports of parental behaviors were found to be low in the previous studies. Moreover, the most recent studies about the agreement between mothers and children which were conducted by Khaleque, et. al. (2006) and Rohner, et. al. (2005) also supported the findings of the current study.

The reason for this low agreement between children and parents could be attributed to the characteristics of early adolescence. Early adolescence is a unique and special period in humans' lives since it is a transition period, which is characterized by the end of an individual's childhood years and the beginning of youth. In this period adolescents have to face the struggle of separating themselves from their parents (Caissy, 1994). Hence, the perceptions of early adolescents and their parents differ.

The present study also explored the levels of agreement and disagreement by categorizing data as loving and less than loving families. The concepts of loving and less than loving families were operationalized in terms of the children's reports of maternal acceptance-rejection. The children who scored between 60-124 on the Child PARQ were grouped into the loving category, whereas children who scored between 125-240 on the Child PARQ were grouped into the less than loving category (Khaleque, et. al., 2006; Rohner, et. al., 2005).

The findings showed that Turkish mothers and children tended to agree on the level of the mothers' acceptance in the loving families. These results were consistent with the study of Khaleque, et. al. (2006), which also indicated that Bangladeshi and Bangladeshi immigrant children tended to report maternal acceptance at about the same degree as did mothers in loving families. On the other hand, in less than loving families, the mothers tended to report increasing acceptance as their children reported decreasing acceptance. The findings were similar to the studies of Khaleque, et. al. (2006) and Rohner, et. al. (2005). In less than loving families, the children reported significantly higher scores for maternal acceptance than what their mothers reported. The findings revealed that in an overall loving mother-child

relationships the children perceived their mothers as being more accepting than the mothers reported themselves to be, whereas in the less than loving or rejecting mother-child relationships the children perceived their mothers as being more rejecting than the mothers reported themselves to be.

Besides, the findings of the children for their fathers revealed that Turkish children and their fathers disagreed on the parental acceptance, both in loving and less than loving families. However, the disagreements between fathers and children were differing in the loving and less than loving families. The children perceived their fathers as being more accepting than how the fathers reported themselves to be in the loving one, whereas they perceived their fathers as being less accepting than how the fathers reported themselves to be in the less than loving ones. In other words, in an overall loving father-child relationship, the children perceived their fathers as being more accepting than the fathers reported themselves to be. In less than loving or rejecting father-child relationships, the children perceived their fathers as being more rejecting than the fathers reported themselves to be.

Due to the small sample size of less than loving families according to the set criteria, another criterion was used to categorize loving and less than loving groups. The groups were categorized in terms of the highest twenty-five percent and the lowest twenty-five percent of the child population assessing their mothers and fathers. Thus, both of the loving and less than loving groups were nearly equally represented in this particular analysis.

The findings of the highest twenty-five percent as well as the lowest twenty-five percent of the child participants revealed that there was no agreement between the perceptions of the mothers and children in both the loving and less than loving families. The disagreement between the mothers and children appeared in the

opposite ways for loving and less than loving families. This finding was congruent with the findings of Khaleque, et. al. (2006) and Rohner, et. al. (2005). The authors suggested that the children perceived their mothers as being more accepting than the mothers reported themselves to be in the loving families, whereas they perceived their mothers as being less accepting than the mothers reported themselves to be in the less than loving families for the Bangladeshi immigrants and the Finnish group.

The findings of the fathers according to the responses of the children revealed that there was a disagreement between the fathers' and the children's reports. Although the fathers reported themselves as being more rejecting than what their children reported in loving families, they rated themselves more accepting than what their children reported in less than loving families.

Another significant finding of the current study showed that children perceived themselves as being less psychologically adjusted than what their mothers and fathers perceived. The children tended to perceive themselves as being more negative regarding self-esteem, self-adequacy, worldview, and less psychologically adjusted, compared to what their mothers and fathers perceived in general. The children's, their mothers', as well as their fathers' perceptions did not differ on hostility and emotional instability. Overall, the perceptions of the mothers and children, as well as those of the fathers and children correlated, but at low levels on the perceived psychological adjustment of the children. In addition, the perceptions of the mothers and fathers were congruent at a modest level.

Finally, the relationship between parental acceptance, control and psychological adjustment by the children was assessed in the current study. The perceptions of the maternal rejection and paternal rejection correlated significantly, and at moderate levels, with the negative psychological adjustment as assessed by the

PAQ. This finding was consistent with the previous studies that were conducted by Çetin (2005); Erkman & Rohner (2006); and Yener (2005). In addition, Erkman (2003) and Erkman & Varan (2004) reported a significant correlation between the perceptions of the maternal and paternal rejection and psychological adjustment of the children, but only at low levels. This finding supported the suggestion of the PARTheory, that when the children perceive more maternal and paternal rejection from their parents, they tend to develop negative psychological adjustment (Khaleque, 2002; Khaleque & Rohner, 2002; Rohner, 2004; Rohner & Britner, 2002; Rohner, et. al., 2005).

Moreover, the congruence between maternal control, as well as paternal control and the psychological adjustment of the children was examined in the present study. The perception of the maternal control as well as paternal control correlated significantly, but only in low levels with the negative psychological adjustment as assessed by the PAQ. These findings were consistent with the previous study's results that were reported by Erkman (2003) and Erkman & Varan (2004). The correlations of parental control and psychological adjustment were higher than the previous ones, indicating that the more the children perceived control by their parents, the less they perceived themselves as being psychologically adjusted. In the Turkish culture, control is a norm and it does not connote lack of love as it does in individualistic cultures. However, as Sunar & Fişek (2005) claimed, Turkish culture is being transformed from a collectivistic to an individualistic one. Hence, this trend could account for the higher correlations between the parental control and psychological maladjustment of the children in the present study.

The relations between maternal and paternal acceptance, as well as maternal and paternal control was moderate, indicating that the children perceived their

mothers and fathers in similar ways regarding acceptance, as well as control in similar ways. According to Tein, et. al. (1994) children tend to attribute the characteristics of one parent to another. The authors' claim was supported by the current study.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the aim of the study, the review of the findings according to the research questions, the implications of the study, and the limitations and recommendations of the study are presented.

Purpose of the Study

One purpose of this study was to find out the reliability of the Parent PAQ to assess parents' perceptions of their children's psychological adjustment, and thereby to find out the congruence between parents' and adolescents' perceptions on the self-perceived psychological adjustment of the child. A second purpose was to find out the level of agreement (congruence) or disagreement (incongruence) among the perceptions of the mothers and fathers; the mothers and children; and the fathers and children on the four dimensions of parental acceptance-rejection as well as the perceived control. Finally, the purpose was to find out the level of agreement (congruence) or disagreement (incongruence) between the perceptions of the mothers and children; and the fathers and children in loving families versus less than loving families.

The participants of the current study consisted of 185 mother/father/children triads. Students from sixth and seventh grades from ten public secondary level schools and their parents, who were representative of middle socioeconomic status families composed the participants of the present study.

Review of the Findings

The research questions one to six addressed the levels of agreement for the reported mother, father and children acceptance as assessed by the PARQ/C.

Overall, the children as well as their mothers and fathers perceived more acceptance than rejection. However, the findings revealed that the children perceived their fathers more favorably than their mothers. They perceived their mothers as being less accepting, whereas the children perceived their fathers as being more accepting than reported by both parents. Moreover, the children experienced moderate levels of control by their mothers and fathers. However, the children perceived less control from their mothers and more control from their fathers, compared to what the parents themselves reported. The perceptions of the children and mothers, the children and fathers, and the mothers and fathers were congruent only at low levels for parental acceptance.

The mothers, as well as the fathers, perceived their children as being more dependent than their children perceived for themselves. On the other hand, the children perceived themselves as being more negative regarding self-esteem, self-adequacy, worldview, and less psychologically adjusted, than what their mothers and fathers perceived. The children and their mothers, along with their fathers, did not differ on hostility and emotional instability. There were low levels of congruence between the reports of the mothers and children and the reports of the fathers and children, while it was at moderate levels between the mothers' and fathers' reports.

When the families were categorized as loving and less than loving, the findings revealed that in an overall loving mother-child relationship the children perceived their mothers as being more accepting than the mothers reported for

themselves. On the other hand, in the less than loving or rejecting mother-child relationships, the children perceived their mothers as being more rejecting than the mothers reported themselves to be. Similarly, the findings of the fathers by the children revealed that, in an overall loving father-child relationship, the children perceived their fathers as being more accepting than the fathers reported themselves to be, whereas in the less than loving or rejecting father-child relationships, the children perceived their fathers as being more rejecting than the fathers reported themselves to be.

