

Sündüs SANCAKOĞLU

M.A. Thesis In Psychology

July - 2011

RELATION BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND DEPRESSION, ANXIETY, AND SELF-ESTEEM IN EARLY ADOLESCENTS

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

by
Sündüs SANCAKOĞLU

Fatih University

July, 2011

Sündüs SANCAKOĞLU

M.A. Thesis In Psychology

July - 2011

RELATION BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND DEPRESSION, ANXIETY, AND SELF-ESTEEM IN EARLY ADOLESCENTS

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

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

by

Sündüs SANCAKOĞLU

Fatih University

July, 2011

© Sündüs SANCAKOĐLU

All Rights Reserved, 2011

APPROVAL PAGE

Student : Sündüs Sancakođlu
Institute : Institute of Social Sciences
Department : Psychology
Thesis Subject : Relation between Socioeconomic Status and Depression,
Anxiety, and Self-Esteem in Early Adolescents
Thesis Date : July 2011

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Tolga ARICAK
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Professor Kemal SAYAR
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Professor Kemal SAYAR

Assist. Prof. Hasan UĐUR

Assoc. Prof. Ali Murat YEL

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Institute of Social Science

Assoc. Prof. Mehmet KARAKUYU
Director

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.
2. The program of advanced study of which this thesis is part has consisted of:
 - i) Research Methods course during the undergraduate study
 - ii) Examination of several thesis guides of particular universities both in Turkey and abroad as well as a professional book on this subject.

Sündüs SANCAKOĞLU

July, 2011

ABSTRACT

Sündüs SANCAKOĞLU

July, 2011

RELATION BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND DEPRESSION, ANXIETY, AND SELF-ESTEEM IN EARLY ADOLESCENTS

The aim of the present study is to examine relationship between socioeconomic status and depression, anxiety, self-esteem in early adolescents (7th grade students). In addition, it is examined whether there is a significant relationship gender difference and parent education with depression, anxiety, and self-esteem.

In this research it was worked with adolescents (7th grade students). In addition, this study is conducted in two schools (private school and state school) to compare the adolescents' socioeconomic status. The number of sample was 106 in which there were 50 girls and 56 boys. 53 of them are from private school and 53 of the students are from state school. It was applied three different scales to analyze depression, anxiety, self-esteem. Children's Depression Inventory (CDI), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children, and Piers Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale were used. And, 'Personal Information Sheet' was filled by adolescents to get the socioeconomic knowledge about them.

Results show that it was found statistical significant difference between depression and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on and between trait anxiety scores and the kind of school. It was not found statistically significance mean difference between state anxiety scores and the kind of school and between self-esteem and the kind of school.

It was found statistically significant mean difference between only except "anxiety" subfactor among self-esteem subfactors scores and the kind of school that students are going on.

It was not found statistically significant mean difference between depression scores and gender, between state anxiety scores and gender, and between self-esteem scores and gender. It was found statistically significance mean difference between trait anxiety scores and gender.

It was not found statistical significant difference for the mother's and father's education degree on depression, state anxiety, trait anxiety, and self-esteem scores of students but it was found significant difference "Happiness", "Anxiety", and "Mental and School Situation" scores with mother education degree and "anxiety" scores with father education degree.

Keywords: Depression, State Anxiety, Trait Anxiety, Self-perception, Self-Concept, Self-Esteem, Behavior and Conformity, Happiness, Anxiety, Popularity, Mental and School Situation, Socioeconomic Status

KISA ÖZET

Sündüs SANCAKOĞLU

Temmuz, 2011

ERKEN ERGENLİK DÖNEMİNDE, SOYOEKONOMİK STATÜ İLE DEPRESYON, KAYGI VE BENLİK SAYGISI ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ

Bu çalışmanın amacı, erken ergenlik döneminde (7. Sınıf öğrencileri), sosyoekonomik statü ile depresyon, kaygı ve benlik saygısı arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Ayrıca, cinsiyet değişkeni, anne ve baba eğitimi ile depresyon, kaygı ve benlik saygısı arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olup olmadığını da incelemektedir.

Bu çalışmada, İstanbul'da yaşayan ergenlerle (7. Sınıf öğrencileri) çalışılmıştır. Ayrıca, bu çalışma ergenlerin sosyoekonomik statülerini karşılaştırmak için iki okulda (devlet ve özel okul) yapıldı. Örneklem 50 kız ve 56 erkek olmak üzere 106 öğrenci içerir. Öğrencilerin 53'ü özel okuldandır ve diğer 53'ü devlet okulundandır. Depresyon, kaygı ve benlik algısını analiz etmek için üç farklı skala uygulandı. Çocuklar için Depresyon Ölçeği, Durumluk-Sürekli Kaygı Ölçeği ve Piers Harris Çocuklar için Benlik Kavramı Ölçeği kullanıldı. Ergenler tarafından onların sosyoekonomik düzeyleri hakkında bilgi edinmek için "Öğrenci Bilgi Formu" dolduruldu.

Sonuçlara göre depresyon ve öğrencilerin devam ettiği okul türü (devlet-özel okul) ve sürekli kaygı ve okul türü arasında anlamlı bir ilişki vardır. Durumluk kaygı ve okul türü ile benlik saygısı ve okul türü arasında anlamlı ilişki bulunmamıştır.

Piers Harris Öz Kavram Ölçeğinin alt ölçeklerinden sadece "kaygı" ile okul türü arasında anlamlı ilişki bulunmuştur.

Depresyon, durumluk kaygı ve benlik saygısı ile cinsiyet değişkeni arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmamıştır. Sürekli kaygı ile cinsiyet değişkeni arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur.

Baba ve anne eğitim durumu ile depresyon, durumluk kaygı, sürekli kaygı ve benlik saygısı arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmamıştır. Fakat "mutluluk ve doyum", "kaygı" ve "zihinsel durum ve okul durumu" alt ölçekleri ile anne eğitim düzeyi, "kaygı" alt ölçeği ile baba eğitim düzeyi arasında anlamlı bir ilişki vardır.

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Depresyon, Durumluk Kaygı, Sürekli Kaygı, Benlik Algısı, Benlik Kavramı, Benlik Saygısı, Davranış ve Uyum, Mutluluk ve Doyum, Kaygı, Fiziksel Görünüş, Popülarite ve Sosyal Beğeni, Zihinsel Durum ve Okul Durumu, Sosyoekonomik Statü

LIST OF CONTENTS

Approval Page	iv
Author Declarations	v
Abstract	vi
Kısa Özet	viii
List of Contents	ix
List of Tables	xii
List of Abbreviations	xvi
Acknowledgements	xvii
Preface	xviii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I DEPRESSION	3
1.1.1. Definition of Depression and Symtoms to Diagnose	3
1.1.2. Etiology of Depression	6
1.1.3. The Prevalence of Depression	7
ANXIETY	8
1.2.1. Definition of Anxiety	8
1.2.2. Definition of Anxiety Disorders	9
1.2.3. Etiology of Anxiety Disorders	11
1.2.4. The Prevalence of Anxiety Disorders	11
SELF-ESTEEM.....	12
1.3.1. Self-Esteem and Expressions Associated with Self-Esteem	12

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS	15
1.5. Definitions	16
1.5.1. Depression	16
1.5.2. Anxiety	17
1.5.3. Anxiety Disorders	17
1.5.4. Self-concept	17
1.5.5. Self-Perception	18
1.5.6. Self-esteem	18
CHAPTER II METHOD	19
2.1. Participants	19
2.2. Procedure	19
2.3. Purpose of Research	19
2.4. Assumptions	20
2.5. Restraints of Research	20
2.6. Scales and Gathering Data	20
2.6.1. Children’s Depression Inventory (CDI)	21
2.6.2. State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC)	21
2.6.3. Piers Harris’ Children Self-Concept Scale	23
2.6.4. Personal Information Sheet	24
2.6.5. Hypotheses	24
CHAPTER III FINDINGS	27
CHAPTER IV RESULTS and DISCUSSION	81
REFERENCES	97

APPENDICES	104
Appendix A: Children’s Depression Inventory	104
Appendix B: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children	108
Appendix C: Piers Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scale	110
Appendix D: Personal Information Sheet	114

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1.1. Symptoms Used by the DSM to Diagnose a Major Depressive Episode...	5
Table 1.2.1. Symptoms of depression which usually occur in children and adolescents	6
Table 2.2.1. Anxiety Disorders in DSM-IV	10
Table 2.2.2. Major Characteristics of Anxiety in children and adolescents	10
Table 3.1.1. Demographic characteristics of students	27
Table 3.1.2. Dispersion of fathers' educational degree	27
Table 3.1.3. Dispersion of fathers' educational degree in terms of the kind of school.	28
Table 3.1.4. Dispersion of mothers' educational degree	29
Table 3.1.5. Dispersion of mothers' educational degree in terms of the kind of school	29
Table 3.1.6. Income level	30
Table 3.1.7. Dispersion of income level monthly due to the the kind of school	31
Table 3.1.8. . Dispersion of the number of children in a family	32
Table 3.1.9. Dispersion of the number of children in a family due to the the kind of school	33
Table 3.1.10. Mothers' Working Situation	34
Table 3.1.11. Dispersion of mother working situation due to the kind of school	34
Table 3.1.12. House situation about rent or not	35
Table 3.1.13. Dispersion of the house situation about rent or not due to the kind of	

school	35
Table 3.1.14. The number of rooms at home	36
Table 3.1.15. Dispersion of number of rooms due to the the kind of school	37
Table 3.1.16. Private school offering specialized courses, after school and especially at the weekends (“dershane” in Turkish)	38
Table 3.1.17. Dispersion of private school offering specialized courses, after school and especially at the weekends (“dershane” in Turkish) due to the the kind of school	38
Table 3.1.18. Private lesson (Having tutor)	39
Table 3.1.19. Dispersion of taking private lesson due to the the kind of school	39
Table 3.1.20. Having student's own room	40
Table 3.1.21. Dispersion of having student's own room due to the the kind of school.	40
Table 3.1.22. Having a computer	41
Table 3.1.23. Dispersion of having a computer due to the the kind of school	41
Table 3.1.24. Having laptop computer	42
Table 3.1.25. Dispersion of having laptop computer due to the the kind of school	42
Table 3.1.26. Dispersion of having a computer and having a laptop computer due to the the kind of school	43
Table 3.1.27. Having a mobile phone	44
Table 3.1.28. Dispersion of having a mobile phone due to the the kind of school	44
Table 3.1.29. Having Mp4, Mp5, etc	45
Table 3.1.30. Dispersion of having Mp4, Mp5, etc due to the the kind of school	45
Table 3.1.31. Having plasma TV / LCD	46
Table 3.1.32. Dispersion of having plasma TV / LCD due to the the kind of school ...	46

Table 3.2.1. The Dispersion of Depression Scale T-test Results Due to The Kind of School	47
Table 3.2.2. The Dispersion of State Anxiety Scale T-test Results Due to The Kind of School	48
Table 3.2.3. The Dispersion of Trait Anxiety Scale T-test Results Due to The Kind of School	48
Table 3.2.4. The Dispersion of PHSC Total Scale T-test Results Due to The Kind of School	49
Table 3.3.1. The results of Pearson Correlation Coefficient analyse between CDI, STAIC, PHSC Scale Total	50
Table 3.4.1. The Dispersion of PHSC Subfactors T-test Results Due to The Kind of School	52
Table 3.4.2. The results of Pearson Correlation Coefficient analyse between CDI, STAIC, PHSC Scale Total and Subfactor	53
Table 3.4.3. The results of Pearson Correlation Coefficient analyse between PHSC Scale Subfactors	56
Table 3.5.1. The Dispersion of Depression Scale T-test Results Due to Gender	58
Table 3.5.2. The Dispersion of State Anxiety Scale T-test Results Due to Gender ...	58
Table 3.5.3. The Dispersion of Trait Anxiety Scale T-test Results Due to The Gender	59
Table 3.5.4. The Dispersion of PHSC Total Scale T-test Results Due to The Gender..	60
Table 3.5.5. The Dispersion of PHSC Subfactors T-test Results Due to The Gender..	61
Table 3.5.6. The Dispersion of Depression Scale, State –Trait Anxiety Scale, PHSC Total, and PHSC Subfactors T-test Results Due to The Kind of School for	

Girls	62
Table 3.5.7. The Dispersion of Depression Scale, State –Trait Anxiety Scale, PHSC Total, and PHSC Subfactors T-test Results Due to The Kind of School for Boys	64
Table 3.6.1. Descriptives statistical independent group T-test results of Depression, State and Trait Anxiety, and Self-Esteem Scores of students due to the mother educational degrees variable	66
Table 3.6.2. The ANOVA results of Depression, State and Trait Anxiety, and Self-Esteem Scores of students due to the mother educational degrees	68
Table 3.6.3. Descriptives statistical independent group T-test results of Depression, State and Trait Anxiety, andSelf-Esteem Scores of students due to the father educational degrees variable	69
Table 3.6.4. The ANOVA results of Depression, State and Trait Anxiety, and Self-Esteem Scores of students due to the father educational degrees	71
Table 3.6.5. Descriptives statistical independent group T-test results of PHSC subfactors of students due to the mother educational degrees variable	72
Table 3.6.6. The ANOVA results of PHSC Dimensions according to students’ mothers’ educational degrees	74
Table 3.6.7. Descriptives statistical independent group T-test results of PHSC subfactos of students due to the father educational degrees variable	76
Table 3.6.8. The ANOVA results of PHSC Dimensions according to students’ fathers’ educational degrees	78

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

PHSC: Piers Harris Self-Concept Scale

CDI: Children's Depression Inventory

STAIC: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children

PHSC: Piers Harris Self-Concept Scale

SES: Socioeconomic Status

(qtd in: transmitting in Author

p. : page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge all those who have contributed to the preparation of this thesis. First of all, I want to thank my advisor Prof. Dr. M. Kemal Sayar because of the appreciation from his guidance. In addition, I want to thank head of Psychology Department Assoc. Prof. O. Tolga Arıçak, and committee members Assoc. Prof. Ali Murat Yel, and Assist.Prof. Hasan Uğur for their helps.

I gratefully acknowledge all the employees and my school administrator for their permission and helps. I should also mention about my firends Vildan Özçelik, Esmâ Günay, Funda Yıldırım, and other my friends for their supporting and contributions, I thank them very much.

In addition, I want to acknowledge administrator of two schools because of the permission and helps for this research. And, of course, I want to thank all the students because of participating this research and answering the questions sincerely.

And, I should thank my family; without their encouragements, maybe I would not find any motivation to complete this thesis. Of course, especially, they deserve very much thanks due to the fact that they have assisted during all my life, too.

PREFACE

Development of human being from infancy to adulthood has great importance. These developmental processes have different subtitles such as cognitive, psychological, social, and so on. That is, human being's developmental process has a great complexity.

Adults want to understand their childrens, adolescents, and youngsters, to help them when they need. In addition, they want to cope with possible problems when they meet. In order to accomplish this, they need more knowledge. Especially, today, because of these reasons, there is an icreasing interest in studies about children and adolescents.

Some of the issues given more importance are to understand children's and adolescents' psychological wellbeing. What depression and anxiety are, why the child and adolescent have, how the adults/families help them and what there are factors influencing depression and anxiety are some of these that should be explained.

In addition, some of the other issues should be answered are what the meaning of self, self-concept, self-perception, and self-esteem is, what the influence of these on development of the problems of depression and anxiety is, and what other factors such as gender and socioeconomic status have the relationship with these problems. This study tries to answer these questions.

INTRODUCTION

Today, there is an increasing interest in studies about children and adolescents. This interest is related to the fact that process from childhood to adulthood consists of great biological, social, and psychological changes.

Adolescence is a developmental period in terms of biological, social, and psychological changes. In addition, during adolescence, there is a clear increase in appearing the psychological disorders such as depression, anxiety, and so on (Fox, Halpern, Ryan, & Lowe, 2010). Because of this, depression, anxiety, and other problems in children and adolescents have had the increasing concern during the last years (Merrell, 2008).

In addition, adolescence is characterized by having “high levels of risk taking, novelty/sensation seeking, experimentation with drugs, and use of specific substances to improve performance” (Schirlin, Rey, Jouvent, Dubal, Komano, Perez-Diaz, & Soussignan, 2009:615).

Therefore, in recent years, there is an increasing attention about prevention of the problems adolescents may have. So, this may be provided by understanding psychological disorders and their development (Flannery-Schroeder, 2006).

On the other hand, it has been aimed to investigate relations of depression and anxiety with other factors. It has thought that self-esteem is one of them having significant associations with depression and anxiety.

For instance, it was found that relationship between self-esteem and depression or anxiety is reciprocal (Benetti and Kambouropoulos, 2010, in press; Bödecs, Horváth, Szilágyi, Gonda, Rihmer, Sándor, 2010). It means higher levels of anxiety and depression and lower levels of self-esteem (Bödecs, et al., 2010).

Furthermore, socioeconomic status has had the another one thought to have a significant relation with depression and anxiety. For instance, researches show higher rates of depression at lower levels of socioeconomic status (Bruce, Takeuchi, and Leaf, 1991; Lorent, Deliege, Eaton, Robert, Philippot, & Anseau, 2003; Mendelson, Kubzansky, Datta, & Buka, 2008). Low socioeconomic status predicts higher levels of depressive and anxiety symptoms among adolescents (McLeod and Owens, 2004).

Based on these explanations, it may be expressed that the aim of the present study is to examine relationship between socioeconomic status and depression, anxiety, self-esteem in early adolescents (7th grade students). At the same time, it is examined whether there is a significant relationship between depression and anxiety; depression and self-esteem; anxiety and self-esteem; socioeconomic status and depression; socioeconomic status and anxiety; and socioeconomic status and self-esteem.

In this research it was worked with adolescents (7th grade students) who live in Istanbul city. In addition, this study is conducted in two schools (private school and state school) to compare the adolescents' socioeconomic status.

Moreover, it was applied three different scales to analyze depression, anxiety, self-esteem. Children's Depression Inventory (CDI), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children, and Piers Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale were used. And, 'Personal Information Sheet' was filled by adolescents to get the socioeconomic knowledge about them. The gathering surveys, data have loaded SPSS programme and they analyzed and assessed. The parameters as parametric or as nonparametric are analyzed with tables and commented.

CHAPTER I

DEPRESSION

1.1.1. Definition of Depression and Symtoms to Diagnose

Depression is a mood disorder. And, depression which is serious health problem is one of the most frequently diagnosed psychiatric disorders in children and adolescents as well.

