

Validity, Reliability, and Partial Norm Study of the Turkish Teacher's Acceptance-  
Rejection/Control Questionnaire Child Short Form

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

Master of Arts  
In  
Educational Sciences

by  
Semra Yıldırım

Boğaziçi University

2006

The thesis of Semra Yıldırım

is approved by:

Thesis Advisor : \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Fatoş Erkman

Committee Member: : \_\_\_\_\_

Assist. Prof. Özlem Ünlühisarcıklı

Committee Member: : \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Ayşe Caner

June 2006

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Fatoş Erkman, for every single aspect of her personality. She is an exceptional person with her humanist, optimist, understanding, positive, approachable, encouraging manner, and beauty. It was a special honor to be your student. Thank you for everything.

I would like to thank to Assist. Prof. Özlem Ünlühisarcıklı and Dr. Ayşe Caner, my committee members for their special contributions with their special personalities.

My appreciation also goes to the administrators and the students of the primary schools which cooperated in data collection.

Also, I am grateful to my dear friends Başak Yılmaz, Simge Kırca, Şengül Hafizoğlu and all others who supported me whenever I needed it.

My special thanks go to my sister, Selda Yılmaz, my brother, Erdiñ Yıldırım, my nephews, Eray, Berkay, and Yağız, my father, Hamza Yıldırım, and of course, to my dear and beautiful mother, Sebiha Yıldırım since I am, so everything I achieved is the product of these people.

I would also like to thank myself for never giving up despite all the difficulties I have experienced.

And last but not least, I would like to express my gratitude and love to my unique darling. He has always helped, encouraged and supported me with his great contributions, effort, and love in every single step of this research and in every single step of my life for seven years. The only thing I can do in return is to love him; I hope he accepts it....

## ABSTRACT

Validity, Reliability, and Partial Norm Study of the Turkish Teacher's Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire Child Short Form

by

Semra Yıldırım

The purpose of the present study is to establish the validity, reliability, and partial norms of the Turkish Teacher Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire Child short form (Turkish Child TARQ/Control) that was developed by Rohner (2002) and revised by him (2004) to assess the perceived teacher acceptance-rejection and behavioral control. The instrument consists of four subscales, namely; Warmth/Affection, Hostility/Aggression, Indifference/Neglect, and Undifferentiated Rejection, and a separate Control scale. It has 29 items.

The sample of the study was composed of 503, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students coming from six different primary schools and three different SES levels in Istanbul, and 253 of them were readministered the instrument for investigating the temporal stability of the instrument.

Internal consistency of the instrument was determined by computing the corrected item-total correlation, which was found to be ranging between .31 and .64, item-subscale, subscale-total, subscale-subscale correlations and Cronbach Alpha values for the total scale, that is .90 ( $p < .01$ ), for its subscales, and for the separate

Control scale. Test-retest reliability coefficient was found to be .76 ( $p < .01$ ) for the total scale.

The concurrent validity of the instrument was computed by correlating the subjects' Child TARQ scores with their scores on the Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory (PTBI) and The Teacher Support Subscale of the Perceived Social Support Scale-Revised (PSSS-R/TSss). The Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique yielded a correlation coefficient of .82 with the PTBI and -.79 with the PSSS-R/TSss ( $p < .01$ ).

Factor analysis that was carried out for determining construct validity of the instrument yielded four factors. When analyzed with two factors, rejection items clustered around F 1 and warmth/affection items clustered around F 2, as expected.

The partial norms of the instrument were established on age, gender, school SES, self-reported semester point average, teacher gender, mother and father education, mother and father employment status, and number of children in the family by using the means and standard deviations. One-way Analysis of Variance and Scheffe procedure results indicated significant differences in perception of teacher rejection in relation to gender ( $F=15.81$ ;  $p < .001$ ), teacher gender ( $F=6.04$ ;  $p < .05$ ), and SPA ( $F= 4.51$ ;  $p < .001$ ), such that males perceived higher rejection, male teachers were perceived to be more rejecting, and low SPA students perceived higher rejection.

Overall, the results of the present study indicated that the Turkish Child TARQ is a highly reliable and valid instrument to be used with children for assessing their perceptions in terms of teacher acceptance-rejection while the Control scale assessing perception of behavioral control by teachers needs some revision.

## ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, çocukların öğretmen red-kabul ve davranış kontrolü algılarını değerlendirmek amacıyla Rohner (2002) tarafından geliştirilen Öğretmen Kabul-Red/Kontrol Ölçeği Çocuk Türkçe Kısa Formu'nun (Türkçe ÖKRÖ/K Çocuk) geçerlik, güvenirlik ve kısmi normlarını belirlemektir. Ölçek Sıcaklık/Sevgi, Saldırganlık/Kin, İlgisizlik/İhmal ve Ayrıştırılmamış Reddetme adlı dört alt ölçekten ve bağımsız olan Kontrol ölçeğinden oluşmaktadır ve toplam 29 maddesi vardır.

Çalışma örneklemini İstanbul'daki altı farklı okul ve üç farklı Sosyo-ekonomik seviyeden gelen 503 adet 4. ve 5. sınıf öğrencisinden oluşmaktadır. Test- tekrar test çalışması için ölçek 253 öğrenciye tekrar uygulanmıştır.

Ölçeğin iç tutarlılığı, madde-toplam, madde-alt ölçek, alt ölçek-toplam, alt ölçek-alt ölçek ilişim katsayıları hesaplanarak ve her bir alt ölçek için ve Kontrol ölçeği için ve bütün ölçek için Cronbach Alpha değerleri bulunarak hesaplanmıştır. Madde-toplam ilişim katsayılarının .31 ile .64 arasında değiştiği ve tüm ölçeğin Cronbach Alpha değerinin .90 olduğu bulunmuştur ( $p < .01$ ). Ayrıca, test-tekrar test güvenirliği .76 olarak saptanmıştır ( $p < .01$ ).

Ölçeğin uyum geçerliği, öğrencilerin ölçekten aldıkları puanlarla Algılanan Öğretmen Davranışları Ölçeği'nden (AÖDÖ) ve Algılanan Sosyal Destek Ölçeği/Öğretmen Desteği Alt Ölçeği'nden (ASDÖ/ÖDAÖ) aldıkları puanlar arasındaki ilişim katsayılarının Pearson Product Moment Korelasyon tekniği kullanılarak hesaplanmasıyla bulunmuştur. Ölçeğin AÖDÖ ile arasında .82, ASDÖ/ÖDAÖ ile de -.79 ilişim katsayısı bulunmuştur ( $p < .01$ ).

Ölçeğin yapı geçerliğini belirlemek için faktör analizi yapılmış ve ölçeğin 4 faktörden oluştuğu görülmüştür. İki faktör ile analiz yapıldığında ise, beklenildiği

gibi, genel red maddelerinin F 1 etrafında ve sıcaklık/sevgi maddelerinin F 2 etrafında toplandığı görülmüştür.

Ölçeğin normları yaş, cinsiyet, okul sosyo-ekonomik seviyesi, dönem not ortalaması, öğretmen cinsiyeti, anne ve baba eğitim seviyesi, anne ve baba çalışma durumu ve ailedeki çocuk sayıları üzerinden ortalama ve standart sapmaları hesaplayarak belirlenmiştir. Tek yönlü Varyans Analizi ve Scheffe tekniği sonuçları, algılanan öğretmen reddi açısından, öğrenci cinsiyetleri ( $F=15.81$ ;  $p<.001$ ), öğretmen cinsiyetleri ( $F=6.04$ ;  $p<.05$ ) ve dönem not ortalamaları grupları arasında istatistikî olarak önemli farklar olduğunu göstermiştir. Erkek öğrencilerin ve not ortalaması düşük olan öğrencilerin daha yüksek red algıladıkları ve erkek öğretmenlerden daha yüksek red algılandığı görülmüştür.

Genel olarak, çalışmanın sonuçları göstermiştir ki, Türkçe ÖKRÖ Çocuk formu, çocukların öğretmen kabul-red algılarını ölçmek için oldukça geçerli ve güvenilir bir ölçektir ancak öğretmen kontrolü algısı formunun yenilenmeye gereksinimi vardır.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZET	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	x
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Historical Background of Child Maltreatment	4
Definition of Child Maltreatment	5
Psychological Maltreatment	7
Psychological Maltreatment in Schools	10
Outcomes of Enhancing and Abusive Teacher Behaviors	13
Assessment of Teacher Behaviors in Schools	24
Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory	26
Methods in PARTheory Research	28
Evidence Supporting the Main Features of PARTheory	29
III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	
IV. METHOD	35
Subjects	35
Instruments	44
The Demographic Form	44
The Child TARQ/Control	44
The Perceived Social Support Scale-Revised/	49



Teacher Support Subscale (PSSC-R/TSss)	
The Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory (PTBI)	51
Procedure	53
Data Analysis	54
V. RESULTS	55
Results on Reliability	55
Internal Consistency	55
Temporal Consistency	60
Results on Validity	60
Concurrent Validity	60
Construct Validity	61
Results on Normative Values	64
VI. DISCUSSION	86
Limitations of the Study	97
Suggestions for Future Research	98
VII. REFERENCES	99
VIII. APPENDICES	104
Appendix A: The Demographic Form	104
Appendix B: The Turkish Child TARQ/Control	105
Appendix C: The PSSC-R/TSss	108
Appendix D: The PTBI	110
Appendix E: Distribution of the sample according to birthplace (cities)	114
Appendix F: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrices	115

## LIST OF TABLES

Table no		Page
Text Tables		
1	Distribution of the Sample according to School and SES of the School	36
2	Test-Retest Reliability Sample Description by School and SES of the School	37
3	Distribution of the sample according to age	37
4	Distribution of the sample according to birthplace (regions)	38
5	Distribution of the sample according to SPA	39
6	Distribution of the sample according to number of children in the family	40
7	Distribution of the sample according to mother education	40
8	Distribution of the sample according to father education	41
9	Distribution of the sample according mothers' employment status	42
10	Distribution of the sample according fathers' employment status	42
11	Distribution of the sample according to mother profession	43
12	Distribution of the sample according to father profession	43
13	Corrected item-total correlations of the Turkish Child TARQ	55
14	Corrected item-subscale correlations of the Warmth/Affection subscale	56
15	Corrected item-subscale correlations of the Hostility/Aggression subscale	57
16	Corrected item-subscale correlations of the Indifference/Neglect subscale	57
17	Corrected item-subscale correlations of the Undifferentiated Rejection subscale	58
18	Corrected item-total correlations of the Control scale	58
19	Cronbach Alpha values of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control	59

20	Subscale-subscale and subscale-total correlations for the Turkish Child TARQ	59
21	Test-retest correlation coefficients of the total TARQ and subscales	60
22	Varimax Rotated Factor Analysis for the Turkish Child TARQ with four factors	62
23	Varimax Rotated Factor Analysis for the Turkish Child TARQ with two factors	63
24	Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ by age	65
25	One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ scores by age	65
26	Means and standard deviations of the Control scale by age	66
27	One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores by age	66
28	Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by gender	67
29	Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by gender	67
30	One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ scores by gender	67
31	One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores by gender	68
32	Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by school SES	68
33	One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores by school SES	69
34	Means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by school SES	69
35	One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores by school SES	70
36	Scheffe procedure for the Control scale scores by school SES	70
37	Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by SPA	71
38	One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ scores by SPA	71
39	Scheffe procedure for the Turkish Child TARQ scores by SPA	72
40	Means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by SPA	72

41	One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores by SPA	73
42	Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by teacher gender	73
43	One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ scores by teacher gender	74
44	Means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by teacher gender	74
45	One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores by teacher gender	74
46	Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by mother education	75
47	One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ scores by mother education	76
48	Means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by mother education	76
49	One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores by mother education	77
50	Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by father education	77
51	One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ scores by father education	78
52	Means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by father education	79
53	One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores by father education	79
54	Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by mothers' employment status	80
55	One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ scores by mothers' employment status	80
56	Means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by mothers' employment status	81
57	One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores	

by mother employment status	81
58 Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by fathers' employment status	82
59 One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ scores by fathers' employment status	82
60 Means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by fathers' employment status	82
61 One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores by father employment status	83
62 Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by number of children in the family	83
63 One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ scores by number of children in the family	84
64 Means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by number of children in the family	84
65 One-Way ANOVA for the Control scale scores by number of children in the family	85

Table no

Page

Appendix Tables

E1 Distribution of the Sample according to Birthplaces (Cities)	114
F1 Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix with Four Factors	115
F2 Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix with Two Factors	116

## I. INTRODUCTION

Every human-being is born in and formed by institutions that he or she himself or herself creates, supports, and administers. Bower (1972) calls these Key Integrative Social System (KISS) institutions which attempt to serve and be served by all members of the society. Socialization, which is a crucial process in human development, occurs through these institutions. These KISS institutions should contain the experiences needed by children to grow up into effectively functioning adults within their operations and processes. Passing through these primary institutions successfully should provide a child with the degrees of freedom to think, to feel, and later, to act as an adult human-being. Two of the KISS institutions stated by Bower as the most embracing of children and their humanizing process are the family and the school (Bower, 1972). As social institutions, both family and school play vital roles in shaping children into effective social beings (Fontana, 1995).

Family is the first social group the child encounters and it remains the most important group throughout childhood for the majority of children. But, in many ways, a close second is the school, the teachers, and the circle of friends a child meets there (Fontana, 1995). School, as a key integrative institution next to the family, is an important context for children's development because of the time children spend there, the degree to which it influences children's experiences and self-perceptions, and its potential to affect children's life course. Schools also directly affect development of children because their structures and practices exert a socializing influence on students (Baker, Dilly, Aupperlee, & Patil, 2003).

To be able to function as psychologically healthy environments, schools should meet and appropriately challenge children's developmental needs including psychological and emotional ones and offer a positive climate (Baker et al., 2003).

Positive school climate is characterized by very low levels or the absence of abuse, maltreatment, sarcasm, ridicule, put-downs, and other verbal assaults from school staff and peers. It helps students feel that they are respected, accepted, supported, treated fairly: students should feel a sense of belonging. Whereas, negative school climates occur when educators view students and families as opponents, rather than clients to be valued, nurtured, and encouraged. Psychological maltreatment such as verbal assaults of students in classrooms, bullying, including scapegoating, name-calling, and put-downs by both peers and staff characterize such schools. Such a negative school climate make students feel that the school is rule-bound, that discipline is administered inconsistently and unfairly, that school staff do not really care about them, and that they are rejected by both peers and staff (Hyman, 2001).

Teachers form a significant component of the school environment in which school-aged children develop. They constitute a group of nonparental adults with whom children have extensive involvement for at least nine months of the year beginning at age seven for the majority of children. In this sense, teachers may take a variety of roles including caretaker, mentor, disciplinarian, and companion, and they have the potential to have both a constructive or destructive impact on the child's self-concept, abilities, achievement, and personality (Bower, 1972). Having emotionally warm relationships with teachers characterized by open communication, support, and involvement provide students with a sense of security within school settings and promotes exploration, comfort, the attainment of competence for children in other school-related developmental domains, as well as social, emotional, and academic competence (Lynch & Cicchetti, 1992). Teachers' interactions with students and students' perceptions of their interactions with teachers have impact on students' behavioral and emotional engagement in the classroom.



Many studies indicate that psychological maltreatment takes place in school settings (Benbenishty, Zeira, Astor, & Khoury-Kassabri, 2002; Piekarska, 2000; Shumba, 2002). Within the school system, maltreating and abusive environments may include inadequate verbal stimulation, unrealistic expectations of performance, negative school climate, uncaring and cold relationships, verbal or physical punishment, etc. Teacher-student relationships and interactions may have abusive characteristics when the students perceive their teachers as uncaring, cold, rejecting, unresponsive, authoritarian, or neglecting. Such abusive behaviors by teachers may be the consequence of lack of training, supervision, social skills, teaching skills, child management skills, patience, unmet needs, or personalities of the teachers and they may have immediate and long term negative effects on students' development in school-related phenomena as well as other domains (Çakar, 1994).

Students' assessments of the quality of their relationships and perceptions of their interactions with teachers are important predictors of their healthy development in psychological, emotional, and school-related domains, and their commitment to schooling (Murdock & Miller, 2003). However, we have very limited number of objective tools that assess the perceptions of students in terms of their relationships and interactions with their teachers that may be either supportive, warm, accepting or abusive in terms of rejection, neglect, and strict discipline and control.

The aim of the present study is to carry out the validity, reliability, and partial norm study of the Turkish Teacher's Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire Child short form (Child TARQ/Control), that was developed by Rohner in 2002 and revised in 2004 to be used by children to evaluate their perceptions about their relationships and interactions with their teachers in terms of acceptance-rejection and behavioral control of their classroom teachers (Rohner, 2005).

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### Historical Background of Child Maltreatment

The systematic study of the phenomenon of child maltreatment is relatively new but the history of it is as old as the recorded history (Zigler & Hall, 1989). Over the centuries, children worldwide have been subjected to child abuse and maltreatment, such as infanticide, ritual killings, maiming, severe physical punishments, abandonment, mutilation, beatings, and forced labor by their parents and other caretakers (Veltkamp & Miller, 1994; Zigler & Hall, 1989). For a long time, children have been treated as the properties of their parents and other caretakers. Children beyond the age of six were considered as small adults and were not separated from adults as a class and as separated individuals (Hart, 1991).

The 1874 Mary Ellen case in New York was the first reported instance of child abuse and it marks the real beginning of the recognition of child maltreatment in the United States. Mary Ellen was an 8-year-old child who had been chained, beaten, and starved by her foster parents. She was discovered by a social worker and taken to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals since there was no child protection agency in those times in the U. S. to handle this case. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was formed out of this experience in 1885 in New York and during the late nineteenth century many other child protection agencies were formed (Veltkamp & Miller, 1994; Zigler & Hall, 1989).

In 1962, the article of Dr. C. Henry Kempe and his colleagues, "The Battered Child Syndrome," was published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* and parents and other caretakers began to be held responsible for child maltreatment in terms of physical abuse (as cited in Veltkamp & Miller, 1994; Zigler & Hall, 1989). This article brought the impact of child maltreatment to the attention of the

medical community and general public. However, physical abuse is only one small, although severe, portion of the whole area of the child maltreatment (Veltkamp & Miller, 1994; Zigler & Hall, 1989).

In the late nineteenth and twentieth century, children have emerged from hundreds years of property status to person status. This marked the separation of children from adults as a special vulnerable class in need of protection and fostered a child-saving era to assure the health and welfare of children. The human rights movement for mistreated and denied adults eventually extended to children and United Nations (UN) Declaration of the Rights of Children in 1959 had its roots in this movement which was devoted totally to the protection and nurturance rights of children. The recently adopted UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN General Assembly, November 20, 1989) is covering a broad range of categories such as health, family, education, maltreatment, and freedom and it is the best available formal expression of international opinion on children rights. Also, it is a strong indicator of the increased, formal, societal emphasis being given to participation, autonomy, and self-determination rights of children, in balance with protection and nurturance rights (Hart, 1991).