Another finding of the study was that as the children perceived more maternal and paternal rejection, as well as more maternal and paternal control from their parents, they also reported poorer psychological adjustment. It is also important to note that as the children perceived their mothers as being accepting and controlling, they also perceived their fathers as being accepting and controlling.

To sum up, the findings support the PARTheory that children cross-culturally experience more parental acceptance than rejection (Rohner, et. al., 2005). However, in Turkey, the children perceived their fathers more favorably than they did their mothers. They perceived their mothers as being less accepting, whereas they perceived their fathers as being more accepting than what both parents reported.

Implications of the Study

For the current study, to assess the parents' perceptions of their children's psychological adjustment and to thereby find out the congruence between the parents' and children's perceptions on the psychological adjustment, the parent version of the Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ) form was developed by

the present researcher. The items of the child version of the PAQ were reconstructed with some minor wording changes. A pilot study was conducted by the researcher for the reliability study of the parent version of the PAQ. The findings of this pilot study revealed that the Parent PAQ is a reliable instrument. Hence, this instrument could be used for the assessment of the psychological adjustment of children as perceived by the parents.

The limitations of previous studies in terms of only studying mother-child dyads were countered in the present research by assessing the perceptions of both parents, mothers and fathers, and the children living in the same household. By having the responses of multiple family members, mothers, fathers, and children, a more representative view of family life could be obtained (Lila, et. al., 2007; Noller & Callan, 1988).

The main significance of the current study was to be the first to include the fathers' reports examining the congruence between the children's perceptions and those of their parents (mothers and fathers collectively), concerning their perceived parental acceptance and psychological adjustments. The incongruence of the mothers' and children's as well as fathers' and children's perceptions of parental acceptance was identified by the PARQ and PAQ questionnaires. In light of the current study, the counselors can use the questionnaire in order to identify the level of congruence or incongruence between parents and children, so that they can develop prevention-based counseling for the parents as well as for the children. In addition, the results of the questionnaires could be used in individual counseling to assess whether or not there are discrepancies between family members.

As parent-child agreement is seen as an essential variable for effective parenting (Tein, Roosa and Michaels, 1994), it is important to draw the conclusions

for developing effective parent training programs, prevention-based counseling and family therapies for the families.

Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research

A limitation of the present study has to do with the process of the sample selection. Since it is based on volunteer participation, the number of students was not equal between schools. In one of the schools only two families participated, whereas in another school fifty-five families participated in the study.

The current study focused on a specific age group, the early adolescence period, so the results can only be discussed in relation to this age group. It is recommended for further research to study different age groups in order to generalize the results.

Also, the present study focused on middle socio-economic status families. The studies with low socio-economic as well as high socio-economic families will be helpful to generalize the results.

One of the limitations of the study in terms of the results is that it is not possible to draw causal inferences about relations among the perceived acceptance and psychological adjustment of the children. Further research exploring causal relations is recommended.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PARENT INFORMATION FORM
(PIF)

AİLE BİLGİ FORMU

ANNE _____

BABA _____

1) Yaşınız:

2) Eğitim Durumunuz:

a) Okur-Yazar

b) İlkokul

c) Ortaokul

d) Lise

e) Üniversite

f) Yüksek Lisans ve Üstü

g) Diğer (belirtiniz)

3) Çalışma Durumunuz:

Çalışmıyor Tam zamanlı Yarı zamanlı Ortalama kaç saat (günlük)

4) Mesleğiniz:

profesyonel işçi serbest emekli memur

diğer (belirtiniz).....

5) Kaç yıllık evlisiniz?

6) Kaç çocuğunuz var? Cinsiyetleri nedir?

7) Formu doldurduğunuz kaçınıcı çocuğunuz? Cinsiyetini belirtiniz

Yaşını belirtiniz

8) Ailenizin gelir durumu:

Düşük () Düşük-Orta () Orta () Yüksek-Orta () Yüksek ()

APPENDIX B

PARENTAL ACCEPTANCE-REJECTION QUESTIONNAIRE/CONTROL
(PARQ/C)

Çocuk/Ergen EKRÖ/K:ANNE

Kod no:

Bu sayfalar annelerin bazen çocuklarına nasıl davrandıklarını anlatan ifadeler içermektedir. Her ifadeyi dikkatle oku ve her cümlelerin annenin sana karşı davranışlarına ne kadar uygun olup olmadığını düşün. Hızlı çalış, ilk aklına gelen düşünceye göre yanıtla ve bir sonraki ifadeye geç. Hiçbir ifade üstünde çok vakit harcama.

Her cümlelerin yanında dört tane kutu var. Eğer ifade, annenin sana davranışı hakkında temelde uygun ise, kendi kendine sor, "Hemen hemen her zaman mı doğru?" yoksa "Bazen mi doğru?". Eğer annenin sana hemen hemen her zaman böyle davrandığını düşünüyorsan, HEMEN HEMEN HER ZAMAN DOĞRU kutusuna, bazen böyle davrandığını düşünüyorsan BAZEN DOĞRU' kutusuna X işareti koy.

Eğer cümle annenin sana karşı davranışını doğru olarak anlatmıyorsa, sana karşı davranışlarına temelde uynuyorsa, o zaman kendi kendine sor, "Nadiren mi doğru?" yoksa "Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman doğru değil mi?". Eğer annen sana nadiren böyle davranıyor ise, "NADİREN DOĞRU" kutusuna, eğer hemen hiçbir zaman böyle davranmıyor ise, "HEMEN HEMEN HİÇBİR ZAMAN" kutusuna X koy.

Unutma. Doğru veya yanlış yanıt yoktur. Onun için mümkün olduğu kadar dürüst ve açık ol.. Cevapların annenden beklediğin davranışlara göre değil, annenin sana gerçekte nasıl davrandığına göre ver.

Örnek: Eğer sen iyi davrandığında sana hemen her zaman sarılıyor ise, o zaman ifadeyi aşağıdaki gibi işaretlemesin

ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU		ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
Hemen hemen her zaman doğru	Bazen doğru	Nadiren doğru	Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman doğru değil

-Annem ben iyi olduğumda bana sarılır.