In the historical perspective, depression was viewed as a “phenomenon of superego and mature ego functioning” (Kessler, 1988). And, it was accepted that it is impossible to have depressive disorder for children because of the fact that child’s superego is not developed. Therefore, in the past, the issue of depression in children had little attention.

Today, there is an increasing attention about the issue of depression in terms of developmental processes from infancy to the adulthood because there is an important increase in appearing of this disorder.

Today, in everyday usage, the term depression is expressed as “the experience of a pervasive unhappy mood”. For the clinical definition of it, experience of sadness (dysphoria) is the main feature in explaining the depression(Wicks-Nelson & Israel, 2009).

Furthermore, depression is defined as a “persistent experience of a sad or irritable mood as well as ‘anhedonia’, a loss of the ability to experience pleasure in nearly all activities” (Cash, 2001:1). In addition, other symptoms are stated as “the change in appetite, disrupted sleep patterns, increased or diminished activity level, impaired

attention and concentration, and markedly decreased feelings of selfworth” (Cash, 2001:1).

Depressive disorders in childhood and adolescence are characterized by “core persistent and pervasive sadness, anhedonia, boredom or irritability that is functionally impairing, and relatively unresponsive to usual experiences that might usually bring relief, such as pleasurable activities and interactions and attention from other people” (Wicks-Nelson & Israel, 2009).

Wicks-Nelson and Israel (2009:160) state that “descriptions of children and adolescents viewed as depressed suggest that they experience a number of other problems as well. Concern may be expressed about a youth’s irritability and temper tantrums –sudden outbursts, tears, yelling, throwing things. Adults who know the child may describe the loss of the experience of pleasure, social withdrawal, lowered self-esteem, inability to concentrate, poor schoolwork as changes in the young person. Alterations of biological functions (sleeping, eating, elimination) and somatic complaints are often noted as well. The young person may also express thoughts of wishing to die”.

Generally, mood disorders are similar in children and in adults; however, how it is manifested varies by developmental period (Durand & Barlow, 2006; Wicks-Nelson & Israel, 2009). Children under 3 years of age might show depression by their facial expressions and by their eating, sleeping, and play behavior. What the older children (between age 9 and age 12) do is the quite different. For these children, the main symptom is to have sadness or irritability and loss of pleasure. On the other hand, adolescents prefer to limit their activities (Durand & Barlow, 2006).

Based on the Child Depression Inventory, (CDI), it may be stated that “depressed children are more hopeless, have lower self-esteem, and make more internal attributions

regarding negative events. In addition, these children believe that control is due to the external factors rather than themselves” (Wicks-Nelson & Israel, 2009:158).

DSM diagnoses for the depressed adolescents are Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymic Disorder, and Adjustment Disorder with Depressed Mood. The symptoms of major depressive episode are the same for children, adolescents, and adults; and are listed in Table 1.1.1.

Table 1.1.1. Symptoms Used by the DSM
to Diagnose a Major Depressive Episode

-
1. Depressed or irritable mood
 2. Loss of interest or pleasure
 3. Change in weight or appetite
 4. Sleep problems
 5. Motor agitation or retardation
 6. Fatigue or loss of energy
 7. Feelings of worthlessness or guilt
 8. Difficulty thinking, concentrating, or making decisions.
 9. Thoughts of death or suicidal thoughts/behavior.

From American Psychiatric Association, 2000

In addition, the DSM states how to diagnose major depressive episode; it is as following:

- Five or more symptoms must be present.
- One of these symptoms must be either depressed (irritable) mood or loss of pleasure.
- The symptoms must be present for at least 2 weeks.

- Symptoms must cause clinically significant distress or impairment in important areas of child or adolescent's functioning (e.g., social, school) (Wicks-Nelson & Israel, 2009, p.158-159).

On the other hand, symptoms of depression which occur more commonly in children and adolescents than in adults are listed in Table 1.2.:

Table 1.2.1. Symptoms of depression which usually occur in children and adolescents

<p>" - Frequent vague, non-specific physical complaints (e.g., headaches, muscle aches, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Frequent absences from school or unusually poor school performance - Outbursts of shouting, complaining, unexplained irritability, or crying - Chronic boredom - Lack of interest in playing with friends - Alcohol or drug abuse - Social isolation and poor communication - Fear of death - Extreme sensitivity to rejection or failure - Increased irritability, anger, or hostility - Reckless behavior - Difficulty maintaining relationships " <p>(Cash, 2001:2)</p>
--

1.1.2.Etiology of Depression

Genetic influences play a crucial role in children and adolescents. Twin studies demonstrate that depressive symptoms have a greater concordance among monozygotic than among dizygotic twins, and a heritability of around 40-65%, with higher estimates

of heritability in adolescent vs. prepubertal children (Rice, Harold, & Thaper, 2002; Zalsman, Brent, & Weersing, 2006).

On the other hand, depressed individuals have been shown to have a negative view of self, future, and the world. It was discussed that parental depression may exert its deleterious effect on child mood disorder not only through genetic mechanisms, but also via modeling of cognitive distortions, parental criminality, parental substance abuse, lack of family cohesion, and parent-child discord (Wicks-Nelson & Israel, 2009:158).

1.1.3. The Prevalence of Depression

Depression can be seen in all age groups. According to research (Mayo Clinic, 1998; cited in Cash, 2001) at least, one in every 33 children and up to one in eight adolescents suffer from depression. Proportion of committing suicide among adolescents who have major depressive disorder is up to 7%.

In addition, it was found that as many as 9% of children and adolescents have experienced at least one episode of DSM-IV major depression (Lewinsohn, et al., 1993). Merrell (2008:7) states that “approximately, 4-6 % of children and youth may exhibit depression as a syndrome or disorder”.

Children and adolescents are at greater risk for developing clinical depression, if they are under stress, have experienced a significant loss, or have attention, learning, or conduct disorders. On the other hand, in terms of vulnerability to depression, there is no gender difference during childhood; however, during adolescence, girls are likely to have depressive disorders twice as often as boys (Cash, 2001).

The prevalence of depression is higher in children with other psychiatric disorders (ADHD, conduct disorder, eating disorders, anxiety disorders) and in those with general medical conditions (diabetes, asthma, cancers and other chronic illnesses. Furthermore,

other related issues are loss of parent or loved one, break-up romantic relationship, and other traumas that consist of natural disasters (Cash, 2001).

On the other hand, lower socioeconomic status (SES) is associated with higher rates of depression. It was found that “income, limited parental education, chronic stress, family disruption, environmental adversities, and racial/ethnic discrimination” are thought to have an influence on depression (Hammen & Rudolph, 2003).

Lastly, neglect and child maltreatment increases the risk not only for depression, but also for substance abuse, disruptive disorder, posttraumatic stress disorder, and suicide attempt.

ANXIETY

1.2.1. Definition of Anxiety

Anxiety is an unavoidable part of life for today's society. Essentially, it is appropriate and reasonable to have some anxiety. Without it, something would be wrong, because there is a need to have potential loss or failure for everyday's activities (Bourne, 2000).

Barlow (2002:104) explains anxiety as “a feature-oriented emotion, characterized by perceptions of uncontrollability and unpredictability over potentially aversive events and a rapid shift in attention to the focus of potentially dangerous events or one's own affective response to these events.

Anxiety is a physiological, behavioral, and psychological reaction. Physiologically, it consists of bodily reactions such as rapid heartbeats, muscle tension, dry mouth, or sweating. Behaviorally, it can have an effect on how to act, how to express yourself, and so on. Psychologically, it is a subjective state of apprehension (Bourne, 2000).

The other issue is that there are two terms that are related to anxiety: fear and phobias. Essentially, there are some similarities among them, but there are significant differences as well.

First of all, fear and anxiety are used interchangeably. However, there is a difference between fear and anxiety. Wicks-Nelson and Israel (2009:120) explain the difference such as “fear as a reaction to an immediate/present threat characterized by an alarm reaction, and anxiety as a future-oriented emotion characterized by an elevated level of apprehension and lack of control”.

The another term is the phobias that are similar to the fears because of the fact that they include specific threat. However, they are more intense, persistent, and maladaptive (Merrell, 2008).

1.2.2. Definition of Anxiety Disorders

Anxiety disorders are distinguished from everyday, normal anxiety. Because anxiety disorders involve “anxiety that is more intense, lasts longer, or leads to phobias that interfere with your life” (Bourne, 2000:4).

Anxiety disorders have the broad category. DSM-IV diagnoses many anxiety disorders in children and adolescents. They are listed in Table 2.2.1.

In addition to this, anxiety disorders are one of the most common disorders experienced by children and adolescents. The main features of anxiety disorders in children and adolescents are stated in Table 2.2.2.

Table 2.2.1. Anxiety Disorders in DSM-IV

— Separation anxiety disorder
— Panic disorders
— Agoraphobia
— Specific phobias
— Social phobia
— Obsessive-compulsive disorder
— Posttraumatic stress disorder
— Acute stress disorder
— Generalized anxiety disorder
— Anxiety disorder due to medical condition or substance inducement

From American Psychiatric Association, 2000

Table 2.2.2. Major Characteristics of Anxiety in children and
adolescents

-
- " - Negative and unrealistic thoughts
 - Misinterpretation of symptoms and events
 - Panic attacks
 - Obsessions and/or compulsive behavior
 - Physiological arousal
 - Hypersensitivity to physical cues
 - Fears and anxieties regarding specific situations or events
 - Excessive worries in general"

(Merrell, 2008:8)

1.2.3. Etiology of Anxiety Disorders

Generally, it is accepted that multiple factors that interact in complex ways are related to anxiety disorders (Wicks-Nelson & Israel, 2009).

Genetic factors play a role in the development of anxiety disorders. What is inherited is a general tendency such as emotional and behavioral reactivity to stimuli (Muris, 2006). Especially, obsessive-compulsive disorder is explained in biological terms; that is, it is thought that obsessive-compulsive disorder is linked to neurobiological abnormalities of the basal ganglia (Leonard, Freeman, Garcia, & Ng., 2005).

In general, it is widely accepted that a general vulnerability to anxiety may be associated with the child's temperament. Temperamental differences are associated with increased risk for the development of anxiety during childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood (Pérez-Edgar & Fox, 2005).

The another factor which is explained for the development of anxiety disorder is the psychosocial influences. It is stated that for the children and adolescents, general vulnerability to anxiety may be related to a variety of experiences that increases the risk for anxiety disorder such as some traumatic stress disorder. This may cause the posttraumatic stress disorder and then, other anxiety disorders (Wicks-Nelson & Israel, 2009).

1.2.4. The Prevalence of Anxiety Disorders

Anxiety disorders are among the most common disorders seen in children and adolescents. It is estimated that it includes about 8% among general child and adolescent population (Morris & Kratochwill, 1998).

In addition to this, APA (2006) states between 12 and 20% of school-age children and adolescents have the diagnostic criteria for one or more anxiety disorders. Furthermore, girls are slightly more likely higher risk than boys for developing anxiety disorders (Costello, Egger, and Angold, 2005; Merrell, 2008).

SELF ESTEEM

1.3.1. Self-Esteem and Expressions Associated with Self-Esteem

In the literature there are different definitions about self and its notions. In the historical perspective, William James (1980; cited in Türe, 2010) firstly used “self” term. He defined the self as the total of everything person has. James states that self consists of two different parts. One of them is the “know self”; it is “objective self”. Another is the “known self” which means “subjective self”. He expresses that a person has a lot of self such as social self, spiritual self and pure self, etc.

According to Freud, “self” has three different parts: “Id”, “ego”, and “superego”. Id is the oldest part of mental device; and it consists of everything coming from born. Ego is the regulator, stabilizing part of mental device. The ego’s essential purpose is to provide a balance between superego and id; to protect the organism from pain; and to provide satisfaction. Superego is the part of mental device consisting of parental and social value judgments (Öztürk, 2001:41).

In addition, there are two terms that should be explained. These are self-concept and self-esteem. Lau, Cheung and Ransdell (2008) express that these terms self-concept and self-esteem are often used interchangeably. Nevertheless, it may be expressed the difference between the two terms. Lau et al. (2008: 494) explain self-concept as “the descriptors or labels that an individual attaches to him – or herself, often related to physical attributes, behavioral characteristics, and emotional qualities”. And, they express that self-esteem refers to “how a person perceives and evaluates him or herself

within the context of experiences and the environment. It is different from self-concept in that it consists of qualitative judgements and feelings attached to a person's description of oneself".

That is, self-concept refers to all parts of self. Self-concept is a multi-dimensional construct. And, it refers to an individual's perception of "self" in relation to any number of characteristics. These characteristics consist of gender, identity, and so on.

Wollfolk (1997) thinks that self-concept has two parts. These are "specific thoughts" and "extrinsic evaluations". Turaşlı (2006) expresses that these terms refer to self-efficacy and self-esteem.

Self-concept development begins with how perceiving environment. Children come to the world with having self-perception. Child develops positive or negatives believes and thoughts about self, according to environmental relationships. Having a positive self-perception ensures children having positive believes and thoughts (Kuzgun, 1983:74).

Self-concept begins to develop between two and six years (Demoulin, 1999). In addition, self-perception development begins the same time. However, development of self-perception is completed at 10-11 years old. That is, self-perception is related to self-concept.

Self-perception is considered within to related categories: self-esteem and self-concept (Yovetich, Leschied, & Flicht, 2000). Self-perception firstly begins with to compose with "verbal or nonverbal attitudes of parents orienting to their children" (Seçer, Çeliköz & Yaşa; 2005:3). The self perception is growing by "feedbacks of interaction with the environment and direct life experiences" (Kuzgun 1996: 7).

Demoulin (1997:210 cited by Turaşlı, 2006:4) explains that the children who have healthy self-perception accept themselves. They feel they are “esteemed” and “respected”. And, “they have good self-esteem and have internal learning desires and can stand to anxiety more”.

Rosenberg (1979; cited in Cohen, 2003) who is the developer of the Rosenber Self-Esteem Scale (RSE) and the leader on self-esteem theory defines self-esteem as “one’s evaluative judgement of the self”. In addition, Rosenberg (1979:54) describes a person with high self-esteem as “one who does not consider himself worse” and a person with low self-esteem as one who “lacks respect for himself, and considers himself unworthy, inadequate or otherwise seriously deficient”.

Harter (1996) describes self-esteem as “one’s feelings of self-worth”. Self-esteem refers to a sense of self-worth or positive self-evaluation.

For Fox (2000), positive self-esteem is associated with academic, sport, and psychotherapeutic settings”. Marsh and Hattie (1996) express that there is a positive influence of high self-esteem on a variety of achievement behavior. Coatsworth and Conroy (2006) think that sport is related to self-esteem; especially their finding is about the impact of swimming on self-esteem.

Kunda (1999) thinks that self-esteem is stated as a person’s global orientation toward the self. This concept has been a great concern of social psychologists because it is thought that it is one of the most significant concepts having a central role in the behavior of people.

It is thought that self-esteem is one important individual difference variable because it is closely related to psychopathology (Bos, Huijding, Muris, Vogel, & Biesheuvel, 2010).

Negative self-evaluations are key issues for the diagnosis of many mental disorders. For instance, Schonfeld (2000)'s study shows that self-esteem is associated negatively with depressive symptoms.

Moreover, there are some researches showing the relationship between anxiety disorders and self-esteem. One of them is that low self-esteem is related to internalizing types of child and adolescent psychopathology such as anxiety (Muris, Meesters, & Fijen, 2003) and depression (Harter, 1993).

For instance, Bart, Bar-Haim, Weizman, Levin, Sadeh, and Mintz (2009) explain that anxiety disorders represent the most common mental syndromes and they occur in about 5-20 % of children. In addition, they found the relationship between anxiety and self-esteem. They significantly confirmed the thought: higher anxiety and lower self-esteem.

On the other hand, relationship between self-esteem and externalizing problems such as aggression and antisocial personality disorder is less clear. Baumeister, Smart, and Boden (1996) argue that externalizing problems are related to high self-esteem. However, Donnellan, Trzesniewski, Robins, Moffitt, and Caspi (2005) express that these problems are related to low self-esteem.

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Socioeconomic status (SES) is one of the social stratifying characteristic related to a variety of health outcomes (Anderson & Armstead, 1995). For instance, individuals with lower SES report greater exposure to stressful life events than individuals with higher SES. And, the relationship between SES and health begins at the earliest stages of the life (Dohrenwend, 1973; cited in. Lupien, King, Meaney, McEwen, 2000).

Research shows that there is a significant relationship between higher rates of depression at lower levels of SES for adults (Bruce, Takeuchi, & Leaf, 1991).

For instance, poverty is related with youth delinquency (Pagani, Boulerice, Vitaro, & Tremblay, 1999). And, it is also associated with externalizing, internalizing, and attentional problems at age 5 (Bor, Najman, Andersen, O'Callaghan, Williams, & Behrens, 1997). Similar findings have been explained for the older children (Zubrick, et al., 1995).

In addition, researches explain that low SES predicts higher levels of depressive and anxiety symptoms among adolescents (Goodman, 1999; McLeod & Owens, 2004). Moreover, Mendolson, Kubzansky, Datta, and Buka (2008:1285) indicate that “increased stress may account in part for the association between low SES and poor mental health outcomes among adolescents”.

DEFINITIONS

1.5.1. Depression

Merrell (2008:4) defined depression as:

“Depression in both children and adults is primarily characterized by the following symptoms: depressed mood or excessive sadness; loss of interest in activities; sleeping problems (either sleeping too much or not enough); fatigue or lack of energy; feelings of worthlessness or excessive guilt; difficulty in thinking, concentrating, or making decisions; and a preoccupation with death”

In addition, two additional symptoms characterize the depression in children and adolescents: “irritability and complaints about physical symptoms, such as stomach pain, headaches, and so on” (Merrell, 2008:4).

The general criterion for the diagnosis of depression is expressed as: “at least five of these symptoms are present most of the time for the same 2-week period, and at least one of the symptoms is depressed mood or loss of interest” (Merrell, 2008:4).

1.5.2. Anxiety

Barlow (2002:104) explains anxiety as “seems best characterized as a feature-oriented emotion, characterized by perceptions of uncontrollability and unpredictability over potentially aversive events and a rapid shift in attention to the focus of potentially dangerous events or one’s own affective response to these events.

1.5.3. Anxiety Disorders

Merrell (2008:7) explained that anxiety disorders involve three areas of symptoms: “subjective feelings (such as discomfort, fear, or dread), overt behaviors (such as avoidance and withdrawal), and physiological responses (such as sweating, nausea, shaking, and general arousal)”.

