http://www.eab.org.tr

Educational Research Association
The International Journal of
Educational Researchers 2019,
10 (4): 48-64
ISSN: 1308-9501

http://ijer.eab.org.tr

Investigation of Protective Factors and Parents' Acception/Rejection Perceptions in Turkish Families

Hatice UYSAL BAYRAK[1]

Abstract

The aim of the current study is to investigate the relations between parents' parental acception/rejection perception and the protective factors of the families in terms of various variables. Total sample of 204 parents with children aged 3-8 years who lives in the internal region of Turkey, were conducted to determine being relationships within and beyond the family. Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire–Mother Form was used in order to determine parental acception/rejection; The Inventory of Family Protective Factors was intended to evaluate the protective factors that contribute to family resilience; Parent As A Teacher Inventory was used to assess parents knowledge levels about child development and education. The current study provides evidence that the Family Protective Factors, Parental Acceptance/Rejection are determinative factors within the families in terms of various variables in Turkish culture.

Keywords: Parent-child relationship, Parents as a teacher, Family protective factors, Turkish families structure

This study was presented at 28th EECERA Annual Conference

Assist. Prof.Dr., Faculty of Education, Nigde Omer Halisdemir University, Turkey, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3996-2402
Correspondence: huysal@ohu.edu.tr

Introduction

The family appears to be the most effectual and economic system to support and sustain the child development. When parents are entered the education of their children in a positive way, children can achieve better school attendance, higher test scores and more positive attitudes and behaviors towards the school. When parents are participated in the education of their children, both parents and their children can benefit. Most parents require feedback on levels of competence related to development of children. Practitioners and research in parents and children development often require an effective method to measure parenting attitudes. Recent research has examined the impact of various parent practices on educational outcomes of children growing up in different ages and social groups from pre-school to high school (Yılmaz Bolat, Gürsoy & Strom, 2016).

Throughout history, there has been a tendency to focus on problems, obstacles and anomalies in the field of cognitive health, and ways to improve them (Saleeby, 2006). As a consequence, the tools used in the field have been developed to reflect this trend (De Jong, Kelly, Berg, & Gonzales, 2002). Recently, however, the focal point has moved towards a new model, the Strengths Approach, which underlines the resources, abilities and potentials of individuals, parents and societies (Benard, 2006; Saleeby, 2006); while avoiding pathological labels and descriptions (Gleason, 2007). The Strengths Approach is of great importance for working with parents (Allen & Petr, 1996). This brought the concept of "family resiliency", which is defined as the parents' ability to mobilize and improve resources and strengths to cope with the challenges of life (McCoy, 1995). One of the basic elements that include flexibility is the "protective factors" (McCubbin & McCubbin, 1993). Protective factors are took into account to be sources of support and occasions that reduce the negative consequences of actions, such as preventing individuals from interfering with risky behaviors or increasing the likelihood of developing positive behaviors and improving healthy development against multiple stress and risks (Benard, 2006; Spooner, Hall, & Lynskey, 2001). Protective factors provide parents with adaptation and flexibility and prepare them for difficulty, change or conflict situations (Mathews, 2000). Due to the above mentioned facts, family protective factors appeared as an important topic of the study and efforts have been made to improve and use psychometric tools that adopt the Perspective of Strengths to evaluate parents (Arthur, Hawkins, Pollard, Catalano, & Baglioni Jr., 2002; De Jong, Kelly, Berg, & Gonzales, 2002; Tedeschi & Kilmer, 2005). The Inventory of Family Protective Factors (IFPF) is a tool improved lately (Gardner, Huber, Steiner, Vazguez, & Savage, 2008). The planning of preventive mental health services for families is largely dependent on the recognation and reinforcement of protective factors (WHO, 2002). Hence, it is important to focus on these factors when evaluating families (Benard, 2006).

Kubin Mete's research (2015) is a descriptive study conducted to investigate the relationships between mother's perceived stress and child abuse potential, family functioning and social isolation. Likewise, it was detected that mothers had relationships between perceived parental acceptance/rejection perception and social isolation, family functions and perceived stress. In addition, the perception of parental acceptance/rejection in children was analyzed in terms of gender differences and finally, the relationship between child abuse and the child's gender was investigated. The sample is composed of 207 students and the mothers of those students in Sinop. In the

research, The Child Abuse Potential Inventory, Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire–Mother Form, The Perceived Stress Scale, The Family Environment Scale, Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support, Child Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire with Control Scale Mother Version were used. At the end of the study, it was found that social isolation and perceived stress play a meaningful role in the perception of child abuse and the acceptance / rejection of the mother, not in family function. No significant difference was found between the child's gender and the mothers' child abuse potential, and also the perception of acceptance / rejection of mothers did not differ according to the gender of the children. Finally, it was determined that girls 'perceptions of mothers' behaviors were more rejected than boys.

