



Education Quarterly Reviews

Bayın, Ümit, and Kaya, Mehmet. (2021), Forgiveness and Perceived Social Support in Teenagers. In: *Education Quarterly Reviews*, Vol.4, No.3, 588-605.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.04.03.363

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

Forgiveness and Perceived Social Support in Teenagers

Ümit Bayın¹, Mehmet Kaya²

¹ MA. Düzce University, umitbayin1@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6238-7579>

² Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sakarya University, mehmetkaya@sakarya.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2659-3601>

Correspondence: Ümit Bayın, MA. Düzce University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Guidance and Psychological Counseling. E-mail: umitbayin1@gmail.com Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6238-7579>

Abstract

In this research, the aim is to investigate the relationship between forgiveness and perceived social support in teenagers in terms of various variables (gender, high school type, education level of parents, expressed relative communication and expressed family, friends, teacher support). The population of the research consists of high school students studying in Kocaeli province in 2019-2020 education year and the research sample consists of 422 students who are chosen with appropriate sampling method from four different high school types in Kocaeli. The data was gathered with "Personal Information Form", "Forgiveness Scale for Teenagers" and "Perceived Social Support Scale". Also, in order to analyse the data, pearson product-moment correlation coefficient technique, regression analysis, one-way analysis of variance, T-test were used ($p < .05$). According to the findings obtained from the research, it was found that there is a significant relation in a positive way between teenagers' forgiveness tendency and perceived social support points. In addition, it was determined that there is a significant and positive relation between perceived social support and empathy establishment aspect of forgiveness and again, between perceived social support and forgiveness tendency. The obtained findings were discussed and interpreted by dealing with the research's hypothesis frame and the related researches. In addition, the research findings and suggestions for the next researches were given place in this research.

Keywords: Puberty, Forgiveness, Perceived Social Support, High School Students

1. Introduction

Adolescence is a period that can differ according to the individual, the society and the period in which he/she lives. This period is a chronological period that begins with the physical, sexual and psychosocial maturation of the individual, and ends at a time when he/she gains independence and productivity. (Derman, 2008). Adams (2000) expressed adolescence as severe mood swings and emphasized emotional change and development. He stated that adolescents exhibit opposing tendencies such as indifference to sensitivity, indifference to energy and excitement, cruelty to compassion, sadness to joy and laughter, and modesty to arrogance. Certel (2003) stated that emotional change and development in adolescents are manifested in the form of increased emotional intensity and imbalance, interest and love for the opposite sex, embarrassment and shyness, daydreaming a lot,

being uneasy and restless, desire to be alone, resistance and reluctance to work, and sudden excitement. Adolescence, in which intense conflict and psychological tension are experienced, is the period in which the individual needs family and social support the most (Türküm, Balkaya, & Balkaya, 2005). It can be said that social support is of great importance for the adolescent trying to form an identity by trying different ways and behaviors, observing and taking role models. Yıldırım (2006) defined the concept of social support, which is seen to be defined in different ways by different opinions, as any kind of help that can include personal, social, psychological and economic factors that individuals receive from their environment. In order to be able to talk about the concept of social support, it is thought that individuals should be able to feel many of the concepts such as mutual love, respect, value, appreciation, interest, emotional support, financial assistance, trust, and importance (Yıldırım, 2006). In addition, when the literature is examined, it is seen that the concept of social support and perceived social support are used interchangeably, although they have different meanings. Demirtaş (2007) defined perceived social support as an individual's expectation and perception of future support relative to the support he received from his environment before. The concept of perceived social support, in a way, is expressed as the value that the individual has set for himself (Özgür, 1993). Stokes (1985) emphasized in his research that perceived social support is more effective on an individual's mental health than social support received.

At the beginning of adolescence, individuals do not have adequate coping strategies, although they are faced with many emotional, physical and psychological psychological tensions (Eryılmaz, 2009). Therefore, the individual needs the social support from his/her environment throughout his/her life and interacts positively with the individuals constituting the sources of social support, and can overcome the difficulties that are likely to be experienced more easily (Tanriverdi, 2012). Social support sources of individuals are family and family environment, friends, teachers, relatives, neighbors and the society in which they live with religious, ideological and ethnic groups (Yıldırım, 1998). It is possible to list the most basic sources of social support of students as family, friends and teachers (Yıldırım, 1997).

It can be said that social development begins with the family, as the first people with whom he/she interacts when he/she opens his/her eyes to the world, as a socio-cultural being, are his/her family. The prosecutor (2006) stated that social support is provided through social relationships. It can be stated that family social support, which is seen as the most important source of social support for the individual, provides a solid basis for individuals to lead a healthy life. In addition, in studies conducted on high school students, it was found that perceived family social support was positively related to individuals' social problem solving (Arslan, 2009), academic achievement levels (Wang & Sound, 2008) and coping with stress (Demirtaş, 2007). However, other important sources of social support that help adolescents cope with the difficulties in their lives are their friends. Considering the developmental periods of the adolescent starting from fertilization and continuing until the end of life, in every developmental period in which he or she lives or is living through infancy, first childhood (game), second childhood (primary school) and adolescence (secondary school-high school), can be said to affect the social development of their friends directly or indirectly. Demir, Baran, and Ulusoy (2005) emphasized that the time adolescents spend with their friends is more than the time they spend with their parents or siblings, and they even bring about many family quarrels. It is thought that friends come before the family, especially in this period when friendship gains importance due to similar psychological, physical and cognitive processes and the high amount of shared time. Since individuals freely express their feelings and thoughts in the presence of their friends, they go a long way in self-expression, self-confidence, social relations and communication skills. In this way, they see their friends, whom they feel close to, as a strong source of social support. In parallel with this, Kiran (2003) stated that adolescents feel relieved when they share their problems with their peers. In addition, Yıldırım (1997) stated that the interests, attitudes and value judgments of adolescents are more influenced by their peers than their families. Another source of social support for adolescents is their teachers, who have an important place in their life along with school life, who are in constant contact at school, where they take role models and spend certain hours of the day. As adolescents' perceived teacher social support increases, self-esteem (Arslan, 2009), commitment to school (Hallinan, 2008), motivation (Wentzel, Battle, Russell, & Looney, 2010), social belonging to school (La Russo, Romer, & Selman, 2008) There is a positive and significant relationship with academic self-belief (Mercer, Nellis, Martinez, & Kirk, 2010) variables. In this

context, it can be said that the perceived social support of family, friends and teachers in adolescents has a preventive role against events and situations that threaten the lives of individuals.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that social support provides benefits to individuals in many areas and is important in the lives of individuals. Social support will help adolescents feel more valuable, increase their self-esteem, and solve their problems in a healthier way (Ünüvar, 2003). Bandura (1997) underlined that as the social support provided by the family and environment increases, the effort they will make to solve the problems they may encounter in entering social events will increase, and thus individuals can be more successful. Gelen (2009) stated that adolescence is the most challenging period of the life cycle and the importance of social support increases even more in this period. Geçtan (2006) also emphasized that when adolescents do not receive the necessary social support, coping with stress and the development of self-confidence are negatively affected. Akın and Ceyhan (2005) stated that social support facilitates self-acceptance in adolescents and that the concepts of social support and self-acceptance support each other in terms of mental health. Based on these, it is thought that evaluating and minimizing the negativities experienced during adolescence in a positive way and providing social support to the adolescent will make significant contributions to the physical and psychological health of the adolescent.