In addition, Merrell (2008:7) expresses that anxiety disorders include “negative and unrealistic thoughts, misinterpretation of symptoms and events, panic attacks, obsessions or compulsive behavior, physiological arousal, oversensitivity to physical cues, fears or anxiety regarding specific situations or events, and excessive worry in general”.

1.5.4. Self-Concept

Demoulin (1999:2) defined self-concept as:

“The sum total of all experiences we are exposed to over time and the negative or positive weights we assign to those experiences- it is, in a small sense, a personal composite of ourselves...and . consists of two major sub-components: self-efficacy which is our sensitivity toward some task and based on motivation, confidence, and ability to control stress associated with that task; and self-esteem which is a perception of self and the weight that is placed on the perception of significant others”.

1.5.5. Self-Perception

Self-perception (self situation) is a whole regulated form of knowledge, thoughts, conviction, perception and beliefs about her/him. Another definition of self-perception is that it is a form of the view and perceiving style of self of human (Kuzgun 1983: 12; Frager and Fadiman 1998: 404-405).

1.5.6. Self-esteem

Rosenberg (1979; cited in Cohen, 2003) defines self-esteem as “one’s evaluative judgement of the self” and “an individual’s general sense of his or her value or worth”. Harter (1996) describes self-esteem as “one’s feelings of self-worth”. Kunda (1999) explains the self-esteem as “a person’s global orientation toward the self”.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

2.1. Participants

A total of participants (49 female, 94 male) were the 7th grade students in Istanbul. They were 13 (79 of them) and 14 (15 of them) years olds. At this study, students were from two different schools (a private school and a state school) to compare socioeconomic status of the participants.

2.2. Procedure

Participants were taken to the study room in a group (5 people in each group). First of all, the meaning and importance of the study are explained as: “This study is about 7th grade students; it is aimed to understand your opinions. Therefore, completing sincerely has a great significance. And, thanks for your participation”.

They were asked to complete three questionnaires and a personal information sheet. That is, after finishing one questionnaire, the other one was given, and personal information sheet was filled at the end of three questionnaires. Three questionnaires were given in a six different ways, and were given randomly in each group to provide to prevent any interaction. For each group of participants, completing all these inventories and personal information sheet took approximately 25 to 30 minutes.

2.3. Purpose of Research

The purpose of this research is to understand whether standards of living (socioeconomic status) are associated to the depression, anxiety, and self-esteem in early adolescents (7th grade students). In addition, it is aimed to see if there is a relation among depression, anxiety, self-esteem in early adolescents (7th grade students).

2.4. Assumptions

It is given place below, the researcher's assumption about literature efficiency and the conversance of the sample:

- It is assumed that the literatures which are reached are efficient.
- It is assumed that Children's Depression Inventory (CDI), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC), and Piers Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (PHSC) show the levels of their depression, anxiety, and self-esteem; Personal Information Sheet has enough information to understand their socioeconomic status; and questions at this sheet is understandable for participants.
- It is assumed that participants have given sincerely answers to the questions.
- It is assumed that the sample group represents the cosmos of research.

2.5. Restraints of Research

This research includes 7th grade students. The findings of this research are limited with the answers of students participating to this study; what the inventories indicate and what the personal information sheet provides the information.

2.6. Scales and Gathering Data

It was used three different scales and a Personal Information Sheet for this research. Children's Depression Inventory, State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children, and Piers Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale were used to determine participants' depression, anxiety, and self-esteem degrees respectively. In addition, Personal Information Sheet was used to have the information about the participants' socioeconomic status.

2.6.1. Children's Depression Inventory (CDI)

Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) was developed for children and adolescents by Kovacs (1981). It consists of 27 items. At this inventory, it is not intended to diagnose, rather it is aimed to measure strength of the depression in children and adolescents. It is the most used instrument to measure children's and adolescents' depression. It is used for the age groups between 7 to 17.

Based on the Beck Depression Inventory, it was prepared by adding items special to children and adolescents. At this inventory, each item consists of three options; and it is asked to choose the most proper option in each item by taking into consideration the last two weeks including today.

Each item has the value of 0, 1 or 2 point; the highest value shows the severity of the depression. The total score is computed by adding all the points of the chosen options. Increase in the total score indicates increase in the severity of the depression. The cut-off point is 19 points.

Reliability and validity study was done by Kovacs. Reliability coefficient obtained by test-retest method was found high ($r=.82$, $p<.0001$). It was computed validity with Anxiety Inventory for Children ($r=.65$, $p<.0001$) and self-esteem (Piers- Harris) ($r=.59$, $p<.0001$) (Uz-Baş, 2003).

Validity and reliability study for Turkish version was done by Öy (1991). It was applied to 380 students twice a week apart. Correlation was found $r=.80$, $p<.001$.

2.6.2. State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC)

State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children was developed by Spielberger in 1973. It was adapted to Turkish by Özusta in 1993. It is a tool for measuring the anxiety based

on the evaluation of children's state and trait anxieties. It includes two scales: State Anxiety Scale and Trait Anxiety Scale. Each scale consists of 20 questions; that is, total number of questions is 40.

In State Anxiety Scale of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, it is asked to choose the most proper option from 3 options in each item by evaluating how he/she feels at the moment. This scale aims to evaluate emotions such as uneasiness, tension, nervousness, and so on. Half of the items express that there is not uneasiness, tension, nervousness, etc.; the rest shows the existence of them.

Each item has the value of 1, 2 or 3 point; 3 point shows the highest value of the state anxiety. The total score is computed by adding all the points of the chosen options. In State Anxiety Scale, the highest score that can be taken is 60; the lowest score can be 20.

Trait Anxiety Scale of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory aims to measure permanent individual differences in anxiety susceptibility. It is asked to choose the most proper option from 3 options in each item by evaluating how he/she feels generally.

In each item, there are 3 options: "almost never", "sometimes", and "often"; respectively, points 1, 2, 3 are given for each item. 3 point shows the highest value of the trait anxiety. The total score is computed by adding all the points of the chosen options. In Trait Anxiety Scale, the highest score that can be taken is 60; the lowest score can be 20.

In addition, there is no time limit in the application of inventory. It may be applied as a group or individual.

Reliability and validity study was done by Spielberger. In State Anxiety Scale, reliability coefficient obtained by test-retest method is for females .47, for males .31.

In Ttate Anxiety Scale, validity value is obtained by test-retest method is for females .71 and for males .65. Reliability work was done by comparing the other inventory commonly used: Manifest Anxiety Scale for Children (MASC). Correlation between Trait Anxiety Scale and MASC is .75. In State Anxiety Scale, reliability value computed for females and obtained by test-retest method is for females .53 and for males .65 (Özusta, 1993).

2.6.3. Piers Harris' Children Self-Concept Scale (The Way I Feel About Myself)

This scale was developed in USA by Piers & Harris in 1964. The first factor analyse of this scale have done in 1183 student sample group with Test Anxiety Scale. The correlations between two different scales are parallel as expected theorotically. These are -.50 for secondary school and -.47 for high school. Moreover, its significant level is at .01 degree.

Turkish version was done with reliability and validity work. The Piers Harris' Children Self-Concept Scale Turkish version has applicated 1,2,5,6, and 7 days distant repeatedly twice. It was applicated 447 students. These students were from 3 public and 2 private elementary schools and secondary school in Istanbul. It was found the Pearson correlation constancy coefficient result changes between .72 and .91 for elementary school and .79 and .98 for secondary school.

The internal consistency was done with Kuder Richardson reliability generalized 20 form of alpha correlations. And, it was found .87 for elementary school and .86 for secondary school. For validity work in Turkey, this scale has applicaed 800 students which cover university and elementary school sample. It was gained 6 factors from this study. Then, this scale has applicated 1388 students with Exam Anxiety Scale. The correlations between two different scales were found -.50 for secondary school, -, 41 for high school at .01 sigificant level (Öner, 2006:813-815).

Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale has eighty-items. Participants answer these items as “yes” or “no”. According to key answer of this scale, high scores mean positive self-concept and self-perception and high self-esteem. And, low scores mean negative self-esteem and self-perception and low self-esteem. This scala has also different six sub dimensions. These are

1. Behavior and Conformity,
2. Happiness,
3. Anxiety,
4. Mental and School Situation,
5. Physical Appearance, and
6. Popularity (Öner, 2005).

2.6.4. Personal Information Sheet

Personal Information Sheet was prepared to get the knowledge about the participants’ socioeconomic level. It consists of the questions about student’s gender, the number of sibling, and father’ and mother’ educational level. And, it includes the questions whether mother is working, whether she /he has own room, whether their house rents or belongs to them, how many rroms there are in their house, family income level, which school (private or public) he/she is going on, whether she/he has, and so on. (see Appendix D). The main difference to describe the students’ socioeconomic status (SES) is the kind of school. Two schools were chosen in terms of representing low and high socioeconomic status (SES).

2.6.5. Hypotheses

It was planned to analyse main hypothesis and its subhypothesis relationship. The main hypotheses of this research are as following:

- There is a significant relationship between socioeconomic status (SES) and depression.

- There is a significant relationship between socioeconomic status (SES) and anxiety (state and trait anxiety).
- There is a significant relationship between socioeconomic status (SES) and self-esteem.

The main difference to describe the students' socioeconomic status (SES) is the kind of school. Two schools were chosen in terms of representing low and high socioeconomic status (SES).

Therefore, the main hypotheses are analyzed as following:

- There is a significant relationship between the kind of school and depression.
- There is a significant relationship between the kind of school and anxiety (state and trait anxiety).
- There is a significant relationship between the kind of school and self-esteem.

Based on Personal Information Sheet, Socioeconomic status (SES) is analyzed. That is, each question is analyzed to compare the relation between the kind of school and each item.

In addition, there are some sub-hypotheses. The subhypothesis about relationship between depression, anxiety, self esteem:

- There is a significant relationship between depression and anxiety (state-trait anxiety).
- There is a significant relationship between depression and self-esteem.
- There is a significant relationship between anxiety (state-trait anxiety) and self-esteem.

The subhypotheses are about self-esteem's subfactors (PHSC all scores) and the kind of school, depression, anxiety (state-trait anxiety), and self-esteem.

- There is a significant relationship between the kind of school and self-esteem's subfactors (PHSC all scores).

- There is a significant relationship between depression and self-esteem's subfactors (PHSC all scores).
- There is a significant relationship between anxiety (state-trait anxiety) and self-esteem's subfactors (PHSC all scores).
- There is a significant relationship between self-esteem and self-esteem's subfactors (PHSC all scores).

The subhypotheses are about gender and depression, anxiety (state-trait anxiety), self-esteem and self-esteem's subfactors (PHSC all scores).

- There is a significant relationship between gender and depression.
- There is a significant relationship between gender and anxiety (state-trait anxiety).
- There is a significant relationship between gender and self-esteem.
- There is a significant relationship between gender and self-esteem's subfactors (PHSC all scores).

In addition, it was examined as

- There is a significant relationship between mother and father educational degrees and depression.
- There is a significant relationship between mother and father educational degrees and anxiety (state and trait anxiety).
- There is a significant relationship between mother and father educational degrees and self-esteem.
- There is a significant relationship between mother and father educational degrees and self-esteem's subfactors (PHSC all scores).

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

3.1. Results of Questions on Personal Information Sheet

Table 3.1.1. Demographic characteristics of students

Variables	f=106	%
Gender (N, %)		
Girl	50	47,2
Boy	56	52,8
School (N, %)		
Private	53	50
State	53	50

As Table 3.1.1. shows, sample group consist of 106 students. This sample group includes 50 girls and 56 boys. 53 of these students are going on private school and 53 of these students are going on state school.

Table 3.1.2. Dispersion of fathers' educational degree

Father Education	F	%
Elementary or not educated	21	19,8
Secondary	17	16
High school	19	17,9
University or more	49	46,2
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.2. shows fathers' educational degree in the sample group. Fathers graduated from university or more are the biggest population that cover 46,2 of group. Elementary school graduated or not educated fathers are 18,4 % of all, high school graduated fathers are 17,9 %, and secondary school graduated fathers are 16 % of them.

Table 3.1.3. Dispersion of fathers' educational degree in terms of the kind of school

Private School	F	%
Elementary or not educated	0	0
Secondary	5	9,4
High school	10	18,9
University or more	38	71,7
Total	53	100
State School	F	%
Elementary or not educated	21	39,6
Secondary	12	22,6
High school	9	17
University or more	11	20,8
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.3. shows fathers' educational degrees in terms of the kind of school. Fathers graduated from university or more are the biggest percentage in private school (71,7 %). On the other hand, elementary school graduated or not educated fathers include the biggest percentage in state school (39,6 %).

In private school, percentage of fathers graduated from high school is 18,9 %, percentage of that in secondary school is 9,4 %. And, elementary school graduated or not educated father does not exist in private school. In state school, percentage of fathers graduated from secondary school is 22,6 %, percentage of that in high school is 17 and percentage of fathers graduated from university or more includes 20,8 %

Table 3.1.4. Dispersion of mothers' educational degree

Mother Education	F	%
Elementary or not educated	32	30,2
Secondary	12	11,3
High school	33	31,1
University or more	29	27,4
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.4. shows mothers' educational degrees that are in the sample group. High school graduated mothers have the biggest percentage (31,1 %). Following, elementary school graduated or not educated mothers are 30,2 %, the percentage of mothers graduated from university or more is 27,4, and in secondary school, it is 11,3 %.

Table 3.1.5. Dispersion of mothers' educational degree in terms of the kind of school.

Private School	f	%
Elementary or not educated	3	5,7
Secondary	4	7,5
High school	24	45,3
University or more	22	41,5
Total	53	100
State School	f	%
Elementary or not educated	29	54,7
Secondary	8	15,1
High school	9	17
University or more	7	13,2
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.5. shows mothers' educational degrees in terms of the kind of school. Mothers graduated from university or more in private school consist of 41,5 % of all the mothers in private school. In private school, percentage of mothers graduated from high school is 45,3 %, percentage of that in secondary school is 7,5 %, and in elementary school, percentage is 5,7 %.

On the other hand, mothers graduated from university or more in state school consist of 13,2 % of all the mothers in state school. In state school, percentage of mothers graduated from high school is 17 %, percentage of that in secondary school is 15,1 %. And mothers graduated from elementary school are the biggest percentage in state school (54,7 %).

Table 3.1.6. Income level

	F	%
1000 TL or less	21	19,8
1000 TL - 2000 TL	17	16
2000 TL - 3000 TL	10	9,4
3000 TL - 4000 TL	4	3,8
4000 TL – 5000 TL	4	3,8
5000 TL – 6000 TL	9	8,5
6000 TL or more	41	38,7
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.6. shows income level. Percentage of income level for 1000 TL or less is 19,8 %. The percentage of that for 1000 TL - 2000TL is 16 %; and for 2000 TL – 3000 TL is 9,4 %. The percentage of income for 3000 TL - 4000 TL and 4000 TL – 5000 TL

is the same (3,8 %). For 5000 TL – 6000 TL, it is 8,5 %. Finally, the percentage of that for 6000 TL or more is 38,7 %.

Table 3.1.7. Dispersion of income level monthly due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
1000 TL or less	21	39,6
1000 TL- 2000 TL	17	32,1
2000TL - 3000 TL	10	18,9
3000 TL - 4000 TL	2	3,8
4000 TL – 5000 TL	0	0
5000 TL – 6000 TL	3	5,7
6000 TL or more	0	0
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
1000 TL or less	0	0
1000 TL- 2000 TL	0	0
2000TL - 3000 TL	0	0
3000 TL - 4000 TL	2	3,8
4000 TL – 5000 TL	4	7,5
5000 TL – 6000 TL	6	11,3
6000 TL or more	41	77,4
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.7. shows income level due to the kind of school. As expected, the biggest percentage of income level in private school is observed for the income level of 6000 TL or more (77,4 %). In private school, the percentage of that for 5000 TL – 6000 TL is 11,3 %. The percentage for the level of 4000 TL – 5000 TL is only 7,5 %. Finally, the

percentage for the level of 3000 TL – 4000 TL is only 3,8 %. In private school, it is not observed to have the income level for 2000 TL – 3000 TL, 1000 TL – 2000 TL, and for 1000 TL or less.

On the other hand, the biggest percentage of income level in state school is 39,6 % for the income level of 1000 TL or less. In state school, the percentage of that for 1000 TL – 2000 TL is 32,1 %. For 2000 TL – 3000, it is 18,9 %. For 3000 TL – 4000, it is 3,8 %. Finally, for 5000 TL – 6000 TL, it is 5,7 %. In state school, it is not observed to have the income level for 4000 TL – 5000 TL and 6000 TL or more.

Table 3.1.8. . Dispersion of the number of children in a family

Number Of Children	F	%
one child	10	9,4
2-3 children	77	72,6
4 or more	19	17,9
Total	106	100

As Table 3.1.8 shows number of children in a family. The percentage of having only one child is 9,4 %. 72,6 % has 2 or 3 children. Finally, 17,9 % has for 4 or more children.

Table 3.1.9. Dispersion of the number of children in a family due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
one child	5	9,4
2-3 children	35	66
4 or more	13	24,5
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
one child	5	9,4
2-3 children	42	79,2
4 or more	6	11,3
Total	53	100

As Table 3.1.9 shows number of children in a family due to the kind of school. In the state school, the percentage of having only one child is 9,4 %. 66 % has 2 or 3 children in the state school. Finally, 24,5 % has for 4 or more children in the state school.

On the other hand, in the private school, 9,4 % has only one child; 79,2 % has 2 or 3 children. Finally, 11,3 % has 4 or more children.

Table 3.1.10. Mothers' Working Situation.

Mother Working Situation	f	%
Working Mother	25	23,6
Housewife Mother	81	76,4
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.10. shows sample group mothers' working or becoming housewife situations. 76,4 % of them are housewife and not working while 23,6 % of mothers are working.

Table 3.1.11. Dispersion of mother working situation due to the kind of school

State School	F	%
Housewife	43	81,1
Working Mother	10	18,9
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
Housewife	38	71,7
Working Mother	15	28,3
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.11. shows dispersion of mother working situation due to the kind of school. The percentage of housewife mothers of the students in the private school is 71,7 % of all the mothers in private school. The percentage of that in the state school is 81,1 % of them in state school. On the other hand, the percentage of working mothers in the private school is 28,3 % while the percentage of that in the state school is 18,9 %.

Table 3.1.12. House situation about rent or not

Home Situation	f	%
rent	31	29,2
belonging to it (not rent)	75	70,8
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.12. shows house situation about rent or not. 70,8 % of participants expresses that their house do not rent while 29,2 % of them states that they have the house through the condition of rent.