### Definitions of Child Maltreatment

Child maltreatment has been roughly conceptualized under four subcategories: physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, and neglect. English (1998) and Tower (1992) define physical abuse as an act of commission by a parent or caretaker characterized by infliction of physical injury (as cited in Horton & Cruise, 2001). Sexual abuse is defined by Kempe (1978) and Krugman & Jones (1987) as the involvement of dependent, immature children in sexual activities

through incest, molestation, and rape (as cited in Horton & Cruise, 2001). Brassard & Gelardo (1987) state that emotional or psychological abuse includes treating a child in a rejecting, degrading, terrorizing, isolating, corrupting, exploiting manner, or denying emotional responsiveness such as love, care, and support (as cited in Horton & Cruise, 2001). Neglect is defined by Kempe (1978) and Palacio & Quintin (1992) as a form of maltreatment characterized by a chronic lack of care and implies the caregiver's failure to act properly in the areas of health, cleanliness, diet, supervision, education or meeting of emotional needs (as cited in Horton & Cruise, 2001).

There is a growing agreement that psychological maltreatment is the core issue in child maltreatment. The term "psychological maltreatment" is used by some to describe especially the emotional abuse form of maltreatment and the term clearly has both cognitive and affective components. Also, psychological maltreatment relates to the core issues that are inherent in all forms of child maltreatment. So, it can be said that the term "psychological maltreatment" clarifies and unifies other constructs. It means that children who experience other forms of maltreatment, such as physical abuse or neglect, are also affected psychologically and emotionally (Hart & Brassard, 1987). Since psychological maltreatment may be regarded as an umbrella construct covering all forms of abuse, and since the present study is focusing on the assessment of a significant part of perceived psychological maltreatment in terms of acceptance-rejection on the part of teacher, this term will be used throughout the study as covering all forms of child maltreatment but especially psychological abuse form of maltreatment. Also, this term will be further explored.

## Psychological Maltreatment

One of the most common forms of child maltreatment that is difficult to define is psychological abuse and it has only recently received significant public or professional attention (Briere, 1992). As stated before, psychological maltreatment is an umbrella term; however, it can occur in isolation and when it does, it is more difficult to recognize, as it is vaguer than other types of abuse. Victims of this type of maltreatment may also have difficulty in recognizing their experience as abuse. They may have no observable signs of being abused but certain actions of parents or other caregivers probably injure these children's self-esteem and self-concept. Since young children normally interpret what their parents or other caretakers such as stepparents, babysitters, or teachers say and do as truth, psychological abuse can have such a powerful impact (Horton & Cruise, 2001).

The International Conference on Psychological Abuse of Children and Youth that was held in 1983 involved the development of the following working definition of psychological maltreatment that appears to have a broad level of support:

Psychological maltreatment of children and youth consists of acts of omission and commission which are judged by community standards and professional expertise to be psychologically damaging. Such acts are committed by individuals, singly or collectively, who by their characteristics (e.g., age, status, knowledge, organizational form) are in a position of differential power that renders a child vulnerable. Such acts damage immediately or ultimately the behavioral, cognitive, affective, or physical functioning of the child. Examples of psychological maltreatment include acts of rejecting, terrorizing, isolating, exploiting, and "mis-socializing." (as cited in Hart & Brassard, 1987, p. 3)

Psychological maltreatment is usually defined in terms of seven types of parent or caretaker behaviors. The behaviors were adapted from the findings of the International Conference on Psychological Abuse of Children and Youth as stated in the work of Garbarino, Guttman, & Seeley (1986) and Hart, Germain, & Brassard (1987) (as cited in Horton & Cruise, 2001; Briere, 1992). These are listed as:

**Rejecting:** Verbalizations or behaviors that communicate rejection or abandonment of the child, such as refusing to help a child or show affection. The child is avoided or pushed away; she or he is made to feel unworthy, unacceptable, and the like.

**Degrading/devaluing:** Words or acts that belittle a child, such as insulting, name-calling, or humiliating a child in a public. The child is criticized, stigmatized, deprived of dignity, and made to feel inferior, and so on.

**Terrorizing:** Verbalizations or actions that are meant to threaten or promote fear in a child. The child is verbally assaulted, frightened, threatened with physical or psychological harm such as threats to the well-being of the child, a pet, or a loved one.

**Isolating:** Actions by an adult that prevent the child from participating in normal social events or interactions, which may involve simple refusals or locking the child up. The child is deprived of social contacts beyond the family, not allowed friends, kept in a limited area for long periods of time without social interaction.

**Corrupting:** Encouragement or lack of redirection by the caregiver that reinforces antisocial behaviors, such as substance abuse, delinquent behavior, or aggression. The child is “mis-socialized” and taught to behave in an antisocial manner, encouraged to develop socially unacceptable interests and appetites.

**Exploiting:** Encouraging, permitting, or demanding a child to act in a way

that will meet the needs of the caregiver or to be the caregiver's advantage.

Denying Emotional Responsiveness: By ignoring or refusing to interact with the child, the caregiver deprives the child of necessary emotional and physical stimulation. The child is deprived of loving, sensitive care; his or her emotional and intellectual development is stifled, the child is generally ignored or neglected.

Psychologically maltreated children experience significant psychological distress and dysfunction since childhood is the most critical period of their lives. During this critical period assumptions about self, others, and the world are being formed; their relations to their own internal states are being established; and coping and skills of affiliation are first acquired. So, psychological maltreatment during this period can easily have an impact on subsequent psychological and social maturation, leading to atypical and potentially dysfunctional development (Briere, 1992). Psychological maltreatment has been indicated to have a variety of psychological correlates and negative physiological effects, affective effects, behavioral/interpersonal effects, and academic effects among children (Horton & Cruise, 2001).

According to the study of Eckenrode, Laird, & Doris (1993) with a sample of 420 maltreated children and a comparison group of 420 nonmaltreated children in the same community, it was indicated that abused and neglected children have poorer academic performance, more grade repetition, and more disciplinary problems than their nonmaltreated counterparts. Again, in another study, Crozier & Barth (2005) examined cognitive functioning and academic achievement in maltreated children. The sample consisted of 2368 children between the ages of 6 and 15 years. These children were participants in the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW), a nationally representative sample of children who have been

reported to child welfare services because of suspected maltreatment and whose reports resulted in a child welfare services investigation. The results showed that children in the NSCAW sample were not performing as well as their nationwide peers on tests of cognitive and academic achievement. The subjects in the study are more likely to score a standard deviation or more below the mean on standardized measures of cognitive functioning and academic achievement than normative samples. These empirical research provide strong evidence for the negative effects of psychological maltreatment on children in school related domains such as cognitive functioning, academic performance, and school behavior.

Garbarino, Guttman, & Seeley (1986) state that although an extensive number of studies have targeted the family as the possible setting for child maltreatment and have investigated the psychological maltreatment of children by their parents and its consequences, psychological maltreatment is not a phenomenon that is specific to family context. This phenomenon also exists in schools, day care centers, welfare agency shelters for children, and detention centers. Especially school system, as the key integrative social system next to the family, exposes itself as another major setting to be analyzed in terms of its potential for psychological maltreatment of children as well as its prevention (as cited in Bars, 1999; Erkman, 1993).

### Psychological Maltreatment in Schools

Educational institutions are expected to develop children and adolescents who are and going to be effectively functioning, compassionate, and creative adults. The school should develop educational programs that can enhance emotional and cognitive competencies in children (Bower, 1972). Hargreavers, Earl, and Ryan



(1996), in agreement with many researchers and educators, state that one of the most fundamental reforms needed in education is to make schools into better communities of caring and support for young people (as cited in Osterman, 2000). It is argued by some critics that schools pay little attention to the socio-emotional needs of students, individually or collectively (Osterman, 2000). Research and studies indicate that psychological maltreatment takes place in educational settings in the form of corporal punishment, emotional abuse, and neglect by educational staff (Benbenishty, Zeira, Astor, & Khoury-Kassabri, 2002; Piekarska, 2000; Shumba, 2002). The school system acts on the child and maltreatment occurs within the concentric zones of national and community policy, educational goals, curriculum, practices that are implemented, the specific learning and teaching conditions, and units of teacher-child relationships and interactions (Erkman, 1993).

UN Convention on the Rights of Child that was adopted by General Assembly of the UN as a major international covenant on November 20, 1989 spell out the nature of childhood and the rights of children that include freedom from both psychological and physical maltreatment in all settings, including school, home, and the criminal justice system (Hyman & Snook, 2000). The covenant states that every child has to be provided with free and compulsory primary education with discipline that respects the child's human dignity. This is what needs to exist but the existing realities of schools in different communities and countries should be recognized so that abusive can be altered to nonabusive and then into enhancement of the total child (Erkman, 1993).

Research on effective schools for young people by Barr & Parrett (2001) and by Schorr (1989, 1997) reveal a key finding, that is, the consistent presence of caring, demanding, and well-prepared teachers. Safe, predictable, and caring school

environments seem to ameliorate risk and enhance school success. Such school environments have generally been quite successful in improving attendance, reducing drop-out rates, and improving academic achievement, and in such environments students are provided with a community of support or a "surrogate family" (as cited in Zucker, 2001).

Hart (1988) points out the fact that schools sometimes fail to provide positive and psychologically healthy climates for the development of meaningful relationships and interactions that are essential for effective learning for the students. Examples of psychological maltreatment in schooling may be strict discipline and control through fear and intimidation that interferes with the needs of safety, belonging, esteem, and love. The different ways of negative discipline in schools can be seen in terms of physical punishment, rejection and disapproval, verbal abuse through verbal assaults, words, and tone of voice (as cited in Erkman, 1991).

Teachers form a significant component of the school environment since they are the people with whom the children spend most of their time in school. Teachers play a significant role in establishing a psychologically healthy learning environment in the educational settings in terms of daily interaction with the students and they can make the socialization process in school abusive or enhancing for their students. Having emotionally warm relationships with teachers characterized by open communication, support, and involvement provide students with a sense of security within school settings and promotes exploration, comfort, the attainment of competence for children in other school-related developmental domains, as well as social, emotional, and academic competence (Lynch & Cicchetti, 1992). On the other hand, teacher-student relationships and interactions may sometimes have abusive characteristics. Hyman (1986) lists some of the abusive teacher behaviors and these

include sarcasm, descending tone of voice, criticizing low achievement, forbidding children from extracurricular activities, name-calling, assigning homework as punishment, ear pulling, throwing things at the child, hitting, and allowing bullying and degrading by other children (as cited in Erkman, 1991, 1993). Such abusive behavior by teachers may have short and long term negative effects on students such as lack of school adjustment and motivation, school failure, underachievement, low self-esteem, and other emotional and psychological problems.

In this sense, assessment of the characteristics and effects of teacher-student interactions and relationships, and teachers' abusive and enhancing behavior as perceived by students received the attention of many researchers.

#### Outcomes of Enhancing and Abusive Teacher Behavior

An extensive body of research indicates that schools, as socializing agencies and significant communities for young people, and interactions among teachers and students, differ in terms of establishing psychologically healthy or unhealthy environments for students. They also have differing impacts on the outcomes of young people.

Lynch & Cicchetti (1996) state that children's and adolescents' interpersonal relationships with significant individuals that are both inside and outside the educational settings have crucial roles in the fulfillment of the aforementioned developmental tasks (as cited in Schiff & Tatar, 2003). Pianta & Walsh (1996) state that dysfunctional interactions between young people and their teachers, as well as other significant individuals, can be linked to many developmental problems involving academic, social, or psychological aspects (as cited in Schiff & Tatar, 2003). Birch & Ladd (1997) and Howes (1999) state that significant teachers fulfill

important roles in preadolescents' lives by providing them with fundamental equipment that is vital to their development and this equipment involves emotional investment in the child in the form of support, by providing a sense of security and self-value, and closeness, that encompasses the degree of warmth and open communication between a child and the teacher (as cited in Schiff & Tatar, 2003). Also, significant teachers believe both in the child and in his or her ability to succeed, challenge children's competence and motivate them to cope with difficult tasks, and facilitate learning as stated by Brooks (1994), Hendry, Roberts, Glendinning, & Coleman (1992), Kesner (2000), and Tatar (1998) (as cited in Schiff & Tatar, 2003).

To reveal the characteristics that make a teacher significant individual in the life of his or her students, Schiff and Tatar (2003) examined the perceptions of preadolescent boys and girls regarding the characteristics of their significant teachers. The sample of the study consisted of 408, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade elementary school students in Israel. The findings indicated that significant teachers were characterized as being, in descending order, learning facilitators, reliable, fair, supporters, warm, and challengers.

Murray (2002) states that both attachment theory and social learning theory provide a theoretical basis for the significance of close relationships between teachers and students. Both of the theories suggest that healthy social and emotional development is facilitated by adult-child relationships that are characterized by warmth, open communication, active involvement, and structure. According to Pianta (1999), emotionally warm relationships between students and teachers provide students with a sense of security within school settings and this promotes exploration, comfort, and social, emotional, and academic competence (as cited in

Murray, 2002).

Pianta and Steinberg (1992) designed a study to gain information from kindergarten teachers regarding their relationships with each of the children in their classes and the children's classroom behaviors. The sample in the study consisted of 436 children between the ages of four years five months and six years six months, and 26 of their kindergarten teachers. The results showed that children with greater levels of support in relationships with their teachers had fewer behavioral problems, greater social competencies, and better school adjustment than did the children experiencing greater conflict in their relationships.

Greenberg, Speltz, & Deklyen (1993) and Pianta (1999) state that similar to parent-child relationships, teacher-child relationships appear to serve a regulatory function with regard to social and emotional development of children and, thus, have the potential to exert a positive or negative influence on children's ability to succeed in the school (as cited in Pianta & Stuhlman, 2004). In a more recent study, Pianta & Stuhlman (2004) examined the associations between closeness and conflict in teacher-child relationships and children's social and academic skills in the 1<sup>st</sup> grade in a sample of 490 children. Assessments of teacher-child relationships were obtained in preschool, kindergarten, and 1<sup>st</sup> grade to assess the stability of teacher-child relationships across the preschool to 1<sup>st</sup> grade interval, and value added by teacher-child relationships to predictions of children's skill levels in 1<sup>st</sup> grade above and beyond the assessments of these skills in preschool. Results showed moderate correlations among teachers' ratings of conflict and slightly lower correlations among teachers' ratings of closeness across years. Hierarchical regression analyses predicted children's social and academic skills in the 1<sup>st</sup> grade from teacher-child relationships quality. Findings generally confirmed that teacher-child relationships

play a significant role in children's ability to acquire the skills necessary for success in school.

Klem & Connel (2004) examined the relationship between teacher support, student engagement, and academic achievement. They used longitudinal data from the *First Things First* school reform model implemented in a large, urban school district. Student records and survey data were obtained from studies conducted in six elementary and three middle schools for years 1990-1995. Measures of teacher support and engagement from the perspectives of students and teachers were obtained at the beginning of each spring semester. The results indicated that teacher support is important to student engagement in school as reported by students and teachers. Students who perceive their teachers as creating a caring, well-structured learning environment in which expectations are high, clear, and fair are more likely to report engagement in school. In turn, high levels of engagement are associated with academic performance and commitment.

Educators and parents value motivation in school for its long-term contribution to children's learning and self-esteem. In contrast to psychological research that has focused on intrapsychic influences on motivation of students, educational research has focused on teacher behaviors that should be effective in promoting student motivation (Skinner & Belmont, 1993). Skinner & Belmont (1993), on the basis of a new motivational model that has as its cornerstone the notion that the source of motivation is internal to the child, so that when the social surround provides for children's basic psychological needs, motivation will flourish, examined the effects of three dimensions of teacher behavior on children's behavioral and emotional engagement across a school year. These dimensions were involvement, structure, and autonomy support. The sample consisted of 144 children

from the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> grades and their 14 female teachers. The findings of the study revealed that there is a strong reciprocal relationship between teachers' behaviors and students' engagement in the classroom. Students' behavioral and emotional engagement in the classroom was predicted from teachers' interactions with students, both directly and through their effects on students' perceptions of their interactions with teachers.

Wentzel (1998) examined the preadolescents' supportive relationships with parents, teachers, and peers in relation to motivation at school in terms of school and class related interest, academic goal orientations, and social goal pursuit. The sample consisted of 167, 6<sup>th</sup> grade secondary school students and it was equally distributed in terms of gender. The findings indicated that supportive relationships with parents, teachers, and peers were related to multiple and different aspects of motivation at school. Perceived support from teachers was found to be unique in its relations to outcomes most proximal to classroom functioning, interest in class, and pursuit of goals to adhere to classroom rules and norms. Relations of perceived support from teachers to students' reported social goal pursuit, prosocial and irresponsible classroom behavior have been reported elsewhere (Wentzel, 1994). However, that student interest in academic activities might be driven by teacher characteristics that reflect social as well as curricular and instructional approaches to learning confirms the significant impact of teacher-student relationships on student motivation at school and the significance of these relationships in the lives of young children.

In a more recent study, Murdock & Miller (2003) examined the relations between 206, 8<sup>th</sup> grade students' achievement motivation and their perceptions of teacher caring, after accounting for influences of parents and peers and controlling for prior (7<sup>th</sup> grade) motivation. Motivation was assessed using students' self-reports

of academic self-efficacy and intrinsic valuing of education, as well as teacher ratings of effort. Teacher, parent, and peer influences on motivation were based on students' self-reports on perceived teacher caring, perceived parental attachment, perceived parental academic support, and perceived peer academic support. Findings of the study revealed that perceived teacher caring accounted for significant amounts of variance in all three measures of 8<sup>th</sup> grade motivation, after controlling for both 7<sup>th</sup> grade motivation and perceived motivational influences from parents and peers.

Osterman (2000) states that to experience relatedness and a sense of belonging in the school settings the students must feel that they are worthy of respect and that the others in this context care for them. Since students' beliefs about themselves develop through their interactions, if these interactions are positive and affirming, students will have a strong sense of relatedness and belongingness. On the contrary, if experiences are negative, that is, if students feel that they are not valued, cared, and unwelcome, their sense of relatedness and belongingness in the school context suffers. As they feel rejected, they are less likely to initiate prosocial behaviors, instead, adopting patterns of aggression or withdrawal. The students' such experiences in the school setting, especially in the classroom, then shape their self-perceptions and behaviors.

At this point, teachers play a major role in determining whether students feel that they are cared for, accepted, and a welcome part of the school community. Being accepted, included, or welcomed leads to positive emotions such as happiness, elation, contentment, and calm while being rejected, excluded, or ignored leads to intense negative feelings of anxiety, depression, grief, jealousy, and loneliness. However, all students do not experience teacher support and acceptance. Research by Kinderman (1993), Ladd (1990), Schwartz (1981), Swift & Spivack (1969), and



Wentzel & Asher (1995) indicate that students receive differential treatment from teachers on the basis of characteristics such as race, gender, class, ability, appearance, teachers' perceptions of student engagement, and ability. Also, other studies suggest that teachers' treatments, preferences, and patterns of interactions with students influence the nature of peer relationships. The findings of these studies show a relationship between teacher preference and peer acceptance, engagement, and academic performance from kindergarten through high school (as cited in Osterman, 2000).

Despite the fact that emotional abuse is considered one of the most devastating forms of child abuse, and there is overwhelming research on emotional abuse, there are still very few studies that have examined this form of child abuse within the classroom. Krugman & Krugman (1984) carried out one of the most known and comprehensive studies to have examined the emotional abuse within the school context. They observed 17 elementary pupils who were emotionally abused by their teacher. The pupils reported the following behaviors of the teacher as abusive: harassment; verbal put-downs; labeling (stupid, dummy); inconsistent erratic behavior; screaming at children until they cried; inappropriate threats to control the classroom; allowing some children to harass and belittle others; use of homework as punishment; throwing homework at children; and physical punishment. The study found that the pupils exhibited the following symptoms: excessive worry about school performance (88 %); change from positive to negative self-perception (76 %); verbalized fear that teacher would hurt children (71 %); excessive crying about school (35 %); headaches (35 %); stomach aches (29 %); decreased functioning in social situations outside class (29 %); nightmares or sleep disturbances (24%); school avoidance or refusal (24 %); and withdrawal behavior or depression

(18 %). Positive changes in the behaviors of 15 of 17 children were reported after the removal of teacher from the school (as cited in Shumba, 2002).