© Ronald P. Rohner, 1989,1997

Çeviri: M. Anjel, F.Erkman, 1993; A. Varan, 2000

Değişiklikler: F. Erkman, 2002

	ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU		ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Her zaman Doğru	Hemen Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
1) Benim hakkımda güzel şeyler söyler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Kötü davrandığımda bana söylenir veya beni azarlar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Sanki ben hiç yokmuşum gibi davranır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Beni gerçekten sevmez.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) Neleri yapıp neleri yapamayacağımı kesin olarak anladığımdan emin olmak ister.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6) Planlarımız hakkında benimle konuşur ve söyleyeceklerimi dinler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7) Onun sözünü dinlemediğim zaman beni başkalarına şikayet eder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8) Benimle yakından ilgilenir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9) Dışarıya çıkacağım zaman, eve kesin olarak kaçta dönmem gerektiğini bana söyler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10) Arkadaşlarımı eve getirmem için beni cesaretlendirir ve onların güzel vakit geçirmesi için elinden geleni yapar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11) Benimle alay eder ve dalga geçer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12) Onu rahatsız etmediğim sürece benimle ilgilenmez.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13) Kızdığı zaman bana bağırır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14) Bana sürekli olarak nasıl davranmam gerektiğini söyler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU		ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen Her zaman Doğru	Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen Hemen Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
15) Benim için önemli olan şeyleri ona anlatabilmemi kolaylaştırır	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16) Bana karşı sert davranır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17) Onun etrafında olmamdan hoşlanır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18) Birçok kuralın olmasına ve kurallara uyulması gerektiğine inanır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19) Bir şeyi iyi yaptığımda, kendimle gurur duymamı sağlar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20) Hak etmediğim zaman bile bana vurur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21) Benim için yapması gereken şeyleri unuttur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22) Beni büyük bir başbelası olarak görür.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23) Bana dilediğim kadar özgürlük tanır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24) Beni başkalarına över.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25) Kızdığı zaman beni çok kötü cezalandırır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26) Sağlıklı ve doğru şeyleri yememe çok dikkat eder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27) İşimi nasıl yapmam gerektiğini bana en ince ayrıntısına kadar söyler	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28) Benimle sıcak ve sevgi dolu bir şekilde konuşur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29) Bana hemen kızar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU		ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen Her zaman Doğru	Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen Hemen Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
30) Sorularımı cevaplayamayacak kadar meşguldür.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31) Benden hoşlanmıyor gibi.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32) İstedğim her yere, ona sormadan gitmeme izin verir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33) Hak ettiğim zaman bana güzel şeyler söyler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34) Çabuk parlar ve öfkesini benden çıkarır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35) Arkadaşlarımın kim olduğuyla yakından ilgilenir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36) Bana ne söylendiyse, aynen öyle davranmamda ısrar eder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37) Yaptığım şeylerle gerçekten ilgilenir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38) Bana bir sürü kırıncı şey söyler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39) Ondan yardım istediğimde beni duymazlıktan gelir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40) Başım derde girdiğinde, hatanın bende olduğunu düşünür.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41) Dilediğim her akşam dışarı çıkmama izin verir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42) Bana istenilen ve ihtiyaç duyulan biri olduğumu hissettirir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43) Onun sinirine dokunduğumu söyler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44) Bana çok ilgi gösterir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU		ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen	Bazen	Nadiren	Hemen Hemen
	Her zaman Doğru	Doğru	Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
45) Her zaman ne yapacağımı söyleyebilmeyi ister.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
46) İyi davrandığım zaman benimle ne kadar gurur duyduğunu söyler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
47) Beni kırmak için elinden elinden geleni yapar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
48) Hatırlaması gerekir diye düşündüğüm önemli şeyleri unuttur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
49) Şayet kötü davranırsam, beni artık sevmediğini hissettirir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
50) Bana yapmam için bazı işler verir ve o işler bitene kadar başka hiçbir şey yapmama izin vermez.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
51) Bana yaptığım şeylerin önemli olduğunu hissettirir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52) Yanlış bir şey yaptığımda beni korkutur veya tehdit eder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53) Benimle zaman geçirmekten hoşlanır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
54) Canım ne isterse yapmama izin verir	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
55) Korktuğumda yada bir şeye canım sıkıldığında, bana yardım etmeye çalışır	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
56) Kötü davrandığım zaman beni arkadaşlarımla önünde utandırır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
57) Benden uzak durmaya çalışır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU		ANNEM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen Her zaman Doğru	Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen Hemen Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
58) Benden şikayet eder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
59) Yaptığım her şeyi kontrol etmek ister.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
60) Benim ne düşündüğüme önem verir ve düşündüklerim hakkında konuşmamdan hoşlanır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
61) Ne yaparsam yapayım, diğer çocukların benden daha iyi olduğunu hisseder	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
62) Bir plan yaparken benim de ne istediğime önem verir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
63) Benim için önemli olan şeyleri, kendisine zorluk çıkarsa da yapmama izin verir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
64) Diğer çocukların benden daha iyi davrandığını düşünür.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
65) Bakmaları için beni başkalarına bırakır. (Örneğin; bir komşu ya da akrabaya	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
66) Bana istenmediğimi belli eder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
67) Yaptığım şeylerle ilgilenir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
68) Canım yandığında veya hasta olduğumda kendimi daha iyi hissetmem için elinden geleni yapar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
69) Kötü davrandığım zaman benden ne kadar utandığını söyler.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
70) Beni sevdiğini belli eder.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ANNEM İÇİN
DOĞRU

ANNEM İÇİN
DOĞRU DEĞİL

Hemen Hemen

Her zaman
Dođru

Bazen
Dođru

Nadiren
Dođru

Hemen Hemen

Hiçbir Zaman
Dođru Deđil

71) Bana karşı yumuşak ve iyi kalplidir.

72) Kötü davrandığım zaman beni utandırır veya suçlu hissettirir.

73) Beni mutlu etmeye çalışır.

Anne/Baba EKRÖ/K

Kod no:

Çocukla ilişkiniz: Anne ____ Baba ____

İlişikteki sayfalar anne-babaların çocuklarına karşı bazen nasıl davrandıklarını anlatan ifadeler içermektedir. Her ifadeyi dikkatle okuyup, sizin çocuğunuza karşı davranışınıza ne kadar uygun olup olmadığını düşünün. Hızlı çalışın, ilk aklınıza gelen düşünceye göre yanıtlayın ve bir sonraki ifadeye geçin. Hiçbir ifade üstünde çok vakit harcamayın.

Her cümlede yanınızda dört tane kutu var. Eğer ifade, sizin çocuğunuza karşı davranışınız hakkında temelde doğru ise, kendi kendinize sorun; "Hemen hemen her zaman mı doğru?" yoksa "Bazen mi doğru?". Eğer çocuğunuza karşı hemen hemen her zaman böyle davrandığınızı düşünüyorsanız, HEMEN HEMEN HER ZAMAN DOĞRU kutusuna, bazen böyle davrandığınızı düşünüyorsanız BAZEN DOĞRU kutusuna X işareti koyun.

Eğer cümle sizin çocuğunuza karşı davranışınızı doğru olarak anlatmıyorsa, ona karşı davranışlarınıza temelde uynuyorsa, o zaman kendi kendinize sorun, "Nadiren mi doğru?" yoksa "Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman doğru değil mi?". Eğer çocuğunuza karşı nadiren böyle davranıyor iseniz, "NADİREN DOĞRU" kutusuna, eğer hemen hiçbir zaman böyle davranmıyor iseniz, "HEMEN HEMEN HİÇBİR ZAMAN" kutusuna X koyun.

Unutmayın, doğru veya yanlış bir yanıt yoktur. Onun için mümkün olduğu kadar dürüst ve açık olun.. Cevaplarınızı nasıl olmak isteyebileceğinize göre değil, gerçekte nasıl olduğunuzu hissediyorsanız ona göre verin.

Örnek: Eğer çocuğunuz iyi davrandığında ona hemen her zaman sarılıyor ve onu öpüyorsanız, o zaman ifadeyi aşağıdaki gibi işaretlemesiniz.

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

-Çocuğum iyi olduğunda
ona sarılır ve onu öperim.

© Ronald P. Rohner, 1989,1997

Çeviri: M. Anjel, F.Erkman, 1993; A. Varan, 2000

Değişiklikler: F. Erkman, 2002

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen	Hemen	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen
	Her zaman Doğru	Bazen 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 ona söylenir veya onu cezalandırırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Çocuğuma sanki orada hiç 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) Çocuğumun neleri yapıp neleri yapamayacağını kesin olarak bilmesini sağlarım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6) Gündelik genel yapılacakları çocuğum ile konuşur ve söyleyeceklerimi dinlerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7) Çocuğum beni dinlemediği zaman çocuğumu başkalarına şikayet ederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8) Çocuğumla yakından ilgilenirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9) Dışarıya çıkacağı zaman, çocuğuma kesin olarak saat kaçta evde olacağını söylerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10) Arkadaşlarını eve getirmesi için çocuğumu cesaretlendirir ve onların iyi vakit geçirmesi için elimden geleni yaparım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11) Çocuğumla alay ederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12) Beni rahatsız etmediği sürece çocuğumun varlığını bilmezden gelirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13) Kızgın olduğum zaman çocuğuma bağırırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen Her zaman Doğru	Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen Hemen Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
14) Çocuğuma sürekli olarak nasıl davranması gerektiğini söylerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15) Çocuğumun, bana açılabilmesini kolaylaştırırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16) Çocuğuma karşı sertimdir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17) Çocuğumun etrafımda olmasından hoşlanırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18) Birçok kuralın olmasına ve kurallara uyulması gerektiğine inanırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19) Çocuğum bir şeyi iyi yaptığında, kendisi ile gurur duymasını sağlarım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20) Hak etmediği zaman bile çocuğuma vururum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21) Çocuğum için yapmam gereken şeyleri unutturum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22) Çocuğum benim için bir yüküdür.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23) Çocuğuma dilediği kadar özgürlük veririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24) Çocuğumu başkalarına överim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25) Kızgın olduğum zaman çocuğumu cezalandırırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26) Çocuğumun, sağlıklı ve doğru yiyecekleri yemesine çok dikkat ederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27) Çocuğuma işini tam olarak nasıl yapması gerektiğini söylerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen	Hemen	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen
	Her zaman Doğru	Bazen Doğru		Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
28) Çocuğumla şefkat ve sevgi dolu konuşurum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29) Çocuğuma karşı sabırsızım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30) Çocuğumun sorularına cevap veremeyecek kadar meşgulüm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31) Çocuğuma içerliyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32) Çocuğuma, istediği her yere, bana sormadan gitmesine izin veririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33) Çocuğumu hak ettiği zaman överim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34) Çocuğum sinirime dokunur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35) Çocuğumun kimlerle arkadaşlık ettiği ile ilgilenirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36) Çocuğumun, ona ne söylendiyse, aynen öyle davranmasında ısrar ederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37) Çocuğumun hayatındaki olaylarla gerçekten ilgilenirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38) Çocuğumla kırıncı konuşurum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39) Çocuğum yardım istediği zaman anlamazlıktan gelir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40) Çocuğumun başı dertte olduğunda ona karşı anlayışsız davranırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41) Dilediği her akşam çocuğumun dışarı çıkmasına izin veririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42) Çocuğuma istenilen ve ihtiyaç duyulan bir kişi olduğunu hissettiririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Hemen			Hemen Hemen
	Her zaman Doğru	Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
43) Çocuğuma sinirime dokunduğunu söylerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44) Çocuğuma çok ilgi gösteririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45) Çocuğuma her zaman ne yapacağını söyleyebilmeyi isterim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
46) Çocuğum iyi davrandığı zaman onunla ne kadar gurur duyduğumu söylerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
47) Çocuğumun kalbini kırarım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
48) Çocuğumun hatırlamamı beklediği olayları unuturum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
49) Çocuğuma yanlış hareket ettiği onu artık sevmediğimi hissettiririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
50) Çocuğuma yapması için bazı işler veririm ve o işler bitene kadar başka hiçbir şey yapmasına izin vermem.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
51) Çocuğuma yaptığı şeyin önemli olduğunu hissettiririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52) Çocuğum yanlış bir şey yaptığında onu tehdit ediyorum veya korkutuyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53) Çocuğumla birlikte zaman geçirmekten hoşlanırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
54) Çocuğumun canı ne isterse yapmasına izin veririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
55) Çocuğumun üzüldüğü, tasalandığı veya korktuğu zaman ona yardım etmeye çalışırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Her zaman Doğru	Hemen Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
56) Çocuğum kötü davrandığı zaman onu oyun arkadaşlarının önünde küçük düşürürüm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
57) Çocuğumun benimle beraber olmasından kaçınırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
58) Çocuğumdan şikayet ederim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
59) Çocuğumun yaptığı her şeyi kontrol etmek isterim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
60) Çocuğumun görüşlerine saygı duyarım açıkça söylemesi için cesaretlendiririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
61) Çocuğumu olumsuz bir şekilde başka çocuklarla kıyaslarım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
62) Plan yaptığım zaman çocuğumu göz önünde bulundururum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
63) Benim için uygun olmasa bile, çocuğumun önemli gördüğü şeyleri yapmasına izin veririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
64) Çocuğum uygunsuz davrandığı zaman onu olumsuz bir şekilde başka çocuklarla karşılaştırırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
65) Bakmaları, ilgilenmeleri için çocuğumu başkalarına bırakırım. (Örneğin; bir komşu ya da akrabaya)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
66) Çocuğuma istenmediğini hissettiririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
67) Çocuğumun yaptığı şeylere ilgi duyarım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
68) Çocuğumun canı yandığında veya hasta olduğunda kendisini daha iyi hissetmesi için elimden geleni yaparım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen	Hemen	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen Hemen Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
	Her zaman Doğru	Bazen Doğru		
69) Çocuğumun kötü davrandığı zaman ondan utandığımı söylerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
70) Çocuğuma onu sevdiğimi hissettiririm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
71) Çocuğuma nazik ve yumuşak davranırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
72) Çocuğum yanlış davrandığında onu utandırır veya suçlu hissettirmeye çalışırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
73) Çocuğumu mutlu etmeye çalışırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX C

PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
(PAQ)

Anne-Baba KİDÖ

Kod no: _____ Tarih: _____

Çocukla İlişkiniz: Anne: ____ Baba: _____

Aşağıda farklı insanların kendileri hakkında hisleri ile ilgili bazı cümleler var. Her cümleyi dikkatlice okuyun ve çocuğunuzu ne kadar iyi anlattığınızı düşünün. Mümkün olduğunca çabuk olun, her madde için aklınıza ilk gelen düşünceye göre yanıt verin ve sonraki maddeye geçin. Her maddeden sonra dört kutu var. Eğer o maddedeki cümle çocuğunuzu doğru olarak anlatıyor ise, kendinize şunu sorun "Hemen hemen her zaman mı doğru ?" yoksa "Sadece bazen mi doğru?"

Eğer hemen hemen her zaman doğru olduğunu düşünüyorsanız HEMEN HEMEN HER ZAMAN DOĞRU kutusuna X işareti koyun; bazen doğru olduğunu düşünüyorsanız BAZEN DOĞRU'yu işaretleyin.

Eğer cümle çocuğunuzu doğru olarak anlatmıyorsa, o zaman kendinize şunu sorun "Nadiren mi doğru?" yoksa "Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman mı doğru değil?". Eğer nadiren doğru ise NADİREN DOĞRU kutusuna X koyun; eğer hemen hiçbir zaman doğru olmadığını hissediyorsanız HEMEN HEMEN HİÇBİR ZAMAN kutusunu işaretleyin.

Unutmayın. hiçbir ifadenin doğru veya yanlış bir yanıtı yok; onun için mümkün olduğu kadar dürüst ve samimi olun. Her ifadeyi çocuğunuzun olmak istediği kişi gibi değil, gerçekte olduğu gibi yanıtlayın.

Örnek: Eğer çocuğunuzun hemen hemen her zaman kendi hakkında iyi duygular beslediğini düşünüyorsanız, "hemen hemen her zaman" kutusuna X koyun.

ÇOCUĞUM İÇİN DOĞRU
Hemen hemen Bazen
her zaman doğru doğru

ÇOCUĞUM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL
Nadiren Hemen hemen
doğru hiçbir zaman doğru değil

-Çocuğum kendi hakkında
iyi duygular besler.

© Ronald P. Rohner, 1989,1997

Çeviri: Azmi Varan, 2000

Yönerge değişikliği: Fatoş Erkman

ÇOCUĞUM İÇİN
DOĞRU

ÇOCUĞUM İÇİN
DOĞRU DEĞİL

Hemen Hemen
Her zaman Bazen
Doğru Doğru Nadiren
Hiçbir Zaman
Doğru Değil

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1) İçinden kavga etmek veya birine bir kötülük yapmak gelir. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2) Hastalandığında, onun için üzülmem hoşuna gider. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3) Kendini beğenir. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4) Yapmak istediği şeyleri herkes kadar iyi yapabileceğini düşünür. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5) İnsanlara duygularını göstermek zorlanır. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6) Yapmaya çalıştığı bir şeyi yapamayınca, kendini kötü hisseder ya da sinirlenir. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7) Yaşamın güzel olduğunu düşünür. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8) İçinden bir şeye veya birisine vurmak gelir. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9) Benim ona çok sevgi göstermemi ister. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10) Bir işe yaramadığını ve hiçbir zaman da yaramayacağını düşünür. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11) Bir çok şeyi iyi yapamadığını hisseder. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12) Bana sevgisini göstermek onun için kolaydır. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13) Önemli bir neden olmamasına rağmen sinirli ve aksidir. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14) Yaşamı tehlikelerle dolu görür. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15) Öyle sinirlenir ki, bir şeyleri fırlatır ya da kırar. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

ÇOCUĞUM İÇİN
DOĞRU

ÇOCUĞUM İÇİN
DOĞRU DEĞİL

Hemen Hemen
Her zaman Bazen Nadiren Hemen Hemen
Doğru Doğru Doğru Hiçbir Zaman
Doğru Değil

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 16) Mutsuz olduğu zaman sorunlarını kendi çözmekten hoşlanır. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17) Tanımadığı biriyle tanıştığında, onun kendinden daha iyi olduğunu düşünür. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 18) İstedığı şeyler için başarılı bir şekilde mücadele edebilir. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19) İyi arkadaşlıklar kurmak ve bu arkadaşlıkları sürdürmekte zorlanır. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20) İşler ters gittiğinde canı sıkılır. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21) Dünyanın iyi ve mutlu bir yer olduğunu düşünür. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 22) Aptalca şeyler yapan insanlarla dalga geçer. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23) Benim onunla çok ilgilenmemi ister. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24) İyi bir insan olduğunu düşünür ve başkalarının da öyle düşünmesini ister. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25) Başarısız biri olduğunu düşünür. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 26) Ailesine sevgi göstermek onun için kolaydır. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 27) Bir an neşeli ve mutlu olur, bir sonraki an üzgün ve mutsuz. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 28) Onun için dünya mutsuz bir yerdir. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 29) Kızdığı zaman suratını asar, somurtur. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

ÇOCUĞUM İÇİN
DOĞRU

ÇOCUĞUM İÇİN
DOĞRU DEĞİL

Hemen Hemen
Her zaman Bazen Nadiren Hemen Hemen
Doğru Doğru Doğru Hiçbir Zaman
Doğru Değil

- 30) Bir şeyde zorlandığında, birinin ona moral vermesini ister.
- 31) Kendinden oldukça memnundur.
- 32) Yapmaya çalıştığı bir çok şeyi beceremediğini düşünür.
- 33) Hoşlandığı birine duygularını göstermeye çalışmak onun için zordur.
- 34) Kolay kolay ne kızar, ne de bir şeye canı sıkılır.
- 35) Dünyayı tehlikeli bir yer olarak görür.
- 36) Kızgınlığını kontrol etmekte zorlanır.
- 37) Canı yandığında ya da hastalandığında üzerine düşmemiz hoşuna gider.
- 38) Kendinden memnun değildir.
- 39) Yaptığı şeylerde başarılı olduğunu düşünür.
- 40) Arkadaşlarına onları gerçekten sevdiğini göstermek onun için kolaydır.
- 41) Zor sorunlarla karşılaştığında hemen canı sıkılır.
- 42) Onun için yaşam güzel bir şeydir.