Correctly perceiving social support, which is seen as a protection shield against problems, evaluating the negativities experienced by individuals in a healthy way and continuing their social relations with this perspective may make it possible to integrate forgiveness into their lives during a turbulent adolescence period, where intense emotional development and change are experienced. Scobie and Scobie (1998) defined forgiveness as a decision in which an individual consciously waives his or her legal right to avenge or compensate for a negative action committed against him or her by a person he cares about. He stated that individuals' problems can be resolved in a healthy way and their spiritual recovery will be realized through forgiveness. In addition, forgiveness is considered necessary in terms of both physical and psychological health of the individual (Kara, 2009). In this context, the act of forgiveness is a skill, as individuals' decision to forgive involves understanding what forgiveness means and willingly and consciously putting it into practice (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000).

In the researches, life satisfaction with forgiveness (Bugay, Demir, & Delevi, 2012), self-actualization (Sarı, 2014), humility (Berry, Worthington, O'Connor, Parrott, & Wade, 2005), hope (Tayşi, Curun, & Orcan, 2015), subjective well-being (Datu, 2014) was found to be positively and significantly related. Within the scope of this research, it is thought that forgiveness in adolescents may be closely related to their perceived social support, and such a study was needed to determine the effects of variables on each other. In this study, the relationship between forgiveness and perceived social support in adolescents and how the variables affect each other were examined. In addition to all these, the relationships between these concepts and gender, high school type, parental education level, expressed kinship communication and expressed family, friends, and teacher support variables were examined.

2. Method

2.1 Research Method

This study is a relational survey that examines the relationship between forgiveness and perceived social support levels of 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grade students according to various variables. Relational screening model is a research model that aims to determine the existence and/or degree of co-variance between two or more variables (Karasar, 2002).

2.2 The Population and Sample of The Research

The study group of the research consists of 422 high school students, 221 (52.4%) female students and 201 (47.6%) male students, studying in 4 different types of high schools in Darıca, Kocaeli. 106 (25.1%) of the

participants were Anatolian High School, 122 (28.9%) Science High School, 109 (25.9%) Private High School and 85 (20.1%) Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School students. All participants participated in the study voluntarily.

2.3 Data Collection Tools

Personal Information Form: In the personal information form prepared by the researchers, questions about gender, high school type, parental education level, and family-friend and teacher social support were included.

Forgiveness Scale for Adolescents (FSA): The Forgiveness Scale for Adolescents (FSA) was developed by Asıcı and Karaca (2018) to evaluate adolescents' tendency to forgive in interpersonal relationships. The scale consists of 21 items and 4 sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are components of forgiveness, holding anger, taking revenge, and empathizing. First level (SBX2/sd=1.81, RMSEA=.04, CFI=.99, NFI=.97, NNFI=.99, SRMR=.05, GFI=.94, AGFI=.92) and second level (S-. BX2/sd=2.12, RMSEA=.05, CFI=.98, NFI=.97, NNFI=.98, SRMR=.06, GFI=.93, AGFI=.91) confirmatory factor analysis results confirmed the four sub-dimensions obtained. It was determined that the item-total correlation values examined within the scope of item analysis studies were sufficient, and the t values of the lower and upper 27% groups were also significant. It was determined that the relations between the sub-dimensions of the scale ranged from -.40 to .61. It was found that the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients of the scale ranged between .70 and .90, the two-half test reliability coefficients ranged between .65 and .80, and the construct reliability coefficients ranged between .71 and .76. Although there are reverse items in the scale, a high score from the scale means that the individual's tendency to forgive is higher.

Perceived Social Support Scale (PSSS-R): In the study, the Perceived Social Support Scale (PSSS-R), developed by Yıldırım (1997) and renewed in 2004, was used to determine the level of social support students perceive from their family, friends and teachers. The scale consists of 50 items and 3 sub-dimensions. The response style of the scale is triple rated, and a high score means that the individual receives more social support. Alpha reliability coefficient and test-retest reliability (rxx) of PSSS-R were examined. Alpha= .93, rxx = .91 for all PSSS-R; Alpha= .94 for Family Social Support, rxx = .89; Alpha= .91 for Friend Social Support, rxx = .85; Alpha = .93, rxx = .86 for Teacher Social Support. The reliability coefficients obtained showed that the PSSS-R and its subscales can be used safely to measure the social support that students receive from their families, friends and teachers (Yıldırım, 2004).

2.4 Data Analysis

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 20.0 software was used for statistical analysis of the research data. Among the students in the sample group, the data of the students who answered the scales incompletely or incorrectly or did not respond at all were excluded as invalid, and the data of 422 students were included in the scoring and evaluation. Then, statistical analyzes were carried out on the obtained data. The significance level of $p < .05$ was taken as a criterion in interpreting whether the findings were significant or not. Pearson Product Moments Correlation Technique, Regression Analysis, One-Way Analysis of Variance, t-test, Welch test, Scheffe test, Tamhane's T2 test and Levene statistics were used for data analysis.

3. Results

Findings on the relationship between forgiveness and perceived social support scores in adolescents. Correlation analysis was used to examine the relationships between the variables in the study, and the results of the analysis and descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Results of Correlation Analysis

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
Components of Forgiveness	1					
Empathy	.508**	1				
Sustaining the Anger	-.304**	-.191**	1			
Revenge	-.156**	-.200**	.644**	1		
Perceived Social Support	.080	.108*	-.125*	-.194**	1	
Tendency to Forgive	.744**	.437**	-.804**	-.710**	.166**	1
\bar{X}	20.06	8.90	16.15	13.95	125.55	50.17
SS	7.17	3.20	4.98	4.66	13.62	12.65

** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$

As a result of the analysis, perceived social support is positively and significantly correlated with the tendency to forgive ($r = .166$) and empathy ($r = .108$). It was observed that there was a significant negative correlation with maintaining anger ($r = -.125$) and taking revenge ($r = -.194$). It was also found that there was no significant correlation with the components of forgiveness ($r = .080$).

Regression analysis was performed to examine the predictive level of perceived social support of forgiveness. Before performing the regression analysis, the data were examined in terms of the regression assumptions and the data that damaged the regression assumptions were deleted from the data set before the regression analysis was performed. In this context, the Mahalanobis distance values were calculated and 17 data that distorted the normal distribution were deleted from the data set. The results of the normal distribution and regression assumptions are presented in Table 3. The findings regarding the regression analysis assumptions are also presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Results of Simple Linear Regression Analysis Assumptions

Variables	Skewness	Kurtosis
Tendency to Forgive	-,226	-,272
Perceived Social Support	-,426	-,695

Table 3: Results of Simple Linear Regression Analysis

Predictive Variables	B	SH	B	T	P	R^2
Invariant	30.850	5.648		5.462	.000	
					.05	
Perceived Social Support	.154	.045	.166	3.441	.001	

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that forgiveness in adolescents predicts the perceived social support variable ($\beta = .166$, $p < .05$) in a statistically significant level.