Table 3.1.13. Dispersion of the house situation about rent or not due to the kind of school

State School	F	%
rent	22	41,5
belonging to it (not rent)	31	58,5
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
rent	9	17
belonging to it (not rent)	44	83
Total	53	100

As Table 3.1.13. shows the house situation about rent or not due to the kind of school. In the state school, 41,5 % stated that their house rent and 58,5 % stated that their houses do not rent. In the private school, the percentage for rent is 17 %. And, it is for not rent is 83 %.

Table 3.1.14. The number of rooms at home

	F	%
one room	0	0
one room and a living room	1	1,9
two rooms and a living room	23	21,7
three rooms and a living room	46	43,4
four rooms or more and a living room	36	34
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.14. shows the number of rooms at home. The biggest population has three rooms and a living room (43,4 %). Following, 34 % of them has four rooms and more and a living room. 21,7 % has two rooms and a living room. Only 1,9 % has one room and a living room. Moreover, there is no one having one room.

Table 3.1.15. Dispersion of number of rooms due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
one room	0	0
one room and a living room	1	1,9
two rooms and a living room	21	39,6
three rooms and a living room	24	45,3
four rooms or more a living room	7	13,2
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
one room	0	0
one room and a living room	0	0
two rooms and a living room	2	3,8
three rooms and a living room	22	41,5
four rooms or more a living room	29	54,7
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.15. shows the number of rooms at home. The biggest population in the state school has three rooms and a living room (45,3 %). Following, 39,6 % of them has two rooms and a living room. 13,2 % has four rooms or more and a living room. Only 1,9 % has one room and a living room. And, finally, in state school, there is no one having one room

The biggest population in the private school has four rooms or more and a living room (54,7 %). Following, 41,5 % of them has three rooms and a living room. 3,8 %

has two rooms and a living room. In the private school, there is no one having one room and a living room or having only one room.

Table 3.1.16. Private school offering specialized courses, after school and especially at the weekends (“dershane” in Turkish)

	f	%
Yes	51	48,1
No	55	51,9
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.16. shows whether students have private school offering specialized courses (“dershane” in Turkish). 51,9 % of them does not have private school offering specialized courses while 48,1 % has that.

Table 3.1.17. Dispersion of private school offering specialized courses, after school and especially at the weekends (“dershane” in Turkish) due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
Yes	23	43,4
No	30	56,6
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
Yes	28	52,8
No	25	47,2
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.17. shows whether students have private school offering specialized courses (“dershane” in Turkish) due to the kind of school. 56,6 % of students in the state school does not have private school offering specialized courses while 43,4 % has that. On the other hand, while 52,8 % in the private school has that, 47,2 % does not have that.

Table 3.1.18. Private lesson (Having tutor)

	F	%
Yes	25	23,6
No	81	76,4
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.18. shows whether students have a private lesson (having tutoring). 76,4 % of them does not have private lesson while 23,6 % has private lesson.

Table 3.1.19. Dispersion of taking private lesson due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
Yes	9	17
No	44	83
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
Yes	16	30,2
No	37	69,8
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.19. shows dispersion of taking private lesson due to the the kind of school. The number of students taking private lesson in private school is 16 (30,2 % of private school students) while the number of that in state school is only 9 (17 % of state school students). On the other hand, the number of students who are not taking private lesson in private school is 37 (69,8 % of all the private school students) while the number of that in state school is 44 (83 % of all the state school students).

Table 3.1.20. Having student's own room

	F	%
Yes	76	71,7
No	30	28,3
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.20. shows whether students have own room or not. 71,7 % of them has own room while 28,3 % does not have own room.

Table 3.1.21. Dispersion of having student's own room due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
Yes	33	62,3
No	20	37,7
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
Yes	43	81,1
No	10	18,9
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.21. shows dispersion of having student's own room due to the the kind of school. The number of students having own room in private school is 43 (81,1 % of private school students) while the number of that in state school is 33 (62,3 % of state school students). On the other hand, the number of students who does not have own room in private school is 10 (18,9 % of private school students) while the number of that in state school is 20 (37,7 % of state school students).

Table 3.1.22. Having a computer

	F	%
Yes	89	84
No	17	16
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.22. shows whether students have a computer or not. 84 % of them has a computer while 16 % does not have a computer.

Table 3.1.23. Dispersion of having a computer due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
Yes	43	81,1
No	10	18,9
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
Yes	46	86,8
No	7	13,2
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.23. shows whether students have computer due to the kind of school. 81,1 % of students in the state school states that they have a computer while 18,9 % states that they do not have a computer. 86,8 % in the private school has the computer whereas 13,2 % does not have that.

Table 3.1.24. Having laptop computer

	F	%
Yes	66	62,3
No	40	37,7
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.24. shows whether students have laptop computer or not. 62,3 % of them has a laptop computer while 37,7 % does not have a laptop computer.

Table 3.1.25. Dispersion of having laptop computer due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
Yes	24	45,3
No	29	54,7
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
Yes	42	79,2
No	11	20,8
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.25. shows dispersion of having laptop computer due to the the kind of school. The number of students having laptop computer in private school is 42 (79,2 % of private school students) while the number of that in state school is 29 (45,3 % of state

school students). On the other hand, the number of students who do not have laptop computer in private school is 11 (20,8 % of private school students) while the number of that in state school is 29 (54,7 % of state school students).

Table 3.1.26. Dispersion of having a computer and having a laptop computer due to the the kind of school

		Having a computer		
		Yes	No	Total
State School				
Having a Laptop Computer	Yes	22	2	24
	No	21	8	29
	Total	43	10	53
Private School				
Having a Laptop Computer	Yes	35	7	42
	No	11	0	11
	Total	46	7	53

Table 3.1.26. shows the dispersion of having a computer and having a laptop computer due to the the kind of school. In the state school, 22 of students expresses that they have both a computer and a laptop computer; 21 of them has only a computer; 2 of them has only a laptop computer; and finally, 8 of them has none of them.

On the other hand, in the private school, 35 of the students has both a computer and a laptop computer; 7 of them has only a laptop computer; 11 of them has only a computer; and finally, there is no one who has none of them.

Table 3.1.27. Having a mobile phone

	f	%
Yes	87	82,1
No	19	17,9
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.27. shows whether students have a mobile phone. 82,1 % of them has a mobile phone while 17,9 % does not have a mobile phone.

Table 3.1.28. Dispersion of having a mobile phone due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
Yes	39	73,6
No	14	26,4
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
Yes	48	90,6
No	5	9,4
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.28. shows dispersion of having a mobile phone due to the the kind of school. The number of students having a mobile phone in private school is 48 (90,6 % of all the private school students) while the number of that in state school is 39 (73,6 % of state school students). On the other hand, the number of students who do not have a mobile phone in private school is only 5 (9,4 % of all the private school students) while the number of that in state school is 14 (26,4 % of state school students).

Table 3.1.29. Having Mp4, Mp5, etc

	F	%
Yes	64	60,4
No	42	39,6
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.29. shows whether students have Mp4, Mp5, etc. 60,4 % of them has a Mp4, Mp5, etc while 39,6 % does not have Mp4, Mp5, etc.

Table 3.1.30. Dispersion of having Mp4, Mp5, etc due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
Yes	20	37,7
No	33	62,3
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
Yes	44	83
No	9	17
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.30. shows dispersion of having Mp4, Mp5, etc due to the the kind of school. The number of students having Mp4, Mp5, etc in private school is 44 (83 % of private school students) while the number of that in state school is only 20 (37,7 % of state school students). On the other hand, the number of students who do not have Mp4, Mp5, etc in private school is only 9 (17 % of private school students) while the number of that in state school is 33 (62,3 % of state school students).

Table 3.1.31. Having plasma TV / LCD

	F	%
Yes	72	67,9
No	34	32,1
Total	106	100

Table 3.1.31. shows whether students have plasma TV / LCD or not. 67,1 % of them has a plasma TV / LCD, etc while 32,1 % does not have plasma TV / LCD.

Table 3.1.32. Dispersion of having plasma TV / LCD due to the the kind of school

State School	F	%
Yes	24	45,3
No	29	54,7
Total	53	100
Private School	F	%
Yes	48	90,6
No	5	9,4
Total	53	100

Table 3.1.32. shows dispersion of having plasma TV / LCD due to the the kind of school. The number of students having plasma TV / LCD in private school is 48 (90,6 % of private school students) while the number of that in state school is only 24 (45,3 % of state school students). On the other hand, the number of students who do not have plasma TV / LCD in private school is only 5 (9,4 % of private school students) while the number of that in state school is 29 (54,7 % of state school students).

3.2. Results about Relationship between the Kind of School (Socioeconomic Status) and Depression, Anxiety, and Self-Esteem

3.2.1. Relationship between the depression and the kind of school

Table 3.2.1. The Dispersion of Depression Scale T-test Results Due to The Kind of School

	School	N	X	S	df	t	P
Depression	Private	53	9,94	6,027	104	2,063	.042*
	State	53	12,62	7,283			

***p<.05**

One of the hypotheses at this research is to find a significant difference for depression between private and state school. Table 3.2.1. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between the kind of school and depression scores due to the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI). It was found statistically significance mean difference between depression scores and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on ($p < .05$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that average depression scores in state school (12,62) is higher than the score in private school (9,94). Depression scores of students in state school are higher than that of students in private school.

3.2.2. Relationship between the state anxiety and the kind of school

Table 3.2.2. The Dispersion of State Anxiety Scale T-test Results Due to The Kind of School

	School	N	X	S	df	t	P
State Anxiety	Private	53	30,64	5,981	104	1,183	.239
	State	53	32,06	6,329			

$p > .05$

Table 3.2.2. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between the kind of school and state anxiety scores due to the State Anxiety Scale of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC). According to results of statistics, average state anxiety score for the students in private school is 30,64 while average state anxiety score for the students in state school is 32,06. It was not found statistically significant mean difference between state anxiety scores and the kind of school that students are going on ($p > 0.05$).

3.2.3. Relationship between the trait anxiety and the kind of school

Table 3.2.3. The Dispersion of Trait Anxiety Scale T-test Results Due to The Kind of School

	School	N	X	S	df	t	P
--	--------	---	---	---	----	---	---

Trait	Private	53	34,13	7,369	104	2,189	.031*
Anxiety	State	53	37,30	7,536			

***p<.05**

Table 3.2.3. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between the kind of school and trait anxiety scores due to the Trait Anxiety Scale of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC). It was found statistically significance mean difference between trait anxiety scores and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on ($p < .05$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that average trait anxiety scores in private school (34,13) is higher than the score in state school (37,30). Trait anxiety scores of students in state school are higher than that of students in private school.

3.2.4. Relationship between the self-esteem and the kind of school

Table 3.2.4. The Dispersion of PHSC Total Scale T-test Results Due to The Kind of School

	School	N	X	S	df	t	P
Self-Esteem	Private	53	58,72	9,999	104	-1,245	0,216
	State	53	55,92	12,911			

$p > .05$

Table 3.2.4. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between the kind of school and self-esteem total scores due to Piers Harris' Children Self-Concept Scale (the PHSC Scale). According to results of statistics, average self-esteem score for the students in private school is 42,429 while average self-esteem score for the students in

state school is 45,585. It was not found statistically significant mean difference between self-esteem scores and the kind of school that students are going on ($p>.05$).

3.3. Analyses of Depression, State-Trait Anxiety, and Self-Esteem due to the Children’s Depression Inventory (CDI), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC), the Piers Harris’ Children Self-Concept Scale (PHSC)

Table 3.3.1. The results of Pearson Correlation Coefficient analyse between CDI, STAIC, PHSC Scale Total

	N		Depressio n	State Anxiety	Trait Anxiety	Self- Esteem
Depression	106	r p	1 .000*	,567 .000*	,617 .000*	-,782 .000*
State Anxiety	106	r p	,567 .000*	1 .000*	,465 .000*	-,525 .000*
Trait Anxiety	106	r p	,617 .000*	,465 .000*	1 .000*	-,638 .000*
Self-Esteem	106	r p	-,782 .000*	-,525 .000*	-,638 .000*	1

* $p<.001$

On the Table 3.3.1. there are the Correlation Analyse results of Children's Depression Inventory, State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children, the Piers Harris' Children Self-Concept Scale.

“Depression” has positive high correlation with “state anxiety” ($r=0,567$, $p<.001$) and “trait anxiety” ($r=0,617$, $p<.001$). “Depression” has negative high correlation with “self-esteem” ($r=-0,782$, $p<.001$).

“State anxiety” has positive high correlation with “trait anxiety” ($r=0,465$, $p<.001$). “State anxiety” has negative high correlation with “self-esteem” ($r=-0,525$, $p<.001$).

“Trait anxiety” has negative high correlation with “self-esteem” ($r=-0,638$, $p<.001$).

3.4. Results about Relationship between PHSC Subfactors and the kind of school (private and state school), Depression, Anxiety, and Self-Esteem

3.4.1. Relationship between the kind of school (private and state school) and self-esteem's subfactors (PHSC all scores).

Table 3.4.1. The Dispersion of PHSC Subfactors T-test Results Due to The Kind of School

	School	N	X	S	df	t	P
Happiness	State	53	8,74	3,606	104	-	.072
	Private	53	9,91	2,995		1,817	
Anxiety	State	53	7,09	2,581	104	-	.004*
	Private	53	8,66	2,941		2,913	
Popularity	State	53	8,62	2,566	104	-	.387
	Private	53	9,02	2,108		0,869	
Behavior and Conformity	State	53	12,21	3,201	104	0,704	.483
	Private	53	11,79	2,865			
Physical Appearance	State	53	6,96	2,377	104	0,525	.601
	Private	53	6,72	2,437			
Mental and School Situation	State	53	4,43	1,635	104	-	.161
	Private	53	4,85	1,378		1,413	

***p<.01**

Table 3.4.1. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between the kind of school and self-esteem subfactors scores due to Piers Harris' Children Self-Concept Scale (the PHSC Scale). It was found statistically significance mean difference between anxiety scores and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on ($p < .01$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that average anxiety scores in private school (7,09) is higher than the score in state school (8,66). Therefore, anxiety scores of students in state school are higher than that of students in private school.

It was not found statistically significant mean difference between self-esteem subfactors scores except "anxiety" subfactor and the kind of school that students are going on ($p > .05$).

3.4.2. Analyses of self-esteem’s subfactors (PHSC all scores) and Depression, State-Trait Anxiety, and Self-Esteem due to the CDI, STAIC, PHSC Total and Subfactors Scale

Table 3.4.2. The results of Pearson Correlation Coefficient analyse between CDI, STAIC, PHSC Scale Total and Subfactor

	N		Depression	State Anxiety	Trait Anxiety	Self-esteem
Happiness	106	r	-,759	-,437	-,587	,877
		p	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**
Anxiety	106	r	-,553	-,438	-,644	,717
		p	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**
Popularity	106	r	-,517	-,456	-,361	,649
		p	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**
Behavior and Conformity	106	r	-,641	-,449	-,505	,785
		p	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**
Physical Appearance	106	r	-,451	-,272	-,323	,672
		p	.000**	.005*	.001*	.000**
Mental and School Situation	106	r	-,310	-,294	-,184	,487
		p	.001*	.002*	.059	.000**

****p<.001, *p<.01**

On the table 3.4.2. there are the Correlation Analyse results of PHSC Subfactors with CDI, STAIC, and PHSC Scale.

“Happiness” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression” ($r=-0,759$, $p<.001$), “State Anxiety” ($r=-0,437$, $p<.001$) and “Trait Anxiety” ($r=-0,587$, $p<.001$). “Happiness” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem” ($r=0,877$, $p<.001$).

“Anxiety” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression” ($r=-0,553$, $p<.001$), “State Anxiety” ($r=-0,438$, $p<.001$) and “Trait Anxiety” ($r=-0,644$, $p<.001$). “Anxiety” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem” ($r=0,877$, $p<.001$).

“Popularity” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression” ($r=-0,517$, $p<.001$), “State Anxiety” ($r=-0,456$, $p<.001$) and “Trait Anxiety” ($r=-0,361$, $p<.001$). “Popularity” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem” ($r=0,649$, $p<.001$).

“Behavior and Conformity” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression” ($r=-0,641$, $p<.001$), “State Anxiety” ($r=-0,449$, $p<.001$) and “Trait Anxiety” ($r=-0,505$, $p<.001$). “Behavior and Conformity” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem” ($r=0,785$, $p<.001$).

“Physical Appearance” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression” ($r=-0,451$, $p<.001$), “State Anxiety” ($r=-0,272$, $p<.01$) and “Trait Anxiety” ($r=-0,323$, $p<.01$). “Physical Appearance” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem” ($r=0,672$, $p<.001$).

“Mental and School Situation” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression” ($r=-0,310$, $p<.01$) and “State Anxiety” ($r=-0,294$, $p<.01$). “Mental and School Situation” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem” ($r=0,487$, $p<.001$). “Mental and School Situation” subfactor does not have correlation with “Trait Anxiety” ($r=-0,184$, $p>.05$).

Table 3.4.3. The results of Pearson Correlation Coefficient analyse between PHSC Scale Subfactors

	N		Happiness	Anxiety	Popularity	Behavior and Conformity	Physical Appearance	Mental and School Situation
Happiness	106	r p	1 .000* *	,680 .000* *	,600 .000**	,650 .000**	,583 .000**	,367 .000**
Anxiety	106	r p	,680 .000* *	1 .000* *	,423 .000**	,582 .000**	,367 .000**	,355 .000**
Popularity	106	r p	,600 .000* *	,423 .000* *	1 .000**	,456 .000**	,388 .000**	,262 .007*
Behavior and Conformity	106	r p	,650 .000* *	,582 .000* *	,456 .000**	1 .000**	,384 .000**	,290 .003*
Physical Appearance	106	r p	,583 .000* *	,367 .000* *	,388 .000**	,384 .000**	1 .000**	,376 .000**
Mental and School Situation	106	r p	,367 .000* *	,355 .000* *	,262 .007*	,290 .003*	,376 .000**	1

**p<.001, *p<.01

On the table 3.4.3. there are the Correlation Coefficient analyse between PHSC Scale Subfactors.

“Happiness” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Anxiety” subfactor ($r=0,680$, $p<.001$), “Popularity” subfactor ($r=0,600$, $p<.001$), “Behavior and Conformity” subfactor ($r=0,650$, $p<.001$), “Physical Appearance” subfactor ($r=0,583$, $p<.001$), and “Mental and School Situation” subfactor ($r=0,367$, $p<.001$).