Yılmaz Bolat's study (2011) aims to investigate the effects of a parent education program on parents who receive parenting education on parent-child communication issues in children in the age group of five to six, who have children's developmental areas, behavioral characteristics, behavioral characteristics and behaviors towards parenting children. The sample included 100 parents who have got five-six years old children and their children have taken education at kindergarten in Adana. Parent As A Teacher Inventory (PAAT) was used as pretest-posttest to evaluate parents knowledge levels about child education and development. The results revealed a significant difference between frustrating, teaching/learning, play, control, creative scores which is dimensions of PAAT and PAAT total scores of experimental and control group parents.

Özel's study (2014) aimed to determine the effects of the parent education programs on the relation between the parents who had 5 to 7-year-old children and their children. Parents' education programs aim to improve children's developmental areas, communication with children, effective time with children, child behavior problems, peer relationships and ways of coping with them, improving the attitudes of parents, and improving the child's behavior and habits. The sample included 200 parents who had 5-7 year-old children who were at kindergarten or at the first grade in Malatya. The program took place once a week and approximately took two hours for 8 weeks. The Turkish version of "The Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ)" was used as pre and posttest to elicit information about indifference-neglect, hostility-aggression, perceived warmth/affection (or coldness, lack of warmth) and undifferentiated rejection of parents on their child. The findings of the study showed that there was a significant difference in apathy-neglect, hostility-aggression, perceived warmth/compassion (or coldness, lack of temperature) and undifferentiated rejection as a result of parental education program.

It is important to identify the problems that may arise from this relationship by revealing the relationship between parental protective factors and their parents' acceptance/rejection perception (Kubin Mete, 2015). Protective factors are considered as sources of support and occasions that prevent people from taking risky behaviors or reducing negative consequences (Benard, 2006; Spooner, Hall & Lynskey, 2001). An interesting meta-analysis by Lereya, Samara, and Wolke (2013) suggested that bullies/victims and victims are more likely to be exposed to negative parenting behaviors, including abuse and neglect and incompatible parenting. On the other hand, positive parenting behavior, including parental control, parental control and parental involvement, were protective factors against peer victimization. The aim of the current study is to investigate the relations between parents' parental acception/rejection perception and the protective factors of the families in-terms-of various variables (parents as a teacher etc.).

Method

Research Model

This research is a descriptive study to explore the parental experiences of caring for a child with protective factors. A snowball sampling technique was employed with preservice teachers in Turkey for parents of children 36-96 months old.

Sample and Data Collection

Total sample of 204 parents with children aged 3-8 years who lives in the internal region of Turkey, were conducted to determine being relationships within and beyond the family. The characteristics of the participants are as follows: Most of the children are girls (95 males, 109 females); 152 of mothers were housewife; 37 of fathers were worker, 70 mothers and 64 fathers were high school graduate. 112 of mothers were aged between 31-40 years old. 78 children were born first child in their home and 98 children were lived in their home as a four people.

The instruments used in this study were socio-demographic information form, Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire–Mother Form, The Inventory of Family Protective Factors and Parent As A Teacher Inventory.

Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire–Mother Form (PARQ) developed-by Rohner (1980) as 56 items was used in order to determine parental acceptance and rejection. Subscales of PARQ are Coldness, Hostility/aggression, Undifferentiated rejection, Indifference/Neglect. This instrument measured on a 4-point Likert type scale. For the PARQ, scores provided for the items are summed. The highest score that may be obtained on the PARQ is 224. The sum of the scores from the subscales gives the total rejection score. High total score obtained from the scale means that a mother has a high rejection rate. In a study by Rohner, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were found to be .74 for the Coldness subscale and .67 for the Undifferentiated Rejection subscale. According to the reliability study of Anjel and Erkman (1993) who were adapted the scale to Turkish, it was determined that the total score alpha coefficient was .90. The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the subscales were .85 in the Coldness subscale, .80 in the Aggression-Hostility subscale, .74 in the Neglect-Indifference subscale, and .67 in the Undifferentiated Rejection dimension.

The Inventory of Family Protective Factors (IFPF) developed-by Gardner, et.al. (2008) as 16 items was intended to evaluate the protective factors that contribute to family resilience. The scale included 4 factors: Fewer Stressors factors (items 1 - 4), Adaptive Appraisal factors (items 5-8), Social Support factors (items 9 - 12), and Compensating Experiences factors (items 13-16). The scale developed to measure protective factors in the family is based on self-report. This instrument measured on a 5-point Likert type scale. For the IFPF, scores provided for the items are summed. As third item of the scale are phrased positively, it is reverse scored. The highest score that may be obtained on the IFPF is 80 and the lowest is 16. The high score obtained from the scale indicates that the respondent perceives the protective factors in his/her family at a high level. As a result of the analyzes, Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale ranged between .77 and .88. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Danışman and Köksal (2011). Cronbach alpha internal consistency of IFPF was .85. The internal consistencies of the subscales were .88 for Adaptive Appraisal and Compensating Experiences, .89 for Social Support and .58 for Fewer Stressors.