Findings on whether the scores of forgiveness and perceived social support in adolescents differ significantly according to gender

In order to reveal whether the scores of forgiveness and perceived social support in adolescents differ according to gender, t-test was used for independent groups. The findings of the analysis are given in Table 4.

Table 4: Independent Groups T-Test Results Regarding the Differences in Adolescents' Forgiveness and Perceived Social Support Scores by Gender

		<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>Sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Tendency to Forgive	Female	221	50.64	12.66	.799	.425
	Male	201	49.65	12.65		
Components of Forgiveness	Female	221	19.27	6.49	-2.39	.017
	Male	201	20.93	7.77		
Empathy	Female	221	8.86	3.17	-.21	-.066
	Male	201	8.93	3.24		
Revenge	Female	221	9.15	4.25	-4.20	.000
	Male	201	11.02	4.90		
Sustaining the Anger	Female	221	13.47	5.07	-1.59	.112
	Male	201	14.24	4.87		
Perceived Social Support	Female	221	127.68	12.85	3.41	.001
	Male	201	123.21	14.08		

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that the mean score of the components of forgiveness of female students ($\bar{X}= 19.27$, $SD= 6.49$) is lower than the mean of components of forgiveness ($\bar{X}= 20.93$, $SD= 7.77$) of male students. The t value ($t=-2.39$, $p<.05$) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups shows that the difference between the mean scores of the two groups is significant at the .05 level. According to this finding, it is seen that male students' scores on the components of forgiveness are significantly higher than that of female students in the same period.

It is understood that the mean empathy score of female students ($\bar{X}= 8.86$, $SD= 3.17$) is lower than the average point of empathy of male students ($\bar{X}= 8.93$, $SD= 3.24$). The t value ($t= -.21$, $p>.05$) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups shows that the difference between the mean scores of the two groups is not significant at the .05 level.

It is seen that the mean score of taking revenge of female students ($\bar{X}= 9.15$, $SD= 4.25$) is lower than the mean score of taking revenge of male students ($\bar{X}= 11.02$, $SD= 4.90$). The t value ($t= -4.20$ $p<.05$) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups shows that the difference between the mean scores of the two groups is significant at the .05 level. According to this finding, it is seen that male students' revenge scores are significantly higher than female students in the same period.

It is observed that the mean score of maintaining anger ($\bar{X}= 13.47$, $SD= 5.07$) of female students is lower than the mean score of maintaining anger ($\bar{X}= 14.24$, $SD= 4.87$) of male students. The t value ($t= -1.59$, $p>.05$) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups shows that the difference between the mean scores of the two groups is not significant at the .05 level.

It is found out that the mean forgiving tendency score average of female students ($\bar{X}= 50.64$, $SD= 12.66$) is higher than the average score of male students' tendency to forgive ($\bar{X}= 49.65$, $SD= 12.65$). The t value ($t=.799$, $p>.05$) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups shows that the difference between the mean scores of the two groups is not significant at the .05 level.

It is seen that the mean score of social support perceived by female students ($\bar{X}= 127.68, SD= 12.85$) is higher than the average score of perceived social support by male students ($\bar{X}= 123.21, SD= 14.08$). The t value ($t= 3.41, p<.05$) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups shows that the difference between the mean scores of the two groups is significant at the .05 level. According to this finding, it is seen that the social support scores perceived by female students are significantly higher than male students in the same period.

Findings on whether the scores of forgiveness and perceived social support in adolescents differ significantly according to the type of high school

In order to reveal whether the forgiveness scores of adolescents differ according to the type of high school, firstly, whether the variances of the scores are homogeneous or not was determined by the Levene test.

Table 5: One-Way Analysis of Variance Results of Forgiveness Levels of Adolescents According to the Variable of High School Type of Education

Levene Test	P	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Sd	Avarage of Squares	F	p
.310	.818	Between groups	4413.322	3	1471.107	9.755	.000
		In-group	63035.050	418	150.802		
		Total	67448.372	421			

As a result of the analysis presented in Table 5, it was seen that the variances were homogeneous for forgiveness [$F(3, 418) = .310, p= .818$] and it was decided to perform a one-way analysis of variance. As a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed to determine whether the levels of forgiveness in adolescents differ according to the variable of high school educational difference was found according to the mean levels of forgiveness in adolescents ($F= 9.755; p<.05$). Then, in order to use complementary post-hoc techniques in order to determine the source of the significant difference, as a result of the homogeneity test of the variances of the groups performed with Levene's test, it was seen that the variances were homogeneous ($L=.310; p>.05$). The results of the test are shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Results of Post-Hoc Scheffe Test Conducted to Determine Which Groups Caused the Difference in Levels of Forgiveness in Adolescents According to the Variable of High School Type of Education

High School Type (i)	High School Type (j)	$x_i - x_j$	Sh x	p
Anatolian	Science	-5.50325*	1.63056	.010
	Private	1.62948	1.67516	.814
	Vocational	2.65538	1.78796	.531
Science	Anatolian	5.50325*	1.63056	.010
	Private	7.13273*	1.61851	.000
	Vocational	8.15863*	1.73500	.000
Private	Anatolian	-1.62948	1.67516	.814
	Science	-7.13273*	1.61851	.000
	Vocational	1.02590	1.77697	.954
Vocational	Anatolian	-2.65538	1.78796	.531
	Science	-8.15863*	1.73500	.000
	Private	-1.02590	1.77697	.954

As can be seen in Table 6, the post-hoc multiple comparison technique Scheffe results showed that forgiveness levels were determined by science high school students ($\bar{X}= 55.04$, $SD= 12.07$) and Anatolian ($\bar{X}=49.53$, $SD= 12.57$), private ($\bar{X}= 47.90$, $SD= 12.81$) and vocational high school ($\bar{X}= 46.88$, $SD= 11.47$) students in favor of science high school students. According to this finding, it is possible to say that the forgiveness levels of science high school students are higher than Anatolian, private and vocational high school students.

In order to reveal whether the perceived social support scores of adolescents differ according to the type of high school, firstly, whether the variances of the scores are homogeneous or not was determined with the Levene test.

Table 7: One-Way Analysis of Variance Results of Perceived Social Support Levels of Adolescents According to the Variable of High School Type of Education

Levene Test	P	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Average of Squares	F	p
.716	.543	Between groups	645.971	3	215.324	1.162	.324
		In-group	77452.164	418	185.292		
		Total	78098.135	421			

As a result of the analysis presented in Table 7, it was seen that the variances were homogeneous for perceived social support [$F(3, 418) = .716$, $p=.543$] and it was decided to perform a one-way analysis of variance. As a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed to determine whether the perceived social support levels of adolescents differ according to the variable of the type of high school education, no difference was found according to the averages of the perceived social support levels in adolescents ($F = 1.162$; $p>.05$). Findings on whether forgiveness and perceived social support scores in adolescents differ significantly according to mother's education level

In order to reveal whether the forgiveness scores of adolescents differ according to the educational level of the mother, firstly, whether the variances of the scores are homogeneous or not was determined by the Levene test.