Çocuk/Ergen KİDÖ

Kod no: _____

Tarih:

Okul: -----

Sınıf: 6 ---- 7 ----

Yaş: ----

Cinsiyet: K ---- E ----

Aşağıda farklı insanların kendileri hakkında hisleri ile ilgili bazı cümleler var. Her cümleyi dikkatlice oku ve seni ne kadar iyi anlattığını düşün. Mümkün olduğunca çabuk ol, her madde için aklına ilk gelen düşünceye göre yanıt ver ve sonraki maddeye geç. Her maddeden sonra dört kutu var. Eğer o maddedeki cümle seni çoğunlukla doğru olarak anlatıyor ise, kendine sunu sor "Hemen hemen her zaman mı doğru?" yoksa "Sadece bazen mi doğru?"

Eğer hemen hemen her zaman doğru olduğunu düşünüyorsan HEMEN HEMEN HER ZAMAN DOĞRU kutusuna X işareti koy, bazen doğru olduğunu düşünüyorsan BAZEN DOĞRU'yu işaretle.

Eğer cümle seni çoğunlukla doğru olarak anlatmıyorsa, o zaman kendine sor "Nadiren mi doğru?" yoksa "Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman mı doğru değil?". Eğer nadiren doğru ise NADİREN DOĞRU kutusuna X koy, eğer hemen hiçbir zaman doğru olmadığını hissediyorsan HEMEN HEMEN HİÇBİR ZAMAN kutusunu işaretle.

Unutma. hiçbir ifadenin doğru veya yanlış bir yanıtı yok; onun için mümkün olduğu kadar dürüst ve samimi ol. Her ifadeyi olmak istediğin kişi gibi değil, gerçekte olduğun gibi yanıtla.

Örnek: Eğer hemen hemen her zaman kendin hakkında iyi duygular besliyorsan, "hemen hemen her zaman" kutusuna X koy.

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU
Hemen hemen Bazen
her zaman doğru doğru

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL
Nadiren Hemen hemen
doğru hiçbir zaman doğru değil

-Kendim hakkında
iyi duygular beslerim.

© Ronald P. Rohner, 1989,1997

Çeviri: Azmi Varan, 2000

Yönerge değişikliği: Fatoş Erkman, 2002

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU

BENİM İÇİN
DOĞRU DEĞİL

	Hemen Her zaman Doğru	Hemen Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
1) İçimden kavga etmek veya birine bir kötülük yapmak geliyor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Hastalandığımda, annemin benim için üzülmesi hoşuma gider.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Kendimi beğenirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Yapmak istediğim şeyleri herkes kadar iyi yapabilirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) İnsanlara duygularımı göstermekte zorlanırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6) Yapmaya çalıştığım bir şeyi yapamayınca, kendimi kötü hisseder ya da sinirlenirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7) Yaşamın güzel olduğunu düşünürüm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8) İçimden bir şeye veya birisine vurmak geliyor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9) Anne ve babamın bana çok sevgi göstermelerini isterim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10) Bir işe yaramadığımı ve hiçbir zaman da yaramayacağımı düşünüyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11) Bir çok şeyi iyi yapamadığımı hissediyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12) Anne ve babama sevgimi göstermek benim için kolaydır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13) Önemli bir neden olmamasına rağmen sinirli ve aksiyim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14) Yaşamı tehlikelerle dolu görüyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU

BENİM İÇİN
DOĞRU DEĞİL

	Hemen Hemen		Hemen Hemen	
	Her zaman	Bazen	Nadiren	Hiçbir Zaman
	Doğru	Doğru	Doğru	Doğru Değil
15) Öyle sinirlenirim ki, bir şeyleri fırlatır ya da kırarım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16) Mutsuz olduğum zaman sorunlarımı kendim çözmekten hoşlanırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17) Tanımadığım biriyle tanıştığımda, onun benden daha iyi olduğunu düşünürüm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18) İstedğim şeyler için başarılı bir şekilde mücadele edebilirim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19) İyi arkadaşlıklar kurmak ve bu arkadaşlıkları sürdürmekte zorlanıyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20) İşler ters gittiğinde canım sıkılır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21) Dünyanın iyi ve mutlu bir yer olduğunu düşünüyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22) Aptalca şeyler yapan insanlarla dalga geçerim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23) Annemin benimle çok ilgilenmesini isterim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24) İyi bir insan olduğumu düşünüyor ve başkalarının da öyle düşünmesini istiyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25) Başarısız biri olduğumu düşünüyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26) Aileme sevgi göstermek benim için kolaydır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27) Bir an neşeli ve mutlu oluyorum, bir sonraki an üzgün ve mutsuz.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU

BENİM İÇİN
DOĞRU DEĞİL

	BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		BENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen Her zaman Doğru	Hemen Bazen Doğru	Nadiren Doğru	Hemen Hiçbir Zaman Doğru Değil
28) Benim için dünya mutsuz bir yerdir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29) Kızdığım zaman suratımı asar, somurturum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30) Bir şeyde zorlandığımda, birinin bana moral vermesini isterim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31) Kendimden oldukça memnunum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32) Yapmaya çalıştığım bir çok şeyi beceremediğimi düşünüyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33) Hoşlandığım birine duygularımı göstermeye çalışmak benim için zordur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34) Kolay kolay ne kızarım, ne de bir şeye canım sıkılır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35) Dünyayı tehlikeli bir yer olarak görüyorum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36) Kızgınlığımı kontrol etmekte zorlanırım.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37) Canım yandığında yada hastalandığımda annemle babamın üzerime düşmesi hoşuma gider.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38) Kendimden memnun değilim.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39) Yaptığım şeylerde başarılı olduğumu düşünüyorum..	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40) Arkadaşlarıma onları gerçekten sevdiğimi göstermek benim için kolaydır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41) Zor sorunlarla karşılaştığımda hemen canım sıkılır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42) Benim için yaşam güzel bir şeydir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX D

OFFICIAL CONSENT

23.11.2006

İstanbul İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü'ne,

Etkili ebeveynlik, sağlıklı ve yaşam kalitesi yüksek bireyler yetiştirmek, dolayısıyla sağlıklı bir toplumun oluşumu için gerekli en önemli faktörlerden biridir. Çocukların ve onları yetiştiren ailelerin kabul ve reddi nasıl algıladıkları; aralarındaki uyumun ortaya çıkarılması daha etkili bir ebeveynlik için önemli veriler sunacaktır.

Bu çalışmada, çocukların ve ailelerinin ebeveyn kabul red algıları arasındaki uyum ölçülerek, elde edilen sonuçlar psikolojik danışma ve aile terapisinde kullanılmak üzere sunulacaktır. Bu ölçümleri yapmak üzere Anne-Baba Kabul-Red/Kontrol Ölçeği (EKRO/K) ve KİDO kullanılacaktır. Bu ölçekler 2001-2002 senelerinde Doç. Dr. Fatoş Erkman tarafından İstanbul ili okullarında geçerlilik, güvenilirlik ve norm çalışmaları için İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü'nün izniyle uygulanmıştır.

Bu amaçla, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Psikolojik Danışmanlık yüksek lisans öğrencisi Ayşen Yıldırım Ekmekci'nin Doç. Dr. Fatoş Erkman'ın yönetiminde ve gözetiminde yürüteceği bir tez çalışması planlanmıştır.

Tez çalışmasının İstanbul ilinde aşağıda ismi geçen ilköğretim okullarında 6. ve 7. sınıflarda yapılması planlanmaktadır.

Tez için kullanılacak anket ve ölçekler ilişikte sunulmaktadır.

Anket ve ölçeklerin değerlendirilerek uygulanması için gereken onayın gereğini arz ederim.