In a study, Piekarska (2000) examined the school stress components, its frequency and intensity, and its psychological and temperamental correlates and consequences. The sample consisted of 271 students between the ages of 13 and 14. The results of the study showed that the most frequent components of school stress factors as perceived by students were teachers' behaviors related to teaching and assessment. Students' descriptions of these behaviors were classified by research team as psychologically and emotionally abusive according to the theoretical conceptualization and definition. In turn, school stress was found to be significantly related to anxiety and low school results in term of success and adjustment.

Hyman (1990) states that being abused by teaching and non-teaching school staff may have an especially adverse effect on children since this staffs are significant as sources of physical and emotional support and protection for them. Especially younger students turn to them for comfort when they are in need. The adults in school are, or ideally should be, the children's immediate source of help when they are threatened or bullied. Furthermore, students learn important life skills in empathy, respect for others, and conflict resolution through their interactions with the adults in school. Thus, victimization by teaching or non-teaching staff in the school may have grave and long-lasting consequences for emotionally or physically abused children (as cited in Benbenishty et al., 2002).

The studies of Hyman & Wise (1979) and Hyman, Zelikoff, & Clarke (1988) indicated that students subjected to mockery, isolation, verbal discrimination, physical and verbal assault, and sexual harassment by school staff are more likely to develop problems in school such as aggressive behavior, fearful reactions, somatic

complaints, dependency and regression, and re-experiencing the trauma inflicted by the educator that is called *Educator Induced Posttraumatic Stress Disorder* (as cited in Benbenishty et al., 2002). Student-teacher relationship is related to other effects of staff maltreatment as the student may learn to fear the teacher rather than respect him or her and the teacher becomes an individual who is aversive and someone to escape from or avoid (Benbenishty et al., 2002).

Aggressive and violent behavior of teachers and non-teaching staff may also result in a strong social learning effect. Students may perceive such types of behavior as legitimate forms of social influence and conflict resolution. Therefore, certain practices by educators that were originally intended to restrain student violence may actually increase the frequency and severity of violence by these students and their peers (Hyman & Snook, 2000).

Benbenishty et al. (2002) examined the prevalence of emotional and physical maltreatment of students by educational staff in primary schools in Israel. The sample consisted of 5472 students from the 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> grades in 71 primary schools. Overall, researchers found that almost 33% of students reported emotional maltreatment by staff and 22.2% of students reported physical maltreatment by staff. Also they found that males are maltreated more than females and lower socio-economic status of parents is associated with higher rates of maltreatment by teaching and non-teaching staff.

In another study which was carried out in Zimbabwe by Shumba (2002), the nature, extent, and effects of emotional abuse and its perpetrators in Zimbabwean primary schools were examined. The results indicated that emotional abuse is the most rarely reported form of child abuse in Zimbabwean primary schools. However, it was indicated that some teachers shout at pupils; scold pupils for mistakes; use

vulgar language on pupils; humiliate pupils publicly; and label students negatively as stupid, foolish, and so on. According to most teachers (71.3%), female teachers emotionally abuse pupils in the majority of the cases. When teachers are asked about the possible effects of some behavioral forms of emotional abuse on children, they gave the following answers: it destroys the confidence in pupils; it confuses pupils; it discourages pupils; it humiliates the pupils; it induces fear in pupils; it makes pupils develop negative attitudes towards school; it destroys the sense of self-worth of the pupil; it affects the pupil's self-image; it demotivates pupils; it irritates the pupil; it frustrates the pupil; and it embarrasses pupils.

When we look at the Turkish family and education systems we see that they are generally patriarchal, authoritarian, restrictive, overprotective, and controlling. While the children are rewarded when they are respectful, passive, calm, and when they obey the rules, they are punished when they are active, assertive, and inquisitive (Fişek, 1982).

In Turkey, there is a limited body of research on psychological maltreatment of children. Zeytinoğlu (1988) asked experts to give their definitions of child maltreatment and it was revealed that psychological maltreatment is the most stated (78.3%) form of abuse. Abusive behaviors that were stated included belittling, lack of love, putting emotional pressures on the child, not giving decision-making power to children, and forcing the child to meet the expectations of the family (as cited in Çakar, 1994; Erkman, 1991).

Gözütok (1993) examined the teachers' and teacher trainees' attitudes towards corporal punishment and the extent of corporal punishment in primary, secondary, and high schools in Ankara. The sample consisted of 364 teachers and teacher trainees and 596 students from primary, secondary, and high schools in

Ankara. There were in total 9 schools, 3 of them from low socioeconomic level, 3 of them from middle socio-economic level, and 3 of them from high socioeconomic level. The findings indicated that teachers' corporal punishment attitude scale point average was found to be "moderate". The types of punishment that teachers were stated to use include verbal sarcasm (f=126), shouting at students (f=61), the punishment of standing on one foot (f=58), the punishment of not to go out during break time (f=58), the punishment of writing (f=40), and corporal punishment such as hitting the head or hand. The frequency of corporal punishment of teachers was stated by students as; everyday (9.22 %), once a week (25.66 %), once in two weeks (12.41 %), and once in a month (14.93 %). Overall, it was indicated that even if the frequency of it differs, corporal punishment does exist in schools and all grades and socio-economic levels.

Erkman & Alantar (1988) asked experts their opinions on emotional abuse and abusive behaviors. On the basis of these reported abusive behaviors they developed Perceived Emotional Abuse Inventory (PEAIA) and administered it to 337 adolescents. The results of the study revealed that students who perceived high emotional abuse from their teachers had lower self-concept, higher anxiety, poorer family and social relationship, and depression as compared to students who perceived low emotional abuse from their teachers.

In another study, Çakar & Erkman (1994), in an attempt to expand the Erkman & Alantar (1988) PEAI-Teacher form that consisted of 16 items, developed Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory (PTBI), a 60 item tool assessing students' perceived psychological maltreatment from their teachers. After the tool was constructed and its reliability study was carried out, it was administered to 300, 8<sup>th</sup> grade students for further reliability and construct validity study of the tool. The

results of construct validation of the tool indicated that there are significant, positive relationships between the perceived psychological abuse from teachers and anxiety and depression. Also, there are negative significant relationships between perceived psychological abuse from teachers and self-concept and achievement. It was concluded that the PTBI is a valid and reliable tool assessing perceived abuse by students from their teachers.

Bars (1999) carried out the partial norm study of the PTBI with a sample of 459 students who were 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade students coming from different SES level schools. The study revealed that when the gender groups are compared, it was found that females perceive higher teacher abuse than males. When the different age groups were compared, it was found that the higher the age of a student, the higher the perception of abuse from teacher. Also the study indicated that the perception of abuse from teachers is negatively correlated with semester point average levels of students, that is, teacher psychological abuse is negatively related to school achievement of students. Another finding of the study is that subjects who have illiterate fathers and illiterate mothers seem to perceive the most abuse from teachers.

#### Assessment of Teacher Behavior in Schools

Because of the issues of challenge of prediction and complexity of the information gathering process, assessment of teacher behaviors, teacher-student relationships and interactions require an assessment process informed by multiple perspectives and multiple methods across multiple occasions and in multiple contexts. This involves gathering information related to the child's perspective, the teacher's perspective, and direct observation of behaviors, interactions, or relationships in the classroom. Proper methods include interview approaches,

questionnaires, behavior checklists, and self-report instruments when assessing the perspectives of elementary and middle-school children (Zucker, 2001).

Some known instruments that are used for assessing psychological maltreatment in schools, teachers' behaviors, and teacher-student relationships include Critical Incident Assessment by Zelikoff & Hyman (1987), School Trauma Survey of Hyman, Witkowsky, Lambert, Alderman, & Tucker (1988), Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory of Çakar (1994), and Student-Teacher Relationships Scale of Pianta (1999) (as cited in Bars, 1999; Zucker, 2001).

In Turkey, we have a very limited number of objective tools that may be used to assess teachers' abusive and enhancing behaviors. The aim of the present study is to carry out the validity, reliability, and partial norm study of the Turkish Teacher's Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire Child Version (short form) (Child TARQ/Control) which was developed by Rohner in 2002 and revised in 2004, to be able to use the instrument in educational or psychological research in Turkey, if it is found to be a sound instrument. The tool was developed to assess children's perceptions about their relationships and interactions with their teachers in terms of acceptance-rejection and behavioral control of their classroom teachers (Rohner, 2005).

The Child TARQ/Control has a rational-theoretical basis since it was developed upon the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory) by Rohner. To be able to clarify the rational-theoretical basis of the Child TARQ/Control, PARTheory, warmth dimension of parenting, methods in PARTheory research, evidence supporting the main features of PARTheory, and studies carried out in Turkey upon PARTheory will be briefly discussed in the next section.

## Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory

PARTheory is evidence based emotional abuse theory that attempts to predict and explain causes, consequences, and other correlates of parental acceptance-rejection for behavioral, cognitive, and emotional development of children. It is a theory of socialization and lifespan development and the main assumption underlying the theory is that all human-beings around the world have a need to receive warmth from the people who are important for them (Erkman, 1992; Rohner, 2005). The theory attempts to answer five classes of questions divided into three sub-theories, namely personality sub-theory, coping sub-theory, and socio-cultural systems sub-theory (Rohner, 2003, 2005).

Personality sub-theory attempts to predict and explain major personality or psychological consequences of perceived parental acceptance and rejection. It asks the questions that children everywhere respond in essentially the same way when they perceive themselves to be accepted or rejected by their parents. And, as to the second question, to what degree do the effects of childhood rejection extend into adulthood and old age (Rohner, 2003, 2005).

Coping sub-theory asks the question of what gives some children and adults the resilience to emotionally cope with the experiences of childhood rejection more effectively than the others who experience the rejection (Rohner, 2003, 2005).

Finally, socio-cultural systems sub-theory asks the question of whether it is true that specific psychological, familial, community, and societal factors tend to be reliably associated with specific variations in parental acceptance-rejection in the worldwide, or not (Rohner, 2003, 2005).

Parental acceptance and rejection form the warmth dimension of parenting, which is a continuum, and all humans can be placed on this continuum, since



everyone has experienced, more or less, love at the hand of major caregivers in childhood. So, warmth dimension of parenting has to do with the quality of affectional bond between the children and their parents, and with the verbal and physical expression of these feelings by parents. At one end of the continuum, there is parental acceptance that refers to the warmth, affection, care, concern, comfort, nurturance support, or love that children may experience from their parents or other major caregivers. There is parental rejection at the other end of the continuum and it refers to the absence or significant withdrawal of these feelings and behaviors by the presence of various psychologically or physically hurtful behaviors and affects (Rohner, 2003, 2005).

Rohner (2003, 2005) states that over the course of 45 years, an extensive body of cross-cultural research revealed that parental rejection can be experienced by any combination of four principal expressions. These are: (1) cold and unaffectionate, the opposite of being warm and affectionate, (2) hostile and aggressive, (3) indifferent and neglecting, and (4) undifferentiated rejecting. The last expression, undifferentiated rejecting, refers to individuals' beliefs that their parents do not really care about or love them even though there might not be clear behavioral indicators that parents do so.

Rohner (2003, 2005) states that parental acceptance-rejection can be studied from two perspectives, that is, it can be studied as perceived by the individual (phenomenological perspective), or it can be studied as reported by an outside observer (the behavioral perspective). Although these two perspectives generally lead to similar conclusions, PARTheory research suggests that if it is not so, one should generally trust the information derived from phenomenological perspective. This is true since the outside observers may fail to detect any behavioral indicators of

rejection even though the child feels the opposite way or vice versa. As Kagan (1978) states, "parental rejection is not a specific set of actions by parents but a belief held by the child" (as cited in Rohner, 2005, p. 61).

#### Methods in PARTheory Research

To test the core aspects of this theory, five discrete methods or types of studies have been used. Since the first type of these studies is most related to the present study, it will be explored in the next paragraph.

The first type of studies includes quantitative psychological studies using techniques such as interviews, behavior observations, and self-report questionnaires, most notably the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), the Parental Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire (PARQ/Control), and the Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ). Both PARQ and PARQ/Control have three versions. The PARQ is used to assess children's perceptions of the degree of acceptance or rejection they receive at the hands of their mothers, fathers, or other caregivers. The PARQ/Control is the same as the PARQ but it also includes a control scale that assesses the behavioral control the children experience from their caregivers. The second versions of these instruments (the Adult PARQ and the Adult PARQ/Control) are used to assess adults' recollections of their childhood experiences of maternal or paternal acceptance-rejection (and control). The third versions (the Father/Mother PARQ and the Father/Mother PARQ/Control) ask parents to reflect on their own accepting-rejecting and controlling behaviors toward their children. The PAQ, on the other hand, assesses individuals' (adults' or children's) self-perceptions of overall psychological adjustment (Rohner, 2003, 2005).

The Child TARQ/Control is a 29-item adaptation of the standard the Child Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire/Control (the Child PARQ/Control) and the structure of the Child PARQ/Control, as well as its scoring procedures and interpretation, is pertinent to the Child TARQ/Control. Because of these, detailed information about the PARQ and the PARQ/Control will be explored in the instruments section of the present study.

### Evidence Supporting the Main Features of PARTheory

Overwhelmingly, the most developed portion of this theory is its personality sub-theory. Majority of the evidence on this sub-theory comes from the studies in which the PARQ, the PARQ/Control, and the PAQ have been used with thousands of children and adults in many ethnic groups and societies throughout the world (Rohner, 2003, 2005).

Khaleque & Rohner (2002) state that regardless of racial, cultural, geographic, and linguistic variations, every study that has used these instruments revealed the same conclusion: the experience of parental acceptance-rejection tends to be associated with many forms of psychological adjustment or maladjustment. The meta-analysis of 43 studies with 7563 respondents worldwide indicated that 3,433 studies with nonsignificant results would be required to disconfirm the conclusion that perceived acceptance-rejection is panculturally associated with children's psychological adjustment; (as cited in Rohner, 2005).

The quality of adults' intimate relationships with their partners is known to be associated with variations in adults' psychological adjustment. In this regard, Rohner and Khaleque (2005) found that the self-reported impaired psychological adjustment of 88 American women was related to the degree to which they experienced their

intimate male partners as somewhat rejecting (as cited in Rohner, 2005).

Another study by Varan, Rohner, & Eryuksel (2005) in Turkey with 440 Turkish males and 660 females found that perceived partner acceptance along with both remembered maternal acceptance and paternal acceptance all made significant and independent contributions to variations in the level of psychological adjustment of both men and women (as cited in Rohner, 2005).

Worldwide, studies carried out by researchers such as Belsky & Pensky (1988), Chen, Rubin, & Li (1995), Dumka, Roosa, & Jackson (1997), Erkman (1992), Fattah (1996), Greenberger & Chen (1996), Hassab-Allah (1996), Hayward (1987), Parker, Kiloh, & Salama (1990), Richter (1994), Whitbeck, Hoyt, Miller, & Kao (1992), and Whitbeck, Conger, & Kao (1993) revealed that parental rejection is consistently related to both clinical and non-clinical depression and depressed affect within major ethnic groups and in many countries (as cited in Rohner, 2005).

The studies of researchers such as Ajdukovic (1990), Marcus & Gray (1998), Maughan, Pickles, & Quinton (1995), Pedersen (1994), Rothbaum & Weis (1994), Salama (1984), Saxena (1992), and Simons, Robertson, & Downs (1989) indicated that besides leading to depression, parental rejection also appears to be a major predictor of behavior problems including conduct disorders, externalizing behavior, and delinquency (as cited in Rohner, 2005). Also, substance abuse was found to be related to parental rejection by Coombs & Paulson (1988), Coombs, Paulson, & Richardson (1991), Myers, Newcomb, Richardson, & Alvy (1997), Rosenberg (1971), Shedler & Block (1990) (as cited in Rohner, 2005).

In Turkey, several studies were carried out by using the PARQ and other tools for assessing parental acceptance-rejection and its possible outcomes and correlates. Some of these studies consist of the validity, reliability, and norms studies

of the Turkish PARQ, the Turkish PARQ/Control and their different versions.

In 1990, Erdem & Erkman investigated the relationship between perceived parental acceptance-rejection and self-concept, anxiety, attributional style of causality, parenting attitudes, and academic achievement for the construct validation of the Child PARQ/Control. The study consisted of 344, 13 and 14 year old 8<sup>th</sup> grade students. Results indicated that perceived rejection was significantly negatively related to self-concept and academic achievement and significantly positively related to anxiety and helpless explanatory style of causality (Erdem & Erkman, 1990).

In another study, Alantar & Erkman (1988) investigated the relationship between parental rejection and emotional abuse with 377, 16 year old high school students coming from different socioeconomic levels. It was found that as parental rejection increased, perceived abuse increased (Alantar, 1988).

Erkman (1989) carried out another study in which she investigated the relationship between parental rejection and perceived family environment with remigrant 16 year old Turkish students. The findings showed that the perception of cohesion in family correlated negatively with maternal low warmth, aggression, neglect, and undifferentiated rejection (as cited in Erkman, 1992).

In 1990, Kozcu examined the relationship between parental acceptance-rejection, perceived emotional abuse, mental health level, and other factors including perceived family attitudes and substance abuse with 127 university students. The results indicated that mental health level is negatively related with perceived emotional abuse and parental rejection. Substance abuse was found to be higher among students who reported high emotional abuse and parental rejection (as cited in Erkman, 1992).

### III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND RESEARCH

#### QUESTIONS

An extensive body of research undertaken worldwide makes it obvious that teachers are important nonparental adults for their students since they play a major role in psychological, emotional, social, behavioral, and academic development of their students. Teachers' abusive and enhancing behavior, different forms of teacher-student relationships and interactions have been indicated to have a variety of affects and psychological correlates among children and adolescents.

Educational researchers and in school settings, school counselors and psychologists need objective, valid, and reliable tools to be able to assess particular aspects of teacher behaviors for developing prevention and intervention programs. Via prevention programs, teachers and teacher trainees may be educated about the possible effects of abusive and enhancing behavior and they may be trained about how to behave in the classroom or how to interact with their students for the healthy development of them. Via intervention programs, teachers who were reported to have abusive behavior by such tools may be trained to change such behavior into enhancing ones. The intervention programs may also be developed to be used with students who report a high degree of perceived abusive behavior from his or her teacher and who suffer from such behavior.

Worldwide, there are variety of tools for assessing teacher behavior, teacher-student interactions and relationships. However, in Turkey, the number of objective, valid, and reliable tools that assess teacher behavior, teacher-student interactions and relationships is limited So, as educational researchers and school counselors, we need such tools.

Taking this need into account, the aim of the present study is to carry out the

validity, reliability, and partial norm study of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control that assesses the perceived acceptance-rejection and behavioral control from teachers.