Table 8: One-Way Analysis of Variance Results of Forgiveness Levels in Adolescents According to Mother Education Level Variable

Levene Test	P	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Average of Squares	F	p
.636	.637	Between groups	27.859	4	6.965	.043	.996
		In-group	67420.513	417	161.680		
		Total	67448.372	421			

As a result of the analysis presented in Table 8, it was seen that the variances were homogeneous for forgiveness [$F(4, 417) = .636$, $p= .637$] and it was decided to perform a one-way analysis of variance. As a result of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which was performed to determine whether the levels of forgiveness in adolescents differ according to the mother's education level variable, no difference was found compared to the mean levels of forgiveness in adolescents ($F = .043$; $p>.05$).

In order to reveal whether the perceived social support scores of adolescents differ according to the educational level of the mother, firstly, whether the variances of the scores are homogeneous or not was determined by Levene test.

Table 9: One-Way Analysis of Variance Results of Perceived Social Support Levels of Adolescents According to Mother Education Level Variable

Levene Test	P	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Average of Squares	F	p
1.034	.389	Between groups	922.856	4	230.714	1.247	.291
		In-group	77175.279	417	185.073		
		Total	78098.135	421			

As a result of the analysis presented in Table 9, it was seen that the variances were homogeneous for perceived social support [$F(4, 417) = 1.034, p = .389$] and it was decided to perform a one-way analysis of variance. As a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which was performed to determine whether the perceived social support levels of adolescents differ according to the mother's education level variable, no difference was found compared to the averages of the perceived social support levels in adolescents ($F = 1.247; p > .05$).

Findings on whether the scores of forgiveness and perceived social support in adolescents differ significantly according to the educational level of the father

In order to reveal whether the forgiveness scores of adolescents differ according to the education level of the father, firstly, whether the variances of the scores are homogeneous or not was determined with the Levene test.

Table 10: One-Way Analysis of Variance Results of Forgiveness Levels in Adolescents According to Father Education Level Variable

Levene Test	P	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Average of Squares	F	p
1.541	.189	Between groups	481.307	4	120.327	.749	.559
		In-group	66967.065	417	160.592		
		Total	67448.372	421			

As a result of the analysis presented in Table 10, it was seen that the variances were homogeneous for forgiveness [$F(4, 417) = 1.541, p = .189$] and it was decided to perform a one-way analysis of variance. As a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed to determine whether the levels of forgiveness in adolescents differ according to the father's education level variable, no difference was found compared to the mean levels of forgiveness in adolescents ($F = .749; p > .05$).

In order to reveal whether the perceived social support scores of adolescents differ according to the educational level of the father, firstly, whether the variances of the scores are homogeneous or not was determined by the Levene test.

Table 11: One-Way Analysis of Variance Results of Perceived Social Support Levels in Adolescents According to the Father's Education Level Variable

Levene Test	P	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	SD	Average of Squares	F	p
1.218	.303	Between groups	473.025	4	118.256	.635	.638
		In-group	77625.110	417	186.151		
		Total	78098.135	421			

As a result of the analysis presented in Table 11, it was seen that the variances were homogeneous for perceived social support [$F(4, 417) = 1.218, p = .303$] and it was decided to perform a one-way analysis of variance. As a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which was performed to determine whether the perceived social support levels in adolescents differ according to the father's education level variable, no difference was found compared to the averages of the perceived social support levels in adolescents ($F = .635; p > .05$).

Findings on whether the perceived family social support scores of adolescents differ significantly according to the expressed family support

In order to reveal whether the perceived family social support scores of adolescents differ according to the expressed family support, firstly, whether the variances of the scores are homogeneous or not was determined by the Levene test.

Table 12: Welch Test Result of Perceived Family Social Support Scores of Adolescents According to Expressed Family Support

Levene test	P		F	SD1	SD2	p
20.609	.000	Welch	34.900	2	22.690	.000

As a result of the analysis presented in Table 12, it was seen that the variances were not homogeneous for perceived family social support [$F(2, 419) = 20.609, p = .000$]. Thus, it was decided to perform the Welch test, which is an alternative to the one-way analysis of variance. The results from this test were found to be significant [Welch test: $F(2,419) = 34,900, p < .001$]. Thus, it was revealed that the family support expressed according to the perceived family social support score differed significantly. Tamhane's T2 test was applied to determine the source of this difference between the groups and the results of the analysis are presented in Table 13.

Table 13: Tamhane's T2 Test Results Regarding Perceived Family Social Support Scores of Adolescents According to Expressed Family Support

Family Support (i)	Family Support (j)	$\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$	Sh x	p
Low	Moderate	-5.00404	3.59077	.477
	Very	-11.13355*	3.53042	.034
Moderate	Low	5.00404	3.59077	.477
	Very	-6.12951*	.77012	.000
Very	Low	11.13355*	3.53042	.034
	Moderate	6.12951*	.77012	.000

As seen in Table 13, Tamhane's T2, a post-hoc multiple comparison technique used after the Welch test to find out whether the perceived family social support scores of adolescents differ according to the expressed family support variable, showed low family support ($\bar{X} = 43.40, SD = 11.12$) and moderate ($\bar{X} = 48.40, SD = 7.11$) and very ($\bar{X} = 54.53, SD = 5.05$).

Findings on whether the perceived friend social support scores of adolescents differ significantly according to the expressed friend support

In order to reveal whether the perceived friend social support scores in adolescents differ according to the expressed friend support, firstly, whether the variances of the scores are homogeneous or not was determined by the Levene test.

Table 14: Welch Test Result of Perceived Friend Social Support Scores of Adolescents According to Expressed Friend Support

Levene Test	P		F	Sd1	Sd2	p
28.711	.000	Welch	75.936	2	120.909	.000

As a result of the analysis presented in Table 14, it was seen that the variances were not homogeneous for the perceived social support of friends [$F(2, 419) = 28.711, p = .000$]. It was also decided to perform the Welch test, which is an alternative to the one-way analysis of variance. The results from this test were found to be significant [Welch test: $F(2,419) = 75,936, p < .001$]. Thus, it was revealed that the friend support expressed according to the perceived friend social support score differed significantly. Tamhane's T2 test was applied to determine the source of this difference between the groups and the results of the analysis are presented in Table 15.

Table 15: Tamhane's T2 Test Results Regarding Perceived Friend Social Support Scores of Adolescents According to Expressed Friend Support

Friend Support (i)	Friend Support (j)	$x_i - x_j$	Sh x	<i>p</i>
Low	Moderate	-4.56087*	1.01269	.000
	Very	-8.82477*	.98354	.000
Moderate	Low	4.56087*	1.01269	.000
	Very	-4.26391*	.43613	.000
Very	Low	8.82477*	.98354	.000
	Moderate	4.26391*	.43613	.000

As seen in Table 15, the post-hoc multiple comparison technique used after the Welch test to find out whether the perceived friend social support scores of adolescents differ according to the expressed friend support variable, Tamhane's T2 result showed low friend support ($\bar{X}= 27.79$, $SD= 6.64$) and moderate ($\bar{X}= 32.35$, $SD= 4.97$) and very ($\bar{X}= 36.62$, $SD= 3.38$) in favor of very, and between adolescents who describe it as little and medium, in favor of medium.