Saygılarımla,

Doç. Dr. Fatoş Erkman
Eğitim Bilimleri Bölüm Başkanı
Eğitim Fakültesi
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi

APPENDIX E

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF PARQ/C AND PAQ FOR CHILDREN

Table E1. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Maternal Acceptance-Rejection/Control in terms of Gender

	Female (n=119)		Male (n=66)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd
PARQ/C				
Warmth/Affection	27.43	8.2	29.93	8.3
Hostility/Aggression	20.66	6.7	22.40	7.7
Indifference/Neglect	20.78	6.0	21.89	5.0
Undifferentiated Rejection	14.11	4.6	15.09	5.0
PARQ Total	82.98	22.78	89.32	21.0
Control	38.25	6.0	38.90	6.4

Table E2. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Paternal Acceptance-Rejection and Control in terms of Gender

	Female (n=119)		Male (n=66)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd
PARQ/C				
Warmth/Affection	28.43	8.3	29.90	9.0
Hostility/Aggression	18.98	4.7	20.40	7.3
Indifference/Neglect	22.00	6.3	23.70	6.2
Undifferentiated Rejection	13.19	3.8	13.92	4.4
PARQ Total	82.60	19.5	87.92	22.2
Control	37.57	5.8	37.80	6.0

Table E3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Maternal Acceptance-Rejection and Control in terms of Age

Age	11 (n=12)		12 (n=88)		13 (n=84)		14 (n=1)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
PARQ/C								
Warmth/Affection	27.17	6.1	28.28	9.0	28.62	7.9	21	
Hostility/Aggression	22.58	7.2	20.03	6.3	22.36	7.7	25	
Indifference/Neglect	22.17	5.1	20.89	6.2	21.38	5.3	17.5	
Undifferentiated Rejection	13.67	3.5	14.05	4.6	14.91	5.0	22	
PARQ Total	85.58	20.1	83.25	23.5	87.28	21.6	85.5	
Control	37.54	8.4	38.62	6.0	38.43	5.9	42	

Table E4. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Paternal Acceptance-Rejection in terms of Age

Age	11 (n=12)		12 (n=88)		13 (n=84)		14 (n=1)	
PARQ/C	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	31.42	9.4	28.09	8.4	29.51	8.7	30	
Hostility/Aggression	20.83	7.8	18.57	3.9	19.94	6.3	46	
Indifference/Neglect	24.75	6.7	21.62	5.7	23.19	6.6	34	
Undifferentiated Rejection	12.21	2.5	12.76	3.2	14.21	4.6	25	
PARQ Total	89.21	24.6	81.04	17.9	86.85	21.7	135	
Control	36.54	6.3	38.34	5.7	37.08	5.9	37	

Table E5. Means and Standard Deviations of Perceived Maternal Acceptance-Rejection in terms of Grade Level

Grade	6th grade (n=95)		7th grade (n=90)	
PARQ/C	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	27.66	8.7	29.03	7.9
Hostility/Aggression	20.19	6.5	22.44	7.5
Indifference/Neglect	20.85	6.1	21.52	5.2
Undifferentiated Rejection	13.99	4.6	14.95	4.9
PARQ Total	82.69	23.2	87.93	21.1
Control	38.44	6.3	38.53	5.9

Table E6. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Paternal Acceptance-Rejection in terms of Grade Level

Grade	6th grade (n=95)		7th grade (n=90)	
PARQ/C	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	27.87	8.0	30.11	9.0
Hostility/Aggression	18.76	4.3	20.25	6.8
Indifference/Neglect	21.60	5.7	23.67	6.8
Undifferentiated Rejection	12.68	3.1	14.27	4.6
PARQ Total	80.91	18.01	88.29	22.47
Control	38.28	5.9	36.97	5.7

Table E7. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Psychological Adjustment according to Gender

Gender	Female (n=119)		Male (n=66)		
	PAQ	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression		11.67	3.7	11.41	3.5
Dependency		18.38	2.7	16.60	3.7
Negative Self-Esteem		10.40	3.3	10.20	2.9
Negative Self-Adequacy		10.87	3.7	10.92	2.9
Emotional Unresponsiveness		11.41	3.0	12.02	3.1
Emotional Instability		16.53	3.8	15.42	3.7
Negative Worldview		11.00	4.4	11.82	3.4
Total		90.27	15.9	88.38	14.8

Table E8. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Psychological Adjustment according to Age

Age	11 (n=12)		12 (n=88)		13 (n=84)		14 (n=1)		
	PAQ	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression		12.17	3.5	11.53	3.9	11.49	3.4	16	
Dependency		17.92	2.3	17.95	3.2	17.54	3.3	15	
Negative Self-Esteem		9.17	2.2	10.66	3.4	10.07	3.0	17	
Negative Self-Adequacy		9.87	3.0	11.06	3.6	10.81	3.3	14	
Emotional Unresponsiveness		11.67	3.2	11.80	3.0	11.39	3.1	16	
Emotional Instability		16.50	3.7	16.10	3.8	16.10	3.7	18	
Negative Worldview		10.25	3.9	11.29	4.4	11.43	3.6	13	
Total		87.54	11.2	90.39	16.4	88.83	15.1	109	

Table E9. Means and Standard Deviations of the Perceived Psychological Adjustment (PAQ) according to Grade

Grade	6th grade (n=95)		7th grade (n=90)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	11.59	3.9	11.56	3.4
Dependency	17.94	3.1	17.54	3.4
Negative Self-Esteem	10.37	3.3	10.29	3.1
Negative Self-Adequacy	10.77	3.5	11.01	3.3
Emotional Unresponsiveness	11.67	3.0	11.57	3.2
Emotional Instability	16.01	3.8	16.27	3.7
Negative Worldview	10.98	4.5	11.62	3.5
Total	89.34	15.9	89.87	15.2

APPENDIX F

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR PARQ/C AND PAQ FOR MOTHERS

Table F1. Means and Standard Deviations of the PARQ/C by Mother Education

Mother Education	Less than high school degree (n=52)		High school degree (n=73)		Undergraduate & further degree (n=60)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	26.72	5.2	24.82	4.0	25.56	5.8
Hostility/Aggression	21.88	6.4	21.99	4.6	22.13	5.4
Indifference/Neglect	20.09	4.0	19.50	4.1	19.94	4.7
Undifferentiated Rejection	14.13	4.2	13.63	2.7	13.69	3.3
PARQ Total	82.84	14.5	79.93	11.9	81.33	12.9
Control	41.98	4.6	40.17	4.2	40.26	3.38

Table F2. Means and Standard Deviations of the PARQ/C by Mother Employment Status

Employment Status	Not working (n=88)		Working (n=76)		Unstated (n=21)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	26.35	5.7	24.82	4.2	25.26	4.3
Hostility/Aggression	22.64	5.4	21.77	5.6	20.21	4.2
Indifference/Neglect	19.87	4.2	20.0	4.6	18.36	3.2
Undifferentiated Rejection	14.09	3.8	13.66	3.1	13.02	2.6
PARQ Total	82.94	14.16	80.24	11.9	77.36	10.5
Control	40.98	4.4	40.61	3.8	39.90	4.2

Table F3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Maternal PARQ/C by Number of Children in the Family

Number of children	No sibling (n=27)		1 (n=125)		2 and more (n=33)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	23.93	3.1	25.54	4.5	27.18	7.3
Hostility/Aggression	20.30	4.6	22.32	5.1	22.23	6.8
Indifference/Neglect	18.17	2.1	20.01	4.5	20.38	4.4
Undifferentiated Rejection	13.02	2.4	13.94	3.5	13.85	3.5
PARQ Total	75.41	8.3	81.80	12.6	83.64	16.1
Control	41.31	3.7	40.50	3.9	41.02	5.1

Table F4. Means and Standard deviations of the Maternal PARQ/C by Birth Order

Birth order	1 (n=97)		2 (n=88)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd
PARQ/C				
Warmth/Affection	24.87	3.9	26.40	5.9
Hostility/Aggression	22.57	5.4	21.38	5.4
Indifference/Neglect	19.65	4.3	19.98	4.2
Undifferentiated Rejection	14.14	3.4	13.40	3.3
PARQ Total	81.23	12.1	81.16	13.9
Control	41.16	4.0	40.20	4.2

Table F5. Means and Standard Deviations of the Maternal PARQ/C by Perceived Income

Perceived Income	Low (n=14)		Average (n=124)		High (n=47)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
PARQ/C						
Warmth/Affection	25.29	4.1	25.46	5.3	26.04	4.4
Hostility/Aggression	23.07	7.0	21.63	5.5	22.67	4.6
Indifference/Neglect	19.75	4.1	19.54	4.6	20.53	3.4
Undifferentiated Rejection	15.29	5.6	13.67	3.3	13.66	2.7
PARQ Total	83.39	15.8	80.31	13.0	82.90	12.0
Control	40.68	3.8	40.62	4.3	40.96	3.7

Table F6. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PAQ by Mother Education