“Anxiety” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Popularity” subfactor ($r=0,423$, $p<.001$), “Behavior and Conformity” subfactor ($r=0,582$, $p<.001$), “Physical Appearance” subfactor ($r=0,367$, $p<.001$), and “Mental and School Situation” subfactor ($r=0,355$, $p<.001$).

“Popularity” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Behavior and Conformity” subfactor ($r=0,456$, $p<.001$), “Physical Appearance” subfactor ($r=0,388$, $p<.001$), and “Mental and School Situation” subfactor ($r=0,262$, $p<.01$).

“Behavior and Conformity” subfactor has positive high correlation “Physical Appearance” subfactor ($r=0,384$, $p<.001$), and “Mental and School Situation” subfactor ($r=0,290$, $p<.01$).

“Physical Appearance” subfactor has positive high correlation “Mental and School Situation” subfactor ($r=0,376$, $p<.001$).

3.5. Results about Relationship between gender and Depression, Anxiety, and Self-Esteem

3.5.1. Relationship between the depression and gender

Table 3.5.1. The Dispersion of Depression Scale T-test Results Due to Gender

	Gender	N	X	S	df	t	P
Depression	Girl	50	12,36	7,409	104	1,554	.123
	Boy	56	10,32	6,088			

p>.05

One of the hypotheses at this research is to find a significant difference for depression between girls and boys. Table 3.5.1. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between gender and depression scores due to the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI). According to results of statistics, average depression score for girls is 12,36 while average depression score for boys is 10,32. It was not found statistically significant mean difference between depression scores and gender (p>0.05).

3.5.2. Relationship between the state anxiety and gender

Table 3.5.2. The Dispersion of State Anxiety Scale T-test Results Due to Gender

	Gender	N	X	S	df	t	P
State Anxiety	Girl	50	31,36	6,407	104	0,017	.986
	Boy	56	31,34	6,007			

p>.05

Table 3.5.2. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship gender and state anxiety scores due to the State Anxiety Scale of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC). According to results of statistics, average state anxiety score for girls is 31,36 while average state anxiety score for boys is 31,34. It was not found statistically significant mean difference between state anxiety scores and gender ($p>0.05$).

3.5.3. Relationship between the trait anxiety and gender

Table 3.5.3. The Dispersion of Trait Anxiety Scale T-test Results Due to The Gender

	Gender	N	X	S	df	t	P
Trait Anxiety	Girl	50	37,24	6,936	104	1,980	.050*
	Boy	56	34,36	7,939			

***p=.05**

Table 3.5.3. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between gender and trait anxiety scores due to the Trait Anxiety Scale of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC). It was found statistically significance mean difference between trait anxiety scores and gender ($p=.05$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that average trait anxiety scores for girls (37,24) is higher than the score for boys (34,36). Trait anxiety scores of girls are higher than that of boys.

3.5.4. Relationship between the self-esteem and gender

Table 3.5.4. The Dispersion of PHSC Total Scale T-test Results Due to The Gender

	Gender	N	X	S	df	t	P
Self-Esteem	Girl	50	56,44	12,021	10	-,739	.462
	Boy	56	58,11	11,216	4		

p>.05

Table 3.5.4. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between gender and self-esteem total scores due to Piers Harris' Children Self-Concept Scale (the PHSC Scale). According to results of statistics, average self-esteem score for girls is 56,44 while average self-esteem score for boys is 58,11. It was not found statistically significant mean difference between self-esteem scores and gender (p>.05).

3.5.5. Relationship between gender and self-esteem's subfactors (PHSC all scores).

Table 3.5.5. The Dispersion of PHSC Subfactors T-test Results Due to The Gender

	Gender	N	X	S	df	t	P
Happiness	Girl	50	8,78	3,466	104	-	.117
	Boy	56	9,80	3,199		1,581	
Anxiety	Girl	50	7,30	2,908	104	-	.049*
	Boy	56	8,39	2,748		1,988	
Popularity	Girl	50	8,76	2,308	104	-	.802
	Boy	56	8,88	2,397		0,251	
Behavior and Conformity	Girl	50	11,98	3,007	104	-	.949
	Boy	56	12,02	3,078		0,064	
Physical Appearance	Girl	50	6,48	2,323	104	-	.146
	Boy	56	7,16	2,440		1,466	
Mental and School Situation	Girl	50	4,66	1,636	104	,118	.906
	Boy	56	4,63	1,421			

***p<.01**

Table 3.5.5. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between gender and self-esteem subfactors scores due to Piers Harris' Children Self-Concept Scale (the PHSC Scale). It was found statistically significance mean difference between anxiety scores and gender ($p < .01$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that average anxiety scores for boys (8,39) is higher than the score for girls (7,30). Therefore, anxiety for girls is higher than for boys.

It was not found statistically significant mean difference between self-esteem subfactors scores except “anxiety” subfactor and gender ($p>.05$).

3.5.6. Relationship between the kind of school (private and state school) and Depression, Anxiety, Self-Esteem and, Self-Esteem’s subfactors (PHSC all scores) for girls and for boys

Table 3.5.6. The Dispersion of Depression Scale, State –Trait Anxiety Scale, PHSC Total, and PHSC Subfactors T-test Results Due to The Kind of School for Girls

	School	N	X	S	df	t	P
Depression	Private	23	11,43	6,947	48	,812	.421
	State	27	13,15	7,824			
State Anxiety	Private	23	3039	6,666	48	,986	.329
	State	27	32,19	6,183			
Trait Anxiety	Private	23	36,09	6,921	48	1,087	.282
	State	27	38,22	6,925			
Total-PHSC	Private	23	56,78	11,188	48	1,184	.855
	State	27	56,15	12,892			
Happiness	Private	23	9,04	3,377	48	-,492	.625
	State	27	8,56	3,588			
Anxiety	Private	23	7,96	3,111	48	-1,491	.142
	State	27	6,74	2,654			
Popularity	Private	23	8,96	2,011	48	-,552	.584
	State	27	8,59	2,561			
Behavior and Conformity	Private	23	11,26	3,003	48	1,585	.120
	State	27	12,59	2,925			
Physical Appearance	Private	23	6,22	2,763	48	,734	.466
	State	27	6,70	1,898			
Mental and	Private	23	4,61	1,672	48	,203	.840

School Situation	State	27	4,70	1,636
-------------------------	-------	----	------	-------

p>.05

Table 3.5.6. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between the kind of school (private and state school) and depression, anxiety, self-esteem and, self-esteem's subfactors scores (PHSC all scores) for girls due to CDI, STAIC, PHSC Scale Total and Subfactor.

It was not found statistically significant mean difference between between the kind of school and depression, anxiety, self-esteem and, self-esteem's subfactors scores for girls (p>.05).

Table 3.5.7. The Dispersion of Depression Scale, State –Trait Anxiety Scale, PHSC Total, and PHSC Subfactors T-test Results Due to The Kind of School for Boys

	School	N	X	S	df	t	P
Depression	Private	30	8,80	5,041	54	2,068	.043*
	State	26	12,08	6,788			
State Anxiety	Private	30	30,83	5,509	54	,674	.503
	State	26	31,92	6,597			
Trait Anxiety	Private	30	32,63	7,462	54	1,779	.081
	State	26	36,35	8,148			
Total-PHSC	Private	30	60,20	8,892	54	-1,518	.135
	State	26	55,69	13,181			
Happiness	Private	30	10,57	2,528	54	-1,967	.054
	State	26	8,92	3,687			
Anxiety	Private	30	9,20	2,734	54	-2,468	.017*
	State	26	7,46	2,502			
Popularity	Private	30	9,07	2,212	54	-,639	.525
	State	26	8,65	2,622			
Behavior and Conformity	Private	30	12,20	2,734	54	-,472	.639
	State	26	11,81	3,476			
Physical Appearance	Private	30	7,10	2,123	54	,198	.844
	State	26	7,23	2,804			
Mental and School Situation	Private	30	5,03	1,098	54	-2,408	.019*
	State	26	4,15	1,617			

***p<.05**

Table 3.5.7. shows statistics and T-test results of relationship between the kind of school (private and state school) and depression, anxiety, self-esteem and, self-esteem's subfactors scores (PHSC all scores) for boys due to CDI, STAIC, PHSC Scale Total and Subfactor.

It was found statistically significance mean difference for boys between "depression" scores and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on ($p < .05$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that average depression scores of boys in state school (12,08) is higher than that score of boys in private school (8,80). Therefore, depression scores of boys in state school are higher than that of boys in private school.

It was found statistically significance mean difference for boys between "anxiety" subfactor scores and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on ($p < .05$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that average anxiety scores of boys in private school (9,20) is higher than the score of boys in state school (7,46). Therefore, anxiety for boys in state school is higher than for boys in private school.

It was found statistically significance mean difference for boys between "mental and school situation" subfactor scores and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on ($p < .05$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that average mental and school situation scores of boys in private school (5,03) is higher than the score of boys in state school (4,15). Therefore, the score of mental and school situation subfactor of boys in private school is better than that of boys in state school.

Moreover, it was not found statistically significant mean difference for boys between between the kind of school and anxiety, self-esteem and, self-esteem's subfactors scores except "depression", "anxiety subfactor", and "mental and school situation subfactor" ($p > .05$).

3.6. Results about Relationship between Mother and Father Educational Degrees and Depression, Anxiety, and Self-Esteem

Table 3.6.1. Descriptives statistical independent group T-test results of Depression, State and Trait Anxiety, and Self-Esteem Scores of students due to the mother educational degrees variable

	Educational Degree	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Depression	Elementary or not educated	32	13,09	8,267	1,461
	Secondary	12	11,75	5,545	1,601
	High school	33	10,15	5,890	1,025
	University or more	29	10,38	6,259	1,162
	Total	106	11,28	6,788	,658
State Anxiety	Elementary or not educated	32	32,22	7,303	1,291
	Secondary	12	30,33	4,334	1,251
	High school	33	30,45	5,783	1,007
	University or more	29	31,83	5,965	1,108
	Total	106	31,35	6,169	,599
Trait Anxiety	Elementary or not educated	32	37,94	8,020	1,418
	Secondary	12	34,67	7,536	2,175
	High school	33	36,03	7,024	1,223
	University or more	29	33,34	7,340	1,363
	Total	106	35,72	7,587	,737
Self-Esteem	Elementary or not educated	32	52,44	13,977	2,471
	Secondary	12	58,08	10,440	3,014
	High school	33	58,27	9,498	1,653
	University or more	29	61,31	9,765	1,813
	Total	106	57,32	11,577	1,124

Table 3.6.1. shows that students' depression, state and trait anxiety, and PHSC total scores and standard deviations due to the mother educational degrees.

The children whose mother has lastly graduated from high school have the lowest means (10,15) for depression score. The highest depression score is in the elementary school graduated or not educated mothers' children (13,09).

The children whose mother has lastly graduated from secondary school have the lowest means (30,33) for state anxiety score. The highest state anxiety score is in the elementary school graduated or not educated mothers' children (32,22).

For the trait anxiety, the lowest mean degree is for children of mothers having the university or more educational degree (33,34). And, similarly as depression or state anxiety, the highest trait anxiety score is in the elementary school graduated or not educated mothers' children (37,94).

For self-esteem, the highest mean degree is for children of mothers having the university or more educational degree (61,31). And, the lowest mean degree is in the elementary school graduated or not educated mothers' children (52,44).

Table 3.6.2. The ANOVA results of Depression, State and Trait Anxiety, and Self-Esteem Scores of students due to the mother educational degrees

	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Depression	Between Groups	173,471	3	57,824	1,265	,291
	Within Groups	4664,039	102	45,726		
	Total	4837,509	105			
State Anxiety	Between Groups	69,630	3	23,210	,603	,615
	Within Groups	3926,455	102	38,495		
	Total	3996,085	105			
Trait Anxiety	Between Groups	337,446	3	112,482	2,011	,117
	Within Groups	5706,063	102	55,942		
	Total	6043,509	105			
Self-Esteem	Between Groups	337,446	3	112,482	2,011	,117
	Within Groups	5706,063	102	55,942		
	Total	6043,509	105			

p>.05

According to ANOVA results, it was not found statistical significant difference among the four levels of mother's education on depression, state anxiety, trait anxiety, and self-esteem scores of students (p>.05).

Table 3.6.3. Descriptives statistical independent group T-test results of Depression, State and Trait Anxiety, and Self-Esteem Scores of students due to

the father educational degrees variable

	Educational Degree	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Depression	Elementary or not educated	21	12,29	9,089	1,983
	Secondary	17	11,35	5,147	1,248
	High school	19	13,05	5,681	1,303
	University or more	49	10,14	6,513	,930
	Total	106	11,28	6,788	,659
State Anxiety	Elementary or not educated	21	31,81	7,973	1,740
	Secondary	17	30,59	5,280	1,281
	High school	19	32,11	4,713	1,081
	University or more	49	31,12	6,210	,887
	Total	106	31,35	6,169	,599
Trait Anxiety	Elementary or not educated	21	36,86	7,920	1,728
	Secondary	17	37,29	6,808	1,651
	High school	19	37,58	7,574	1,738
	University or more	49	33,96	7,539	1,077
	Total	106	35,72	7,587	,737
Self-Esteem	Elementary or not educated	21	54,14	14,118	3,081
	Secondary	17	56,82	8,655	2,099
	High school	19	55,63	12,446	2,855
	University or more	49	59,51	10,796	1,542
	Total	106	57,32	11,577	1,124

Table 3.6.3. shows that students' depression, state and trait anxiety, and PHSC total scores and standard deviations due to the father educational degrees.

The children whose fathers have lastly graduated from high school have the highest means (13,05) for depression score. The lowest mean degree of depression is for students of fathers having the university or more educational degree (10,14).

The children whose father has lastly graduated from secondary school have the lowest means (30,59) for state anxiety score. Children of high school graduated fathers have the highest mean degree of state anxiety (32,11).

For the trait anxiety, the lowest mean degree is for children of fathers having the university or more educational degree (33,96). And, similarly as depression or state anxiety, children of high school graduated fathers have the highest trait anxiety score (37,58).

For self-esteem, the highest mean degree is for children of fathers having the university or more educational degree (59,51). And, the lowest mean degree is in the elementary school graduated or not educated fathers' children (54,14).

Table 3.6.4. The ANOVA results of Depression, State and Trait Anxiety, and Self-Esteem Scores of students due to the father educational degrees

PHSC Factors	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Depression	Between Groups	144,394	3	48,131	1,046	,376
	Within Groups	4693,115	102	46,011		
	Total	4837,509	105			
State Anxiety	Between Groups	27,674	3	9,225	,237	,870
	Within Groups	3968,411	102	38,906		
	Total	3996,085	105			
Trait Anxiety	Between Groups	286,859	3	95,620	1,694	,173
	Within Groups	5756,651	102	56,438		
	Total	6043,509	105			
Self-Esteem	Between Groups	505,386	3	168,462	1,266	,290
	Within Groups	13567,708	102	133,017		
	Total	14073,094	105			

p>.05

According to ANOVA results, it was not found statistical significant difference among the four levels of father's education on depression, state anxiety, trait anxiety, and self-esteem scores of students (p>.05).

Table 3.6.5. Descriptives statistical independent group T-test results of PHSC subfactors of students due to the mother educational degrees variable

	Educational Degree	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Happiness	Elementary or not educated	32	8,19	3,881	0,686
	Secondary	12	8,33	3,916	1,13
	High school	33	9,82	2,877	0,501
	University or more	29	10,41	2,557	0,475
	Total	106	9,32	3,351	0,325
Anxiety	Elementary or not educated	32	6,69	2,788	0,493
	Secondary	12	7,67	3,085	0,89
	High school	33	8,06	2,474	0,431
	University or more	29	9,07	2,878	0,534
	Total	106	7,88	2,864	0,278
Popularity	Elementary or not educated	32	8,19	2,681	0,474
	Secondary	12	8,75	2,768	0,799
	High school	33	9,18	1,895	0,33
	University or more	29	9,14	2,199	0,408
	Total	106	8,82	2,345	0,228
Behavior and Conformity	Elementary or not educated	32	11,28	3,429	0,606
	Secondary	12	12,75	3,251	0,938
	High school	33	11,94	2,621	0,456
	University or more	29	12,55	2,873	0,534
	Total	106	12	3,03	0,294
Physical Appearance	Elementary or not educated	32	6,56	2,59	0,458
	Secondary	12	6,5	2,646	0,764
	High school	33	7,03	2,257	0,393
	University or more	29	7,07	2,313	0,43
	Total	106	6,84	2,399	0,233
Mental and School Situation	Elementary or not educated	32	4,09	1,673	0,296
	Secondary	12	4,33	1,231	0,355
	High school	33	4,94	1,435	0,25
	University or more	29	5,03	1,401	0,26
	Total	106	4,64	1,519	0,148

Table 3.6.5. shows that students' PHSC total scores and standard deviations due to the mother educational degrees.

Children of mothers having the university or more educational degree have the highest degree for "happiness" (10,41), "anxiety" (9,07), "physical appearance" (7,07), and "mental and school" condition (5,03).

For the "popularity" (9,18), high school graduated mothers' children have the highest degree.

For the "behavior and conformity" condition (12,75), secondary school graduated mothers' children have the highest degree.

On the other hand, the elementary school graduated or not educated mothers' children have the lowest degree is for "happiness" (8,19), "anxiety" (6,69), "popularity" (8,19), "behavior and conformity" (11,28), and "mental and school condition" (4,09).

The secondary school graduated mothers' children have the lowest degree for "physical appearance" (6,50).

Table 3.6.6. The ANOVA results of PHSC Dimensions according to students' mothers' educational degrees.

PHSC Factors	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Happiness	Between Groups	95,609	3	31,870	3,000	,034*
	Within Groups	1083,485	102	10,622		
	Total	1179,094	105			
Anxiety	Between Groups	88,123	3	29,374	3,875	,011*
	Within Groups	773,283	102	7,581		
	Total	861,406	105			
Popularity	Between Groups	20,112	3	6,704	1,227	,304
	Within Groups	557,482	102	5,466		
	Total	577,594	105			
Behavior and Conformity	Between Groups	32,230	3	10,743	1,176	,323
	Within Groups	931,770	102	9,135		
	Total	964,000	105			
Physical Appearance	Between Groups	6,567	3	2,189	,374	,772
	Within Groups	597,707	102	5,860		
	Total	604,274	105			
Mental and School Situation	Between Groups	18,148	3	6,049	2,752	,046*
	Within Groups	224,230	102	2,198		
	Total	242,377	105			

***p<.05**

According to ANOVA results, statistical significant difference was found among the four levels of mother's education on "Happiness" score of students in PHSC subfactors (F=3,000, p<.05). Table 3.6.5. shows that mean is 8,19 for students whose mother's is elementary school graduated or not educated, 8,33 for students whose mother graduated from secondary school, 9,82 for students whose mother graduated from high school, and 10,41 for students whose mother having educational degree of university or more.