Findings on whether the perceived teacher social support scores of adolescents differ significantly according to the expressed teacher support.

In order to reveal whether the perceived teacher social support scores of adolescents differ according to the expressed teacher support, firstly, whether the variances of the scores are homogeneous or not was determined by the Levene test.

Table 16: One-Way Analysis of Variance Results of Perceived Teacher Social Support Scores of Adolescents

		According to Expressed Teacher Support						
Levene Test	<i>P</i>	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	<i>SD</i>	Average of Squares	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	
2.707	.068	Between groups	6551.738	2	3275.869	66.012	.000	
		In-group	20793.013	419	49.625			
		Total	27344.751	421				

As a result of the analysis presented in Table 16, it was seen that the variances were homogeneous for perceived social support [$F(2, 419) = 2.707$, $p= .068$] and it was decided to perform a one-way analysis of variance. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 17.

Table 17: Scheffe Test Results Regarding Perceived Teacher Social Support Scores of Adolescents According to Expressed Teacher Support

Teacher Support (i)	Teacher Support (j)	$x_i - x_j$	Sh x	<i>p</i>
Low	Moderate	-7.37888*	.92405	.000
	Very	-11.84394*	1.03152	.000
Moderate	Low	7.37888*	.92405	.000
	Very	-4.46506*	.80340	.000
Very	Low	11.84394*	1.03152	.000
	Moderate	4.46506*	.80340	.000

As seen in Table 17, as a result of the Scheffe post-hoc multiple comparison technique applied, adolescents describing teacher support as low ($\bar{X}= 31.89$, $SD= 8.27$) and moderate ($\bar{X}= 39.27$, $SD= 6.73$) and high ($\bar{X}= 43.74$, $SD= 6.74$) in favor of a lot, among the adolescents who describe it as low, it differs significantly in favor of moderate between those who describe it as moderate.

4. Discussion and Recommendations

4.1 Discussion

The relationship between forgiveness and social support.

In this study, a positive and significant relationship was found between forgiveness and perceived social support scores in adolescents. In addition, a positive and significant relationship was found between the perceived social support and the empathy dimension of forgiveness and the forgiveness scale. Again, a negative significant relationship was found between perceived social support and the dimensions of forgiveness, maintaining anger and taking revenge. No significant relationship was found between the dimensions of the components of forgiveness and perceived social support. While this information points to the importance of perceived social support in the ability to forgive, it shows that adolescents with a tendency to forgive have higher perceived social support.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that there are limited number of studies examining forgiveness and its sub-dimensions together with the concept of social support. Anderson (1999) stated that forgiving others in a social environment reduces interpersonal conflict and allows the individual to create and maintain the necessary social support networks in a healthy way. Toussaint (2015) also stated that forgiveness is necessary to protect expanded social networks. He emphasized that the probability of conflict in large social networks is high and that the negative effects of interpersonal conflict can be reduced and social support can be expanded thanks to the ability to forgive. McCullough (2000) also emphasized in his study that the tendency to forgive others may be related to health, thus contributing to less stressful social relationships and encouraging social support.

Fredrickson (2001) expressed forgiveness as a social action that facilitates social support. Worthington and Scherer (2004) emphasized in their study that forgiveness will indirectly affect health by improving social support, reducing stress in marriages, and improving relational skills and bonds. Lawler- Row and Piferi, 2006, Worthington et al., 2001, and Webb et al., 2011 concluded that individuals with a higher tendency to forgive have higher perceived social support scores. However, while Worthington et al. (2007) concluded that decision-making forgiveness is associated with positive health through good social support. This research supports the findings of Uchino (2009) that social support and positive health are in a relationship and Webb, Hirsch, Visser, and Brewer (2013) examined the mediator role of social support between forgiveness and health. As a result of the research, it was found that social support mediated the relationship between forgiveness and health. Failure to forgive has also been associated with depression and anxiety, as well as poor social support and coping ability (Maltby, Macaskill, & Day, 2001). In the study of Chiamello et al. (2008), in which the sub-dimensions of forgiveness were examined according to the demographic variable of age, it was found that while the scores of sensitivity to conditions and willingness to forgive were lower in older adolescents than in young adolescents, the scores related to persistent anger and desire to take revenge were higher in older adolescents than in younger adolescents.

Examination of forgiveness and social support in terms of demographic variables of the sample.

When analyzed by gender, it was seen that male students' scores on the components of forgiveness and taking revenge were significantly higher than the female students in the same period. It was concluded that the difference between empathy and maintaining anger dimension scores was not significant for male and female students in the same period. In addition, while it was seen that the perceived social support scores of female students were significantly higher than that of male students in the same period, it was concluded that the difference between the scores of the forgiveness tendency scale was not significant for female and male students in the same period.

Studies in which there is no significant difference between the tendency to forgive according to the gender variable, which supports the research findings (Ercan & Alp, 2011; Han, 2015; Asıcı, 2013; Brown, 2003;

Macaskill et al., 2002; Walker & Gorsuch, 2002; Toussaint & Webb, 2005; Nateghian et al., 2008) constitute the majority of the literature. However, studies in which the tendency to forgive scores were mostly in favor of women (Aslan, Mert, & Yıldız, 2016; Miller, Worthington, & McDaniel, 2008) were found. No studies were found in favor of the tendency to forgive men.

In the literature, there are studies in which the perceived social support score is mostly in favor of women, which supports the findings of the study (Erdeger, 2001; Elbir, 2000; Arslan, 2009; Oktan, 2005; Savi-Çakar & Karataş, 2012; Öztosun, 2018; Bayoğlu & Puruçuoğlu, 2010; Arıcıoğlu, 2008; Ustabaş, 2011; Cırık, 2010). At the same time, there were studies in favor of males (Aliyev & Tunç, 2017) and studies that did not have a significant difference according to the gender variable (Çakır, 1993; Demirtaş, 2007; Kemer & Atik, 2005; Erim, 2001; Gündoğan, 2016).

When examined according to the type of high school attended, the difference was found statistically significant according to the mean scores of the adolescents' tendency to forgive. Adolescents' tendency to forgive scores differ significantly between science high school students and Anatolian, private and vocational high school students in favor of science high school students. According to this information, it is possible to say that science high school students' tendency to forgive is higher than Anatolian, private and vocational high school students. In this context, it is predicted that adolescents studying at science high schools will produce healthier and more positive results in terms of alternative behaviors and attitudes that they can apply in the face of hurt experiences in interpersonal relationships. Although there is no study in the literature that deals with the tendency to forgive and the type of high school studied, it has been observed that there are a limited number of studies involving perceived social support and high school type. Köseoğlu and Erçevik, 2015; Baştürk, 2002 and Kahrıman, 2002 stated that there were significant differences in perceived social support scores against vocational high schools, while Cırık stated that 2010 resulted in favor of those studying at private schools. The difference according to the mean scores of perceived social support in adolescents was not statistically significant.

