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Adaptation of the boundary violations scale developed based on structural family therapy to the Turkish context: A study of validity and reliability
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The purpose of this study was to adapt “The Boundary Violations Scale” (Madden et al., 2002), which was created to measure the intergenerational boundary violations in families from the perspective of children, to Turkish and to test the validity and reliability of the Turkish version of this instrument. This instrument was developed based on structural family therapy and aimed at measuring boundary violations in three areas: Promoting Maturity, Forming Coalitions, and Communicating as Peers. The research participants consisted of 511 students and 114 parents who lived in an eastern Mediterranean city in Turkey. To determine the validity of the scale, the students’ mothers were asked to complete the O’Leary-Porter and Dyadic Adjustment Scales. An explanatory factor analysis is conducted to examine the construct validity of the scale. The results of the analysis established the consistency between the adapted and original scales. The results of the study suggest that the Turkish version of the “The Boundary Violations Scale” is conceptually equivalent to the original and satisfactorily reliable and valid.
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INTRODUCTION

Boundary is one of the most critical concepts of structural family therapy. It is conceptualized as physical and psychological factors that organize people and distinguish them from one another (Gladding, 2012). Boundaries prevent differentiation in families by drawing the emotional line between the outside world and the family’s sub-systems (Barker and Chang, 2013; Minuchin, 1974). In so doing, borders define the insiders and the...
outsiders when an incident occurs in a family.

According to the structural family therapy, families include many subsystems such as parental/spousal subsystem, siblings’ subsystem, grandparents’ subsystem, adult/child subsystem, and a subsystem of other extended family members (Dallos and Draper, 2012). Although each subsystem has its own functions, members of these subsystems reciprocally affect one another. Levels of interactions and engagements among family members and the subsystems are managed and sustained by boundaries (Minuchin, 1974). Each family member executes its own actions by the help of borders (Connell, 2010). Within this framework, there should be a clear set of boundaries between family members and subsystems (Minuchin, 1974).

LITERATURE REVIEW

There are varying types of families: connected family, disconnected family and elusive family. The connected families allow members to develop their interpersonal communication skills and relationships. There are rules and customs allowing family members to develop their interpersonal communication skills and relationships (Gladding, 2012). In functional families, members can establish relationships that facilitate individual growth. However, the members do not pressure each other to co-dependency and they do not require another member to accomplish a function that is above their developmental capacity (Kindsvatter et al., 2008). Parents and children concurrently experience the feelings of autonomy and belonging (Gladding, 2012). The acceptance of differences allows especially adolescents to individualize without disconnecting from their families (Worden, 2013). Clear boundaries are closely related to families’ healthy functioning (Goldenberg and Goldenberg, 2008).

Disconnected families on the other hand, are families with ambiguous or too stringent boundaries which increases the individual member’s risk of not being able to perform their functions (Goldenberg and Goldenberg, 2008). Excessively stringent boundaries hinder the communication between subsystems and possibly result in people deadlocking in their own roles (Gladding, 2012). Elusive families set vague and ambiguous boundaries where some family members are fused (Gladding, 2012). Families with this structure do not have boundaries or frames for generational hierarchy (grandparents-parents-children). Only a small number of accepted behaviors (thoughts and emotions) are allowed and reinforced by the cost of belonging and guilt mechanisms. Individual development is repressed to a large extent and family’s problem solving processes are inhibited (Worden, 2013).

The parental subsystem’s responsibility is to facilitate the management of the family system such as raising the children (Anderson and Sabatelli, 2007), and, providing reciprocal support and encouragement between spouses. This subsystem presents an “area” where parents take responsibility for adult worries and problems (Kindsvatter et al., 2008). When there is ineffectiveness in the spousal subsystem, parenting roles becomes more complex and the child developmental level becomes vague. These problems in the development of independence and discipline force children to make decisions related to parenting (Deiner, 2010). The sibling/child subsystem is both a safe environment (area) where children discover the world and learn how to communicate with others. The sibling/child subsystem in combination with parental support slowly introduces children to the real world (Kindsvatter et al., 2008).

A family system in which children and parents function as a team and child and adult roles are differentiated is beneficial for both parents and children. Even when there is a parental conflict, children need to know that their parents would not leave them in uncertainty and that they would find a way to consolidate their differences. When there is intense conflict between parents, a child may be asked to act in association with one parent while ostracizing the other (Collins et al., 2013; Ritvoe, 2002; Greif, 1996; Minuchin, 1974).

In this type of situation, the problem experienced by the child can be explained in two different ways; conflict of loyalty and taking the “parent position”. (Ritvo and Glick, 2002). The concept of parent-like child refers to a situation wherein a child assumes the responsibilities of a parent while the actual parent plays the child’s role in the family (Collins et. al., 2013). Such deformations among generations result in parent-child relationship disturbances in which the typical parent and child roles become distorted or even inverted (Shaffer and Sroufe, 2005). Studies demonstrate the relationship between boundary dissolution and psychological maladaptation (Carlson et. al., 1995; Fullinwider-Bush and Jacobvitz, 1993).