Parent As A Teacher Inventory (PAAT) developed-by Strom (1984) as 32 items was

used to assess parents knowledge levels about child development and education. The scale included 5 factors: Creative factors (4 items), Frustrating factors (7 items), Control factors (5 items), Play factors (10 items) and Teaching/learning factors (6 items). This instrument measured on a 4-point Likert type scale. For the PAAT, scores provided for the items are summed. As 12 items of the scale are phrased positively, they are reverse scored. The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the total score alpha coefficient was .83. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Yilmaz Bolat, Gürsoy and Strom (2016). Cronbach alpha internal consistency of the PAAT was found as .83.

A sociodemographic information form was used. All participants were voluntarily participated and given an informed consent form.

Analyzing of Data

The statistical analysis of investigation data was made by using SPSS 24.0 and the significant level of the investigation was accepted as .05. All participants were voluntarily participated and given an informed consent form; all measures chosen to understand for checking out with the other whether validity of measure and consistency of participants. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was employed in order to detect normality. As a result of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, IFPF, PAAT, PARQ tests were not normally distributed (p_{IFPF}=.029; p_{PAAT}=.008; p_{PARQ}=.000; p<.05). Also some groups in the study have less than thirty participants. Hence, during the evaluation process Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance were used. In the analyses concerning relationship between scales, Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient was used.

Findings

Table 1. Kruskal Wallis-H Test results to investigate whether the scores of IFPF differ according to maternal and paternal education statuses variables

	Maternal education status	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Mann Whitney U
Fewer Stressors	Primary school	43	83.86	3	8.348	.039	University>Primary school University>High school
	Secondary school	44	99.24				
	High school	70	96.51				
	University	40	119.36				
Adaptive Appraisal	Primary school	43	91.76	3	4.337	.227	
	Secondary school	44	109.09				
	High school	70	91.80				
	University	40	108.29				
Social Support	Primary school	43	81.74	3	18.271	.000	Secondary school >Primary school University>Primary school University>High school
	Secondary school	44	108.18				
	High school	70	87.99				
	University	40	126.73				
Compensating Experiences	Primary school	43	94.71	3	2.008	.571	
	Secondary school	44	101.07				
	High school	70	94.59				
	University	40	109.05				
Total	Primary school	43	83.40	3	14.695	.002	University>Primary school University>High school
	Secondary school	44	105.69				

	High school	70	89.14				
	University	40	125.68				
	Paternal education status	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Mann Whitney U
Fewer Stressors	Primary school	25	77.56	3	6.327	.097	
	Secondary school	31	75.79				
	High school	64	81.35				
	University	49	99.39				
Adaptive Appraisal	Primary school	25	87.18	3	5.069	.167	
	Secondary school	31	73.24				
	High school	64	81.05				
	University	49	96.49				
Social Support	Primary school	25	87.86	3	4.303	.231	
	Secondary school	31	70.71				
	High school	64	84.82				
	University	49	92.82				
Compensating Experiences	Primary school	25	102.56	3	10.211	.017	Primary school > Secondary school Primary school > High school University > High school
	Secondary school	31	74.58				
	High school	64	74.75				
	University	49	96.02				
Total	Primary school	25	91.08	3	8.932	.030	University > Secondary school University > High school
	Secondary school	31	67.37				
	High school	64	80.50				
	University	49	98.93				

The results depicted by Table 1 indicate that there was a statistically significant difference in fewer stressors, social support and IFPF total score between the four groups of maternal education status. There was a statistically significant difference in compensating experiences and IFPF total score between the four groups of paternal education status. After this process, complementary comparison techniques were started to determine which groups had significant differences after Kruskal Wallis-H. For this purpose, Mann Whitney-U was applied. As a result of the analyzes, it was found that the difference was in favor of mothers with university degrees in terms of Fewer Stressors, Social Support and Total scores. Likewise, it was found that the difference was in favor of fathers with university degrees in terms of Total scores and fathers with primary school graduate in terms of Compensating Experiences scores.