When examined according to the education level of the parents, the difference was not statistically significant according to the mean scores of forgiveness and perceived social support in adolescents. Studies in the literature that support the research findings, in which perceived social support scores are examined according to parental education level and there is no differentiation (Yılmaz, 2000; Kahrıman & Polat, 2003; Aliyev & Tunç, 2017; Arslan, 2009; Gündoğan, 2016; Litwin, 2000; Aydın, Kahraman and Everdurmaz, 2017) are available. There are also studies stating that perceived social support scores increase as the education level of parents increases (Ustabaş, 2011; Cırık, 2010; Yağcı, 2010; Köse, 2009; Oktan, 2005; Arıcıoğlu, 2008). On the other hand, Soylu (2002) stated that as father education decreases, perceived social support scores decrease.

When examined according to the expressed family support, the difference according to the averages of the perceived family social support scores in adolescents was found to be statistically significant. It differs significantly between the adolescents who describe the expressed family support as little or medium and those who describe it as much in favor of much. According to this information, it is possible to say that the adolescents who describe the expressed family support as high perceive higher family social support than the adolescents who describe the expressed family support as low or moderate. Studies have also found that family support is negatively related to the incidence of depression and delinquent behaviors (Windle, 1992) and positively to social problem solving (Arslan, 2009; Demirtaş, 2007) and the level of coping with stress (Traş & Arslan, 2013). When analyzed according to the expressed friend social support, the difference was found statistically significant according to the averages of the perceived friend social support scores of the adolescents. It differs significantly between the adolescents who describe the expressed friend support as little or medium and those who describe it as much in favor of much. According to this information, it is possible to say that the adolescents who describe the expressed friend support as high perceive higher friend social support than the adolescents who describe the expressed friend support as low or moderate. Kıran (2003) stated that adolescents are better understood by their friends than their families, and they have the opportunity to freely express their thoughts and problems. However, Santrock (2012) emphasized that adolescents need to be loved and accepted by their friends and peers, and their relationships with their peers are of great importance for their lives. In addition, studies have found that

friend support is positively related to well-being (Doğan, 2006; Lynch & Cicchetti, 1997) and social competence (Traş & Arslan, 2013) and negatively related to irregular behavior (Bal, 2010).

When analyzed according to the expressed teacher social support, the difference according to the averages of perceived teacher social support scores in adolescents was found to be statistically significant. It differs significantly between the adolescents who describe the expressed teacher support as little or medium and those who describe it as much in favor of much. According to this finding, it is possible to say that the adolescents who describe the expressed teacher support as high perceive higher teacher social support than the adolescents who describe the expressed teacher support as low or moderate. Studies have also shown that teacher support is positively related to school engagement (Karababa, Oral, & Dilmaç, 2018; Hallinan, 2008), school success, and feeling of belonging to school (Roeser, Midgley, & Urdan, 1996).

It is seen that the findings including family, friend and teacher social support expressed are consistent with the answers given by the participants to the Perceived Social Support Scale (PSSS-R). In this context, it can be said that the participants gave sincere and sincere answers to the data collection tools. When the studies on the concept of social support in the literature were examined, no findings were found that included the social support of family, friends and teachers, which was expressed to the participants, except for the scores they received from the scales of perceived social support. It is thought that this adds a unique value to the research.

4.2 Recommendations

In line with the results of the research, suggestions to families, school counselors, teachers and researchers are as follows:

To families;

In this study, which reveals that family support plays an important role in the rise of the adolescent's tendency to forgive, it is seen that it is important for families to take active roles in preventive studies that will contribute positively to the mental health and psychological development of the adolescent.

In this developmental period, families can use volunteer activities, short-term internships and courses suitable for their interests to increase their children's empathy skills, minimize anger and revenge, and help them become individuals with a high tendency to forgive.

To school psychological counselors;

Psychological counselors can design psychoeducational programs to improve students' forgiveness tendencies. While designing the aforementioned programs, modules that will improve adolescents' empathy skills and anger control can be included.

Psychoeducational programs on communication skills, assertiveness, self-confidence development, social skills, communication barriers, language of you-me language can be prepared by the psychological counselor in order to strengthen the interpersonal communication of the adolescent and to enable him/her to look at events or situations from a different perspective. Thanks to these programs, the social support of friends can be strengthened.

It is thought that it will be beneficial to organize parent training for families to be more supportive towards adolescents by the psychological counselor. With this training, a different perspective can be given to the family on topics such as what parents can do for the cognitive, social and emotional development areas of the adolescent, and the role of parents in strengthening communication and relationships within the family.

Considering which situations cause low tendency to forgive and social support, psycho-educational programs can be organized and implemented by the psychological counselor to strengthen the family-child-teacher relationship. Including the family and the teacher in the activities will increase the perceived social support of the students.

To teachers;

It is thought that increasing the parent meetings of the classroom guidance teachers and ensuring that the students are followed up regularly will enable the parents to participate more actively in the education process and increase the family social support perceived by the students.

Supporting adolescents by teachers and parents when they are exposed to hurtful situations in their interpersonal relationships will contribute to the recovery process. Therefore, cooperation between teachers and parents is important.

Teachers can direct students to social, cultural and sportive activities in line with their interests and abilities. In this way, when students use their energies correctly and spend a happy and quality time, they can choose to empathize and be sensitive in interpersonal relations and allow them to move away from anger and revenge feelings.

To the researchers;

During the research process, it was noticed that a limited number of studies were conducted on the concept of forgiveness in adolescents in our country. It is thought that there is a need for relational and experimental studies examining the variables of forgiveness and perceived social support together.

In the study, the relationship between forgiveness and perceived social support was discussed. In the research process, the relationship of forgiveness with parental attitudes, loneliness, emotional intelligence, alexithymia and self-image, which is thought to contribute to science, can be examined.

In this study, it was seen that perceived and expressed family, friend and teacher social support showed consistency. Questions about the social support of family, friends and teachers, which are also expressed in different studies, can be included.

References

- Adams, G. (2000). Adolescent development: The essential readings. *Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford*. United Kingdom. <https://fokt.pw.mas.pdf>
- Akın, Y. D., & Ceyhan, E. (2005). Resmi ve özel genel lise öğrencilerinin ailelerinden, arkadaşlarından ve öğretmenlerinden algıladıkları sosyal destek düzeyleri açısından kendini kabul düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(2), 69–87. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/7169819.pdf>
- Aliyev, R., & Tunç, E. (2017). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin algılanan sosyal destek düzeyi ve benlik algılarının incelenmesi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 21(2), 401-418. <http://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ataunisobil/issue/34503/424693>
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street. Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Arıcıoğlu, A. (2008). *Hacettepe Üniversitesi eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin algıladıkları sosyal destek*. (Master's thesis). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Arslan, Y. (2009). *Lise öğrencilerinin algıladıkları sosyal destek ile sosyal problem çözme arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. (Master's thesis). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Asıcı, E. (2013). *Öğretmen adaylarının affetme özelliklerinin öz-duyarlık ve benlik saygısı açısından incelenmesi*. (Master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.
- Asıcı, E., & Karaca, R. (2018). Ergenler için affetme ölçeği (eaö): Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Turkish Studies Educational Sciences*, 13(11), 205-228. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.13144>
- Aslan, M., Mert, H. Ş., & Yıldız, M. (2016). Narsistik kişilik ile affedicilik arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. 2. *Uluslararası Çin'den Adriyatik'e Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi*, 147-153. <http://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1489254957.pdf>
- Aydın, A., Kahraman, N., & Hiçdurmaz, D. (2017). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin algılanan sosyal destek ve psikolojik iyi olma düzeylerinin belirlenmesi. *Psikiyatri Hemşireliği Dergisi*, 8(1), 46. <https://doi.org/10.14744/phd.2017.95967>
- Bal, S. (2010). *Çocukluk örselenme yaşantıları, ana-baba- ergen ilişki biçimleri ve sosyal destek algısının, kuraldışı davranışlarla ilişkisi*. (Master's thesis). Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change, *Psychological Review*. 84(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Baştürk, D. (2002). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki öğrencilerde algılanan sosyal desteğin akademik başarı üzerine etkisi*. (Master's thesis). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