The questions that the present study will investigate are as follows:

- I. What is the reliability of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control Short Form?
  - A. What is the reliability of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control Short Form in terms of internal consistency?
    - a. What is the range of item-total correlations?
    - b. What are the ranges of item-subscale correlations?
    - c. What is the range of subscale-subscale correlations?
    - d. What is the range of subscale-total correlations?
    - e. What are the Cronbach Alpha values for the warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect, undifferentiated rejection subscales, for the control scale, and for the total Turkish Child TARQ?
  - B. What is the temporal stability of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control Short Form as assessed by test-retest correlation?
    - a. What are the two to three week interval test-retest correlations for the Warmth/Affection, Hostility/Aggression, Indifference/Neglect, Undifferentiated Rejection subscales, for the Control scale, and for the total Turkish Child TARQ?
- II. What is the validity of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control Short Form?
  - A. What is the concurrent validity of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control Short Form?
    - a. Is the Turkish Child TARQ/Control Short Form significantly and

positively correlated to the Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory?

- b. Is the Turkish Child TARQ/Control Short Form significantly and negatively correlated to the Teacher Support Subscale?

B. What is the construct validity of the Turkish Child TARQ Short Form as investigated by factor analysis?

- a. Do the items cluster around four factors that are consistent with the original subscales?
- b. Do the items cluster around two primary factors namely warmth and rejection?
- c. How many factors do the items cluster around with free factor analysis?

III. What are the partial norms of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control according to age, gender, self reported semester point average (SPA), school SES, teacher gender, number of children in the family, mother and father education, and mother and father employment status?



## IV. METHOD

### Subjects

Data were mostly collected from the 5<sup>th</sup> grade students for the present study. In some schools, data were also collected from the 4<sup>th</sup> grade students since the number of 5<sup>th</sup> grade students was not enough. The data were not collected from upper or lower grades than 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grades because in upper grades, the students have different teachers for each class, therefore, the students do not have much chance to spend so much time with one teacher. However, 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students have one classroom teacher who enters many of their classes and with whom they can spend much more time. So, 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students were expected to have more valid and reliable perceptions about their teachers' behaviors. In lower grades, students may not be mature enough to understand the instructions, directions, and the items of the measures. After taking all these factors into consideration, it was decided to run the study with 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students.

The subjects were chosen from the population of children studying in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade of 6 primary schools representing three different socio-economic statuses (SES) in Istanbul: two schools representing the high SES, two representing the middle SES, and two representing the low SES in order to be able to make the subjects more representative of the population of 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade children. Socio-economic levels of the schools were estimated depending on the location of the schools and their being public or private schools.

The selection of the schools was done on a convenience basis in terms of willingness to cooperate with the researcher and participate in this study. After taking permission from the Ministry of National Education and principals of the schools, the measures of the study were applied to 503 female and male students from six

different schools and three different SES levels (see Table 1).

Table 1: *Distribution of the Sample according to School and SES of the School.*

School	SES of the School	Frequency	Percent
A	Low SES	118	23.5
B	Low SES	67	13.3
Total		185	36.8
C	Middle SES	94	18.7
D	Middle SES	76	15.1
Total		170	33.8
E	High SES	87	17.3
F	High SES	61	12.1
Total		148	29.4
TOTAL		503	100

Table 1 shows that most of the subjects were the students of school A and these students constitute 23.5 % of the sample with 118 students. The least represented school was F with 61 subjects that make up 12.1 % of sample. In terms of school SES, most of the subjects were the students of low SES schools and they constitute 36.8 % of the sample with 185 students. Subjects from the middle SES schools make up 33.8 % of the sample with 170 students and subjects from the high SES schools making up 29.4 % of the sample with 148 students

For test-retest reliability, one school from each SES level was selected. This selection was based on the cooperation of the school administration for the second data collection after two to three weeks following the initial application of measures.

The total number of the subjects for the second data collection was 253 (see Table 2).

Table 2: *Test-Retest Reliability Sample Description by School and SES of the School.*

School	SES of school	Total
A	Low SES	109
C	Middle SES	84
F	High SES	60
TOTAL		253

Demographic characteristics of the sample are as follows: the age range of 10.6 to 10.11 is the most frequent age range in the sample, (n = 175) and it constitutes 34.8 % of the total sample (see Table 3).

Table 3: *Distribution of the Sample according to Age.*

Age Range	Frequency	Percent
Unstated	29	5.8
9.0 – 9.5	19	3.8
9.6 – 9.11	40	8.0
10.0 – 10.5	127	25.2
10.6 – 10.11	175	34.8
11.0 – 11.5	97	19.3
11.6 – 11.11	11	2.2
12.0 – 12.5	5	1.0
Total	503	100

In terms of gender, male population was less than females, with 51.1 % females and 48.9 % males. Most of the subjects were born in the Marmara Region, (79.7 %) and the rest were from seven regions of Turkey and different cities abroad (see Table 4). According to the distribution of birthplaces in terms of cities, most of the subjects were born in Istanbul with 77.7 % (see Appendix E Table E 1).

Table 4: *Distribution of the Sample according to Birthplace (Regions).*

Birthplace	Frequency	Percent
Unstated	37	7.4
Marmara Region	401	79.7
Aegean Region	7	1.4
Inner Anatolian Region	12	2.4
Black Sea Region	21	4.2
Mediterranean Region	3	0.6
Southeast Anatolian Region	5	1.0
East Anatolian Region	11	2.2
Abroad Country	6	1.2
Total	503	100

The most frequent SPA range as stated by subjects was 4.50-5.00 with 59.2 % of total subjects and 19.3 % of subjects not knowing or stating their last SPA (see Table 5)

For this study, data were collected from 18 different classes in 6 different schools and only three of these classes' classroom teachers were male teachers. Classroom teachers of 15 classes were female teachers. Data analysis indicated that

79.9 % of the total sample (n = 402) had a female classroom teacher while 20.1 % of the total sample (n = 101) had a male classroom teacher.

Table 5: *Distribution of the Sample according to SPA.*

Semester Point Average	Frequency	Percent
Unstated	97	19.3
1.00 - 1.49	4	0.8
1.50 - 1.99	2	0.4
2.00 - 2.49	3	0.6
2.50 - 2.99	8	1.6
3.00 - 3.49	9	1.8
3.50 - 3.99	21	4.2
4.00 - 4.49	61	12.1
4.50 - 5.00	298	59.2
Total	503	100

In high SES schools, data were also collected from the 4<sup>th</sup> grade students since the number of the 5<sup>th</sup> grade students in these schools is less than the number of 5<sup>th</sup> grade students in middle and low SES schools. The second reason was to be able to make high SES schools as equally representative as the other SES level schools. The sample consisted of 420, 5<sup>th</sup> grade students that is 84 % of the total sample and 83, 4<sup>th</sup> grade students that is 16 % of the total sample.

In terms of number of children in the family it was seen in most of the families that 48.1 % were two children families. The families who had more than four children had the lowest percentage (see Table 6).

Table 6: *Distribution of the Sample according to Number of Children in the Family.*

Number of Children	Frequency	Percent
Unstated	8	1.6
1 child	109	21.7
2 children	242	48.1
3 children	97	19.3
4 children	31	6.2
More than 4 children	16	3.2
Total	503	100

In terms of parental education, subjects' mothers were mostly primary school graduates with 25.2 %, followed by high school graduates (20.3 %) and university graduates (20.3 %) (see Table 7).

Table 7: *Distribution of the Sample according to Mother Education.*

Mother Education	Frequency	Percent
Unstated	14	2.8
Not primary school graduate	26	5.2
Primary school graduate	127	25.2
Secondary school graduate	73	14.5
High school graduate	102	20.3
Vocational high school graduate	26	5.2
Entered university but not graduated	17	3.4
University graduate	102	20.3
Graduate or postgraduate	16	3.2
Total	503	100

Fathers of the subjects were more educated compared to their mothers with 29 % university graduates and with 21.5 % high school graduates (see Table 8).

Table 8: *Distribution of the Sample according to Father Education.*

Father Education	Frequency	Percent
Unstated	13	2.6
Not primary school graduate	10	2
Primary school graduate	82	16.3
Secondary school graduate	64	12.7
High school graduate	108	21.5
Vocational high school graduate	33	6.6
Entered university but not graduated	15	3
University graduate	146	29
Graduate or postgraduate	32	6.4
Total	503	100

In terms of the employment status, while 64.4 % of the subjects' mothers were not working, 94.2 % the subjects' fathers were working. Subjects' mothers that were not working were mostly housewives with 56.4 % and fathers that were not working were mostly retired (see Tables 9, 10). In terms of profession, most of the fathers were working as free with 38.6 %, while most of the mothers have no profession with 56.5 % (see Tables 11, 12).

While categorizing the professions of parents, the professions such as engineer, teacher, doctor, lawyer, academician, and pharmacists were considered as professionals and parents who work without social security and without paying

income taxes were considered as free lance workers. The professions that can not be categorized were stated as “other”

Table 9: *Distribution of the Sample according to Mothers' Employment Status.*

Mothers' Employment Status	Frequency	Percent
Retired	29	5.8
Looking for a job	11	2.2
Housewife	275	56.4
Dead	1	0.2
Working	177	35.2
Other	10	0.2
Total	503	100

Table 10: *Distribution of the Sample according to Fathers' Employment Status.*

Fathers' Employment Status	Frequency	Percent
Retired	14	2.8
Looking for a job	7	1.4
Dead	4	0.8
Working	474	94.2
Other	4	0.8
Total	503	100



Table 11: *Distribution of the Sample according to Mothers' Profession.*

Mothers' Profession	Frequency	Percent
No profession	284	56.5
Government employee	18	3.6
Private sector employee	52	10.3
Free	13	2.6
Worker	14	2.8
Free lance	37	7.4
Professional	44	8.7
Other	14	2.8
Unstated	27	5.4
Total	503	100

Table 12: *Distribution of the Sample according to Fathers' Profession.*

Fathers' Profession	Frequency	Percent
No Profession	7	1.4
Government Employee	38	7.6
Private Sector Employee	106	21.1
Free	194	38.6
Worker	37	7.4
Free lance	11	2.2
Professional	65	12.9
Other	25	5
Unstated	20	4
Total	503	100

In this study, four instruments were used for the purposes of establishing the validity, reliability, and for the partial norm study of the Child Teacher Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire/Control Turkish Short Form.

*Demographic Form*

In order to be able to determine the demographic characteristics of the subject population, the demographic form developed by Bars (1999) was utilized with the elimination and addition of some questions. This form includes questions on age, sex, sex of teachers, number of siblings, profession and the employment of parents, educational information of the parents, and the previous semester's point average of the subjects. The demographic form is presented in Appendix A.

*Teacher's Acceptance-Rejection/ Control Questionnaire, Child Version (Short Form)  
(Child TARQ/Control)*

The Child TARQ/Control (short form) is a 29-item adaptation of the standard Child Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire/Control (Child PARQ/Control short form) which was developed for children to assess the perceived parents' (mothers' and fathers') acceptance-rejection and behavioral control. The structure of the child PARQ/Control (short form) as well as its scoring procedures and interpretation is pertinent to the Child TARQ/Control which was designed by Rohner in 2002 and revised in 2004 to be used by children to evaluate the perceived acceptance-rejection and behavioral control of their classroom teachers (Rohner, 2005).

The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) is a self-report

instrument which was designed by Rohner in 1971 on a rational-theoretical basis to measure perceptions of individuals about parental acceptance-rejection (Rohner, 2003). The PARQ has three versions namely the Adult PARQ, the Parent PARQ, and the Child PARQ which are nearly identical except for verb tense (present or past), and referent (mother, father, or child version of the PARQ). The Adult PARQ assesses adults' perceptions of their parent's (father's or mother's) treatment of them when they were at primary school age 7 through 12. The Parent PARQ asks fathers and mothers to assess the way they perceive how they treat their children at the present; and the Child PARQ asks children to assess the way they feel their mother or father treat them at the present (Rohner, 2003).

The Parental Acceptance –Rejection/Control Questionnaire is identical to the PARQ except that it incorporates the 13-item Parental Control Scale that assesses the parental behavioral control. The Child PARQ/Control was developed by Rohner, Saavedra, and Granum in 1980. As all versions of the PARQ/Control, the Child PARQ/Control consist of five scales namely Warmth/Affection, Hostility/Aggression, Indifference/Neglect, Undifferentiated Rejection, and Control. The Child TARQ/Control consists of the same scales, that is, overall acceptance-rejection, and Control scale. The Warmth/Affection scale refers to teacher-child relationships where teacher is perceived to give love or affection without qualification, but not necessarily with great demonstrations. The Hostility/Aggression scale assesses conditions where children believe their teacher is angry, bitter, or resentful of them, or to conditions where children believe or think that their teacher intends to hurt them, physically or verbally. The Indifference/Neglect scale assesses conditions where children see their teacher as unconcerned or uninterested in them. Children see such teachers as paying little

attention to them, or not wanting to spend time with them. Undifferentiated Rejection scale assesses the perceived rejection from teacher, that is, perceived absence or significant withdrawal of warmth and affection. The fifth scale, that is, Control scale assesses the extent to which children perceive their teachers to be behaviorally controlling (Rohner, 2005).

The original form of the Child PARQ/Control consists of 73 items whereas the Child TARQ/Control Short Form and the Child PARQ/Control Short Form consist of 29 items. In the original scale, the Warmth/Affection subscale consists of 20 items; the Hostility/Aggression and Indifference/Neglect subscales each consists of 15 items, the Undifferentiated Rejection subscale consists of 10 items, and the Control scale consists of 13 items; whereas, in the Child TARQ/Control Short Form, the Warmth/Affection subscale consists of 8 items; the Hostility/Aggression and Indifference/Neglect subscales each consists of 6 items, the Undifferentiated Rejection subscale consists of 4 items; and the Control scale contains 5 items (Rohner, 2003, 2005).

Analysis of the reliability and validity of the Child PARQ and the Mother PARQ was guided in 1975 by the standards outlined in the *American Psychological Association's Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests* (1974) (as cited in Rohner, 2003). 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 to assess the convergent and discriminant validity of the Adult and Child PARQ. The results showed that all four scales of both the adult and child versions are significantly related to the validation scales ( $p < .001$ ). The correlations between the PARQ and the validation scales ranged from .43 to .90 for the adult form and .55 to

.83 for the child form. As the principal measure of reliability, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was used. In the 1975 validation study, the PARQ reliability coefficients for the mother version of the Adult PARQ range from .86 to .95, with a median reliability of .91 and reliability coefficients on the mother version of the Child PARQ spread from .72 to .90 with a median reliability off .82. A second study by Rohner and Cournoyer in 1975 with 58 students at the University of Connecticut revealed a spread of reliability coefficients from .83 to .96 with a median coefficient of .91. In summary, it can be concluded that measures of reliability along with the measures of convergent and discriminant validity in these studies indicated that the instrument is sound (Rohner, 2003).

Factor analysis of the items of the Adult and the Child PARQ (mother version) revealed that in the Adult version, three factors namely rejection, acceptance, and physical punishment emerged and accounted for 75.5% of the variance. In the Child version, two factors accounted for 58 % of the variance and these were the factors of rejection and acceptance (Rohner, 2003).

In Turkey, Polat carried out the translation study of the PARQ in 1988. She administered the questionnaire to 120, 5<sup>th</sup> grade students from upper middle and low SES. She found that Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the subscales of the PARQ ranged from .76 to .89 and the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the total scale was found to be .80 (Polat, 1988).

In 1990, Erdem and Erkman carried out the validity and reliability study of the Child PARQ with 344, 8<sup>th</sup> graders coming from different SES in Istanbul. For construct validation study, factor analysis was used and it yielded two factors as in the original study of Rohner in 1980. Also, the test-retest reliability coefficient of the subscales ranged between .48 and .64, and for the total score, it was .70. The

Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the subscales were found to be ranging between .78 and .90. The subscale total correlations were found to ranging between .85 and .90 (Erdem & Erkman, 1990).

In the Child TARQ/Control short form and other versions of the PARQ, all items are scored on a four point Likert-like scale ranging from (4) Almost always true to (1) Almost never true. In the Child TARQ/Control short form, the score of each scale is computed by adding the points of the items of that scale. Some items (items 16 and 20) are reverse scored, that is, 4 points is reversed to 1 point, 3 points to 2 points, 2 points to 3 points, and 1 point to 4 points. To compute the total TARQ score, scores of the scales of Warmth/Affection, Hostility/Aggression, Indifference/Neglect, and Undifferentiated Rejection are summed with the entire Warmth/Affection scale reverse scored. To compute the Control scale, the points of the items of the Control scale are added together (Rohner, 2005).

Low scores on the acceptance and rejection portion of the questionnaire, that is, the sum of all four acceptance-rejection scales, with the entire Warmth/Affection scale reverse scored reveal that the teacher is perceived to be accepting (i.e., warm and affectionate, low in hostility and aggression, low in indifference and neglect, and non-rejecting in the undifferentiated form). High scores reveal the opposite, that is, the teacher is perceived to be rejecting, that is, cold and unaffectionate, hostile and aggressive, indifferent and neglecting, and rejecting in undifferentiated form. Low scores on the Control scale reveal that the teacher is perceived to be low in behavioral control (i.e., permissive/lax control) and high scores reveal that the teacher is strict/restrictive in control. Scores at or above the midpoint of 60 on the acceptance and rejection portion of the Child TARQ/Control show that the teacher is perceived to be qualitatively more rejecting than accepting (Rohner, 2005).

Translation of the Child PARQ/Control was carried out by Polat in 1988 by using back translation techniques. In 1993, Anjel and Erkman, and in 2000, Varan translated the form into Turkish again with some revisions, and in 2002 Erkman carried out the last revision. In the present study, the Child TARQ/Control Turkish Short Form was taken from the Turkish Child PARQ/Control and a few changes were made by the researcher. The Turkish Child PARQ/Control that was used for translating the Child TARQ/Control Short Form is the version by Erkman (2002). The items of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control Short Form are almost identical to the items of the Turkish Child PARQ/Control except the referent (my teacher instead of my father or my mother) and a few words. Translation and transliteral equivalence studies of the PARQ for adapting its versions to Turkish were carried out before by Polat (1988) and Anjel (1993). In this study, transliteral equivalence study of the Child TARQ/Control short form was not carried out since the items of the Child TARQ/Control are identical to other versions of the PARQ except the referent and tense. The Turkish Child TARQ/Control is presented in Appendix B.

*The Perceived Social Support Scale-Revised/Teacher Support Subscale (PSSS-R/TSs)*

The Perceived Social Support Scale (PSSS-R) was developed (1997) and revised by Yıldırım (2004). It is a self-report instrument that assesses levels of perceived social support from family, friends, teachers for high school students (Yıldırım, 1997).

The instrument has 50 items and three subscales. The subscales are the family support subscale (FSs) with 20 items, the peer support subscale (PSs) with 13 items, and the teacher support subscale (TSs) with 17 items. It consists of a 3-point

Likert Scale where 3 points are given to “suitable to me”, 2 points are given to “partially suitable to me”, and 1 point is given to “not suitable to me”. The minimum score is 50 and maximum score is 150. High points mean high perceived social support (Yıldırım, 2004).

Yıldırım (1997) carried out the validity and reliability study of the instrument with a sample of 660, 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 11<sup>th</sup> grade students. The age of the students ranged between 14 and 17 years. For the reliability study of the instrument and its subscales, test-retest and Cronbach Alpha techniques were used. Analysis of the data showed that test-retest reliability for the total PSSS-R was found to be .91, for the FSs, it was .89, for the PSs, it was .85, and for the TSs, it was found to be .86. Cronbach Alpha coefficients were found to be .91, .94, .91, and .93 respectively (Yıldırım, 2004).