Mother Education	Less than high school degree (n=52)		High school degree (n=73)		Undergraduate and further degree (n=60)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
PAQ						
Hostility/Aggression	11.92	3.6	11.58	3.2	10.72	3.2
Dependency	19.67	2.3	19.82	3.0	19.12	2.7
Negative Self-Esteem	9.79	2.3	9.37	2.5	9.03	2.2
Negative Self-Adequacy	10.61	3.0	10.12	3.2	9.22	2.9
Emotional Unresponsiveness	11.00	3.4	11.30	3.7	10.42	2.5
Emotional Instability	17.15	4.0	15.79	3.2	15.60	3.3
Negative Worldview	9.87	3.2	9.26	2.8	8.90	2.5
Total	90.01	13.4	87.24	14.0	83.00	11.19

Table F7. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PAQ by Mother Employment Status

Working Status	Not working (n=88)		Working (n=76)		Unstated (n=21)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	11.62	3.3	11.45	3.6	10.29	2.0
Dependency	19.39	2.9	19.89	2.6	18.95	2.7
Negative Self-Esteem	9.59	2.6	9.23	2.2	9.05	2.3
Negative Self-Adequacy	10.41	3.3	9.53	2.9	9.62	2.6
Emotional Unresponsiveness	11.45	3.6	10.64	2.8	9.76	3.3
Emotional Instability	16.26	3.6	16.20	3.5	15.19	3.4
Negative Worldview	9.73	2.9	9.01	2.7	8.64	2.6
Total	88.46	13.5	85.96	13.2	81.50	10.4

Table F8. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (mother) PAQ by Number of Children in the Family

Number of Sibling	No sibling (n=27)		1 (n=125)		2 or more (n=33)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	9.93	2.5	11.61	3.4	11.79	3.4
Dependency	19.30	3.0	19.44	2.7	20.15	2.6
Negative Self-Esteem	9.41	2.3	9.52	2.4	8.80	2.1
Negative Self-Adequacy	9.93	3.2	10.04	3.2	9.68	2.5
Emotional Unresponsiveness	10.81	3.3	11.06	3.3	10.55	3.4
Emotional Instability	15.19	2.7	16.35	3.6	15.97	3.8
Negative Worldview	9.33	2.8	9.24	2.6	9.59	3.4
Total	83.89	13.5	87.27	13.7	86.53	11.1

Table F9. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Mother) PAQ by birth order of the Target Child

Birth Order	1 (n=97)		2 (n=88)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	11.57	3.4	11.21	3.3
Dependency	19.61	2.8	19.48	2.8
Negative Self-Esteem	9.56	2.5	9.18	2.3
Negative Self-Adequacy	10.13	3.5	9.78	2.5
Emotional Unresponsiveness	11.60	3.3	10.19	3.1
Emotional Instability	16.34	3.8	15.86	3.2
Negative Worldview	9.36	2.7	9.26	2.8
Total	88.17	14.6	84.96	11.4

Table F10. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Mother) PAQ by Perceived Income

Perceived Income	Low (n=14)		Average(n=124)		High (n=47)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	13.21	3.5	11.04	3.2	11.81	3.4
Dependency	19.89	3.3	19.41	2.7	19.81	2.8
Negative Self-Esteem	10.61	3.0	9.19	2.2	9.51	2.6
Negative Self-Adequacy	11.29	3.3	9.62	2.9	10.48	3.3
Emotional Unresponsiveness	11.93	3.5	10.60	3.2	11.51	3.4
Emotional Instability	17.71	4.4	15.69	3.5	16.74	3.2
Negative Worldview	10.14	3.0	9.18	2.8	9.43	2.8
Total	94.79	12.9	84.72	12.8	89.29	13.3

APPENDIX G

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF PARQ/C AND PAQ FOR FATHERS

Table G1. Means and Standard Deviations of the PARQ/C by Father Education

Father Education	Less than high school degree (n=40)		High school degree (n=63)		Undergraduate and further degree (n=82)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	28.49	6.5	27.77	6.3	28.28	5.1
Hostility/Aggression	20.85	5.1	21.80	6.7	21.82	5.5
Indifference/Neglect	37.13	3.1	36.90	2.6	37.57	3.3
Undifferentiated Rejection	12.76	3.2	13.09	3.4	12.90	2.9
PARQ Total	99.23	11.7	99.56	14.6	100.57	11.0
Control	36.06	4.1	35.52	4.2	33.87	5.0

Table G2. Means and Standard Deviations of the PARQ/C by Father Employment Status

Employment Status	Not working (n=9)		Working (n=165)		Unstated (n=11)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	26.39	5.7	28.25	5.9	28.18	5.3
Hostility/Aggression	20.06	6.3	21.49	5.7	24.50	6.4
Indifference/Neglect	37.22	2.0	37.23	3.1	37.55	2.2
Undifferentiated Rejection	11.89	1.9	12.96	3.1	13.41	4.2
PARQ Total	95.56	12.2	99.92	12.3	103.64	13.7
Control	35.78	6.9	34.70	4.5	37.23	5.0

Table G3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Paternal PARQ/C by Number of Children in the Family

Number of sibling	No sibling (n=27)		1 (n=125)		2 and more(n=33)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Warmth/Affection	28.80	6.5	27.92	5.6	28.52	6.2
Hostility/Aggression	21.30	6.2	21.62	5.5	21.77	6.8
Indifference/Neglect	36.76	3.0	37.40	2.8	37.05	3.7
Undifferentiated Rejection	13.02	3.2	13.01	3.1	12.58	3.3
PARQ Total	99.87	13.0	99.95	11.8	99.92	14.4
Control	34.91	3.8	34.51	4.7	36.39	4.9

Table G4. Means and Standard Deviations of the Paternal PARQ/C by Birth Order

Birth order	1 (n=97)		2 (n=88)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd
PARQ/C				
Warmth/Affection	28.65	6.1	27.60	5.4
Hostility/Aggression	21.95	5.6	21.22	6.1
Indifference/Neglect	37.29	3.0	37.20	3.0
Undifferentiated Rejection	13.24	3.2	12.60	3.0
PARQ Total	101.13	11.7	98.61	13.1
Control	34.73	4.1	35.10	5.2

Table G5. Means and Standard Deviations of the Paternal PARQ/C by Perceived Income

Perceived Income	Low (n=14)		Average (n=124)		High (n=47)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
PARQ/C						
Warmth/Affection	28.29	7.7	28.23	5.9	27.91	5.0
Hostility/Aggression	19.82	3.8	21.5	5.6	22.40	6.7
Indifference/Neglect	36.29	2.3	37.68	2.9	37.96	3.3
Undifferentiated Rejection	11.96	1.9	12.90	3.0	13.31	3.7
PARQ Total	96.36	11.1	99.71	11.8	101.59	14.2
Control	36.43	5.7	34.92	4.4	34.40	4.9

Table G6. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PAQ by Father Education

Education Level	Less than high school degree (n=40)		High school degree (n=62)		Undergraduate and further degree (n=83)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
PAQ						
Hostility/Aggression	12.04	4.0	10.63	2.8	11.51	3.3
Dependency	19.11	2.7	19.86	3.4	18.71	3.1
Negative Self-Esteem	10.29	2.8	9.62	2.8	9.65	2.5
Negative Self-Adequacy	10.13	2.6	9.62	2.8	10.18	3.1
Emotional Unresponsiveness	11.80	3.0	11.15	3.6	11.22	3.0
Emotional Instability	15.96	3.6	15.33	2.8	15.62	3.2
Negative Worldview	9.12	3.0	8.87	2.8	9.04	2.5
Total	88.45	14.1	85.08	11.8	85.93	12.5

Table G7. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent PAQ by Father Employment Status

Working Status	Not working (n=9)		Working (n=165)		Unstated (n=11)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	11.44	3.1	11.18	3.3	13.50	3.7
Dependency	20.22	1.8	19.15	3.2	18.95	2.9
Negative Self-Esteem	8.94	1.9	9.79	2.7	10.32	2.2
Negative Self-Adequacy	9.67	4.6	10.0	2.8	10.0	2.4
Emotional Unresponsiveness	9.33	2.4	11.49	3.3	10.45	1.9
Emotional Instability	15.89	3.1	15.55	3.2	15.95	2.5
Negative Worldview	8.11	2.1	8.94	2.7	10.64	2.4
Total	83.61	11.3	86.08	12.9	89.82	9.4

Table G8. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Father) PAQ by Number of Children in the Family

Number of Sibling	No sibling (n=27)		1 (n=125)		2 or more (n=33)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	10.0	2.8	11.44	3.2	11.99	3.8
Dependency	19.24	3.6	19.00	3.1	19.85	2.8
Negative Self-Esteem	9.10	2.1	10.0	2.7	9.68	3.1
Negative Self-Adequacy	9.10	2.3	10.08	2.8	10.27	3.3
Emotional Unresponsiveness	10.65	3.2	11.50	3.3	11.18	3.1
Emotional Instability	14.76	3.0	15.73	3.1	15.77	3.5
Negative Worldview	8.80	3.3	9.03	2.6	9.06	2.5
Total	81.63	11.5	86.74	12.5	87.80	13.4