On Table 3.6.6., statistical significant difference was found among the four levels of mother's education on "Anxiety" score of students in PHSC subfactors ($F=3,875$, $p<.05$). Table 3.7.5. shows that mean is 6,69 for students whose mother's is elementary school graduated or not educated, 7,67 for students whose mother graduated from secondary school, 8,06 for students whose mother graduated from high school, and 9,07 for students whose mother having educational degree of university or more.

Furthermore, statistical significant difference was found among the four levels of mother's education on "Mental and School Situation" score of students in PHSC subfactors ($F=2,752$, $p<.05$). Table 3.6.5. shows that mean is 4,09 for students whose mother's is elementary school graduated or not educated, 4,33 for students whose mother graduated from secondary school, 4,94 for students whose mother graduated from high school, and 5,03 for students whose mother having educational degree of university or more.

According to ANOVA results, it was not found statistical significant difference among the four levels of mother's education on "Popularity", "Behavior and Conformity", and "Physical Appearance" in self-esteem subscores of students ($p>.05$).

Table 3.6.7. Descriptives statistical independent group T-test results of PHSC subfactors of students due to the father educational degrees variable.

		Educational		Std.	Std.	
		Degree	N	Mean	Deviation	Error
Happiness	Elementary or not educated	21	8,43	3,944	,861	
	Secondary	17	8,88	3,100	,752	
	High school	19	9,00	3,575	,820	
	university or more	49	9,98	3,031	,433	
	Total	106	9,07	3,412	,716	
Anxiety	Elementary or not educated	21	6,76	2,700	,589	
	Secondary	17	6,24	2,538	,616	
	High school	19	8,16	3,167	,727	
	University or more	49	8,82	2,563	,366	
	Total	106	7,49	2,742	,574	
Popularity	Elementary or not educated	21	8,19	2,822	,616	
	Secondary	17	9,18	2,007	,487	
	High school	19	8,68	2,750	,631	
	University or more	49	9,02	2,066	,295	
	Total	106	8,77	2,411	,507	
Behavior and Conformity	Elementary or not educated	21	11,76	3,576	,780	
	Secondary	17	11,88	2,619	,635	
	High school	19	12,05	3,308	,759	
	University or more	49	12,12	2,884	,412	
	Total	106	11,95	3,097	,647	
Physical Appearance	Elementary or not educated	21	7,05	2,459	,537	
	Secondary	17	6,94	2,164	,525	
	High school	19	6,58	2,545	,584	
	University or more	49	6,82	2,455	,351	
	Total	106	6,85	2,406	,499	
Mental and School Situation	Elementary or not educated	21	4,48	1,327	,290	
	Secondary	17	4,24	1,562	,379	
	High school	19	4,68	1,493	,342	
	University or more	49	4,84	1,599	,228	
	Total	106	4,56	1,495	,310	

Table 3.6.7. shows that students' PHSC total scores and standard deviations due to the father educational degrees.

Some PHSC sub-dimensions are the same. Children of fathers having the university or more educational degree have the highest degree for "happiness" (9,98), "anxiety" (8,82), "behavior and conformity" (12,12), and "mental and school" condition (4,84).

For the "popularity" (9,18), secondary school graduated fathers' children have the highest degree.

For the "physical appearance" (7,05), the highest score is for the children of fathers having the educational degree of elementary school graduated or not educated.

On the other hand, the elementary school graduated or not educated fathers' children have the lowest degree is for "happiness" (8,43), "popularity" (8,19), and "behavior and conformity" (11,76),

The secondary school graduated fathers' children have the lowest degree for "anxiety" (6,24), and "mental and school condition" (4,24).

For "physical appearance" (6,58), high school graduated fathers have the lowest degree.

Table 3.6.8. The ANOVA results of PHSC Dimensions according to students' fathers' educational degrees.

PHSC Factors	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Happiness	Between Groups	43,207	3	14,402	1,293	,281
	Within Groups	1135,887	102	11,136		
	Total	1179,094	105			
Anxiety	Between Groups	116,664	3	38,888	5,326	,002*
	Within Groups	744,742	102	7,301		
	Total	861,406	105			
Popularity	Between Groups	12,801	3	4,267	,771	,513
	Within Groups	564,794	102	5,537		
	Total	577,594	105			
Behavior and Conformity	Between Groups	2,213	3	,738	,078	,972
	Within Groups	961,787	102	9,429		
	Total	964,000	105			
Physical Appearance	Between Groups	2,402	3	,801	,136	,939
	Within Groups	601,872	102	5,901		
	Total	604,274	105			
Mental and School Situation	Between Groups	5,281	3	1,760	,757	,521
	Within Groups	237,096	102	2,324		
	Total	242,377	105			

***p<.01**

According to ANOVA results in Table 3.6.8., statistical significant difference was found among the four levels of father's education on "Anxiety" score of students in PHSC subfactors (F=5,326, p<.05). Table 3.6.7. shows that mean is 6,76 for students whose father's is elementary school graduated or not educated, 6,24 for students whose

father graduated from secondary school, 8,16 for students whose father graduated from high school, and 8,82 for students whose father having educational degree of university or more.

According to ANOVA results, it was not found statistical significant difference among the four levels of father's education on "Happiness", "Popularity", "Behavior and Conformity", "Physical Appearance" and "Mental and School Situation" in self-esteem subscores of students ($p > .05$).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research was planned to investigate the relationship between socioeconomic status and depression, anxiety, self-esteem in early adolescents (7th grade students).

Furthermore, it was examined whether there is a significant relationship between depression and anxiety; depression and self-esteem; anxiety and self-esteem; socioeconomic status and depression; socioeconomic status and anxiety; and socioeconomic status and self-esteem.

In addition, it was also examined whether there is a significant relationship of depression, anxiety, self-esteem, and its subfactors with gender difference, mother and father educational level.

At this research, three different scales and a “Personal Information Sheet” were used. “Children’s Depression Inventory”, “State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children”, and “Piers Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scale” were used to determine participants’ depression, anxiety, and self-esteem degrees respectively. In addition, “Personal Information Sheet” was used to have the information about the participants’ socioeconomic status. Total and subfactors scores that were gathered from these scales were interpreted and tabled with appropriate statistical analyze techniques.

At this research, students in the sample group were chosen from two different schools representing different socioeconomic status in Istanbul. One of them is the state school representing low socioeconomic status. Another one is the private school chosen for high socioeconomic status.

In order to compare these two schools, “Personal Information Sheet” was filled by students. Therefore, the sociodemographic data of sample group was examined. The

sample group includes 106 children whom 47,2 % of these group gender is girl and 52,8 % is boy. 50% of this sample group is from private elementary school while 50% is from the state elementary school.

In addition, “Personal Information Sheet” has provided some information to compare private and state school. One of them is parent educational level. Fathers graduated from university or fathers having more education are the biggest percentage in private school (71,7 %) while elementary school graduated or not educated fathers include the biggest percentage in state school (39,6 %). However, elementary school graduated or not educated father does not exist in private school.

The similar results were obtained in mother educational level. Mothers graduated from elementary school or not educated mothers are the biggest percentage in state school (54,7 %). However, mothers graduated from university or mothers having more education in state school consist of 13,2 % of all the mothers in state school. On the other hand, mothers graduated from university or more in private school consist of 41,5 % of all the mothers in private school. In private school, percentage of mothers graduated from high school is 45,3 %.

In conclusion, as expected, it was found that private school parents have more educational degree than state school parents.

Also, as expected, these private and state schools have crucial difference in terms of income level. The biggest percentage of income level in private school is observed for the income level of 6000 TL or more (77,4 %). In addition, in private school, it is not observed to have the income level for 2000 TL – 3000 TL, 1000 TL – 2000 TL, and for 1000 TL or less. On the other hand, the biggest percentage of income level in state school is 39,6 % for the income level of 1000 TL or less. And, in state school, the percentage of income level for 1000 TL – 2000 TL is 32,1 % and for 2000 TL – 3000, it

is 18,9 %. Finally, in state school, it is not observed to have the income level for 4000 TL – 5000 TL and 6000 TL or more.

As Dowd, Zajawa, and Aiello (2009) state, childhood socioeconomic status is measured using the years of education of the household reference person and family income. At this research, these two points were taken into consideration by choosing two different schools. And, these frequencies that were expressed and other results that will be explained later on show differences between these two schools.

Other questions in “Personal Information Sheet” have showed differences and sometimes similarities in the private and state schools. Therefore, this personal information sheet provides to understand by giving some information about what differences and similarities of people having different socioeconomic status are.

One of these is having Mp4, Mp5, etc. 83 % in private school has Mp4, Mp5, etc while 37,7 % in state school has that. Furthermore, 90,6 % of private school students has plasma TV / LCD while 45,3 % of state school students has that. 79,2 of the private school students has laptop computer while this percent in state school is 45,3. Other question is that in the state school, 41,5 % stated that their house rent and in the private school, the percentage for rent is 17 %.

On the other hand, frequencies of some questions in “Personal Information Sheet” show that clear and severe differences at some points do not exist. For instance, there is some difference in terms of the number of rooms at home. The biggest population in the state school has three rooms and a living room (45,3 %). Following, 39,6 % of them has two rooms and a living room. Only, 1,9 % has one room and a living room. On the other hand, the biggest population in the private school has four rooms or more and a living room (54,7 %). Following, 41,5 % of them has three rooms and a living room.

In addition, there is some difference in terms of taking private lesson. While 30,2 % of private school students take private lesson, 17 % of state school students takes that.

On the other hand, frequencies of some questions in “Personal Information Sheet” were similar across private and state schools. One of them is that 71,7 % mothers of the students in private school is housewife while this percent in state school is 81,1 %.

The other issue is about number of children in a family. In the state school, 9,4 % has only one child, 66 % has 2 or 3 children, and 24,5 % has for 4 or more children. There was not severe difference in the family of the private school students, 9,4 % has only one child; 79,2 % has 2 or 3 children, and 11,3 % has 4 or more children.

There was not severe difference in frequencies about having private school offering specialized courses (“dershane” in Turkish). In state school, 43,4 % has that while 52,8 % in the private school has that.

In addition, according to frequencies of having a mobile phone, there is no severe difference in private and state school. 90,6 % of the private school students and 73,6 % of state school students have the mobile phone.

The other question is about having student's own room. 81,1 % of private school students and 62,3 % of state school students have their own room.

Results about frequencies of having a computer are similar. 81,1 % of students in the state school and 86,8 % of students in the private school have a computer.

In conclusion, as Dowd, Zajawa, and Aiello (2009) state, in order to understand socioeconomic status, educational degree of the parents and family income level is accepted as the basic issues. According to the results of these frequencies, there is a

clear difference between private and state school in terms of income level of the family and parent educational degree.

As a result of research, Ahioğlu (2006) expresses that families having high socioeconomic status offer favorable living conditions to their children. However, in terms of some living conditions as explained through frequencies and tables so far, sometimes there is meaningful, sometimes little or no difference between private and state school.

In this research, participants were 7th grade students. These years are very important periods which named as “early adolescent” in developmental psychology. Adolescence is a developmental period in terms of biological, social, and psychological changes. And, during adolescence, there is an clear increase in appearing the psychological disorders such as depression, anxiety, and so on (Fox, Halpern, Ryan, & Lowe).

In addition, in Turkey, these adolescents have a stressful period of living because they have very important exam which named “SBS” and they are preparing for this exam. Which high school they will go will be determined by “SBS”. Their families have high expectations toward children; generally, they are waiting for success of their children. Therefore, most of the families try to do extra education programme during this exam process for their children; some of them prefer to take private lesson for their children. Generally, families prefer to private school offering specialized courses, after school and especially at the weekends (“dershane” in Turkish). Students participate this education programs, every weekends and weekadays after school. These conditions are very tiring not only for students but also for their parents.

Furthermore, some parents thinking to offer better education conditions prefer to send their children private school by making serious expenses. That is, these parents have the income level above the average income levels of society.

In addition, these private schools which families prefer have better education conditions than state schools. These schools are not as crowded as state schools. They offer students better foreign language education, more foreign language lessons, better science and computer labs, better painting workshops, better sports halls, and better libraries. They present more individual attention for students.

State school students are obliged to compete with private school students in SBS exam. They need to be good to have better future. Having a better future increases anxiety levels of state school students.

Because of the general developmental features of adolescence and specific education conditions of Turkey, it is expected depressive mood, high anxiety, and low self-esteem for all of these students. However, nevertheless, this is probably more possible especially for state school students who do not have important advantages and better living conditions as private school students.

Therefore, at this study, it was hypothesized that there is a significant relationship between socioeconomic status (SES) and depression, anxiety, and self-esteem. And, the main difference to describe the students' socioeconomic status (SES) is the kind of school. Private and state schools represent low and high socioeconomic status (SES). Therefore, the main hypotheses are analyzed as that there is a significant relationship between the kind of school and depression. The other is that there is a significant relationship between the kind of school and anxiety (state and trait anxiety). Another is that there is a significant relationship between the kind of school and self-esteem.

According to results of this study, it was found statistically significance mean difference between depression scores and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on.

This finding is similar to Hammen and Rudolph (2003)'s research. Hammen and Rudolph (2003)'s research show that lower socioeconomic status (SES) is associated with higher rates of depression and they state that low family income level and limited parental education level are two of the factors that affect depression. Furthermore, McLeod and Owens (2004) found the result that low socioeconomic status predicts higher levels of depressive and anxiety symptoms among adolescents

The mean of depression scores in state school (12,62) is higher than the mean of that in private school (9,94). Students in state school have higher depression scores than students in private school. Because of the fact that the cutpoint in "Child Depression Inventory" is 18, that mean (12,62) is not so low. Therefore, this should be taken into consideration by teachers, pedagogues, psychologists, and families.

The mean of state anxiety score for the students in private school is 30,64 while average state the mean of that for the students in state school is 32,06. However, unlike the hypothesis, according to results of this study, it was not found that there is not statistically significant difference between state anxiety and the kind of school (private and state schools).

Unlike from this research, Duman (2008) at her study found significant result between income level (socioeconomic status) and state anxiety. This may be explained by the point of view that generally it is accepted that anxiety is widely affected with the child's temperament. Also, Pérez-Edgar and Fox (2005) state that temperamental differences are associated with increased risk for the development of anxiety during childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood.

However, at this research, it was found statistically significance mean difference between trait anxiety scores and the kind of school (private and state schools). Duman (2008)' research result is similar with result of this research. Duman (2008) at her study found significant result between income level (socioeconomic status) and trait anxiety.

The mean of trait anxiety scores in private school (34,13) is higher than the score in state school (37,30). That is to say, trait anxiety scores of students in state school are higher than that of students in private school. Furthermore, the maximum of STAIC score is 60; therefore, it is thought that these means (34,13 and especially 37,30) show that these students trait anxiety is not low. All these conditions related to the stressfull and tiring educational life should be reviewed.

The mean of self-esteem score for the students in private school is 58,72 while average state the mean of that for the students in state school is 55,92. However, unlike the hypothesis, according to results of this study, it was not found that there is not statistically significant difference between self-esteem and the kind of school (private and state schools).

This result is different from the results of Ahioğlu (2006)' and Haktanır (1998)'s researches. Ahioğlu (2006) expresses that families having high socioeconomic status offer favorable living conditions to their children. Also, Haktanır (1998) found that socioeconomic status affects the self-esteem as a result of research.

On the other hand, as expected, results show that depression has positive high correlation with state anxiety and trait anxiety. Depression has negative high correlation with self-esteem. State anxiety has positive high correlation with trait anxiety. State anxiety has negative high correlation with self-esteem. Trait anxiety has negative high correlation with self-esteem.

All these findings are similar to Benetti and Kambouropoulos (2010, in pres)'s and Bödecs, et al. (2010)'s researches. As Bödecs, et al. (2010) explain, higher levels of anxiety and depression and lower levels of self-esteem.

Moreover, it was analyzed the subfactors of PHSC scale. According to PHSC Scale, higher scores means positive meaning for PHSC total score and all the subfactors (Öner, 2005).

Accordingly, it is seen that sample group children “behavior and conformity” sub factor mean is 12,21 for state school students and 11,79 for private school students while the maximum of score is 16, sample group children “happiness” sub factor mean is 8,74 for state school students and private for state school students while the maximum of score is 13, sample group children “anxiety” sub factor mean is 7,09 for state school students and 8,66 for private school students while the maximum of score is 13, sample group children “popularity and social appreciation” sub factor mean is 8,62 for state school students and 9,02 for private school students while the maximum of score is 11, sample group children “Physical appearance” sub factor mean is 6,96 for state school students and 6,72 for private school students while the maximum of score is 10, sample group children “mental and school situation” sub factor mean is 4,43 for state school students and 4,85 for private school students while the maximum of score is 7. This result about PHSC scale has shown similarities with other researches (Bencik, 2006, 81).

According to results, it was found statistically significance mean difference between anxiety scores of PHSC scale and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on. The means of anxiety scores in private school is higher than the means of the score in state school. Therefore, anxiety scores of students in state school are higher than that of students in private school. On the other hand, it was not found statistically significant mean difference between self-esteem subfactors scores except “anxiety” subfactor and the kind of school that students are going on.

As a result of analysis PHSC subfactors with depression, state-trait anxiety and self-esteem, as expected, it was found that “Happiness” subfactor has negative high correlation with depression, state anxiety and trait anxiety. “Happiness” subfactor has

positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem”. “Anxiety” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression”, “State Anxiety” and “Trait Anxiety”. “Anxiety” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem”. “Popularity” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression”, “State Anxiety” and “Trait Anxiety”. “Popularity” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem”. “Behavior and Conformity” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression”, “State Anxiety” and “Trait Anxiety”. “Behavior and Conformity” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem”. “Physical Appearance” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression” “State Anxiety” and “Trait Anxiety”. “Physical Appearance” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem”. “Mental and School Situation” subfactor has negative high correlation with “Depression” and “State Anxiety” “Mental and School Situation” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Self-Esteem”. “Mental and School Situation” subfactor does not have correlation with “Trait Anxiety”.