Principle component analysis (PCA) was used for the construct validation of the PSSS-R and its subscales. The results indicated that the FSs had three factors: social companionship and emotional support, advice and information support, and appraisal support. The PSs had one factor, namely, emotional and appraisal support. And finally, the TSs had two factors: emotional support and information and appraisal support (Yıldırım, 2004).

The Criterion validity of the PSSS-R was examined by correlating the total score of the PSSS-R and the scores of its subscales with the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and The Daily Hassles Scale (DHS). Negative significant correlations were found between the PSSS-R and the BDI. The correlation coefficients were found to be -.32 between the PSSS-R and the BDI; -.30 between the FSs and the BDI; -.19 between the PSs and the BDI; and -.23 between the TSs and the BDI. Also negative significant correlation was found between the PSSS-R /



TSss and the DHS. There was no significant correlation between the FSss / PSss and the DHS (PSSS-R and DHS= -.36; TSss= -.34) (Yıldırım 2004). For the purposes of the present study only TSss has been utilized (see Appendix C).

#### *The Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory (PTBI)*

For assessing the adolescents' perceptions of abusive parental and teacher behavior, Erkman and Alantar developed an inventory called The Perceived Emotional Abuse Inventory for Adolescents (PEAIFA) in 1988 which has two parts namely the Parental Section (PS) with 36 items and the Teacher Section with 16 items (Bars, 1999). In 1994, Çakar developed The Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory (PTBI), based on the study of Erkman and Alantar, for the purpose of assessing psychological maltreatment in schools as perceived by students from their teachers (Çakar, 1994).

For the purpose of item construction, three sources were utilized. The first source was the valid instruments that assess emotional abuse and/or classroom environment such as the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), the Classroom Environment Scale (CES), the Perceived Emotional Abuse Inventory (PEAIFA-PS-TS), and the Family Environment Scale (FES). The second source was the abuse literature and the third source was the investigator herself and her thesis advisor. A total of 74 items were formulated and 16 of them were original while the rest were taken from the valid instruments stated above and that were included with some modifications (Çakar, 1994). The items that had item correlations below .25 were deleted and the final form consisted of 60 items (Bars, 1999).

PTBI is a self-report instrument on which all items are scored on a four point Likert-like scale ranging from (4) "Almost always" to (1) "Almost never". The

maximum possible score that can be attained from the scale is 240 and the minimum is 60. In the scale, 18 items are reverse scored. PTBI can be administered to school-aged children and adolescents in nearly 30 minutes (Bars, 1999).

Studies of reliability and validity were carried out by Çakar in 1994 with a sample of 300, 8<sup>th</sup> grade students. The results of data analysis indicated an adequate internal consistency with .90 Cronbach Alpha value for the 74 item PTBI and .91 Cronbach Alpha value for the 60 item PTBI which is the final form. The range of item-total correlations of the final form was from .23 to .81 with an average value of .63. Five weeks interval test-retest reliability was found to be .70. For the study of construct validity, perceived abuse was correlated with self-concept via the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (WIFAM), depression via the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI), anxiety via the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-Trait Form (STAI-T), and achievement of the students via the Grade Point Average (GPA) of the students. The results indicated that perception of psychological abuse from teachers correlated significantly with depression, anxiety, self-concept, and achievement, .41, .42, -.51, and -.26 ( $p < .01$ ) respectively (Çakar, 1994).

Another study for the PTBI was carried out by Bars in 1999 with a sample of 459 adolescents studying in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade of seven high schools from three different socio-economic levels for the purpose of partial norm and reliability studies of PTBI. The results of reliability studies indicated that item-total correlations of the PTBI ranged between .23 and .81 with 75 % of the items having item-total correlations above .60. One-month interval test-retest reliability values were .84 for low school SES and .93 for middle school SES. The partial norms of PTBI on age, gender, semester point average (SPA), schools SES, and mother's education were established by this study (Bars, 1999). The PTBI is presented in Appendix D.

The first step in this study was the selection of the sample that consists of the 5<sup>th</sup> and in some schools also the 4<sup>th</sup> grade students from low, middle, and high socio-economic levels. For this purpose, six primary schools in Istanbul were selected on a convenience basis. Two of these schools represent the high SES, the other two represent the middle SES, and the last two represent the low SES.

The second step of the present study was taking permission from the Ministry of National Education and the principals of the identified schools in order to collect data from students. After taking permission, arrangements for the administration of the tools were made by the researcher by contacting the school principals, school counselors, and classroom teachers.

The third step was the selection of three schools from the six schools for the administration of the TARQ/Child short form for the purpose of a two to three weeks interval test-retest reliability study of the tool. These three schools represent the three different SES levels. After two to three weeks from the initial administration, the tool was readministered in these three schools.

The researcher carried out all test administrations via the help of school counselors. After presenting the TARQ/Child short form, the PTBI, and the PSSS-R/TSss as the questionnaires measuring student-teacher relationship that the researcher uses in her thesis, subjects were informed about how they were going to answer the four instruments, namely the Demographic Form, the TARQ/Child short form, the PTBI, and the PSSS-R/TSss. On the first page of each instrument, instructions about how the instruments are answered were written. The subjects were instructed not to write their names on the instruments but to write their codes which were given to all subjects by the researcher.

In this study, to establish the reliability of the tool, internal consistency and temporal stability of the tool was investigated. Internal consistency of the instrument was determined by the corrected item-total, item-subscale, subscale-total, subscale-subscale and Cronbach Alpha correlation coefficients for the total TARQ, for its subscales, and for the Control scale separately. Temporal stability of the tool was determined by two to three weeks interval test-retest administration and to find the test-retest reliability coefficient for the total TARQ, for its subscales, and for the separate Control scale, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique was used.

To establish the validity of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control, the total TARQ scores of the subjects were correlated with their scores on the PTBI and the PSSS-R/TSss by using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique to determine its concurrent validity. To determine its construct validity, factor analyses were carried out for four factors consistent with the original subscales, for two factors, that is overall warmth and rejection, and as free to determine how many factors do the items cluster around. For the factor analyses, Varimax Rotated Factor Analysis method was used.

To determine the partial norms for the Turkish Child TARQ/Control short form, descriptive statistics techniques such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were carried out for age, self-reported SPA, gender, school SES, father and mother educational level, father and mother employment status, father and mother profession, teacher gender, and birthplace of participants. Also, One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics were carried out to investigate significant differences between the subgroups and the Scheffe procedure was conducted to investigate which subgroups differed significantly from the others, if they did.

## V. RESULTS

This chapter describes the actualization of three purposes; namely; establishing the reliability of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control in terms of internal consistency and temporal stability; establishing the concurrent and construct validity of the instrument; and establishing the preliminary norms for 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control according to age, gender, school SES, self-reported semester point average, number of children in the family, father and mother education, employment status of father and mother, and teacher gender.

### Results on Reliability

#### *Internal Consistency*

Corrected item-total correlations of the Turkish Child TARQ ranged between .31 (item 5) and .64 (item 12) with 50 % of the items having item-total correlations above 0.50 with an average value of .50 (see Table 13).

Table 13: *Corrected Item-Total Correlations of the Turkish Child TARQ.*

Item No	r	Item No	r	Item No	r
1	.56	11	.51	21	.41
2	.45	12	.64	22	.49
4	.39	13	.57	23	.50
5	.31	15	.45	24	.42
6	.57	16	.59	25	.52
8	.41	17	.53	27	.48
9	.48	18	.48	28	.55
10	.62	19	.44	29	.63

The Cronbach Alpha value for the total TARQ was found to be .90 ( $r = .90$ ;  $p < .01$ ) (see Table 19).

While computing the corrected item-total correlations, the items of the control scale were not computed since the score of this scale is not used while computing the total score of the Child TARQ and it is computed and used separately.

Corrected item-subscale correlations were computed for the four subscales of the instrument, namely, the warmth/affection subscale, the hostility/aggression subscale, the indifference/neglect subscale, the undifferentiated rejection subscale and for the separate control scale.

Corrected item-subscale correlation of the warmth/affection (W/A) subscale ranged between .42 (item 4) and .62 (item 29), with an average of .53 (see Table 14).

Table 14: *Corrected Item-Subscale Correlations of the Warmth/Affection Subscale.*

Item no	r	Item no	r
1	.52	21	.50
4	.42	23	.55
11	.54	27	.56
15	.53	29	.62

The Cronbach Alpha value for the Warmth/Affection subscale was found to be .81 ( $r = .81$ ;  $p < .01$ ) (see Table 19).

Corrected item-subscale correlations of the hostility/aggression (H/A) subscale ranged between .28 (item 5) and .56 (item 12), with an average of .43 (see Table 15).

Table 15: *Corrected Item-Subscale Correlations of the Hostility/Aggression Subscale*

Item no	r	Item no	r
5	.28	17	.47
8	.43	22	.46
12	.56	24	.37

The Cronbach Alpha value for the Hostility/Aggression subscale was found to be .68 ( $r = .68$ ;  $p < .01$ ) (see Table 19).

For the subscale of indifference/neglect (I/N), corrected item-subscale correlations ranged between .41 (item 2) and .53 (item 13), with an average of .47 (see Table 16).

Table 16: *Corrected Item-Subscale Correlations of the Indifference/Neglect Subscale.*

Item no	r	Item no	r
2	.41	16	.46
9	.50	18	.48
13	.53	28	.46

The Cronbach Alpha value for the Indifference/Neglect subscale was found to be .74 ( $r = .74$ ;  $p < .01$ ) (see Table 19).

Corrected item-subscale correlations of the Undifferentiated Rejection (UR) subscale ranged between .35 (item 19) and .56 (item 10), with an average of .47 (see Table 17).

Table 17: *Corrected Item-Subscale Correlations of the Undifferentiated Rejection Subscale.*

Item no	r	Item no	r
6	.51	19	.35
10	.56	25	.44

The Cronbach Alpha value for the Undifferentiated Rejection subscale was found to be .67 ( $r = .67$ ;  $p < .01$ ) (see Table 19).

For the separate Control scale corrected item-total correlations were computed and found to be ranging between .09 (item 3) and .24 (item 14), with an average of .14 (see Table 18).

Table 18: *Corrected Item-Total Correlations of the Control Scale.*

Item no	r	Item no	r
3	.09	20	.03
7	.21	26	.23
14	.24		

The Cronbach Alpha value for the Control scale was found to be .34 ( $r = .34$ ;  $p < .01$ ) (see Table 19).

Table 19 shows the Cronbach Alpha values of the warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/neglect, undifferentiated rejection subscales, the control scale, and the total TARQ.



Table 19: *Cronbach Alpha Values of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control.*

Scale	Cronbach Alpha
Warmth/Affection	.81**
Hostility/Aggression	.68**
Indifference/Neglect	.74**
Undifferentiated Rejection	.67**
Control	.34**
Total TARQ	.90**

\*\*p<.01.

For investigating the internal consistency of the Turkish Child TARQ, subscale-total and subscale-subscale correlations were also computed. The correlations ranged between .47 (between H/A and W/A) and .70 (between H/A and UR) for the subscale-subscale correlations and .82 and .87 for the subscale-total correlations (see Table 20).

Table 20: *Subscale-Subscale and Subscale--Total Correlations for the Turkish Child TARQ.*

	W/A	H/A	I/N	UR	Total TARQ
W/A	1.0**	.47**	.62**	.52**	.82**
H/A		1.0**	.63**	.70**	.82**
I/N			1.0**	.64**	.87**
UR				1.0**	.82**
Total TARQ					1.0**

\*\*p<.01.

*Temporal Consistency*

For investigating the temporal stability of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control and its subscales, the tool was readministered to 253 of 503 students (see Table 2 on p. 37) two to three weeks after the initial administration. The Two-three weeks interval test-retest reliability coefficient of the total TARQ was found to be .76 and for the subscales the coefficients were found to be ranging between .51 (Control scale) and .66 (W/A subscale). All of the correlation coefficients were found to be significant at the .01 level. Test-retest reliability coefficients of the total TARQ and its subscales can be seen on Table 21.

Table 21: *Test-Retest Correlation Coefficients of the Total TARQ, the Subscales, and the Control Scale.*

Scale	r
Warmth/Affection	.66**
Hostility/Aggression	.60**
Undifferentiated Rejection	.61**
Indifference/Neglect	.55**
Control	.51**
Total TARQ	.76**

\*\*p<.01.

### Results on Validity

*Concurrent Validity*

To investigate the concurrent validity of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control, the scores of the subjects on this instrument were correlated with their scores on two

different instruments, namely, the Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory (PTBI) and the Teacher Support Subscale (TSss) of the Perceived Social Support Scale-Revised (PSSS-R).

Whether if there is a positive significant correlation between the Turkish Child TARQ/Control and the PTBI, was investigated since on the PTBI, the higher the score, the higher the perceived psychological abuse from the teacher and on the TARQ/Control, the higher the score, the higher the perceived rejection from the teacher. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique indicated a correlation coefficient of .82 between the Turkish Child TARQ and the PTBI that is significant at the .01 level ( $r=.82$ ;  $p<.01$ ). The same technique yielded a correlation coefficient of .20 between the control scale and the PTBI that is significant at the .01 level ( $r=.20$ ;  $p<.01$ ).

It was also investigated whether there is negative significant correlation between the Turkish Child TARQ/Control and the TSss since on the TSss, the higher the score, the higher the perceived social support from the teacher and since perceived social support and warmth are highly related concepts. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique indicated a correlation coefficient of -.79 between these two instruments that is significant at the 0.01 level ( $r=-.79$ ;  $p<.01$ ). The correlation coefficient between the control scale and the TSss was found to be -.07 that is not significant at the .01 level. Also, the correlation coefficient between the PTBI and the TSss was found as  $r = -.79$ ;  $p<.01$ .

### *Construct Validity*

To investigate the construct validity of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control short form, Varimax rotated factor analysis was carried out. In this study, firstly, four

factors were investigated since the total TARQ contains four different subscales.

Table 22 shows the results of the Varimax rotated factor analysis with four factors.

Table 22: *Varimax Rotated Factor Analysis with Four Factors.*

Subscales	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
W/A	1, 4, 11, 15 21, 23, 27, 29			
H/A		5, 12, 17	8, 22	24
I/N	16	2, 13	9, 18	28
UR		6, 10,	19	25

As can be seen on Table 22, Factor 1 contains all the items of warmth/affection subscale and one item of the indifference/neglect subscale; Factor 2 contains three items of the hostility/aggression subscale, two items of the indifference/neglect subscale, and two items of the undifferentiated rejection subscale; Factor 3 contains two items of the hostility/aggression subscale, two items of the indifference/neglect subscale, and one item of the undifferentiated rejection subscale; and Factor 4 contains one item from all the subscales except warmth/affection subscale. These four factors were found to account for 48.67 % of the variance.

When the items that fall under four factors were compared with the items of four subscales it is seen that 100 % of the warmth/affection subscale items and 16.67 % of the indifference/neglect subscale items fall under Factor 1; 50 % of the hostility/aggression subscale items, 33.33 % of the indifference/neglect subscale items, and 50 % of the undifferentiated rejection subscale items fall under Factor 2;

33.33 % of the hostility/aggression subscale items, 33.33 % of the indifference/neglect subscale items, and 25 % of the undifferentiated rejection subscale items fall under Factor 3, and 16.67 % of the hostility/aggression subscale items, 16.67 % of the indifference/neglect subscale items, and 25 % of the undifferentiated rejection subscale items fall under Factor 4. As it is seen, most of the items (9) cluster around Factor 1, while the others spread between three factors. Item-factor correlations were found to be ranging between .43 and .65, .36 and .61, .46 and .57, and .33 and .56 for Factors 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively (see Appendix F Table F 1).

Secondly, two factors, warmth and rejection, were investigated and Table 23 shows the results of the Varimax rotated factor analysis with two factors.

Table 23: *Varimax Rotated Factor Analysis with Two Factors.*

Subscales	Factor 1	Factor 2
W/A		1, 4, 11, 15, 21, 23, 27, 29
H/A	5, 8, 12, 17, 22, 24	
I/N	9, 13, 18, 28	2, 16
UR	6, 10, 19, 25	

As can be seen on Table 23, Factor 1 contains all the items of overall rejection subscales except item 2 and 16 that are the items of the indifference/neglect subscale. Factor 1 contains all the items of warmth/affection subscale that is the overall warmth/acceptance, and item 2 and 16. These two factors were found to account for 39.37 % of the variance. Item factor correlations were found to be ranging between

.31 and .67 for Factor 1 and, .34 and .65 for Factor 2 (see Appendix F Table F 2).

When the items that fall under two factors were compared with the items that belong to the warmth/affection subscale and the three overall rejection scales, it is seen that 87.5 % of the overall rejection scales items fall under Factor 1 and 100 % of the warmth/affection subscale items and 12.5 % of the indifference/neglect subscale items fall under Factor 2. As it is seen most of the items (14) that belong to overall rejection scales cluster around Factor 1 and the items that belong to overall acceptance scale cluster around Factor 2.

Thirdly, free factor analysis was carried out and it yielded 4 factors that are the same as the analysis with four factors.

#### Results on Normative Values

The norms of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control short form according to age, gender, school SES, SPA, teacher gender, number of children in the family, parental education, and parental employment status were computed using mean and standard deviation.

As can be seen on Table 24, the means of the Turkish Child TARQ short form scores by age range between 42.65 (unstated) and 35.6 (12 years – 12 years 5 months). The mean score of the students who did not state their ages is the highest one and it means that this group perceives the highest rejection from their teachers. Also, it can be seen that the older the age of a student the lower the mean score for perception of rejection from teacher which can be suggestive of being negatively correlated with age. Additionally, One-Way Analysis of Variance (One-Way ANOVA) statistics was carried out to investigate significant differences between age

groups. It was found that the means of each eight age groups did not significantly differ from each other (see Table 25).

Table 24: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ by Age.*

Age Range	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Unstated	42.65	29	10.83
9 - 9.5	40.68	19	12.82
9.6 - 9.11	38.43	40	13.50
10 - 10.5	38.30	127	12.01
10.6 - 10.11	38.90	175	13.66
11 - 11.5	37.32	97	12.38
11.6 - 11.11	36.73	11	11.55
12 - 12.5	35.60	5	9.02
Total	38.61	503	12.72

Table 25: *One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Age.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	830.74	7	118.68	0.73
Within Groups	80376.89	495	162.38	
Total	81207.63	502		

Table 26 shows that the means of the Control scale scores by age range between 14.64 (11.6 – 11.11) and 17.00 (12 – 12.5). One-Way Analysis of Variance statistics was carried out to investigate significant differences between the age groups. It was found that the means of each eight age groups did not significantly differ from each other (see Table 27).

Table 26: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Control Scale by Age.*

Age Range	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Unstated	29	15.28	2.12
9 - 9.5	19	15.79	2.07
9.6 - 9.11	40	15.35	2.30
10 - 10.5	127	15.45	2.78
10.6 - 10.11	175	15.99	2.80
11 - 11.5	97	16.05	2.41
11.6 - 11.11	11	14.64	2.77
12 - 12.5	5	17.00	2.55
Total	503	15.74	2.63

Table 27: *One-Way ANOVA for the Control Scale Scores by Age.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	65.30	7	9.33	1.36
Within Groups	3402.62	495	6.88	
Total	3467.92	502		

As can be seen on Table 28, the mean score of the Turkish Child TARQ for males is greater than the one for females. One-Way ANOVA statistics was carried out to investigate significant differences between gender and it was found that males' mean score is significantly different and higher than the females' ( $F= 15.81$ ;  $p<.001$ ) indicating higher perception of rejection from their teachers (see Table 29).