- Bayoğlu, A. S., & Purutçuoğlu, E. (2010). Yetiştirme yurdunda kalan ergenlerin gelecek beklentileri ve sosyal destek algıları. *Kriz Dergisi*, 18(1), 27-39. http://doi.org/10.1501/Kriz_0000000316
- Berry, J. W., Worthington, E. L., O'Connor, L. E., Parrott, L., & Wade, N. G. (2005). Forgiveness, vengeful rumination, and affective traits. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 1-43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2004.00308.x>
- Brown, R. P. (2003). Measuring individual differences in the tendency to forgive: Construct validity and links with depression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 759-771. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203029006008>
- Bugay, A., Demir, A., & Delevi, R. (2012). Assessment of reliability and validity of the Turkish Version of Heartland Forgiveness Scale. *Psychological Reports*, 111(2), 575-584. <https://doi.org/10.2466/08.21.PR0.111.5.575-584>
- Certel, H. (2003). Din psikolojisi, (2nd edition), Ankara, Andaç Yayınları, 167-168.
- Cırık, İ. (2010). *İlköğretim 5., 6., 7. ve 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin algıladıkları sosyal destek düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. (Doctoral dissertation). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Datu, J. A. D. (2014). Forgiveness, gratitude and subjective well-being among Filipino adolescents. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 36(3), 262-273. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-013-9205-9>
- Demirtaş, A. S. (2007). *İlköğretim 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin algılanan sosyal destek ve yalnızlık düzeyleri ile stresle başa çıkma düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki*. (Master's thesis). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Derman, O. (2008). Ergenlerde psiko-sosyal gelişim. *Adolesan Sağlığı II Sempozyum Dizisi*, 63, 19-21. <http://www.ctf.edu.tr/stek/pdfs/63/6302.pdf>
- Doğan, T. (2006). Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin İyilik Halinin İncelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30, 120-129. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/hunefd/issue/7806/102372>
- Enright, R. D., & Fitzgibbons, R. P. (2000). Helping clients forgive: An empirical guide for resolving anger and restoring hope: What forgiveness is not. *Washington DC: American Psychological Association*, 37-51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10381-000>
- Ercan, L., & Alp, D. (2011). Öğretmenlerin yıldırıma maruz kalma ile affetme düzeylerinin incelenmesi, XI. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi, 3-5 October, İzmir. https://www.pegem.net/akademi/kongrebildiri_detay.aspx?id=134048
- Eryılmaz, A. (2009). Ergenlik döneminde stres ve başa çıkma. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 20-37. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/yyuefd/issue/13712/166011>
- Fredrickson, B. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218-226.
- Geçtan, E. (2006). *Psikodinamik Psikiyatri ve Normaldışı Davranışlar*. İstanbul: Metis Yayıncılık.
- Gelir, E. (2009). *Ana baba tutumları, aile sosyal atomu ve cinsiyete göre ilköğretim altıncı sınıf öğrencilerinin öğrenilmiş çaresizlik ve akademik başarılarının incelenmesi*. (Master's thesis). Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.
- Gündoğan, S. (2016). *Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin saldırganlık düzeylerinin algılanan sosyal destek ve öznel iyi oluş açısından incelenmesi*. (Master's thesis). Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Hallinan, M. T. (2008). Teacher influences on students' attachment to school. *Sociology of Education*, 81, 271-283. <http://doi.org/10.1177/003804070808100303>
- Han, S. Y. (2015). Effects of adolescent self-conscious emotion, empathy, and forgiveness on prosocial behavior by gender and age. *Journal of Korean Home Management Association*, 33, 117-131. <https://doi.org/10.7466/JKHMA.2015.33.5.117>
- Kahrman, İ. (2002). *Adolesanlarda Aile ve arkadaşlardan algılanan sosyal destek ile benlik saygısı arasındaki ilişki*. (Master's thesis). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.
- Kahrman, İ., & Polat, S. (2003). Adölesanlarda aileden ve arkadaşlardan algılanan sosyal destek ve benlik saygısı arasındaki ilişki. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, 6(2), 13-24. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ataunihem/issue/2624/33758>
- Kara, E. (2009). Din ve psikolojik açıdan bağışlayıcılığın terapötik değeri. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(8), 221-229. http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt2/sayi8pdf/kara_elif.pdf
- Karababa, A., Oral, T., & Dilmaç, B. (2018). Ortaokul öğrencilerinde okula bağlılığın yordanmasında algılanan sosyal destek ve değerlerin rolü. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33(2), 269-279. <https://acikerisim.konya.edu.tr/xmlui/handle/20.500.12452/1975>
- Karasar, N. (2002). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara, Nobel Yayınevi.
- Kemer, G., & Atik, K. (2005). Kırsal ve il merkezinde yaşayan lise öğrencilerinin umut düzeylerinin aileden algılanan sosyal destek düzeyine göre karşılaştırılması. *M.Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 21, 161-168. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/maruabd/issue/377/2245>