Table 2. Kruskal Wallis-H Test results to determine whether the scores of PARQ differ according to age of mother variables

	Age of mother	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Mann Whitney U
Hostility/ aggression	20-30	67	92.75	2	6.251	.044	41-50>20-30
	31-40	112	102.83				
	41-50	25	127.16				
Indifference/ Neglect	20-30	67	110.40	2	2.175	.337	
	31-40	112	100.03				
	41-50	25	92.38				
Undifferentiated rejection	20-30	67	112.51	2	3.428	.180	
	31-40	112	95.91				
	41-50	25	105.22				

Coldness	20-30	67	112.04	2	4.656	.098
	31-40	112	94.44			
	41-50	25	113.04			
Total	20-30	67	111.62	2	4.050	.132
	31-40	112	94.96			
	41-50	25	111.82			

Table 3. Kruskal Wallis-H Test results to determine whether the scores of PARQ differ according to paternal education statuses variables

	Paternal education status	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Mann Whitney U
Hostility/ aggression	Primary school	25	85.94	3	2.615	.455	
	Secondary school	31	97.32				
	High school	64	81.75				
	University	49	80.97				
Indifference/ Neglect	Primary school	25	95.48	3	4.238	.237	
	Secondary school	31	94.52				
	High school	64	83.39				
	University	49	75.73				
Undifferentiated rejection	Primary school	25	92.60	3	2.978	.395	
	Secondary school	31	90.05				
	High school	64	86.95				
	University	49	75.38				
Coldness	Primary school	25	90.08	3	6.451	.092	
	Secondary school	31	99.45				
	High school	64	85.92				
	University	49	72.06				
Total	Primary school	25	94.56	3	7.932	.047	Secondary school> University
	Secondary school	31	98.90				
	High school	64	85.82				
	University	49	70.26				

The results depicted by Table 2 suggest that there was a statistically significant difference in hostility/aggression of parent between the three groups of age of mother. There was a statistically significant difference in perception of acceptance/rejection of parent between the four groups of paternal education status (Tablo 3).

After this process, complementary comparison techniques were started to determine which groups had significant differences after Kruskal Wallis-H. For this purpose, Mann Whitney-U was applied. As a result of the analyzes, it was found that the difference was in favor of mothers with 20-30 years old in terms of hostility/aggression scores. Likewise, it was found that the difference was in favor of fathers with secondary school graduate in terms of Total scores.

Table 4. Mann-Whitney-U Test results for testing the significance of the difference between PAAT scores according to participants' gender variables

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	Asymp. Sig.
Creative	boy	95	105.25	9998.50	4916.500	.531
	girl	109	100.11	10911.50		
Frustrating	boy	95	110.04	10454.00	4461.000	.087
	girl	109	95.93	10456.00		
Control	boy	95	112.16	10655.00	4260.000	.028
	girl	109	94.08	10255.00		
Teaching/	boy	95	109.84	10435.00	4480.000	.095

learning	girl	109	96.10	10475.00		
Play	boy	95	105.59	10031.50	4883.500	.484
	girl	109	99.80	10878.50		
Total	boy	95	109.53	10405.50	4509.500	.112
	girl	109	96.37	10504.50		

Mann-Whitney U Test (Table 4) showed that parents' control attitudes towards their sons was statistically significantly higher than the daughters.

Table 5. Kruskal Wallis-H Test results to determine whether the scores of PAAT differ according to number of people at home variables

	number of people at home	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Mann Whitney U
Creative	2	5	135.60	5	11.607	.041	6>3
	3	23	86.13				6>4
	4	98	97.42				6>5
	5	49	98.09				
	6	21	132.17				
	7	7	131.07				
Frustrating	2	5	147.90	5	15.934	.007	2>3
	3	23	77.85				2>5
	4	98	98.15				6>3
	5	49	98.34				7>3
	6	21	136.12				6>4
	7	7	125.79				6>5
Control	2	5	153.30	5	16.184	.006	2>3
	3	23	84.28				2>4
	4	98	93.21				6>3
	5	49	105.26				7>3
	6	21	129.76				6>4
	7	7	140.50				7>4
Teaching/ learning	2	5	157.50	5	14.071	.015	2>3
	3	23	81.39				2>4
	4	98	98.37				2>5
	5	49	98.55				6>3
	6	21	132.98				6>4
	7	7	112.14				6>5
Play	2	5	145.50	5	12.173	.032	2>3
	3	23	79.24				5>3
	4	98	95.52				7>3
	5	49	110.19				
	6	21	115.71				
	7	7	138.00				
Total	2	5	162.70	5	20.953	.001	2>3
	3	23	75.13				2>4
	4	98	94.58				2>5
	5	49	104.06				5>3
	6	21	135.57				6>3
	7	7	135.71				7>3
							6>4
							6>5

Table 6. Kruskal Wallis-H Test results to determine whether the scores of PAAT differ according to birth order variables

	Birth order	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Mann Whitney U
Creative	1	78	100.33	3	9.210	.027	4+>1
	2	78	103.32				4+>2
	3	32	85.06				
	4+	15	139.97				
Frustrating	1	78	100.90	3	5.273	.153	
	2	78	102.75				
	3	32	89.23				
	4+	15	131.07				
Control	1	78	96.03	3	9.240	.026	4+>1
	2	78	99.82				4+>2
	3	32	101.53				
	4+	15	145.40				
Teaching/ learning	1	78	101.43	3	7.017	.071	4+>1
	2	78	100.85				4+>2
	3	32	89.58				
	4+	15	137.43				
Play	1	78	99.83	3	3.894	.273	
	2	78	98.96				
	3	32	101.30				
	4+	15	130.60				
Total	1	78	98.65	3	9.248	.026	4+>1
	2	78	100.04				4+>2
	3	32	94.39				
	4+	15	145.87				