Table 28: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Gender.*

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Male	246	40.88	14.19
Female	257	36.44	10.72
Total	503	38.61	12.72

Table 29: *One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Gender.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	2484.86	1	2484.85	15.81****	.001
Within Groups	78722.77	501	157.13		
Total	81207.63	502			

\*\*\*\*p<.001

Table 30 shows that the mean score of the Control scale for males is greater than the one for females.

Table 30: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Control Scale by Gender.*

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Male	246	16.10	2.56
Female	257	15.40	2.65
Total	503	15.74	2.63

One-way ANOVA result indicated that males' mean score is significantly different and higher than the females' ( $F=9.08$ ;  $p<.005$ ) (see Table 31).

Table 31: *One-Way ANOVA for the Control Scale Scores by Gender.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	61.74	1	61.74	9.08***	.005
Within Groups	3406.18	501	6.80		
Total	3467.92	502			

\*\*\* $p<.005$ .

Table 32 shows means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores for each school SES groups. In the middle SES sub-sample it is seen that the mean value of perception of rejection by teachers is 39.52 and is numerically higher than the low SES and high SES sub-samples'.

Table 32: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by School SES.*

School SES	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Low SES	185	38.68	12.43
Middle SES	170	39.52	13.54
High SES	148	37.48	12.08
Total	503	38.61	12.72

One-Way ANOVA statistics was carried out to investigate if there are significant differences between the SES groups and it was found that the SES groups

did not significantly differ from each other in terms of TARQ mean scores (see Table 33).

Table 33: *One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by School SES.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	331.74	2	165.87	1.03
Within Groups	80875.89	500	161.75	
Total	81207.63	502		

Table 34 shows the means and standard deviations of the Control scale by school SES. It is seen that the mean score of the control scale for middle SES group is the highest one while high SES group has the lowest one.

Table 34: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Control Scale Scores by School SES.*

School SES	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Low SES	185	15.47	2.70
Middle SES	170	16.31	2.56
High SES	148	15.44	2.53
Total	503	15.74	2.63

One-way ANOVA statistics indicated that the means of the Control scale of SES groups differed significantly ( $F=6.13$ ;  $p<.005$ ) (see Table 35). Scheffe procedure was conducted to investigate which groups differed and the results indicated that middle SES group significantly differed from the low and high SES

group while low and high SES groups did not significantly differ from each other. Therefore, middle SES group perceives the highest control from their teachers (see Table 36).

Table 35: *One-Way ANOVA for the Control Scale Scores by School SES.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	82.97	2	41.49	6.13***	.005
Within Groups	3384.95	500	6.77		
Total	3467.92	502			

\*\*\*p<.005.

Table 36: *Scheffe Procedure for the Control Scale Scores by School SES.*

		Subset for alpha = .05	
School SES	N	1	2
High SES	148	15.44	
Low SES	185	15.47	
Middle SES	170		16.31

\*p<.05

Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by SPA levels are presented on Table 37. There were 97 subjects who did not state their SPA's, so they were eliminated in this analysis. It is seen that there is a negative relationship between SPA and TARQ scores except in some cases.

Table 37: Means and Standard Deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by SPA.

SPA	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.00 - 1.49	4	38.75	12.87
1.50 - 1.99	2	70.00	4.24
2.00 - 2.49	3	45.00	21.17
2.50 - 2.99	8	45.87	15.54
3.00 - 3.49	9	40.56	10.98
3.50 - 3.99	21	43.33	13.00
4.00 - 4.49	61	40.46	13.85
4.50 - 5.00	298	36.40	11.15
Total	503	38.61	12.72

Table 38 shows that SPA groups differed significantly ( $F= 4.51$ ;  $p<.001$ ). To investigate which groups differed from each other, the Scheffe procedure ( $p<0.05$ ) was conducted and it was found that the group with 1.50-1.99 SPA significantly differed from all the SPA groups except 2.00-2.49 and 2.50-3.00. The SPA groups other than the 1.50-1.99 did not significantly differ from each other (see Table 39).

Table 38: One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by SPA.

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	5532.62	8	691.58	4.51****	.001
Within Groups	75675.01	494	153.19		
Total	81207.63	502			

\*\*\*\* $p<.001$ .

Table 39: *Scheffe Procedure for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by SPA*

Semester Point Average	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
4.50 - 5.00	298	36.40	
1.00 - 1.49	4	38.75	
4.00 - 4.49	61	40.46	
3.00 - 3.49	9	40.56	
3.50 - 3.99	21	43.33	
2.00 - 2.49	3	45.00	45.00
2.50 - 2.99	8	45.87	45.87
1.50 - 1.99	2		70.00

\*p<.05

Table 40 shows the means and standard deviations the Control scale by SPA.

It is seen that the SPA group with 2.00 – 2.49 perceives the highest teacher behavioral control while the group with 1.00 – 1.49 SPA perceives the lowest one

Table 40: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Control Scale Scores by SPA.*

Semester Point Average	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.00 - 1.49	4	13.00	2.31
1.50 - 1.99	2	16.00	0.00
2.00 - 2.49	3	17.00	1.53
2.50 - 2.99	8	16.63	2.07
3.00 - 3.49	9	15.67	2.55
3.50 - 3.99	21	16.05	1.94
4.00 - 4.49	61	15.56	2.67
4.50 - 5.00	298	15.73	2.66
Total	406	15.73	2.61

The results of One-way ANOVA statistics indicated no significant differences between the means of the Control scale scores of different SPA groups (see Table 41).

Table 41: *One-Way ANOVA for the Control Scale Scores by SPA.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	51.59	7	7.37	1.08
Within Groups	2705.06	398	6.80	
Total	2756.65	405		

Table 42 shows the means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by teacher gender and it is seen that the mean score of male teachers is higher than the female teachers’.

Table 42: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Teacher Gender.*

Teacher Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Male	101	41.38	11.89
Female	402	37.92	12.84
Total	503	38.61	12.72

One-Way ANOVA statistics was carried out to investigate if this difference is significant and it was found to be significant ( $F=6.04$ ;  $p<.05$ ). This means that male teachers are perceived to be more rejecting by their students compared to their female counterparts (see Table 43).

Table 43: *One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Teacher Gender.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	966.80	1	966.80	6.04*	.05
Within Groups	80240.83	501	160.16		
Total	81207.63	502			

\*p&lt;.05

Table 44 shows the means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by teacher gender. It is seen that the mean score of the control scale for females is higher than the one for males.

Table 44: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Control Scale Scores by Teacher Gender.*

Teacher Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Male	101	15.19	2.45
Female	402	15.88	2.66
Total	503	15.74	2.63

One-way ANOVA statistics indicated that female teachers are perceived to be significantly more controlling than the male teachers ( $F=5.70$ ;  $p<.05$ ) (see Table 45).

Table 45: *One-Way ANOVA for the Control Scale Scores by Teacher Gender.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	38.99	1	38.99	5.70*	.05
Within Groups	3428.93	501	6.84		
Total	3467.92	502			

\*p&lt;.05.



Table 46 shows the means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by mother education. The mean values range between 44.85 and 36.12 and it is seen that the lesser the education of mother the more the perceived rejection from teacher.

Table 46: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Mother Education.*

Mother Education	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Unstated	14	38.29	14.68
Not graduate of primary school	26	44.85	14.37
Primary school graduate	127	40.76	13.59
Secondary school graduate	73	37.29	11.35
High school graduate	102	38.30	14.15
Vocational high school graduate	26	36.12	9.16
University but not graduate	17	37.24	10.44
University graduate	102	36.68	11.07
Graduate or Postgraduate	16	37.50	11.33
Total	503	38.61	12.72

One-Way ANOVA statistics was carried out to investigate significant differences between mother education groups and it was found that the means of nine mother education groups did not differ significantly (see Table 47).

Table 48 shows the means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by mother educational level.

Table 47: *One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Mother Education.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	2333.90	8	291.74	1.83
Within Groups	78873.73	494	159.66	
Total	81207.63	502		

Table 48: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Control Scale Scores by Mother Education.*

Mother Education	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Unstated	14	16.00	2.42
Not graduate of primary school	26	16.19	2.70
Primary school graduate	127	15.79	2.54
Secondary school graduate	73	15.64	2.54
High school graduate	102	15.94	2.83
Vocational high school graduate	26	16.23	2.86
University but not graduate	17	16.29	2.37
University graduate	102	15.17	2.56
Graduate or Postgraduate	16	15.87	2.53
Total	503	15.74	2.63

One-way ANOVA statistics was carried out to investigate significant differences between the means of the Control scale scores for the mother education groups and the results indicated no significant differences between these groups (see Table 49).

Table 49: *One-Way ANOVA for the Control Scale Scores by Mother Education.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	56.75	8	7.01	1.03
Within Groups	3411.17	494	6.91	
Total	3467.92	502		

Table 50: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Father Education.*

Father Education	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Unstated	13	36.92	14.03
Not graduate of primary school	10	47.00	15.19
Primary school graduate	82	40.81	13.30
Secondary school graduate	64	41.22	12.83
High school graduate	108	38.19	12.96
Vocational high school graduate	33	37.91	14.15
University but not graduate	15	33.33	8.81
University graduate	146	37.07	11.72
Graduate or Postgraduate	32	37.53	11.76
Total	503	38.61	12.72

Table 50 shows the means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by father education. The mean values range between 47 and 33.33 and it is seen that students whose fathers are not graduates of primary school are likely to perceive more rejection from their classroom teachers. Also the students whose

fathers entered university but did not graduate are likely to perceive less rejection from their classroom teachers.

Additionally, One-way ANOVA statistics was carried out to see whether the means of the father education groups differed significantly and it was found that the means of nine father education groups did not differ significantly (see Table 51)

Table 51: *One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Father Education.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	2412.12	8	301.51	1.89
Within Groups	78795.51	494	159.51	
Total	81207.63	502		

Table 52 shows the means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by father education. It is seen that the subjects whose fathers have graduate or postgraduate degrees perceive the highest behavioral control from their teachers while the subjects whose fathers entered university but did not graduate perceive the lowest.

One-way ANOVA statistics was carried out to investigate the significant differences between the means of the Control scale scores for father education groups and the results indicated that the groups did not differ significantly (see Table 53).

Table 52: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Control Scale Scores by Father Education.*

Father Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Unstated	13	15.77	2.69
Not graduate of primary school	10	15.60	2.76
Primary school graduate	82	15.82	2.64
Secondary school graduate	64	15.78	2.50
High school graduate	108	16.06	2.77
Vocational high school graduate	33	15.70	2.46
University but not graduate	15	15.07	2.63
University graduate	146	15.44	2.71
Graduate or Postgraduate	32	16.22	2.09
Total	503	15.74	2.63

Table 53: *One-Way ANOVA for the Control Scale Scores by Father Education.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	39.03	8	4.88	0.70
Within Groups	3428.89	494	6.94	
Total	3467.92	502		

Means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by mother and father employment statuses were also computed. It was found that the mean

score for the working mother group is 37.40 and for the nonworking one 39.30 (see Table 54).

Table 54: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Mother Employment Status.*

Mother Employment Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Unstated	1	29.00	-
Working	177	37.40	11.34
Not Working	325	39.30	13.39
Total	503	38.61	12.72

One-Way ANOVA statistics indicated that there is no significant difference between the means of mother employment status groups (see Table 55).

Table 55: *One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Mother Employment Status.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	505.06	2	252.53	1.57
Within Groups	80702.57	500	161.41	
Total	81207.63	502		

Table 56 shows the means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by mother employment status groups and it is seen that the subjects whose mothers are working perceive slightly higher behavioral control from their teachers than the subjects whose mothers are not working. One-way ANOVA statistics indicated that

the mother education groups did not differ significantly from each other (see Table 57).

Table 56: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Control Scale Scores by Mother Employment Status.*

Mother Employment Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Unstated	1	18.00	.
Working	177	15.79	2.73
Not Working	325	15.71	2.58
Total	503	15.74	2.63

Table 57: *One-Way ANOVA for the Control Scale Scores by Mother Employment Status.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	5.84	2	2.92	0.42
Within Groups	3462.08	500	6.92	
Total	3467.92	502		

Table 58 shows the means and standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ by father employment status. It is seen that the mean score of working father groups is 38.51 while it is 40.29 for the nonworking father group.

One-Way ANOVA statistics indicated that the means of father employment status groups did not differ significantly from each other (see Table 59).

Table 58: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Father Employment Status.*

Father Employment Status	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Working	475	38.52	12.70
Not Working	28	40.29	13.07
Total	503	38.61	12.72

Table 59: *One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Father Employment Status.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	83.23	1	83.23	0.51
Within Groups	81124.40	501	161.93	
Total	81207.63	502		

Means and standard deviations of the Control scale scores by father employment status can be seen on Table 60. One-way ANOVA statistics indicated no significant differences between the means of the Control scale scores for these groups (see Table 61).

Table 60: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Control Scale Scores by Father Employment Status.*

Source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Working	475	15.75	2.64
Not Working	28	15.68	2.40
Total	503	15.74	2.63



Table 61: *One-Way ANOVA for the Control Scale Scores by Father Employment Status.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	0.13	1	0.13	0.02
Within Groups	3467.79	501	6.92	
Total	3467.92	502		

As can be seen on Table 62, the means and the standard deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ scores by number of children in the family range between 37.65 (one child) and 47.87 (more than four children) and it is seen that as the number of children in the family increases, the perception of rejection from teachers increases which may be indicative of a positive correlation.

Table 62: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Number of Children in the Family.*

Number of Children	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Unstated	8	37.87	14.76
1 child	109	37.65	11.69
2 children	242	38.37	12.85
3 children	97	38.60	13.29
4 children	31	39.35	10.01
More than 4 children	16	47.87	15.61
Total	503	38.61	12.72

One-Way ANOVA statistics indicated that the number of children in the family groups did not differ significantly (see Table 63).

Table 63: *One-Way ANOVA for the Turkish Child TARQ Scores by Number of Children in the Family.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1509.83	5	301.97	1.88
Within Groups	79697.80	497	160.36	
Total	81207.63	502		

Means and standard deviation of the Control scale scores by number of children in the family can be seen on Table 64. The subjects who have families with 4 children perceive the highest behavioral control from their teachers while the subjects who have families with more than 4 children perceive the lowest.

Table 64: *Means and Standard Deviations of the Control Scale Scores by Number of Children in the Family.*

Number of Children	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Unstated	8	14.25	2.31
1 child	109	15.58	2.76
2 children	242	15.93	2.53
3 children	97	15.55	2.76
4 children	31	16.03	2.74
More than 4 children	16	15.37	2.22
Total	503	15.74	2.63

One-way ANOVA statistics was carried out to investigate the significant differences between the number of children in the family groups and the results indicated no significant differences between these groups (see Table 65).

Table 65: *One-Way ANOVA for the Control Scale Scores by Number of Children in the Family.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	38.13	5	7.63	1.11
Within Groups	3429.79	497	6.90	
Total	3467.92	502		

## VI. DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to establish the reliability, validity, and partial norms of the Turkish Teacher's Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire Child short form (Turkish Child TARQ/Control). Reliability analysis of the instrument was carried out in terms of internal consistency and temporal stability; validity investigation was carried out in terms of concurrent and construct validity; and partial norms of the instrument were established on age (9 through 12), gender, school SES, self-reported semester point average, teacher gender, mother and father education, mother and father employment status, and number of children in the family.

The reliability data in terms of internal consistency of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control was identified by computing the corrected item-total correlations and the Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the total scale, for each subscale, and for the separate Control scale. Corrected item-total correlations of the total scale ranged between .31 and .64 with an average value of .50. Erdem & Erkman (1990) had investigated the reliability and validity of the Turkish Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire Child form (PARQ/Child) which is a similar instrument to the instrument in this study except for the referent (my mother or father instead of my teacher). They found that the corrected item-total correlations of the Turkish PARQ/Child ranged between .34 and .67 which is very parallel to the findings of the present study. In the present study, Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the total scale was found to be .90 which was found to be .95 by Erdem & Erkman (1990) and .80 by Polat (1988) for the Turkish PARQ/Child. Erkman (2003) also investigated the Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the mother and father versions of the Turkish Child PARQ/Control. The Cronbach Alpha value of the mother version was found to be .81

and was found to be .85 for the father version.

Corrected item-subscale correlations were also investigated and they were found to be ranging between .42 and .62 for the Warmth/Affection subscale, .28 and .56 for the Hostility/Aggression subscale, .41 and .53 for the Indifference/Neglect subscale, and .35 and .56 for the Undifferentiated Rejection subscale. For the separate Control scale, corrected item-subscale correlations were found to be ranging between .09 and .24, which are highly lower than the corrected item-subscale correlations of the subscales of the Turkish Child TARQ. This difference may be due to the cultural differences in the perception of control.

The Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the subscales of the Turkish Child TARQ were found to be ranging between .67 and .81 in the present study. In the original study of the PARQ/Child by Rohner in 1980, the Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the subscales were found to be ranging between .72 and .90. They were found to be ranging between .76 and .89 in Polat's study (1988) and .78 and .89 in the study of Erdem & Erkman (1990) with the Turkish PARQ/Child. In Erkman's study (2003), the Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the subscales of the mother version of the Turkish Child PARQ were found to be ranging between .81 and .91 and they were found to be ranging between .94 and .58 for the father version.

When these findings are compared with the findings of the present study, it is seen that the Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the subscales of Turkish Child TARQ are slightly lower than the coefficients of the original PARQ/Child and the Turkish PARQ/Child. This slight difference may be due to differences in the number of items. In this study, short form of the instrument was used while in other studies, long forms were used. However, it is also seen that, in the present study, as is in the original study in 1980, and in the studies of Polat (1988), Erdem & Erkman (1990),

and Erkman (2003), the highest Cronbach Alpha coefficients belong to the Warmth/Affection subscale and the lowest ones belong to the Undifferentiated Rejection subscale and it indicates the parallel between the findings in the different studies.

Also, in the present study, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the separate Control scale was found to be .34, which is much lower than the coefficients of the subscales of the Turkish Child TARQ. In Erkman's study (2003) with the Turkish Child PARQ/Control, the Cronbach Alpha value for the Control scale was found to be .74 for the mother version and it was found to be .76 for the father version that are lower than the coefficients of the subscales of the Turkish Child PARQ.

The subscale-total correlations of the Turkish Child TARQ were found to be .87 for the Indifference/Neglect subscale and .82 for the other three subscales. These correlations ranged between .73 and .90 in Polat's study (1988) and .85 and .90 in the study of Erdem & Erkman (2003) with the Turkish PARQ/Child. In the present study and in the studies of Polat (1988) and Erdem & Erkman (1990), the highest subscale-total correlation coefficients were found to belong to the Indifference/Neglect subscale. These findings indicate the congruency between the studies.

The lowest subscale-subscale correlation was found to be .47, which is between the Warmth/Affection and the Hostility/Aggression subscales. This correlation was found to be positive since the items of Warmth/Affection subscale is reverse scored when computing the total TARQ score. This slightly low correlation between these subscales may indicate that perceiving the teachers as warm and affectionate is not much related to perceiving them as non-hostile or non-aggressive. The highest subscale-subscale correlation was found to be .70 that is between the Hostility/Aggression and the Undifferentiated Rejection subscales. This relatively

high correlation may indicate that perceiving the teacher as undifferentiatedly rejecting is related with perceiving them as hostile and aggressive.