Table G9. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Father) PAQ by birth order of the Target Child

Birth Order	1 (n=97)		2 (n=88)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	11.34	3.3	11.31	3.3
Dependency	19.14	3.2	19.23	3.1
Negative Self-Esteem	9.88	2.7	9.67	2.7
Negative Self-Adequacy	10.03	2.9	9.93	2.8
Emotional Unresponsiveness	12.02	3.3	10.56	3.0
Emotional Instability	15.91	3.1	15.25	3.1
Negative Worldview	9.01	2.0	8.99	2.6
Total	87.31	13.0	84.94	12.1

Table G10. Means and Standard Deviations of the Parent (Father) PAQ by Perceived Income

Perceived Income	Low (n=14)		Average (n=124)		High (n=47)	
	M	Sd	M	Sd	M	Sd
Hostility/Aggression	12.00	3.3	11.22	3.3	11.41	3.3
Dependency	19.57	2.9	19.08	3.0	19.36	3.5
Negative Self-Esteem	9.25	2.8	9.68	2.6	10.19	2.9
Negative Self-Adequacy	9.93	2.4	9.91	2.8	10.18	3.2
Emotional Unresponsiveness	13.07	3.8	10.92	3.2	11.85	2.9
Emotional Instability	17.50	3.3	15.15	3.1	16.20	3.0
Negative Worldview	9.14	3.0	8.93	2.5	9.15	3.2
Total	90.46	12.8	84.88	12.12	88.35	13.5

REFERENCES

- Anjel, M. (1993). *The transliteral equivalence, reliability and validity studies of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) mother-form: A tool for assessing child abuse*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Aquilino, W. S. (1999). Two views of one relationship: Comparing parent's and young adult children's reports of the quality of integrational relations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(4), 858- 870.
- Caissy, G. A. (1994). *Early adolescence*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.
- Cournoyer, D. E., Sethi, R., Cordero, A. (2005). Perceptions of parental acceptance-rejection and self-concepts among Ukrainian university students. *Etos*, 33(3), 335-346.
- Çetin, N. (2005). *Suçlu ve normal ergenlerde algılanan anne-baba kabul ve reddi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ege University, Izmir.
- Deal, J. E., Halverson Jr., C. F., & Wampler, K. S. (1989). Parental agreement on child-rearing orientations: Relations to parental, marital, family, and child characteristics. *Child Development*, 60, 1025-1034.
- Demo, D. H., Small, S. A., & Savin-Williams R. C. (1987). Family relations and the self-esteem of adolescents and their parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 705-715.
- Erdem, T., (1996). *The validity and reliability of the Turkish form of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Erkan, S., & Toran, M. (2004). Alt sosyo-ekonomik düzey annelerin çocuklarını kabul ve reddetme davranışlarının incelenmesi (Diyarbakır ili örneği). *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* , 27, 91-97.
- Erkman, F. (2003). *Turkish children's perception of parental warmth, corporal punishment and psychological adjustment*. Paper presented at the SCCR 32nd Annual Meeting, Charleston South Carolina.
- Erkman, F. (2004). *The relationship of self-reported physical punishment to parental acceptance-rejection of Turkish parents*. Paper presented at the SCCR 33rd Annual Meeting, San Jose, California.
- Erkman, F., & Rohner, R. P. (2006). Youths' perceptions of corporal punishment, parental acceptance, and psychological adjustment in a Turkish metropolis. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 40(3), 250-267.

- Fişek, G. O. (1991). A cross-cultural examination of proximity and hierarchy as dimensions of family structure. *Family Process*, 30, 121-133.
- Fişek, G. O. (1995). Gender hierarchy: Is it a useful concept in describing family structure? In J. Van Lawick & M. Sanders (eds.), *Family, gender and beyond*. Heemstede, The Netherlands: LS Books.
- Hoghughi, M. (2004). Parenting- an introduction. In M. Hoghughi & N. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of parenting theory and research for practice* (pp. 1-18). London: Sage Publications.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Manwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Khaleque, A. (2002). Parental love and human development: Implications of parental acceptance-rejection theory. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research* , 17(3-4), 111-122.
- Khaleque, A., & Rohner, R. P. (2002). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and psychological adjustment: A meta-analysis of cross-cultural and intracultural studies. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61(1), 54-64.
- Kim, E. (2005). Korean American parental control: Acceptance or rejection? *Ethos*, 33(3), 347-366.
- Kim, K., & Rohner, R. P. (2002). Parental warmth, control, and involvement in schooling: Predicting academic achievement among Korean American adolescents. *Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(2), 127-140.
- Kimmel, D. C., & Weiner, I. B. (1995). *Adolescence: A developmental transition*. (2nd ed.). Canada: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Knafo, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Parenting and adolescents' accuracy in perceiving parental values. *Child Development*, 74(2), 595-611.
- Lerner, R. M. (2002). *Adolescence: Development, diversity, context, and application*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Lila, M., Garcia, F., & Gracia, E. (2007). Perceived paternal and maternal acceptance and children's outcomes in Colombia. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 35(1), 115-124.
- Noller, P., & Callan, V. J. (1988). Understanding parent-adolescent interactions: Perceptions of family members and outsiders. *Developmental Psychology*, 24(5), 707-714.
- Phares, V., Compas, B. E., & Howell, D. C. (1989). Perspectives on child behavior problems: Comparisons of children's self-reports with parent and teacher reports. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1(1), 68-71.

- Polat, A. S. (1988). Parental acceptance-rejection. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Rohner, R. P. (2004). The parental "Acceptance-rejection syndrome": Universal correlates of perceived rejection. *American Psychologist*, 830-840.
- Rohner, R. P., & Britner, P. A. (2002). Worldwide mental health correlates of parental acceptance-rejection: Review of cross-cultural and intracultural evidence. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 36(1), 16-47.
- Rohner, R. P., & Bourque, S. L., & Elordi, C. A. (1996). Children's perceptions of corporal punishment, caretaker acceptance, and psychological adjustment in a poor, biracial southern community. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58(4), 842-852.
- Rohner, R. P., & Khaleque, A. (2003). Reliability and validity of the parental control scale: A meta-analysis of cross-cultural and intracultural studies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34(6), 643-649.
- Rohner, R. P., & Khaleque, A. (2005). *Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection* (4th ed.). Storrs, CT: Rohner Research Publications.
- Rohner, R. P., Khaleque, A., & Cournoyer, D. E. (2005). Parental acceptance-rejection: Theory, cross-cultural evidence, and implications. *Ethos*, 33 (3), 299-334.
- Rohner, R. P., Khaleque, A., & Nahar, Z. (2006). Agreement between children's and mothers' perceptions of maternal acceptance and rejection: A comparative study of mothers and children in Bangladesh and Bangladeshi immigrant mothers and children in the United States, *Interpersonal Acceptance: The Essence of Peace, ICIAR Proceedings*.
- Rohner, R. P., Khaleque, A., Riaz, M. N., Khan, U., Sadeque, S., & Laukkala, H. (2005). Agreement between children's and mothers perceptions of maternal acceptance and rejection: A comparative study in Finland and Pakistan. *Ethos*, 33(3), 367-377.
- Schwartz, J. C., Barto-Henry, M. L., & Pruzinsky, T. (1985). Assessing child-rearing behaviors: A comparison of rating made by mother father, child, and sibling on the CRPBI. *Child Development*, 56, 462-479.
- Sunar, D. (2002). Change and continuity in the Turkish middle class family. In R. Liljestrom & E. Özdalga (Eds), *Autonomy and dependence in family* (pp. 217-237). London:RoutledgeCurzon
- Sunar, D., & Fişek, G. O. (2005). Contemporary Turkish families. In J. P. Roopnarine & U. P. Gielen (Eds.) *Families in global perspective* (pp. 169-183). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Tein, J., Roosa, M. W., & Michaels, M. (1994). Agreement between parent and child reports on parental behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56 (2), 341-355.
- Varan, A., & Erkman, F. (2004). Sıcaklık boyutu: Ebeveyn kabul ve reddi kuramı, ölçüm araçları ve araştırma bulguları. *XIII. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi*, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.
- Veneziano, R. A. (2000). Perceived paternal and maternal acceptance and rural African American and European American youths' psychological adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(1), 123-132.
- Veneziano, R. A., & Rohner, R. P. (1998). Perceived paternal acceptance, paternal involvement, and youths' psychological adjustment in a rural, biracial southern community. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(2), 335-343.
- Yener, N. (2005). *Çocukların algıladıkları ebeveyn kabul veya reddinin okul başarısı ve okul uyumu ile ilişkisi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ege University, İzmir.