Table 7. Kruskal Wallis-H Test results to determine whether the scores of PAAT differ according to age of mother variables

	Age of mother	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Mann Whitney U
Creative	20-30	67	105.84	2	1.745	.418	
	31-40	112	98.06				
	41-50	25	113.46				
Frustrating	20-30	67	106.49	2	.459	.795	
	31-40	112	100.59				
	41-50	25	100.38				
Control	20-30	67	98.60	2	1.960	.375	
	31-40	112	101.50				
	41-50	25	117.46				
Teaching/ learning	20-30	67	112.04	2	5.066	.079	
	31-40	112	94.15				
	41-50	25	114.34				
Play	20-30	67	106.50	2	1.417	.492	
	31-40	112	98.22				
	41-50	25	110.96				
Total	20-30	67	107.61	2	1.823	.402	
	31-40	112	97.53				
	41-50	25	111.06				

Table 8. Mann-Whitney-U Test results for testing the significance of the difference between PAAT scores according to participants' maternal and paternal occupations variables

	Maternal occupation	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	Asymp. Sig.
Creative	housewife	152	103.09	15670.00	3102.000	.169
	other	47	90.00	4230.00		
Frustrating	housewife	152	102.00	15504.00	3268.000	.376
	other	47	93.53	4396.00		
Control	housewife	152	104.78	15926.00	2846.000	.034
	other	47	84.55	3974.00		
Teaching/ learning	housewife	152	100.41	15262.50	3509.500	.855
	other	47	98.67	4637.50		
Play	housewife	152	105.97	16108.00	2664.000	.008
	other	47	80.68	3792.00		
Total	housewife	152	104.17	15833.50	2938.500	.066
	other	47	86.52	4066.50		

	Paternal occupation	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	Asymp. Sig.
Creative	worker	37	102.93	3808.50	2851.500	.683
	other	161	98.71	15892.50		
Frustrating	worker	37	105.61	3907.50	2752.500	.470
	other	161	98.10	15793.50		
Control	worker	37	91.36	3380.50	2677.500	.335
	other	161	101.37	16320.50		
Teaching/ learning	worker	37	99.04	3664.50	2961.500	.957
	other	161	99.61	16036.50		
Play	worker	37	125.16	4631.00	2029.000	.002
	other	161	93.60	15070.00		
Total	worker	37	107.20	3966.50	2693.500	.364
	other	161	97.73	15734.50		

Table 9. Kruskal Wallis-H Test results to determine whether the scores of PAAT differ according to maternal and paternal education statuses variables

	Maternal education status	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Mann Whitney U
Creative	Primary school	43	114.77	3	6.266	.099	
	Secondary school	44	98.82				
	High school	70	98.10				
	University	40	83.83				
Frustrating	Primary school	43	120.08	3	8.022	.046	Primary school> High school
	Secondary school	44	97.10				
	High school	70	92.95				Primary school> University
	University	40	89.01				
Control	Primary school	43	115.45	3	8.274	.041	Primary school> University
	Secondary school	44	97.17				
	High school	70	100.91				
	University	40	79.99				
Teaching/ learning	Primary school	43	117.87	3	7.108	.069	
	Secondary school	44	94.16				
	High school	70	97.63				

	University	40	86.44				
Play	Primary school	43	119.14	3	23.408	.000	Primary school> High school
	Secondary school	44	116.58				Primary school> University
	High school	70	94.35				Secondary school> High school
	University	40	66.15				Secondary school> University
							High school> University
Total	Primary school	43	124.33	3	16.676	.001	Primary school> High school
	Secondary school	44	102.69				Primary school> University
	High school	70	95.44				Secondary school> University
	University	40	73.95				
	Paternal education status	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Mann Whitney U
Creative	Primary school	25	89.58	3	6.812	.078	
	Secondary school	31	99.47				
	High school	64	86.47				
	University	49	71.59				
Frustrating	Primary school	25	109.90	3	13.099	.004	Primary school> High school
	Secondary school	31	97.05				Primary school> University
	High school	64	80.08				Secondary school> University
	University	49	71.10				
Control	Primary school	25	104.54	3	8.879	.031	Primary school> High school
	Secondary school	31	94.16				Primary school> University
	High school	64	83.05				Secondary school> University
	University	49	71.79				
Teaching/ learning	Primary school	25	103.46	3	8.233	.041	Primary school> University
	Secondary school	31	95.34				Secondary school> University
	High school	64	81.93				
	University	49	73.05				
Play	Primary school	25	100.18	3	19.523	.000	Primary school> University
	Secondary school	31	106.71				Secondary school> University
	High school	64	86.20				High school> University
	University	49	61.95				
Total	Primary school	25	110.44	3	19.806	.000	Primary school> High school
	Secondary school	31	103.18				Primary school> University
	High school	64	81.85				Secondary school> High school
	University	49	64.63				Secondary school> University
							High school> University