These findings on the item-subscale, subscale-subscale correlations and the Cronbach Alpha values are highly supportive of the internal consistency of the instrument.

Two to three weeks interval test-retest reliability correlation for the total scale was found to be .76 in the present study. In the original study of the PARQ/Child by Rohner in 1980 and in Polat's study with its Turkish version (1988), test-retest reliability was not calculated but, in the study of Erdem & Erkman (1990), it was found to be .70 for the Turkish PARQ/Child. In the present study, for the separate Control scale test-retest reliability coefficient was found to be .51 that is modest. For the subscales of Turkish Child TARQ, test-retest reliability coefficients were found to be ranging between .55 and .66 and in the study of Erdem & Erkman (1990), they were found to be ranging between .48 and .64. It is seen that the test-retest reliability coefficients of the present study are higher than the ones in the study of Erdem & Erkman (1990). This may indicate that children's perceptions of acceptance-rejection from their teachers are more stable than their perceptions of acceptance-rejection from mothers or fathers. Another factor that causes test-retest reliability coefficients of the Turkish PARQ/Child to be lower than the coefficients of the Turkish Child TARQ may be the difference in test-retest sample sizes in these studies. In the study of Erdem & Erkman (1990), test-retest reliability sample consisted of only 76 students, that is 22 % of the total sample while, in this study, test-retest reliability sample consisted of 253 students that is higher than the 50 % of the total sample. Therefore, the finding of the present study may be interpreted as more robust because of this sample size.

As can be seen, the results of the internal consistency of the present study may be said to be congruent with Rohner's findings on the PARQ/Child (1980) and with the findings of Polat (1988), Erdem & Erkman (1990), and Erkman (2003) on the Turkish PARQ/Child and the Turkish Child PARQ/Control. The results of temporal stability in the present study are more satisfactory than the results in the study of Erdem & Erkman (1990). In the light of this evidence, it can be concluded that the Turkish Child TARQ is made up of homogeneous items that have internal consistency and satisfying stability over time. On the other hand, internal consistency and temporal stability of the control scale were found to be very low compared to the total scale and its subscales. Therefore, the control scale needs to be revised by taking the cultural differences in the perception of teacher control into account or it may be eliminated from this instrument.

For establishing the validity of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control, the scores of the TARQ of the subjects were correlated with their scores on two different instruments. The first instrument was the Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory (PTBI) that was developed by Çakar and Erkman (1994). This instrument was developed for assessing psychological maltreatment in schools as perceived by students from their teachers and found to be a highly valid and reliable instrument. In this instrument, high scores indicate high perception of psychological abuse from teachers and in the Child TARQ, high scores indicate high perceived rejection from teachers. By using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique, a correlation coefficient of .82 was found between these two instruments that is significant at the .01 level ( $r = .82; p < .01$ ). This high correlation indicates that perceived rejection and psychological maltreatment are highly related concepts and the two instruments measure the similar constructs. The same technique yielded a correlation coefficient



of .20 between the Control scale and the PTBI ( $r = .20$ ;  $p < .01$ ).

The second instrument that was used to establish the concurrent validity of the Turkish Child TARQ was the Teacher Support Subscale of the Perceived Social Support Scale-Revised. This instrument was developed by Yıldırım in 1997 and revised in 2004. Its validity and reliability studies were done by Yıldırım and they were found to be highly sound. The subscale that was used in this study assesses the perceived social support from teachers. In this instrument, high scores mean high perceived social support and in the Child TARQ, low scores indicate high perceived warmth and acceptance. By using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique, a correlation coefficient of  $-.79$  was found between these two instruments that is significant at the .01 level ( $r = -.79$ ;  $p < .01$ ). This high correlation indicates that perceived acceptance and warmth are related with perceived social support and these two instruments measure the similar constructs. The correlation coefficient between the Control scale and the TSss was found to be  $-.07$  that is not significant at the .01 level. This low correlation coefficient indicates that perception of social support from a teacher is not related to the perception of behavioral control from the same teacher.

On both of the concurrent validation analysis, the results indicated that the Turkish Child TARQ has high concurrent validity.

For the construct validation of the Turkish Child TARQ, Varimax rotated factor analysis was carried out. Firstly, the instrument was analyzed with four factors since it consists of four different subscales. The analysis indicated that Factor 1 consisted of all the items of the acceptance portion of the instrument (warmth/affection subscale) while the items of other subscales spread into other three factors. Factor 1 was found to account for 31.43 % of the variance. When the same analysis was carried out without identifying the factor number, the instrument

yielded four factors as in the analysis with four factors case.

Factor analysis was also carried out with two factors since the instrument was supposed to have two different portions namely, warmth and rejection. In the original study of the PARQ/Child by Rohner in 1980 and the study of the Turkish PARQ/Child by Erdem & Erkman (1990), construct validation of the instrument yielded two primary factors. In the analysis of the present study, it was found that all the items of the warmth/affection subscale and two items of the indifference/neglect scale clustered around Factor 2, while other items clustered around Factor 1. When items 2 and 16 are investigated, it was seen that both of the statements are asking about the perceived level of attention from the teacher and attention may be considered under the concept of acceptance. Therefore, it can be concluded that Factor 1 represents the rejection and Factor 2 represents the warmth dimension as in the findings of Rohner in 1980 and Erdem & Erkman (1990).

The partial norms of the Turkish Child TARQ/Control on age, gender, school SES, self-reported semester point average, teacher gender, mother and father education, mother and father employment status, and number of children in the family were established by using means and standard deviations. Additionally, One-Way of ANOVA was conducted for each subgroup to investigate the significant differences.

When the age groups were compared, it was found that there were no significant differences between the age groups but it was seen that, the higher the age of the student, the trend is toward lower perception of rejection from the teacher. This finding is contradictory to the finding of Bars in her study with the PTBI (1999). She found significant differences between the age groups in terms of perceived abuse from teachers and the higher the age of the student, the higher the

perception of abuse from the teacher. Although the differences were not found to be statistically significant in the present study, the difference between two studies may be caused from the age range differences between these studies. Bars assessed students whose ages ranged between 14 and 18, while in the present study, the age range of subjects was 9 to 12 years 5 months. It may be interpreted by the fact that until adolescence the perception of rejection or abuse declines since children mature in every aspect with time. But, by adolescence, this perception again increases since during this period extreme changes in behavior, emotions, and perceptions are expected to occur due to physical, biological, and psychological changes.

Different studies yielded conflicting results in the literature about the relationship of gender with rejection. Rohner (1980), Polat (1988), and Erkman & Alantar (1989) found no significant difference in their studies with the PARQ/Child. Çakar (1994) found no significant difference in her study with the PTBI. Whereas, in Erkman's study (1989) with remigrants and in the study of Erdem & Erkman (1990), males were found to be perceiving higher maternal rejection. In the present study, when the gender groups were compared, it was found that males perceive significantly higher rejection from teachers than females ( $F=15.81$ ;  $p<.001$ ). Also, in the present study, it was found that males perceive significantly higher behavioral control from their teachers than females ( $F=9.08$ ;  $p<.005$ ). However, in the study of Bars (1999), it was found that males perceive lower abuse from teachers than females, a finding contradictory to the one in this study. These conflicting findings indicate that further research is required to investigate the gender differences at different ages.

One-way ANOVA statistics results indicated no significant difference between the school SES groups in the present study but it was seen that middle SES

group perceives the highest rejection while high SES group perceives the lowest rejection. Also, middle SES group was found to be perceiving significantly higher behavioral control from their teachers than low and high SES groups ( $F=6.13$ ;  $p<.005$ ). In Rohner's study with the PARQ/Child, no significant difference was found between the social classes, however in the studies of Polat (1988) and Erdem & Erkman (1990), significant differences were found between SES groups. They found that low SES group perceives the highest rejection from their parents while in the present study low SES group is in the middle of high and middle SES groups in terms of perceived rejection from the teacher. This difference between the present study and the other two studies with the PARQ/Child may indicate that low SES group children perceive high rejection from their parents and they do not perceive their teachers to be rejecting as much as their parents. High SES group children were found to be perceiving the least rejection from their teachers and this is an expected finding.

When SPA levels of the subjects were compared by One-Way ANOVA, significant difference between the SPA levels was found ( $F= 4.51$ ;  $p<.001$ ). Scheffe procedure indicated that the 1.50-1.99 SPA group, perceiving the highest teacher rejection, significantly differed from all the SPA groups except for 2.00-2.49 and 2.50-2.99 SPA groups. The SPA groups other than the 1.50-1.99 did not significantly differ from each other ( $p<0.05$ ). In the study of Bars (1999), it was found that the 1.00-1.49 SPA group significantly differed from the other SPA groups perceiving highest teacher abuse. In the present study, the 1.00-1.49 SPA group did not significantly differ from other SPA levels except the 1.50-1.99. These findings of the present study may be due to huge differences between the sample sizes of SPA groups. Only two subjects stated to have an SPA of 1.50-1.90 with a mean of 70,

which is very high compared to the means of other SPA groups. Only four subjects stated to have an SPA of 1.00-1.49 while 298 subjects stated to have an SPA of 4.50-5.00. The difference between the present study and study of Bars may be due to these factors. However, as in the study of Bars, in the present study, it was found that the 4.50-5.00 SPA group had the lowest perceived rejection from teachers.

The similar finding in both of the studies may indicate that the students with poor academic skills are the most abused and rejected by the teachers or that they are more likely to perceive rejection and by reducing the abusive and rejecting teacher behavior, academic success of these students can be raised which in turn would also have positive effects on the psychological, emotional, and mental well-being of students.

When the perceived rejection and control from female and male teachers were compared it was found that male teachers are perceived to be significantly more rejecting than the females teachers ( $F=6.04$ ;  $p<.05$ ) while female teachers are perceived to be significantly more controlling ( $F=5.70$ ;  $p<.05$ ). This difference may be due to fact that female teachers are generally perceived by the primary school students as “substitute mothers” who care, love, and control and this “mothering” may be related to biological, physical, psychological, and social differences between females and males, as well as the cultural norms.

Although no significant differences were found between the mother and father education groups by One-way ANOVA statistics, when the means are closely investigated, it was seen that subjects whose fathers and mothers had no formal education seemed to perceive the highest rejection from their teachers. The result is similar to the One-way ANOVA results of father and mother employment status groups. Again, there were no significant differences between the working and

nonworking father and mother groups in terms of perceived rejection and behavioral control from teachers, but when the means are investigated closely, the subjects whose mothers and fathers were not working seemed to perceive more rejection and less behavioral control than the subjects whose fathers and mothers were working.

When the groups with different number of children in the family were compared by One-way ANOVA statistics, no significant difference was found between these groups. However, when the means of these groups are closely investigated, it was seen that as the number of children in the family increases, the perceived rejection from the teacher increases, indicative of a positive relationship. Also, as the number of children in the family increases, the SES level of the family is expected to decrease. So, this positive relationship may also evidence the negative relationship between the socio-economic status of the subjects and perceived rejection from teachers

As a conclusion, it can be said that the results of the present study indicated highly satisfactory evidence for the psychometric properties of the Turkish Child TARQ in terms of internal consistency, temporal stability, and concurrent and construct validity. The similarities between the results of reliability and validity studies of other instruments such as the PARQ/Child, the Turkish PARQ/Child, the Turkish Child PARQ/Control, the PTBI, and the Turkish Child TARQ also present supportive evidence for the psychometric properties of the instrument. However, the separate Control scale was not found to be as reliable and as valid as the total TARQ, therefore, it is suggested that its items be revised.

The partial norms on a limited age group, specifically 9 to 12 years 5 months, gender, school SES, self-reported SPA, teacher gender, parental education, parental employment status, and number of children in the family as starting points were also

established. The partial norm study indicated that the subjects who are older, female, from high SES schools, academic achievers, single children, who have female teachers, more educated and working mothers and fathers perceive the least rejection from their teachers. This is expected and similar to the findings of other related studies (Bars, 1999; Erdem & Erkman, 1990; Erkman, 2003; Polat, 1988).

### Limitations of the Study

The findings of the present study are encouraging with respect to psychometric properties of the Turkish TARQ/Control Child short form. However, there are some limitations of the study.

The first and the most important limitation of the study is that the subjects were selected from some schools in Istanbul and random sampling could not be achieved for practical reasons. Other limitations of the study in relation to norm establishment are the sample size (N=503) and the age range of the subjects (9 years–12 years, 5 months). The sample should be larger in a norm study and the norms could not be established for older ages than 12 years, 5 months.

Another limitation of the study has to do with the definition of SES levels of the schools and the SPA's of the subjects. SES levels of the schools were estimated depending on the location of the neighborhood and their being public or private. SPA levels of the subjects were determined by self report of the students. Therefore, the criteria with which SES and SPA levels were determined can be criticized as not being sufficiently objective.

The fourth limitation of the study is in relation to distribution of grade levels. In high SES schools, data were also collected from the 4<sup>th</sup> grader students since the numbers of the 5<sup>th</sup> grade students were less than the ones in other schools. However,

in middle and low SES schools, data were only collected from the 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. Therefore, the distribution of the sample according to grade levels was unequal with 84 % 5<sup>th</sup> grade students and 16 % 4<sup>th</sup> grade students.

#### Suggestions for Future Research

Firstly, it is suggested for future researchers that the reliability, validity and norm study of the Turkish TARQ/Control short form should be replicated on a larger random sample that consists of a wider age range.

Secondly, revising the items of the Control scale is suggested. The results of the reliability study of this scale indicated that it has low internal consistency and temporal stability and it may be due to cultural differences in the perception of behavioral control. So, the items of the scale may be revised and adapted to Turkish culture, so that, it may yield valid and reliable results.



## VII. REFERENCES

- Alantar, M. (1989). *Psychological maltreatment: An attempt of its definition by experts and its assessment among a group of adolescents*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- 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.
- Baker, J. A., Dilly, L. J., Aupperlee, J. L., & Satil, D. A. (2003). The developmental context of school satisfaction: Schools as psychologically healthy environments. *School Psychology Quarterly, 18*(2), 206-22.
- Bars, Z. (1999). *The partial norm study of the Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Benbenishty, R., Zeira, A., Astor, R. A., & Khoury-Kassabri, M. (2002). Maltreatment of primary school students by educational staff in Israel. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 26*, 1291-1309.
- Bower, E. (1972). Education as a humanizing process and its relationship to other humanizing processes. In S. E. Golann, C. Eisdorfer (Eds.), *Handbook of community mental health* (pp. 37-49). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Briere, J. N. (1992). *Child abuse trauma: Theory and treatment of the lasting effects*. California: Sage Publications.
- Cronier, J. C. & Barth, R. P. (2005). Cognitive and academic functioning in maltreated children. *Children & Schools, 27*, 197-207.
- Çakar, Y. (1994). *The construction of Perceived Teacher Behavior Inventory (PTBI)*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

- Eckenrode, J., Laird, M., & Doris, J. (1993). School performance and disciplinary problems among abused and neglected children. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 53-62.
- Erdem, T. & Erkman, F. (1990, November). *The validity and reliability of the Turkish form of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire*. Paper presented at the 8<sup>th</sup> International Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect, Hamburg, Germany.
- Erkman, F. (1991). Çocukların duygusal ezimi. In Esin Konanç, ipek Gürkaynak, & Ayten Egemen (Eds.), *Çocuk istismarı ve ihmali* (pp. 163-169). Ankara: Gözde Repro Ofset.
- Erkman, F. (1992). Support for Rohner's parental acceptance-rejection theory as a psychological abuse theory in Turkey. In Saburo Iwawaki, Yoshihisa Kashima, & Kwok Leung (Eds.), *Innovations in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 384-395). Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger B. V.
- Erkman, F. (1993, November). *Child abuse and the school system*. Paper presented at the International Society for Prevention of Child Abuse & Neglect Regional Conference, Padova, Italy.
- Erkman, F. (2003, February). *Turkish children's perception of parental warmth, corporal punishment and psychological adjustment*. Paper presented at the SCCR 32<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting, Charleston South Carolina.
- Fişek, G. (1982). Psychopathology and the Turkish family: A family systems theory analysis. In Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), *Sex roles, family, and community in Turkey* (pp. 295-321). Indiana: Indiana University. Turkish Studies 3.
- Fontana, D. (1995). *Psychology for teachers* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Gözütok, F. D. (1993). *Okulda dayak*. Ankara: 72 Ofset.

- Hart, S. N. (1991). From property to person status. *American Psychologist, 46*, 53-59.
- Hart, S. N. & Brassard, M. R. (1987). A major threat to children's mental health. *American Psychologist, 42*, 160-165.
- Hyman, I. A. & Snook, P. A. (2000). Dangerous schools, alienated students. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 10*, 133-136.
- Hyman, I. A. & Snook, P. A. (2001). Dangerous schools and what you can do about them. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*, 488-500.
- Horton, C. B., Cruise, T. K. (2001). *Child abuse and neglect: The school's response*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Klem, A. M. & Connel, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *The Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 262-273.
- Lynch, M. & Cicchetti, D. (1992). Maltreated children's reports of relatedness to their teachers. In Robert C. Pianta (Ed.), *Beyond the parent: The role of other adults in children's lives* (pp. 81-107). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Murdock, T. B. & Miller, A. (2003). Teachers as sources of middle school students' motivational identity: Variable-centered and person-centered analytic approaches. *The Elementary School Journal, 103*, 383-399.
- Murray, C. (2002). Supportive teacher-student relationships: Promoting the social and emotional health of early adolescents with high incidence disabilities. *Childhood Education, 78*, 285-290
- Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(3), 323-367
- Pianta, R. C. & Steinberg, M. (1992). Teacher-child relationships and the process of adjusting to school. In Robert C. Pianta (Ed.), *Beyond the parent: The role of*

*other adults in children's lives* (pp. 61-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Pianta, R. C. & Stuhlman, M. W. (2004). Teacher-child relationships and children's success in the first years of school. *School Psychology Review*, 33(3), 444-458.
- Piekarska, A. (2000). School stress, teachers' abusive behaviors, and children's coping strategies. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 24(11), 1443-1449
- Polat, A. S. (1988). *Parental acceptance-rejection*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Rohner, R. P. & Khaleque, A. (2003). *Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection* (Rev. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Storrs: Rohner Research Publications.
- Rohner, R. P. & Khaleque, A. (2005). *Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Storrs: Rohner Research Publications.
- Schiff, M. & Tatar, M. (2003). Significant teachers as perceived by preadolescents: Do boys and girls perceive them alike? *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(5), 269-276.
- Shumba, A. (2002). The nature, extent and effects of emotional abuse on primary school pupils by teachers in Zimbabwe. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26, 783-791.
- Skinner, E. A. & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(4), 571-581.
- Veltkamp, L. J. & Miller, T. W. (1994). *Clinical handbook of child abuse and neglect*. Connecticut: International Universities Press.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1994). Relations of social goal pursuit to social acceptance, classroom behavior, and perceived social support. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86(2), 173-182.

- Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social relationships and motivation in middle school: The role of parents, teachers, and peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(2), 202-209.
- Yıldırım, İ. (1997). Algılanan sosyal destek ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi güvenilirliği ve geçerliği. *Hacettepe Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 13*, 81-87.
- Yıldırım, İ. (2004). Depresyonun yordayıcısı olarak sınav kaygısı, gündelik sıkıntılar ve sosyal destek. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 27*, 241-250.
- Zigler, E. & Hall, N. W. (1989). Physical child abuse in America: Past, present, and future. In Dante Cicchetti & Vicki Carlson (Eds.), *Child maltreatment: Theory and research on the causes and consequences of child abuse and neglect* (pp. 38-75). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zucker, S. (2001). Good teaching. *School Psychology Quarterly, 16*(3), 343-349.