Results show that “Happiness” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Anxiety” subfactor, “Popularity” subfactor, “Behavior and Conformity” subfactor, “Physical Appearance” subfactor , and “Mental and School Situation” subfactor. “Anxiety” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Popularity” subfactor, “Behavior and Conformity” subfactor, “Physical Appearance” subfactor, and “Mental and School Situation” subfactor. “Popularity” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Behavior and Conformity” subfactor, “Physical Appearance” subfactor, and “Mental and School Situation” subfactor. “Behavior and Conformity” subfactor has positive high correlation “Physical Appearance” subfactor, and “Mental and School Situation” subfactor. “Physical Appearance” subfactor has positive high correlation with “Mental and School Situation” subfactor. This high correlation values show the similarities with explanations of Öner (2005).

One of the hypotheses at this research is to find a significant difference for depression between girls and boys. According to results of statistics, the mean of

depression score for girls is 12,36 while the mean of depression score for boys is 10,32. It was not found statistically significant mean difference between depression scores and gender. That is to say, according to results, it was not found gender difference on depression.

However, this finding is not similar as Lefkowitz and Tesiny's (1985) research. They found not only there is significant relation between depression and income level and socioeconomic status but also depression level for girls is higher than boys.

According to results of statistics, the mean of state anxiety score for girls is 31,36 while the mean of state anxiety score for boys is 31,34. It was not found statistically significant mean difference between state anxiety scores and gender.

On the other hand, as expected, it was found statistically significance mean difference between trait anxiety scores and gender. The mean of trait anxiety scores for girls (37,24) is higher than the mean of that score for boys (34,36). Trait anxiety scores of girls are higher than that of boys. Generally, researches show there is a significant difference about anxiety and gender (i.e., Fergusson, Horwood, & Lynskey, 1993 and Verhulst, van der Ende, Ferdinand, & Kasius, 1997). This is explained by these researchers as reaction of females to stressful life conditions.

Furthermore, according to results of statistics, average self-esteem score for girls is 56,44 while average self-esteem score for boys is 58,11. It was not found statistically significant mean difference between self-esteem scores and gender.

According to results of relationship between gender and self-esteem subfactors scores, it was found statistically significance mean difference between anxiety scores and gender. Average anxiety scores for boys (8,39) is higher than the score for girls (7,30). Therefore, as expected, anxiety for girls is higher than for boys. It was not found

statistically significant mean difference between self-esteem subfactors scores except “anxiety” subfactor and gender.

According to results, it was not found statistically significant mean difference between between the kind of school and depression, anxiety, self-esteem and, self-esteem’s subfactors scores for girls. However, it was found statistically significance mean difference for boys between “depression” scores and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on. Average depression scores of boys in state school (12,08) is higher than that score of boys in private school (8,80). Therefore, depression scores of boys in state school are higher than that of boys in private school. In addition, average depression score of girls in state school is 13,15 and that score of girls in private school is 11,43. That is to say, depression scores of boys in state school are higher than the scores of girls in private school. This shows the difference between state and private school from many aspect of view; this should be examined in detail by other researches.

It was found statistically significance mean difference for boys between “anxiety” subfactor scores and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on. Inspection of the two group means indicates that average anxiety scores of boys in private school (9,20) is higher than the score of boys in state school (7,46). Therefore, anxiety for boys in state school is higher than for boys in private school. This shows the difference between state and private school from another point as well.

It was found statistically significance mean difference for boys between “mental and school situation” subfactor scores and the kind of school (private and state schools) that students are going on. Average mental and school situation scores of boys in private school (5,03) is higher than the score of boys in state school (4,15). Therefore, the score of mental and school situation subfactor of boys in private school is better than that of boys in state school. As stated above, these differences show the difference between state and private school in terms of many aspects such as living conditions, how to

perceive themselves, how to feel enough, and so on. And, these may be searched in different studies.

Moreover, it was not found statistically significant mean difference for boys between the kind of school and state-trait anxiety, self-esteem and, self-esteem's subfactors scores except "depression", "anxiety subfactor", and "mental and school situation subfactor".

On the other hand, it was analysed the relationship of mother and father education with depression, state-trait anxiety and self-esteem, PHSC subfactors. According to results, as expected, high education parents support their children positively. As expected, the highest depression score, state anxiety score, trait anxiety score is in the elementary school graduated or not educated mothers' children (13,09, 32,22, and 37,94 respectively). And, the lowest mean degree for self-esteem is in the elementary school graduated or not educated mothers' children (52,44). On the other hand, the children whose mother has lastly graduated from high school have the lowest means (10,15) for depression score. The children whose mother has lastly graduated from secondary school have the lowest means (30,33) for state anxiety score. For the trait anxiety, the lowest mean degree is for children of mothers having the university or more educational degree (33,34). For self-esteem, the highest mean degree is for children of mothers having the university or more educational degree (61,31).

However, nevertheless, according to results, it was not found statistical significant difference the mother's education on depression, state anxiety, trait anxiety, and self-esteem scores of students.

The children whose fathers have lastly graduated from high school have the highest means for depression score (13,05), for state anxiety score (32,11), and for trait anxiety score (37,58). The children whose father has lastly graduated from secondary school have the lowest means (30,59) for state anxiety score. The lowest mean degree of

depression and the lowest mean degree of trait anxiety are for students of fathers having the university or more educational degree (10,14 and 33,96 respectively). For self-esteem, the highest mean degree is for children of fathers having the university or more educational degree (59,51). And, the lowest mean degree is in the elementary school graduated or not educated fathers' children (54,14).

In another words, the view of that high education parents support their children positively is clearly seen in results dispersion of data about father education and depression, state-trait anxiety, and self-esteem. Ahioğlu (2006) expresses the similar explanations and expresses that families having high socioeconomic status offer favorable living conditions to their children, have more intense and constructive communication with their children. These families having upper socio-economic status are more concerned with their children.

According to results, nevertheless, it was not found statistical significant difference of the father's education on depression, state anxiety, trait anxiety, and self-esteem scores of students.

According to results of students' PHSC total scores, it is seen similar findings about relationship with parental education. Due to the mother educational degrees, children of mothers having the university or more educational degree have the highest degree for "happiness" (10,41), "anxiety" (9,07), "physical appearance" (7,07), and "mental and school" condition (5,03). For the "popularity" (9,18), high school graduated mothers' children have the highest degree. For the "behavior and conformity" condition (12,75), secondary school graduated mothers' children have the highest degree.

On the other hand, the elementary school graduated or not educated mothers' children have the lowest degree is for "happiness" (8,19), "anxiety" (6,69), "popularity" (8,19), "behavior and conformity" (11,28), and "mental and school condition" (4,09).

The secondary school graduated mothers' children have the lowest degree for "physical appearance" (6,50).

According to results, statistical significant difference was found mother's education on "Happiness" score of students in PHSC subfactors. It was found significant difference mother's education on "Anxiety" score of students in PHSC subfactors. Furthermore, it was found statistical significant difference mother's education on "Mental and School Situation" score of students in PHSC subfactors. This shows the effect of mother education level on their children. Higher education level of mothers means to support children in different points. However, it was not found statistical significant difference mother's education on "Popularity", "Behavior and Conformity", and "Physical Appearance" in self-esteem subscores of students.

According to results of this study, children of fathers having the university or more educational degree have the highest degree for "happiness" (9,98), "anxiety" (8,82), "behavior and conformity" (12,12), and "mental and school" condition (4,84). For the "popularity" (9,18), secondary school graduated fathers' children have the highest degree. For the "physical appearance" (7,05), the highest score is for the children of fathers having the educational degree of elementary school graduated or not educated. On the other hand, the elementary school graduated or not educated fathers' children have the lowest degree is for "happiness" (8,43), "popularity" (8,19), and "behavior and conformity" (11,76). The secondary school graduated fathers' children have the lowest degree for "anxiety" (6,24), and "mental and school condition" (4,24). For "physical appearance" (6,58), high school graduated fathers have the lowest degree. All these findings about differences of means of scores due to the PHSC subfactors and father education show clearly influence of parent education.

According to results, it was found statistical significant difference between father's education and "Anxiety" subscore of students. According to results, it was not found statistical significant difference of father's education on "Happiness", "Popularity",

“Behavior and Conformity”, “Physical Appearance” and “Mental and School Situation” in self-esteem subscores of students.

On the other hand, researches about relationship between socioeconomic status and depression, anxiety, and self-esteem are not much in Turkey even though there are studies demonstrating bilateral relations such as depression and self-esteem. Therefore, there is a great need to similar researches about relationship of socioeconomic status and development of child.

Future studies may be planned to understand relationship in detail such as that why there is a significant difference for trait anxiety between private and state school students.

Furthermore, in future studies, the number of samples may be increased. The other point is to do similar researches at many schools. Therefore, comparisons can be provided in detail.

REFERENECES

Ahiođlu, Ő.(2006). *Öđretmen ve veli görüŐmelerine göre farklı sosyoekonomik düzeydeki ailelerin ilköđretim birinci sınıf öđrencilerinin okuma yazma sürecini etkileme biçiminin deđerlendirilmesi*. Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Adana.

Anderson, N.B. & Armstead, C.A. (1995). Toward understanding the association of socioeconomic status and health: A new challenge for the biopsychosocial approach. *Psychotism Med*, 57, 213-225.

APA Working Group on Psychoactive Medications for Children and Adolescents. (2006). *Report of the Working Group on Psychoactive Medications for Children and Adolescents. Psychopharmalogical, psychosocial, and combined interventions for childhood disorders: evidence base, contextual factors, and future directions*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Avenevoli,S., Stolar, M., Li, J., Dierker, L., and Merikangas, K. R. (2001). Comorbidity of Depression in Children and Adolescents: Models and Evidence from a Prospective High-Risk Family Study. *Society of Biological Psychiatry*, 49, 1071-1081.

Barlow, D. H. (2002). *Anxiety and its disorders: The nature and treatment of anxiety and panic* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Bart, O, Bar-Haim, Y., Weizman, E., Levin, M., Sadeh, A., & Mintz, M. (2009). Balance treatment ameliorates anxiety and increases self-esteem in children with comorbid anxiety and balance disorder. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 30, 486–495.

Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review*, 103, 5-33.

Bencik, S. (2006). *Üstün yetenekli çocuklarda mükemmeliyetçilik ve benlik algısı arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Hacettepe University.

Benetti, C. & Kambouropoulos, N. (2010, in press). Affect-regulate indirect effect soft trait anxiety and trait resilience on self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 341–52.

Bor, W., Najman, J. M., Anderson, M. J., O'Callaghan, M., Williams, G. M., & Behrens, B. C. (1997). The relationship between low family income and psychological disturbance in young children: An Australian longitudinal study. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 31, 664-675.

Bourne, E. J. (2000). *The Anxiety and Phobia Workbook* (3rd Ed. pp. 1-49). Oakland, Ca: New Harbinger Publications, Inc.

Bos, A. E. R., Huijding, J., Muris, P., Vogel, L. R. R., & Biesheuvel, J. (2010). Global, contingent and implicit self-esteem and psychopathological symptoms in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 311-316.

Bödecs, T., Horváth, B., Szilágyi, E., Gonda, X., Rihmer, Z., Sándor, J. (2010, in press). Effects of depression, anxiety, self-esteem, and health behaviour on neonatal outcomes in a population-based Hungarian sample. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, 1-6.

Bruce, M. L., Takeuchi, D. T., & Leaf, P. J. (1991). Poverty and psychiatric status. Longitudinal evidence from the New Haven Epidemiologic Catchment Area study. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 48, 470-474.

Cash, R. E. (2001). *Social / Emotional Development: Depression in Children and Adolescents*.

<http://www.nasponline.org/resources/handouts/social%20template.pdf>, 1-4.

Coatsworth, J.D. and Conroy, D. E. (2006). Enhancing the self-esteem of youth swimmers through coach training: Gender and age effects. *Psycho Sport Exerc*, 7, 173-192.

Collins, K. A., Westraa, H. A., Dozoib, D. J. A.; Burnsc, D. D. (2004). Gaps in accessing treatment for anxiety and depression: Challenges for the delivery of care. *Clinical Psychology Review* 24, 583–616.

Costello, E. J., Egger, H. L., & Angold, A. (2005). The developmental epidemiology of anxiety disorders: Phenomenology, prevalence, and comorbidity. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 14, 631-648.

Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., Moffitt, T. E., & Caspi, A. (2005). Low self-esteem is related to aggression, antisocial behavior, and delinquency. *Psychological Science*, 16, 328-335.

Dowd, J. B., Zajawa, A., & Aiello, A. (2009). Early origins of health disparities: Burden Of infection, health, and socioeconomic status in U.S. children. *Social Science and Medicine*, 68, 699-707.

Duman, G. K. (2008). *İlköğretim 8. Sınıf öğrencilerinin durumluk sürekli kaygı düzeyleri ile sınav kaygısı düzeyleri ve ana-baba tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İzmir.

Durand, V. M. & Barlow, D. H. (2006). *Essentials of Abnormal Psychology* (4th ed. pp.123- 261). Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.

Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L. J. & Lynskey, M. T. (1993). Prevalence and comorbidity of DSM-III-R diagnoses in a birth cohort of 15 year olds. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 32, 1127-1134.

Flannery-Schroeder, E. C. (2006). Reducing Anxiety to prevent depression. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 31, 36-42.

Fox, K.R. (2000). The effects of exercise on self-perceptions and self-esteem. In: S.J.H. Biddle, K.R. Fox, & S.H. Boucher (Eds.) *Physical Activity and Psychological Well-Being*. New York: Routledge.

Fox, J. K., Halpern, L. F., Ryan, J. L., & Lowe, K. A. (2010). Stressful life events and the tripartite model: Relations to Anxiety and depression in adolescent females. *Journal of Adolescence*, 33, 43-54.

Goodman, E. (1999). The role of socioeconomic status gradients in explaining differences in U.S. adolescents' health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 89, 1522-1528.

Gotlib IH, Hammen CL (1992): *Psychological Aspects of Depression: Toward a Cognitive-Interpersonal Integration*. (The Wiley series in clinical psychology). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Haktanır, G. (1998). Okul öncesi eğitim. *Okul ve Aile*, 7, 42-44

Hammen, C. & Rudolph, K. D. (2003). Childhood mood disorders. In E. J. Mash & R. A. Barkley (Eds.). *Child Psychopathology* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Hankin, B. L., & Abela, J. R. Z. (2005). The development of depression: A developmental psychopathology perspective. In B. L. Hankin, & J. R. Z. Abela (Eds.), *Development of psychopathology: A vulnerability-stress perspective*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Harter, S. (1993). Causes and consequences of low self-esteem in children and adolescents. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Self-Esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard*. New York: Plenum.

Harter, S. (1996). Historical roots of contemporary issues involving self-concept. In: Bracken BA, ed. *The handbook of Self-Concept*. New York: Wiley

Kessler, J. W. (1988). *Psychopathology of Childhood*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kunda, Z. (1999). *Social cognition: Making sense of people*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Lau, P. W. C., Cheung, M. W. L., & Rand, L. B. (2008). A structural equation model of the relationship between body perception and self-esteem: Global physical self-concept as the mediator. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 9, (493-509).

Lefkowitz, M. M. & Tesiny, E. P. (1985). Depression in children: Prevalence and correlates. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 647-656.

Leonard, H. L., Ale, C. M., Freeman, J. B., Garcia, A. M., & Ng, J. S. (2005). Obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 14, 727-743.

Lewinsohn, P. M., Hops, H., Roberts, R. E., Seeley, J. R., & Andrews, J. A. (1993). Adolescent psychopathology: I. Prevalence and incidence of depression and

other DSM-III-R disorders in high school students. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 102, 133-144.

Lorant, V., Deliege, D., Eaton, W., Robert, A., Philippot, P., & Anseau, M. (2003). Socioeconomic inequalities in depression: a meta-analysis. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 157, 98-112.

Lupien, S. J., King, S., Meaney, M. J., & McEwen, B. S. (2000). Child's stress hormone levels correlate with mother's socioeconomic status and depressive state. *Society of Biological Psychiatry*, 48, 976-980.

Marsh, H.W. & Hattie, J. (1996). Theoretical perspectives on the structure of self-concept. In: B.A. Bracken (Ed.). *The Handbook of Self Concept*. New York: Wiley.

McLeod, J. D., & Owens, T. J. (2004). Psychological well-being in the early life course: variations by socioeconomic status, gender, and race/ethnicity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67, 257-278.

Mendelson, T., Kubzansky, L. D., Datta, G. D., & Buka, S. L. (2008). Relation of female gender and low socioeconomic status to internalizing symptoms among adolescents: A case of double jeopardy? *Social Science & Medicine* 66, 1284-1296.

Merrell, K.W. (2008). *Helping Students Overcome Depression and Anxiety* (2nd ed., pp. 1-68). New York: The Guilford Press.

Morris, R.J. & Kratochwill, T. R. (1998). Childhood fears and phobias. In R. J. Morris & T. R. Kratochwill (Eds.), *The Practice of Child Therapy* (2nd ed., pp, 91-131). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Muris, P. (2006). The pathogenesis of childhood anxiety disorders: Considerations from a developmental psychopathology perspective. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30, 5-11.

Muris, P., Meesters, C., & Fijen, P. (2003). The Self-perception profile for children: Further evidence for its factor structure, reliability, validity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1791-1802.

Öner, N. (2005). *Piers' Haris Çocuklarda Öz Kavramı Ölçeği EL Kitabı*. Turkish Psychologist Assosiation Press.

Öy, B. (1991). *Çocukluk depresyonunu derecelendirme ölçeğinin öğrenciler ve çocuk ruh sağlığı kliniğine başvuran çocuklarda uygulanması*. Ankara: Yayınlanmamış Uzmanlık Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Psikiyatri Anabilim Dalı.

Öztürk, O. (2001). *Ruh sağlığı ve bozuklukları*. 8th edition. Ankara : Nobel Medicine Press.

Özusta, Ş. (1993). *Çocuklar için Durumluk ve Sürekli Kaygı Envanteri'nin Uyarlama, Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması*. Ankara: Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Pérez-Edgar, K. & Fox, N. A. (2005). Temperament and anxiety disorders. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 14, 681-706.

Reinherz, H. Z., Paradis, A. D., Giaconia, R. M., Stashwick, C. K., & Fitzmaurice, G. (2003). Childhood and adolescent predictors of major depression in the transition to adulthood. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 160, 2141-2147.

Rice, F., Harold, G., & Thaper, A. (2002). The genetic aetiology of childhood depression: A review. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 43, 65-79.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the Self*. New York: Basic Books.

Schirlin, O., Rey, G., Jouvent, R., Dubal, S., Komano, O., Perez-Diaz, F., & Soussignan, R. (2009). Attentional bias for doping words and its relation with physical self-esteem in young adolescents. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10, 615-620.