In general, the results depicted by Table 5 indicate that there was a statistically significant difference in creative, frustrating, control, teaching/learning, play and PAAT

total score between the six groups of number of people at home. The Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in creative, control, teaching/learning and PAAT total score between the four groups of birth order (Table 6). There was not a statistically significant difference in any PAAT score between the three groups of age of mother (Table 7). As shown in table 8, there was a statistically significant difference in control and play between the two groups of maternal occupation. There was a statistically significant difference in play between the two groups of paternal occupation. Mann-Whitney U Test showed that housewife (nonworking) mothers' control and play attitudes towards their children was statistically significantly higher than the working mothers. Worker fathers' play attitudes towards their children was statistically significantly higher than the fathers who work other sectors. Also, the results depicted by Table 9 indicate that this test suggested that there was a statistically significant difference in frustrating, control, teaching/learning, play and PAAT total score between the four groups of paternal education status. There was a statistically significant difference in control, play and PAAT total score between the four groups of maternal education status.

After this process, complementary comparison techniques were started to determine which groups had significant differences after Kruskal Wallis-H. For this purpose, Mann Whitney-U was applied. As a result of the analyzes, it was found that the difference was in favor of two people at home in terms of creative, frustrating, control, teaching/learning, play and total scores. Likewise, it was found that the difference was in favor of mothers who 20-30 years old in terms of hostility/aggression scores and children were borned as fourth and higher in family in terms of creative, control, teaching/learning and PAAT total scores. Therewithal it was found that the difference was in favor of children of worker fathers and housewife mothers in terms of play scores. In addition, it was found that the difference was in favor of mothers with primary school graduate in terms of control, play and total scores; also the difference was in favor of fathers with primary school graduate in terms of frustrating, control, teaching/learning and total scores.

As a result of the analyzes of Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient indicate that there was a positive correlation between the perception of acceptance/rejection of parent and PAAT total scores (spearman's p=.536, p=.000, p2=.29). There was a positive correlation between the perception of acceptance/rejection of parent and the frustrating subscale scores of the PAAT total (spearman's p=.499, p=.000, p2=.25).

Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

There are many reasons for problem behaviors in preschool children. Some of the behavioral problems are part of the development process. The problem can be taken into account if it persists after the development process. Conversely, the family is a significant component on the child's socioemotional development process. The family and social environment affect the child's problem behavior, such as divorce between mother and father, parent deprivation, parents' and children's quality, parents 'attitudes, gender and cultural characteristics. Coping with problem behaviors is primarily necessary to increase knowledge and skills, such as child development and education, parenting skills, positive relationships between children and their families and problem-solving skills (Özbey, 2010). In this context, the article emphasized important problems in the preschool period and presented suggestions and suggestions.

Kerimoğlu's study (2012) is a descriptive study made for examining the effect of

perceived social support on mothers' receptive and rejective attitude in relationship with her children who have cerebral palsy. The study sample consisted of 127 mothers whose children with cerebral palsy in Ankara. The mothers who were included in this study have children who did not have any disease other than cerebral palsy and children were between 3-18 years old. The mothers were primary caregiver. Multidimensional Perceived Social Support Scale applied to the mothers for determining the social support they perceived and Parent Child Relationship Scale, Mother Form to determine relationship between mothers and their children who have cerebral palsy. As a result, mothers stated that they did not have enough time for themselves and other family members. They stated that they were separated from their social environment due to having children with cerebral palsy and that they had difficulty in explaining the state of their children. In addition, it was found that the social support perceived by the mothers positively affects the relationship between the children with cerebral palsy and the relationship between the mother and the child has improved with the increase in perceived social support. It has been found that mothers with high social support perceive more acceptance behavior to their children with cerebral palsy and mothers with low social support behaviors show more rejection behavior to their children. Aktaş Özkafacı's research (2012) aims to analyze the relationship between mothers' attitude towards growing up children and social skill level of the children. Related to the aim of the research, 33 children who are at the age of 6 in İstanbul have been observed and 'Social Skill Evaluation Scale' has been applied to them. 'Parent's Attitude Scale' has been applied to their mothers. According to the results of the study, there is a positive and significant relationship between the authoritarian attitudes of mothers and the social skill levels of preschool children. On the other hand, there is no statistically significant relationship between mothers' authoritarian, overprotective, permissive attitudes and social skill levels of children. According to the correlation analysis, there is a negative, very low relationship between the attitudes of the pre-school children and the social skill levels of the overrepresented mothers. It is seen that there is no difference according to gender by considering whether there is a difference in mothers' attitudes towards children's social skills according to the gender of children.