104  
APPENDIX A

Ön Bilgi Formu

Kod no: \_\_\_\_\_ Cinsiyeti: Erkek \_\_\_ Kız \_\_\_  
Doğum gününüz: gün: \_\_\_ ay: \_\_\_ yıl: \_\_\_ Sınıfınız: \_\_\_\_\_  
Okulunuz: \_\_\_\_\_ Doğduğunuz Şehir: \_\_\_\_\_  
Kaç kardeşsiniz? Tek çocuk \_\_\_ 2 kardeşiz \_\_\_ 3 kardeşiz \_\_\_ 4 kardeşiz \_\_\_ Diğer \_\_\_  
Öğretmeniniz: Bayan \_\_\_ Erkek \_\_\_  
Son karnedeki not ortalamanız: 1.00-1.49 \_\_\_ 1.50-1.99 \_\_\_ 2.00-2.49 \_\_\_ 2.50-2.99 \_\_\_  
3.00-3.49 \_\_\_ 3.50-3.99 \_\_\_ 4.00-4.49 \_\_\_ 4.50-5.00 \_\_\_

Anne/Baba Eğitimi:	Anne	Baba
1. İlkokul (beşinci sınıf) mezunu değil	___	___
2. İlkokul (beşinci sınıf) mezunu	___	___
3. Ortaokul mezunu	___	___
4. Lise mezunu (ya da lise denklik sınavı geçmiş olma)	___	___
5. Lise artı iş / ticaret veya meslek okulu diploması ya da dengi	___	___
6. Bir ila dört yıl arası üniversite ama mezun değil	___	___
7. Üniversite mezunu	___	___
8. Üniversite sonrası uzmanlık derecesi (yüksek lisans, doktora gibi)	___	___
9. Diğer, belirtiniz _____	___	___

Anne/Baba İş:	Anne	Baba
1. Çalışıyor	___	___
Çalışıyor ise		
a) Annenin mesleği: _____		
b) Babanın mesleği: _____		
2. Çalışmıyor	___	___
Çalışmıyor ise		
a) Emekli	___	___
b) İş arıyor	___	___
c) Diğer, belirtiniz _____		

## APPENDIX B

Çocuk/Ergen ÖKRÖ/K (Kısa Form)

Kod no: \_\_\_\_\_

Tarih: \_\_\_\_\_

Bu sayfalar öğretmenlerin bazen öğrencilerine karşı nasıl davrandıklarını anlatan ifadeler içermektedir. Her ifadeyi dikkatle oku ve her cümlemin öğretmenin 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 cümlemin yanında dört tane kutu var. Eğer ifade, öğretmenin sana davranışı hakkında temelde uygun ise, kendi kendine sor; “Hemen hemen her zaman mı doğru?” yoksa “Bazen mi doğru?”. Eğer öğretmenin 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 öğretmenin sana karşı olan davranışını doğru olarak anlatmıyorsa, sana karşı davranışlarına temelde uymuyorsa, o zaman kendi kendine sor, “Nadiren mi doğru?” yoksa “Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman doğru değil mi?”. Eğer öğretmenin sana nadiren böyle davranıyor ise, “NADİREN DOĞRU” kutusuna, eğer hiçbir zaman böyle davranmıyor ise “HEMEN HEMEN HİÇBİR ZAMAN” kutusuna X koy.

Unutma, doğru veya yanlış bir yanıt yoktur. Onun için mümkün olduğu kadar dürüst ve açık ol. Cevaplarını öğretmeninden beklediğin davranışlara göre değil, öğretmenin sana gerçekte nasıl davrandığına göre ver.

Örnek: Eğer sen iyi davrandığında sana her zaman gülümsüyor ve mutlu görünüyor ise, o zaman ifadeyi aşağıdaki gibi işaretlemelisin.

	Öğretmenim İçin Doğru		Öğretmenim İçin Doğru Değil	
	Hemen hemen her zaman doğru	Nadiren doğru	Bazen doğru	Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman doğru değil
Öğretmenim İyi davrandığımda gülümser ve mutlu görünür	<u>X</u>	—	—	—

	ÖĞRETMENİM İÇİN DOĞRU		ÖĞRETMENİM İÇİN DOĞRU DEĞİL	
	Hemen hemen her zaman doğru	Bazen doğru	Nadiren doğru	Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman doğru değil
ÖĞRETMENİM				
1. Benim hakkımda güzel şeyler söyler.	___	___	___	___
2. Bana hiç ilgi göstermez	___	___	___	___
3. Neleri yapıp neleri yapamayacağımı kesin olarak anladığımdan emin olmak ister	___	___	___	___
4. Benim için önemli olan şeyleri anlatabilmemi kolaylaştırır	___	___	___	___
5. Hak etmediğim zaman bile bana vurur	___	___	___	___
6. Beni büyük bir baş belası olarak görür	___	___	___	___
7. Bana sürekli olarak nasıl davranmam gerektiğini söyler	___	___	___	___
8. Kızdığı zaman beni cezalandırır	___	___	___	___
9. Sorularımı cevaplayamayacak kadar meşguldür	___	___	___	___
10. Benden hoşlanmıyor gibi	___	___	___	___
11. Yaptığım şeylerle gerçekten ilgilenir	___	___	___	___
12. Bana bir sürü kırıcı şey söyler	___	___	___	___
13. Ondan yardım istediğimde beni duymazlıktan gelir	___	___	___	___
14. Bana ne söylendiyse aynen öyle davranmamda ısrar eder	___	___	___	___
15. Bana istenilen ve ihtiyaç duyulan biri olduğumu hissettirir	___	___	___	___
16. Bana çok ilgi gösterir	___	___	___	___
17. Beni kırmak için elinden geleni yapar	___	___	___	___
18. Hatırlaması gerekir diye düşündüğüm önemli şeyleri unuttur	___	___	___	___
19. Eğer kötü davranırsam benden hoşlanmadığımı hissettirir	___	___	___	___
20. Canım ne isterse yapmama izin verir	___	___	___	___
21. Bana yaptığım şeylerin önemli olduğunu hissettirir	___	___	___	___



ÖĞRETMENİM İÇİN  
DOĞRUÖĞRETMENİM İÇİN  
DOĞRU DEĞİL

	Hemen hemen her zaman doğru	Bazen doğru	Nadiren doğru	Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman doğru değil
22. Yanlış bir şey yaptığımda beni korkutur veya tehdit eder	—	—	—	—
23. Benim ne düşündüğüme önem verir ve düşündüklerim hakkında konuşmamdan hoşlanır	—	—	—	—
24. Ne yaparsam yapayım, diğer çocukların benden daha iyi olduğunu hisseder	—	—	—	—
25. Bana istenmediğimi belli eder	—	—	—	—
26. Yaptığım her şeyi kontrol etmek ister	—	—	—	—
27. Beni önemseydiğini belli eder	—	—	—	—
28. Onu rahatsız etmediğim sürece benimle ilgilenmez	—	—	—	—
29. Bana karşı yumuşak ve iyi kalplidir	—	—	—	—

108  
APPENDIX C

Çocuk/Ergen ASDÖ/ÖDAÖ

Kod no: \_\_\_\_\_

Tarih: \_\_\_\_\_

Elinizdeki ölçekte öğretmenlerin bazen öğrencilerine karşı nasıl davrandıklarını içeren ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Bu ifadelerin öğretmeninizin davranışlarına uygun olup olmadığını düşünün.

Her ifadeyi okuduktan sonra o ifade öğretmeninizin size karşı olan davranışları bakımından size ne kadar uyuyorsa “Bana Uygun”, “Kısmen Bana Uygun”, veya “Bana Uygun Değil” şeklinde işaretleyiniz.

ÖRNEK:

	Bana Uygun	Kısmen Bana Uygun	Bana Uygun Değil
ÖĞRETMENİM			
1. Benimle gerçekten ilgilenir.	_____	_____	_____

© İ. Yıldırım, 1997, 2004

ÖĞRETMENİM	Bana Uygun	Kısmen Bana Uygun	Bana Uygun Değil
1. Amaç, ilgi ve yeteneklerim konusunda benimle konuşur	___	___	___
2. Bana gerçekten güvenir	___	___	___
3. Sorunlarımı çözmeme yardım eder	___	___	___
4. Bir haksızlığa uğradığımda beni gerçekten destekler	___	___	___
5. Bana gerçekten değer verir	___	___	___
6. Bana doğru tavsiyelerde bulunur	___	___	___
7. Doğru kararlar vermeme yardım eder	___	___	___
8. Hatalarımı nazikçe düzeltir	___	___	___
9. Beni gerçekten anlar	___	___	___
10. Üstün, güçlü yanlarımı vurgular	___	___	___
11. Sıkıntılı durumlarımda zaman ayırıp beni gerçekten dinler	___	___	___
12. Arkadaşlarımla ilişkilerimin güçlenmesini destekler	___	___	___
13. Sosyal etkinliklere katılmamı teşvik eder	___	___	___
14. Çok çalıştığım ya da başarılı olduğum zaman beni över	___	___	___
15. Duygu, düşünce ve inançlarıma saygı duyar	___	___	___
16. Derslerde sorularıma içtenlikle cevap verir	___	___	___
17. Bana karşı genellikle adil davranır	___	___	___

110  
APPENDIX D

Çocuk/Ergen AÖDÖ

Kod no: \_\_\_\_\_

Tarih: \_\_\_\_\_

Elinizdeki ölçekte öğretmen öğrenci ilişkisini içeren ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Bu ifadelerin öğretmeninizin davranışlarına uygun olup olmadığını düşünün.

Her ifadeyi okuduktan sonra o ifade öğretmeninizin davranışları bakımından ne kadar doğruysa “Hemen hemen her zaman doğru”, “Bazen doğru”, “Nadiren doğru”, veya “Hiçbir zaman doğru değil” şeklinde işaretleyiniz.

Örnek:

	Hemen hemen her zaman doğru	Bazen doğru	Nadiren doğru	Hiçbir zaman doğru değil
1. Öğretmenim beni çok sever	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Hemen hemen her zaman dođru	Bazen dođru	Nadiren dođru	Hiçbir zaman dođru deđil
1. Öğretmenim bana nazik ve yumuşak davranır	___	___	___	___
2. Öğretmenim aşırı ödev verir, gece yarısına kadar bitmez	___	___	___	___
3. Sınıfça oybirliği ile karar alabiliriz	___	___	___	___
4. Öğretmenim sık sık dışarı çıkar	___	___	___	___
5. Öğretmenim ceza olarak ödev verir	___	___	___	___
6. Öğretmenim başarısız olduğumda bana arkadaşlarımı örnek gösterip, eleştirir	___	___	___	___
7. Öğretmenim beni hak ettiğim ödüllerden mahrum eder	___	___	___	___
8. Öğretmenim beni haksız yere cezalandırır	___	___	___	___
9. Öğretmenim sınıfta benimle alay eder	___	___	___	___
10. Öğretmenim ben yokmuşum gibi davranır	___	___	___	___
11. Öğretmenim dođru cevabı vermezsem beni sınıfta utandırır	___	___	___	___
12. Öğretmenim yaramazlık yapan öğrenciyi sınıftan çıkarır	___	___	___	___
13. Öğretmenim sınıfta bir ödev verip bizi kendi halimize bırakır	___	___	___	___
14. Öğretmenim bana ters davranır	___	___	___	___
15. Öğretmenim bir şeyi başardığım zaman gurur duymamı sağlar	___	___	___	___
16. Öğretmenim çabuk kızar	___	___	___	___
17. Öğretmenim bana istendiđimi hissettirir	___	___	___	___
18. Öğretmenim bize yardımcı olabilmek için olađanüstü gayret sarf eder	___	___	___	___
19. Öğretmenim disiplini sağlamak için bizi tehdit eder	___	___	___	___
20. Öğretmenim sınıfta çalışkan tembel ayrımı yapar	___	___	___	___
21. Öğretmenim ben konuştuğumda saygı ile dinler	___	___	___	___

	Hemen hemen her zaman dođru	Bazen dođru	Nadiren dođru	Hiçbir zaman dođru deđil
22. Öğretmenim öfkelendiğinde bana bir şeyler fırlatır (tebeşir, kalem, kitap gibi)	___	___	___	___
23. Öğretmenim başarısız bile olsak bize iyi not verir	___	___	___	___
24. Öğretmenim bize uygun durumda sorumluluk verir	___	___	___	___
25. Öğretmenim hakkımda güzel şeyler söyler	___	___	___	___
26. Öğretmenim diđer arkadaşlarımla beni dövmelelerine göz yumar	___	___	___	___
27. Öğretmenim aşırı sert ve otoriter bir disiplin anlayışından yanadır	___	___	___	___
28. Öğretmenim beni beceriksizliğim nedeni ile sık sık tenkit eder	___	___	___	___
29. Öğretmenim onu rahatsız etmediğim sürece beni yok sayar	___	___	___	___
30. Öğretmenim ona açılmamı sağlar	___	___	___	___
31. Öğretmenim beni gerçekten sevmez	___	___	___	___
32. Öğretmenim benimle sınıfta sıcak ve sevecen konuşur	___	___	___	___
33. Öğretmenim benimle içtenlikle ilgilenir	___	___	___	___
34. Öğretmenim bana kırıcı şeyler söyler	___	___	___	___
35. Öğretmenim yardım istediğimde duymazlıktan gelir	___	___	___	___
36. Öğretmenim bir sıkıntım olduğunda bana anlayışsız davranır	___	___	___	___
37. Öğretmenim beni kırmak için elinden geleni yapar	___	___	___	___
38. Öğretmenim üzüldüğüm veya endişeli olduğum zaman bana yardım etmeye çalışır	___	___	___	___
39. Öğretmenim beni ilgi ile dinler, konuşmam için beni cesaretlendirir	___	___	___	___
40. Öğretmenim istenmediğimi belli eder	___	___	___	___
41. Öğretmenim yaptığım şeylere ilgi gösterir	___	___	___	___
42. Öğretmenim benim için bir sürü kural ve düzen koyar	___	___	___	___

	Hemen hemen her zaman dođru	Bazen dođru	Nadiren dođru	Hiçbir zaman dođru deđil
43. Öğretmenim sınıf tartışma ve faaliyetlerine katılmamıza önem verir	—	—	—	—
44. Öğretmenim uygunsuz davranışlarımı hoş karşılar	—	—	—	—
45. Öğretmenim diğer arkadaşlarım kadar başarılı olmadığımı söyler, beni onlarla kıyaslar	—	—	—	—
46. Öğretmenim beni dövmekle tehdit eder	—	—	—	—
47. Öğretmenim sınıftaki kavgalarda tarafsız kalmaz	—	—	—	—
48. Öğretmenim fikirlerime değer vermez	—	—	—	—
49. Öğretmenim çok hoşgörülüdür	—	—	—	—
50. Öğretmenim bize güvenmez	—	—	—	—
51. Öğretmenimin bizi bir şeylerden dolayı kınayıp kınamaması o günkü ruh haline bağlıdır	—	—	—	—
52. Öğretmenim bizi küçümseyerek konuşur	—	—	—	—
53. Öğretmenim benim çevresinde olmama tahammül edemez	—	—	—	—
54. Öğretmenim dersle daha fazla ilgilenmem için beni döver	—	—	—	—
55. Öğretmenim hepimizi ismimizle tanır	—	—	—	—
56. Öğretmenim beni sınıfta bir baş belası gibi görür	—	—	—	—
57. Öğretmenim bazı arkadaşlarımıza sınıf dışında kendi özel işlerini yaptırır	—	—	—	—
58. Öğretmenim bazı çocuklara istemedikleri tarzda dokunarak onlara ilgi gösterir	—	—	—	—
59. Öğretmenim deđişik nedenlerle çeşitli cezalar uygular (cetvelle ele vurmak, saç çekmek, başa vurmak, tokat atmak gibi)	—	—	—	—
60. Öğretmenim nasıl davranacağım hakkında yaşıma uygun seçimler yapmama izin verir	—	—	—	—

114  
APPENDIX E

Table E 1: *Distribution of the Sample according to Birthplaces (Cities)*

Birthplace	f	percentage	Birthplace	f	percentage
İstanbul	391	77.7	Konya	2	0.4
unstated	37	7.4	Trabzon	2	0.4
Kayseri	5	1.0	Van	1	0.2
Samsun	4	0.8	Zonguldak	1	0.2
Erzincan	4	0.8	Sivas	1	0.2
İzmir	3	0.6	Afyon	1	0.2
Bitlis	3	0.6	Gümüşhane	1	0.2
Ordu	3	0.6	Giresun	1	0.2
Sakarya	3	0.6	Eskişehir	1	0.2
Corum	3	0.6	Burdur	1	0.2
Tokat	3	0.6	Bursa	1	0.2
Ankara	3	0.6	Yozgat	1	0.2
Ardahan	2	0.4	Azerbaycan	1	0.2
Edirne	2	0.4	İsviçre	1	0.2
Muğla	2	0.4	Elazığ	1	0.2
Almanya	2	0.4	Şanlıurfa	1	0.2
Amerika	2	0.4	Isparta	1	0.2
Diyarbakır	2	0.4	Adana	1	0.2
Rize	2	0.4	Kırklareli	1	0.2
Gaziantep	2	0.4	Total	503	100
Kütahya	2	0.4			
Tekirdağ	2	0.4			



115  
APPENDIX F

Table F 1: *Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix with Four Factors*

Items	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
item 1	0.50	0.25	0.21	0.15
item 2	0.31	0.45	0.17	-0.05
item 4	0.43	0.05	0.15	0.13
item 5	0.11	0.36	0.10	0.11
item 6	0.20	0.49	0.26	0.29
item 8	0.04	0.16	0.47	0.29
item 9	0.23	0.22	0.48	0.06
item 10	0.26	0.61	0.22	0.23
item 11	0.56	0.14	0.10	0.21
item 12	0.21	0.54	0.34	0.30
item 13	0.26	0.43	0.41	0.06
item 15	0.58	0.17	0.09	-0.01
item 16	0.65	0.14	0.21	0.13
item 17	0.16	0.44	0.26	0.29
item 18	0.19	0.19	0.57	0.05
item 19	0.12	0.20	0.52	0.12
item 21	0.53	0.15	0.05	0.02
item 22	0.17	0.07	0.46	0.43
item 23	0.59	0.12	0.11	0.19
item 24	0.15	0.21	0.24	0.33
item 25	0.23	0.36	0.09	0.56
item 27	0.58	0.18	0.10	0.05
item 28	0.27	0.25	0.30	0.38
item 29	0.58	0.21	0.21	0.29

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table F 2: *Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix with Two Factors*

Items	Factor	
	1	2
item 1	0.34	0.53
item 2	0.34	0.34
item 4	0.18	0.43
item 5	0.31	0.15
item 6	0.58	0.25
item 8	0.54	0.03
item 9	0.48	0.23
item 10	0.59	0.32
item 11	0.23	0.57
item 12	0.67	0.26
item 13	0.55	0.29
item 15	0.13	0.59
item 16	0.26	0.65
item 17	0.56	0.20
item 18	0.50	0.19
item 19	0.51	0.12
item 21	0.11	0.54
item 22	0.53	0.17
item 23	0.21	0.59
item 24	0.43	0.17
item 25	0.50	0.28
item 27	0.17	0.59
item 28	0.51	0.28
item 29	0.37	0.59

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.