Schonfeld, I. S. (2000). An updated look at depressive symptoms and job satisfaction in first-year women teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 363-371.

Türe, FS (2010). Dikkat Eksikliği ve hiperaktivite bozukluğu olan çocukların (8-12 yaş) değişik anne tutumlarına göre benlik saygısı düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Unpublished M. Sc. Thesis. Maltepe University.

Uz Baş, A. (2003). *İlköğretim 4. Ve 5. Sınıflarda okuyan öğrencilerin sosyal becerileri ve okul uyumu ile depresyon düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. İzmir: Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Verhulst, F. C., van der Ende, J., Ferdinand, R. F., & Kasius, M. C. (1997). The prevalence of DSM-III-R diagnoses in a national sample of Dutch adolescents. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 54, 329-336.

Woolfolk, A. E. (1998). *Educational Psychology*, (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon . 660.

Yovetich, WM. S., Leschied, A.W., & Flicht, J. (2000). Self-esteem of school-age children who stutter. *J. Fluency Disord*, 25, 143-153.

Zalsman, G., Brent, D.A., & Weersing, V. R. (2006). Depressive disorders in childhood and adolescence: An overview: Epidemiology, clinical manifestation and risk factors. *Child and Adolescent Clinics of North America*, 15, 827-841.

Zubrick, S. R., Silburn, S. R., Garton, A., Burton, P., Dalby, R., Carlton, J., Shepherd, C., & Lawrence, D. (1995). *Western Australian child health survey: Developing health and well-being in the nineties*. Perth Western Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Institute for Child Health Research.

Appendix A: The Children's Depression Inventory-Turkish Text

ÇDÖ

Aşağıda gruplar halinde bazı cümleler yazılıdır. Her gruptaki cümleleri dikkatlice okuyunuz. Her grup için bugün dahil son iki hafta içinde sizin durumunuza en uygun olan cümlenin yanındaki numarayı daire içine alınız.

- A.) 1.Kendimi arada sırada üzgün hissederim.
2.Kendimi sık sık üzgün hissederim.
3.Kendimi her zaman üzgün hissederim.
- B.) 1.İşlerim hiçbir zaman yolunda gitmeyecek.
2.İşlerimin yolunda gidip gitmeyeceğinden emin değilim.
3.İşlerim yolunda gidecek.
- C.) 1.İşlerimin çoğunu doğru yaparım.
2.İşlerimin çoğunu yanlış yaparım.
3.Her şeyi yanlış yaparım.
- D.) 1.Bir çok şeyden hoşlanırım.
2.Bazı şeylerden hoşlanırım.
3.Hiçbir şeyden hoşlanmam.
- E.) 1.Her zaman kötü bir çocuğum.
2.Çoğu zaman kötü bir çocuğum.
3.Arada sırada kötü bir çocuğum.
- F.) 1.Arada sırada başıma kötü bir şeyler geleceği düşünürüm.
2.Sık sık başıma kötü bir şeyler geleceğini düşünürüm.
3.Başıma çok kötü şeyler geleceğinden eminim.

G.) 1.Kendimden nefret ederim.

2.Kendimi beğenmem.

3.Kendimi beğenirim.

H.) 1.Bütün kötü şeyler benim hatam.

2.Kötü şeylerin bazıları benim hatam.

3.Kötü şeyler genellikle benim hatam değil.

İ.) 1.Kendimi öldürmeyi düşünmem.

2.Kendimi öldürmeyi düşünürüm ama yapamam.

3.Kendimi öldürmeyi düşünüyorum.

I) 1.Her gün içimden ağlamak gelir.

2.Birçok günler içimden ağlamak gelir.

3.Arada sırada içimden ağlamak gelir.

J.) 1.Her şey her zaman beni sıkır.

2.Her şey sık sık beni sıkır.

3.Her şey arada sırada beni sıkır.

K.) 1.İnsanlarla beraber olmaktan hoşlanırım.

2.Çoğu zaman insanlarla beraber olmaktan hoşlanmam.

3.Hiç bir zaman insanlarla beraber olmaktan hoşlanmam.

L.) 1.Herhangi bir şey hakkında karar veremem.

2.Herhangi bir şey hakkında karar vermek zor gelir.

3.Herhangi bir şey hakkında kolayca karar veririm.

M.) 1. Güzel/yakışıklı sayılırım.

2. Güzel/yakışıklı olmayan yanlarım var.

3. Çirkinim.

N.) 1. Okul ödevlerimi yapmak için her zaman kendimi zorlarım.

2. Okul ödevlerimi yapmak için çoğu zaman kendimi zorlarım.

3. Okul ödevlerimi yapmak sorun değil.

O.) 1. Her gece uyumakta zorluk çekerim.

2. Birçok gece uyumakta zorluk çekerim.

3. Oldukça iyi uyurum.

Ö.) 1. Arada sırada kendimi yorgun hissederim.

2. Birçok gün kendimi yorgun hissederim.

3. Her zaman kendimi yorgun hissederim.

P.) 1. Hemen her gün canım yemek yemek istemez.

2. Çoğu gün canım yemek yemek istemez.

3. Oldukça iyi yemek yerim.

Q.) 1. Ağrı ve sızılardan endişe etmem.

2. Çoğu zaman ağrı ve sızılardan endişe ederim.

3. Her zaman ağrı ve sızılardan endişe ederim.

R.) 1. Kendimi yalnız hissetmem.

2. Çoğu zaman kendimi yalnız hissederim.

3. Her zaman kendimi yalnız hissederim.

S.) 1.Okuldan hiç hoşlanmam.

2.Arada sırada okuldan hoşlanırım.

3.Çoğu zaman okuldan hoşlanırım.

T.) 1.Bir çok arkadaşım var.

2.Bir çok arkadaşım var ama daha fazla olmasını isterdim.

3.Hiç arkadaşım yok.

U.) 1.Okul başarım yok.

2.Okul başarım eskisi kadar iyi değil.

3.Eskiden iyi olduğum derslerde çok başarısızım.

Ü.) 1. Hiçbir zaman diğer çocuklar kadar iyi olamıyorum.

2. Eğer istersem diğer çocuklar kadar iyi olurum.

3. Diğer çocuklar kadar iyiyim.

V.) 1. Kimse beni sevmez.

2. Beni seven insanların olup olmadığından emin değilim.

3. Beni seven insanların olduğundan eminim.

Y.) 1. Bana söyleneni genellikle yaparım.

2. Bana söyleneni çoğu zaman yaparım.

3. Bana söyleneni hiçbir zaman yapmam.

Z.) 1. İnsanlarla iyi geçinirim.

2. İnsanlarla sık sık kavga ederim.

3. İnsanlarla her zaman kavga ederim.

Appendix B: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory For Children (STAIC) -Turkish

Text

NASIL HİSSEDİYORUM ANKETİ

Kızların ve erkeklerin kendilerini anlattıkları bazı cümleler aşağıda verilmiştir. Her cümleyi dikkatle okuyun ve şu anda nasıl hissettiğinize karar verin. Daha sonra, sizi en doğru anlatan ifadenin önündeki parantezler arasına (X) işareti koyun. Yanlış veya doğru cevap diye bir şey yoktur. Her hangi bir cümle üzerinde fazla zaman geçirmeyin.

Tam şu anda, bu dakikada nasıl hissettiğinizi en iyi anlatan ifadeyi seçmeyi unutmayın.

1. Kendimi () çok sakin hissediyorum () sakin hissediyorum ()sakin hissetmiyorum
2. Kendimi () çok öfkeli ()öfkeli hissediyorum ()öfkeli hissetmiyorum
3. Kendimi ()çok huzurlu ()huzurlu hissediyorum ()huzurlu hissetmiyorum
4. Kendimi ()çok sinirli ()sinirli hissediyorum ()sinirli hissetmiyorum
5. Kendimi ()çok huzursuz ()huzursuz hissediyorum ()huzursuz hissetmiyorum
6. Kendimi ()çok dinlenmiş ()dinlenmiş hissediyorum ()dinlenmiş hissetmiyorum
7. Kendimi ()çok ürkmüş ()ürkmüş hissediyorum ()ürkmüş hissetmiyorum
8. Kendimi ()çok rahatlamış ()rahatlamış hissediyorum ()rahatlamış hissetmiyorum
9. Kendimi ()çok endişeli ()endişeli hissediyorum ()endişeli hissetmiyorum
10. Kendimi ()çok hoşnut ()hoşnut hissediyorum ()hoşnut hissetmiyorum
11. Kendimi ()çok korkmuş hissediyorum ()korkmuş hissediyorum ()korkmuş hissetmiyorum
12. Kendimi ()çok mutlu hissediyorum ()Kendimi mutlu hissediyorum () Kendimi mutlu hissetmiyorum
13. Kendimden()çok eminim ()Kendimden eminim ()emin değilim
14. Kendimi()çok iyi hissediyorum ()Kendimi iyi hissediyorum ()Kendimi iyi hissetmiyorum
15. Kendimi()çok başım dertte hissediyorum ()başım dertte hissediyorum ()başım dertte hissetmiyorum
16. Bir şeylerin beni ()çok rahatsız ettiğini hissediyorum ()rahatsız ettiğini hissediyorum ()rahatsız ettiğini hissetmiyorum
17. Kendimi()çok keyifli hissediyorum ()keyifli hissediyorum ()keyifli hissetmiyorum
18. Kendimi()çok dehşete kapılmış hissediyorum ()dehşete kapılmış hissediyorum ()dehşete kapılmış hissetmiyorum
19. Kafamda()her şeyi çok karmakarışık hissediyorum ()karmakarışık hissediyorum ()karmakarışık hissetmiyorum
20. Kendimi()çok neşeli hissediyorum ()neşeli hissediyorum ()neşeli hissetmiyorum

NASIL HİSSEDİYORUM ANKETİ

Kızların ve erkeklerin kendilerini anlattıkları bazı cümleler aşağıda verilmiştir. Her cümleyi dikkatle okuyun ve hangisinin sizin için en doğru olduğuna karar verin. “hemen hemen hiç” mi, “bazen” mi yoksa “sık sık” mı? Daha sonra, sizi en doğru anlatan ifadenin önündeki parantezler arasına (X) işareti koyun. Yanlış veya doğru cevap diye bir şey yok. Herhangi bir cümle üzerinde fazla zaman geçirmeyin. Genellikle nasıl hissettiğinizi anlatan ifadeyi seçmeyi unutmayın.

1. Yanlış yapacağım diye endişelenirim.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
2. Ağlayacak gibi olurum.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
3. Kendimi mutsuz hissederim.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
4. Karar vermekte güçlük çekerim.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
5. Sorunlarla yüz yüze gelmek bana zor gelir..... ()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
6. Çok fazla endişelenirim.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
7. Evde sinirlerim bozular.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
8. Utangacım.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
9. Sıkıntılıyım.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
10. Aklımdan, engelleyemediğim önemsiz düşünceler geçer ve beni rahatsız eder ()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
11. Okul beni endişelendirir..... ()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
12. Ne yapacağıma karar vermekte zorluk çekerim.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
13. Kalbimin hızlı hızlı çarptığını fark ederim..... ()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
14. Nedenini bilmediğim korkularım vardır..... ()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
15. Anne-babam için endişelenirim.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
16. Ellerim terler.....()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
17. Kötü bir şeyler olacak diye endişelenirim..... ()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
18. Geceleri uykuya dalmakta güçlük çekerim..... ()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
19. Karnımda bir rahatsızlık hissederim..... ()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık
20. Başkalarının benim hakkımda ne düşündükleri beni endişelendirir..... ()hemen hemen hiç ()bazen ()sık sık

Appendix C: Piers Harris Self-Concept Scale-Turkish Text

Kendim Hakkında Düşüncelerim

Aşağıda 80 cümle var. Bunlardan sizi tanımlayanları evet, tanımlamayanları ise hayır ile cevaplandırın. Bazı cümlelerde karar vermek zor olabilir. Yine de lütfen bütün cümleleri cevaplayın. Aynı cümleyi hem evet, hem hayır şeklinde işaretlemeyin. Unutmayın, cümledeki ifade genellikle sizi anlatıyorsa evet, genellikle sizi anlatmıyorsa hayır olarak işaretleyeceksiniz. Cümlenin size uygun olup olmadığını en iyi siz kendiniz bilebilirsiniz. Bunun için kendinizi gerçekten nasıl görüyorsanız aynen öyle cevaplandırın. Cevaplarınızı işaretlerken, buradaki cümlenin numarası ile cevap kağıdındaki numaranın aynı olmasına dikkat edin.

1. İyi resim çizerim.
2. Okul ödevlerimi bitirmem uzun sürer.
3. Ellerimi kullanmada becerikliyimdir.
4. Okulda başarılı bir öğrenciyim.
5. Aile içinde önemli bir yerim vardır.,
6. Sınıf arkadaşlarım benimle alay ediyorlar.
7. Mutluyum.
8. Çoğunlukla neşesizim.
9. Akıllıyım.
10. Öğretmenler derse kaldırıncaya heyecanlanırım.
11. Dış (fiziki) görünüşüm beni rahatsız ediyor.
12. Genellikle çekingenim.
13. Arkadaş edinmekte güçlük çekerim.
14. Büyüdüğümde önemli bir kimse olacağım.
15. Aileme sorun yaratırım.
16. Kuvvetli sayılırım.
17. Sınavlardan önce heyecanlanırım.

18. Okulda terbiyeli, uyumlu davranırım.
19. Herkes tarafından pek sevilen biri değilim.
20. Parlak, güzel fikirlerim vardır.
21. Genellikle kendi dediklerimin olmasını isterim.
22. İstedğim bir şeyden kolayca vazgeçerim.
23. Müzikte iyiyim.
24. Hep kötü şeyler yaparım.
25. Evde çoğu zaman huysuzluk ederim.
26. Sınıfta arkadaşlarım beni sayarlar.
27. Sinirli biriyim.
28. Gözlerim güzeldir.
29. Derse kalktığımda bildiklerimi sıkılmadan anlatırım.
30. Derslerde sık sık hayal kurarım.
31. (Kardeşiniz varsa) Kardeş(ler)ime sataşırım.
32. Arkadaşlarım fikirlerimi beğenir.
33. Başım sık sık belaya girer.
34. Evde büyüklerimin sözünü dinlerim.
35. Sık sık üzülür, meraklanırım.
36. Ailem benden çok şey bekliyor.
37. Halimden memnunum.
38. Evde ve okulda pek çok şeyin dışında bırakıldığım hissine kapılırım.
39. Saçlarım güzeldir.
40. Çoğu zaman okul faaliyetlerine gönüllü katılırım.
41. Şimdiki halimden başka olmayı isterdim.
42. Geceleri rahat uyurum.
43. Okuldan hiç hoşlanmıyorum.
44. Arkadaşlar arasında oyunlara katılmak için seçim yapılırken, en son seçilenlerden biriyim.
45. Sık sık hasta olurum.
46. Başkalarına karşı iyi davranmam.

47. Okul arkadaşlarım güzel fikirlerimin olduğunu söylerler.
48. Mutsuzum.
49. Çok arkadaşım var.
50. Neşeliyim.
51. Pek çok şeye aklım ermez.
52. Yakışıklıyım / güzelim.
53. Hayat dolu bir insanım.
54. Sık sık kavgaya karışıırım.
55. Erkek arkadaşlarım arasında sevilirim.
56. Arkadaşlarım bana sık sık sataşır.
57. Ailemi düş kırıklığına uğrattım.
58. Hoş bir yüzüm var.
59. Evde hep benle uğraşırlar.
60. Oyunlarda ve sporda başı hep ben çekerim.
61. Ne zaman bir şey yapmaya kalksam her şey ters gider.
62. Hareketlerimde hantal ve beceriksizim.
63. Oyunlarda ve sporda, oynamak yerine seyrederim.
64. Öğrendiklerimi çabuk unuturum.
65. Herkesle iyi geçinirim.
66. Çabuk kızarım.
67. Kız arkadaşlarım arasında sevilirim.
68. Çok okurum.
69. Bir grupta birlikte çalışmaktansa tek başıma çalışmaktan hoşlanırım.
70. (Kardeşiniz varsa) Kardeş(ler)imi severim.
71. Vücutça güzel sayılırım.
72. Sık sık korkuya kapılırım.
73. Herzaman birşeyler düşürür ve kırarım.
74. Güvenilir bir kimseyim.
75. Başkalarından farklıyım.
76. Kötü şeyler düşünürüm.

77. Kolay ađlarım.
78. İyi bir insanım.
79. İşler hep benim yüzümden ters gider.
80. Şanslı bir kimseyim.

Appendix D: Personal Information Sheet -Turkish Text

ÖĞRENCİ BİLGİ FORMU

.../...../2011

1. Cinsiyetiniz: Kız Erkek
2. Okulunuz: Devlet Okulu Özel Okul
3. Ailenizdeki Çocuk Sayısı:
 Tek Çocuk 2-3 Çocuk 4 Veya Daha Fazla
4. Babanızın Öğrenim Durumu:
 Hiç okula gitmedi veya İlkokul Mezunu
 Ortaokul Mezunu
 Lise mezunu
 Üniversite Mezunu, Yüksek Lisans Mezunu, Doktora
5. Annenizin Öğrenim Durumu:
 Hiç okula gitmedi veya İlkokul Mezunu
 Ortaokul Mezunu
 Lise mezunu
 Üniversite Mezunu, Yüksek Lisans Mezunu, Doktora
6. Annenizin Çalışma Durumu: Ev hanımı/çalışmıyor Çalışıyor
7. Oturduğunuz Ev Kime Ait? Kira Kendinize Ait

8. Evinizde Oda Sayısı (Mutfak Hariç):

- Tek Oda
 Tek Oda ve Salon
 İki Oda ve Salon
 Üç Oda ve Salon
 Dört veya Daha Fazla Oda ve salon

9. Ailenizin aylık geliri:

- 1000 TL veya daha az 1000 TL - 2000 TL arası
 2000 TL - 3000 TL arası 3000 TL – 4000 TL arası
 4000 TL – 5000 TL arası 5000 TL – 6000 TL arası
 6000 TL veya daha fazla

10. Şu anda dershaneye gidiyor musunuz? Evet Hayır
11. Şu anda özel ders alıyor musunuz? Evet Hayır
12. Kendinize ait odanız var mı? Evet Hayır
13. Bilgisayarınız var mı? Evet Hayır
14. Dizüstü bilgisayarınız (Laptop) var mı? Evet Hayır
15. Cep telefonunuz var mı? Evet Hayır
16. Mp4, Mp5,'iniz var mı? Evet Hayır
17. Evinizde plazma / LCD TV var mı? Evet Hayır