Kubin Mete's research (2015) was conducted with the aim of investigating the relations between mothers' parental acception/rejection perception and family functioning, perceived stress and social isolation. At the end of the study, it was found that social isolation and perceived stress play an important role in the perception of acceptance/rejection of the mother. The perception of acceptance/rejection of mothers did not differ according to the gender of the children. In this study, similarly, the perception of acceptance/rejection of mothers did not differ by children's gender as in the Kubin Mete's research study.

Other studies have found that victimization is associated with criminal, hostile and inconsistent parenting, and is associated with high negative expression and high levels of family conflict and violence (Burk et al. 2008; Schwartz et al. 1997). In this study, similarly, old mothers (41-50 years old) showed their children more hostility/aggression attitudes.

Shin and Kim (2008) examined 297 children from 4 to 7 years old, and they showed that parental neglect and abuse were positively related to peer victimization while parental affection and warmth were related negatively to peer victimization. Moreover, another study defined that the socioeconomic disadvantage of family, low maternal temperature and maltreatment are risk factors for chronic victimization using a large-

scale sample of 2232 primary and elementary school children (Bowes et al. 2013). In this study, differently, young mothers (20-30 years old) did not show their children more coldness attitudes.

Similarly, Booth (1994) depicted maternal stress, poor social support and depression positively correlated with internalization and externalization, and were negatively correlated with social participation and acceptance at the age of 8 years. Another study by Burk et al. (2008) indicated early childhood and family risk factors related to bullying in childhood. They examined 238 children since their birth, their teachers and mothers. The findings showed that bullying, victims and aggressive victims showed more temperamental disorders than socially regulated children. In terms of family risk factors, the results showed that aggressive victims were more likely to be exposed to mothers' depression than bullying. In this study, similarly, there was a positive correlation between the perception of acceptance/rejection of parent and the frustrating.

The current study provides evidence that the Family Protective Factors, Parental Acceptance/Rejection are a determinative factor within the families in-terms-of various variables in Turkish culture.

Future studies with international sample will examine transnational effects on perception of acceptance/rejection of parent and protective factors, as well as parents' knowledge levels about child development and education on different countries.

Future studies with this sample will examine long-term effects on perception of acceptance/rejection of parent and protective factors, as well as parents' knowledge levels about child development and education.

Studies with larger samples of similarly Turkish parents would permit analyses of moderators of outcome (e.g., parental depression, behavior problems at baseline, race or ethnicity) and mediational pathways (from parenting to child outcomes).

Future prevention efforts could identify younger children of social/antisocial parents in a variety of settings (e.g., residence zone, socioeconomic status).

References

Aktaş Özkafacı, A. (2012). *Annenin Çocuk Yetiştirme Tutumu İle Çocuğun Sosyal Beceri Düzeyi Arasindaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul

Allen, R. I. & Petr, C. G. (1996). Toward developing standards and measurements for family-centered practice in family support programs. I. G. H. S. Singer, A. P. Turnbull, H. R. Turnbull, III, L. K. Irvin & L. E. Powers, (Ed.), *Family, community, and disability: Redefining family support. Innovations in public-private partnerships* (57-85). Baltimore: Brookes.

Anjel, M., & Erkman, F. (1993). The transliteral equivalance, reliability and validity studies of the parental acceptance-rejection questionnaire mother form: A total for assessing child abuse. Master Thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.

Arthur, M. J., Hawkins, J. D., Pollard, J., Catalano, R. F. & Baglioni Jr., A. J. (2002). Measuring risk and protective factors for substance use, delinquency, and other adolescent problem behaviors: The communities that care youth survey. *Evaluation Review, 26,* 575-601.

Benard, B. & Marshall, K. (2001). Protective factors in individuals, families, and

schools: National longitudinal study on adolescent health findings. National Resilience Resource Center University of Minnesota. Retrieved from http://www.hss.state.ak.us/ dbh/prevention/programs/resiliency/docs/Resilience_Research_for_Prevention_ Programs.pdf.

Booth, C. L. (1994). Predicting social adjustment in middle childhood: the role of preschool attachment security and maternal style. *Social Development, 3*(3), 189–204.

Bowes, L., Maughan, B., Ball, H., Shakoor, S., Ouellet-Morin, I., Caspi, A. & Arseneault, L. (2013). Chronic bullying victimization across school transitions: The role of genetic and environmental influences. *Development and Psychopathology, 25*(02), 333–346.