- Kıran, E. B. (2003). Akran baskı düzeylerine ve cinsiyetlerine göre öğrencilerin risk alma davranışı ve okul başarılarının incelenmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 2(20), 17-26. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tpdrd/issue/21440/229613>
- Köse, E. (2009). *Yurtta kalan ve ailesiyle birlikte yaşayan lise öğrencilerinin yalnızlık ve sosyal destek düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. (Master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.
- Köseoğlu, S. E., & Erçevik, A. (2015). The relation between emotional autonomy and social support levels for high school students. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2, 198-216. <https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2015.15.2-5000161320>
- La Russo, M. D., Romer, D., & Selman, R. L. (2008). Teachers as builders of respectful school climates: Implications for adolescent drug use norms and depressive symptoms in high school. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37, 386-398. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-007-9212-4>
- Lawler-Row, K. A., & Piferi, R. L. (2006). The forgiving personality: Describing a life well lived? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(6), 1009-1020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.04.007>
- Lynch, M., & Cicchetti, D. (1997). Children's relationships with adults and peers: An examination of elementary and junior high school students. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35, 81-99. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4405\(96\)00031-3](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4405(96)00031-3)
- Macaskill, A., Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2002). Forgiveness of self and others and emotional empathy. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(5), 663-665. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00224540209603925>
- Maltby, J., Macaskill, A., & Day, L. (2001). Failure to forgive self and others: a replication and extension of the relationship between forgiveness, personality, social desirability and general health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(5), 881-885. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869\(00\)00080-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(00)00080-5)
- McCullough, M. E. (2000). Forgiveness as human strength: Theory, measurement and links to well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19(1), 43-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2000.19.1.43>
- Mercer, S.H., Nellis, L.M., Martinez, R.S., & Kirk M. (2010). Supporting the students most in need: Academic self-efficacy and perceived teacher support in relation to within-year academic growth. *Journal of School Psychology*, 49, 323-338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2011.03.006>
- Miller, A. J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & McDaniel, M. A. (2008). Gender and forgiveness: A meta-analytic review and research agenda. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 27, 843-876. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2008.27.8.843>
- Nateghian, S., Shirinzadeh, S., Molazadeh, J., & Ghaderi, E. (2008). Factor structure of Forgivingness questionnaire and its relation with mental health: A report from Iran. *Iranian Journal of Psychiatry*, 3(3), 114-120. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.585.7031&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Oktan, V. (2005). Yalnızlık ve algılanan sosyal destek düzeyinin ergenlerdeki öfkenin gelişimine etkisi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 21, 183-192. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/maruaebd/issue/377/2247>
- Öztosun, A. (2018). *Ergenlerde algılanan sosyal destek ve sosyal dışlanma deneyimlerinin internet bağımlılığını yordayıcılığı*. (Master's thesis). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Roeser, R. W., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. C. (1996). Perceptions of the school psychological environment and early adolescents' psychological and behavioral functioning in school: The mediating role of goals and belonging. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(3), 408-422. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.88.3.408>
- Santrock, J. W. (2012). *Ergenlik* (D. M. Siyez, Trans). Ankara, Nobel Yayınevi.
- Sarı, E. (2014). Affetmenin kendini gerçekleştirme üzerindeki etkileri. *İlköğretim Online*, 13(4),1493-1501. <https://doi.org/10.17051/io.2014.06489>
- Savcı, A. B. (2006). *Kanserli Hastalarda Yaşam Kalitesini ve Sosyal Destek Düzeyini Etkileyen Faktörler*. (Master's thesis). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.
- Savi-Çakar, F., & Karataş, Z. (2012). Ergenlerin benlik saygısı, algıladıkları sosyal destek ve umutsuzluk düzeyleri: Bir yapısal eşitlik modeli çalışması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 12(4), 2397-2412.
- Scobie, E. D., & Scobie, G. E. W. (1998). Damaging events: The perceived need for forgiveness. *Journal of the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 28, 373-401. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5914.00081>
- Tanrıverdi, S. (2012). *Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinde internet bağımlılığı ile algılanan sosyal destek arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Van.
- Taysi, E., Curun, F., & Orcan, F. (2015). Hope, anger, and depression as mediators for forgiveness and social behavior in Turkish children. *The Journal of Psychology*, 149(4), 378-393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2014.881313>
- Toussaint, L., & Webb, J. R. (2005). Gender differences in the relationship between empathy and forgiveness. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(6), 673-685. <https://doi.org/10.3200/socp.145.6.673-686>
- Toussaint, L., Worthington, E., & Williams, D. R. (Eds.). (2015). *Forgiveness and Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9993-5>

- Traş, Z., & Arslan, E. (2013). An investigation of perceived social support and social self efficacy in adolescents. *Elementary Education Online*, 12(4), 1133-1140. <http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr/index.php/io/article/view/1373>
- Türküm, S. A., Balkaya, A., & Balkaya, A. (2005). Akılcı olmayan inanç ölçeğinin lise öğrencilerine uyarlanması: geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışmaları. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 23(3), 77-83. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12438/620>
- Uchino, B. N. (2009). Understanding the links between social support and physical health: A life-span perspective with emphasis on the separability of perceived and received support. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(3), 236–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01122.x>
- Ustabaş, S. (2011). *İlköğretim 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin saldırganlık ve algılanan sosyal destek düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi*. (Master's thesis). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Ünüvar, A. (2003). *Çok yönlü algılanan sosyal desteğin 15-18 yaş arası lise öğrencilerinde problem çözme becerileri ve benlik saygısına etkisi*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Walker, D. F., & Gorsuch, R. L. (2002). Forgiveness within the Big Five personality model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32(7), 1127–1138. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(00\)00185-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00185-9)
- Wang, C. D. C., & Sound, C. C. (2008). The role of generational status, self-esteem, academic self efficacy and perceived social support in college students' psychological well-being. *Journal of College Counseling*, 11, 101-118. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1882.2008.tb00028.x>
- Webb, J. R., Hirsch, J. K., Visser, P. L., & Brewer, K. G. (2013). Forgiveness and health: Assessing the mediating effect of health behavior, social support, and interpersonal functioning. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 147(5), 391–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2012.700964>
- Webb, J. R., Robinson, E. A. R., & Brower, K. J. (2011). Mental health, not social support, mediates the forgiveness-alcohol outcome relationship. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 25(3), 462–473. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022502>
- Wentzel, K.R., Battle, A., Russell, S.L., & Looney, L.B. (2010). Social supports from teachers and peers as predictors of academic and social motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 35(3), 193-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.03.002>
- Windle, M. (1992). Temperament and social support in adolescence: Interrelations with depressive symptoms and delinquent behaviors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 21(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01536980>
- Worthington, E. L., & Scherer, M. (2004). Forgiveness is an emotion focused coping strategy that can reduce health risks and promote health resilience: Theory, review, and hypotheses. *Psychology and Health*, 19(3), 385–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0887044042000196674>
- Worthington, E. L., Berry, J. W., & Parrott, III, L. (2001). Unforgiveness, forgiveness, religion, and health. In Allen C. Sherman (Ed.), *Faith and health: Psychological perspectives*, 107–138. New York, NY: Guilford Press. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232444099_Unforgiveness_forgiveness_religion_and_health
- Worthington, E. L., Witvliet, C. V. O., Pietrini, P., & Miller, A. J. (2007). Forgiveness, health, and well-being: A review of evidence for emotional versus decisional forgiveness, dispositional forgiveness, and reduced unforgiveness. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 30(4), 291–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-007-9105-8>
- Yağcı, M. V. (2010). *ÖSS sınavına giren öğrencilerin sınav kaygısı ve algıladıkları sosyal destek düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması*. (Master's thesis). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Yıldırım, İ. (1997). Algılanan sosyal destek ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi güvenilirliği ve geçerliği. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13, 81–87. <http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/yonetim/icerik/makaleler/1180-published.pdf>
- Yıldırım, İ. (1998). Akademik başarı düzeyleri farklı olan lise öğrencilerinin sosyal destek düzeyleri. *Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 2(9), 33–38. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tpdrd/issue/21429/229611>
- Yıldırım, İ. (2006). Akademik başarının yordayıcısı olarak gündelik sıkıntılar ve sosyal destek. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30, 258-267. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/87680>