Burk, L. R., Park, J. H., Armstrong, J. M., Klein, M. H., Goldsmith, H. H., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Essex, M. J. (2008). Identification of early child and family risk factors for aggressive victim status in first grade. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 36*(4), 513–526.

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*, 385–396.

Danışman, I. G. & Köksal, S. (2011). Ailedeki Koruyucu Etkenler Ölçeği Türkçe Formunun Geçerlik ve Güvenirliği. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, *14*(28), 39-46.

De Jong, P., Kelly, S., Berg, I. K. & Gonzales, L. (2002). Building strengths-based tools for child protection practice: A case of "parallel process". In D. Saleeby, (Ed.), *The strengths perspective in social work practice* (3. edition) (106-123). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Fowler, P. C. (1980). Family environment and early behavioral development: a structural analysis of dependencies. *Psychological Reports, 47,* 611-617.

Gardner, D. L., Huber, C. H., Steiner, R., Vazquez, L. A. & Savage, T. A. (2008). The development and validation of the Inventory for Family Protective Factors: A Brief assessment for family counseling. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 16*(2), 107-117.

Gleason, E. T. (2007). A strengths-based approach to the social developmental study. *Children & Schools, 29*(1), 51-59.

Kerimoğlu, G. (2012). *Serebral Palsili Çocuğu Olan Annelerin Algıladıkları Sosyal Desteğin Anne Çocuk İlişkileri Üzerine Etkisinin İncelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Kubin Mete, B. (2015). *Çocuk İstismarı: Stres, Aile İşlevselliği, Sosyal Yalıtım, Kabul/Red*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Lereya, S. T., Samara, M., & Wolke, D. (2013). Parenting behavior and the risk of becoming a victim and a bully/victim: A meta-analysis study. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 37*, 1091–1108.

Matthews, D. W. (2000). Family resiliency. North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service. Retrieved from http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/ depts/fcs/pdfs/fcs-508.pdf.

McCubbin, M. A. & McCubbin, H. I. (1993). Family coping with health crises: The Resiliency Model of Family Stress and Adaptation. C. Danielson, B. Hamel-Bissel ve P. Winstead-Fry, (Ed.), *Families, health, and illness*. New York: Mosby.

McCoy, J., (1995). Family resiliency: Building strengths to meet life's challenges. Iowa State University Extension and the National Network for Family Resiliency. Retrieved from http://www.extension.iastate.edu/Publications/EDC53.pdf.

Milner, J. (1986). *The Child Abuse Potential Inventory Manual*. IL: Psytec Inc.

Özbey, S. (2010). Okul öncesi çocuklarda uyum ve davranış problemleriyle başa çıkmada ailenin rolü. *Aile ve Toplum, 6*(22), 9-18.

Özel, E. (2014). *5-7 Yaş Çocuğa Sahip Ebeveynlere Verilen Anne Baba Eğitimlerinin Aile Çocuk Ilişkisine Etkisi (Malatya Ili Örneği)*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Malatya.

Rohner, R. P. (1980). Worldwide tests of parental acceptance-rejection theory: An overview cross-cultural research. *Behavior Science Research, 15*, 1-21.

Rohner, R. P., Saavedra, J. M., & Granum, E. O. (1978). Development and validation of the parental acceptance-rejection questionnaire. *Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 8*, 17-48.

Saleeby, D. (2006). The strengths perspective in social work practice (4. edition). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S. & Bates, J. E. (1997). The early socialization of aggressive victims of bullying. *Child Development, 68*(4), 665–675.

Shin, Y., & Kim, H. Y. (2008). Peer victimization in Korean preschool children: The effects of child characteristics, parenting behaviours and teacher-child relationships. *School Psychology International, 29*, 590–605.

Spooner, C., Hall, W. & Lynskey, M. (2001). Structural determinants of youth drug use: The scope for youth health development. Australian National Council on Drugs, ACT. Retrieved from http://addictionstudies.dec.uwi.edu/Documents/generic%20drug%20 information/Stuctur al_Determinants_of_Drug_Use.pdf.

Strom, R. D. (1984). *Parent As A Teacher Inventory Manual*. Scholastic Testing Service, Bensenville, IL.

Tedeschi, R. G. & Kilmer, R. P. (2005). Assessing strengths, resilience, and growth to guide clinical interventions. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 36(3), 230-237.

WHO. (2002). *The world health report: Reducing risks, promoting heathy life*. France: World Health Organization.

Yılmaz Bolat, E. (2011). *Anne Baba Eğitiminin Beş–Altı Yaş Çocuğa Sahip Anne Babaların Çocuk Yetiştirme Tutum Ve Davranışlarına Etkisinin İncelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Yılmaz Bolat, E., Gürsoy, F., & Strom, R. (2016). Öğretmen Olarak Anne Baba Envanteri: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim*

Fakültesi Dergisi, *12*(3), 961-970.

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G. & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*, 30-41.