According to structural family therapy, the family organization map starts to emerge with the help of boundaries that define relationships, togetherness and coalitions (Minuchin et al., 2006). Despite the value of comprehending the boundaries in a family, a valid and reliable measure of boundary violations does not exist in Turkey. Hence, the present study was undertaken to adapt “The Boundary Violations Scale (BVS)” to Turkish (Madden-Derdich et al., 2002). The BVS measures the intergenerational boundary violations from the children’s point of view and consists of three subscales. The first subscale, Communicating as Peers, refers to the very close relationship between a parent and child and also includes discussing some parental disagreements with children. Consequently, this subscale can be an indicator of intergenerational boundary violations if parent communicates too openly with a child by sharing information related to the spousal...
conflict (Ahron, 1981) and Coperantal Relationship Scales (O’Leary-Porter, 1980), Interparental relationship, and child adjustment measures. The BVS and the parent-child relationship, the interparental investigated the correlation between the subscales of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA). The results demon-strated that the conflict, and the child may not have the skill set to cope withthis conflict. However, they must return to the siblings’ subsystem (Minuchin, 1974). Consequently, children may have to develop skills that are above their age and act more mature in these conditions.

In 12-item BVS Promoting Maturity was measured by items 3, 4, 9 and 10; Forming Coalitions was assessed by items 5, 6, 11, and 12; and Communicating as Peers was assessed by items 1, 2, 7, and 8. Each subscale includes 4 5-point Likert scales that range from never to always. Higher scores indicate high levels of intergenerational boundary violations in a family.

The construct validity of the scale was evaluated via an exploratory factor analysis (EFA). The results demonstrated that Promoting Maturity explained 21.8% of the variance, Forming Coalitions explained 20.6% of the variance, and Communicating as Peers accounted for 20.4% of the variance. This three-factor structure explained 62.8% of the total variance. In the context of measurement validity, Madden-Derdich et al. (2002) investigated the correlation between the subscales of the BVS and the parent-child relationship, the interparental relationship, and child adjustment measures. The O’Leary-Porter (Porter and O’Leary, 1980), Interparental conflict (Ahron, 1981) and Coperantal Relationship Scales (Ahron, 1981) were used to measure the relationship between parents, coparental conflict and the coparental relationship, respectively. Guildubaldi and Clemimshaw’s (1985) Parent Satisfaction scale was chosen to investigate the satisfaction with the spouse’s parenting.

Moreover, the Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale developed by Olson et al. (1983) and the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) created by Achenbach (1991) were used to measure the parent-child relationships and the children’s behavior, respectively. Finally, child conduct was determined by using Cook’s (1986) Youth Self Report (YSR). The relationships between the subscales of the BVS completed by the child participants and the parent-child communication and child conduct measures were investigated. Additionally, correlations between the BVS subscales and satisfaction with spouses parenting, co-parental involvement, co-parental conflict, and the children’s internalizing and externalizing problems were calculated. A positive correlation between the children’s ratings on the coalition formation subscale and the mothers’ ratings of parental conflict (r = .34, p < .01) and co-parental conflict (r = .35, p < .01) (such as on issues related to raising a child) were found. A negative correlation was found between scores on the coalition formation subscale and parents’ ratings of satisfaction with their spouse’s parenting and co-parental interaction (r = -.28, p < .01). Lastly, the parents’ ratings related to child’s internalizing (r = .28, p < .01) and externalizing behaviors (r = .30, p < .01) were found to be positively correlated with scores on the coalition formation subscale.

A negative relationship is established between mothers’ ratings of satisfaction with their spouse’s parenting and scores on the maturity subscale (r = -.28, p < .01). Thus, mothers who perceive their children to be more mature have lower levels of satisfaction with their spouses parenting. Additionally, a meaningful positive relationship between mother reported internalizing behaviors of children and scores on the Promoting Maturity subscale (r = .24, p < .01) is demonstrated.

A positive meaningful relationship is observed between the children’s insights on open communication with their mother (r = .42, p < .01) and father (r = .50, p < .01) and scores on the Communicating as Peers subscale. Nevertheless, no meaningful relationship is encountered between scores on the Communicating as Peers subscale and any of the inter-parental domains. Similarly, there is no meaningful relationship between this subscale and child conduct. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is calculated for the internal consistency of each subscale. Cronbach’s α for the Promoting Maturity, Forming Coalitions, and Communicating as Peers subscales were .79, .75 and .78, respectively.

Although there are some scales to better observe and understand families in Turkey (Bulut, 1990; Fışiloğlu and Demir, 2000), there is no scale that examines intergenerational boundary violations. Realizing this need, the purpose of this study was to adapt “The BVS” developed by Madden-Derdichetal. (2002) to Turkish and to test the validity and reliability of the Turkish version of this instrument.

**METHODS**

**Participants**

This study was conducted based on the data collected from 511 volunteer students attending three different (1 private and 2 public) junior high schools during the 2012 to 2013 school year. Two-hundred and seventy of these students were girls (52.8%) and 241 were boys (47.2%); the students had a mean age of 12.4 (age
range between 10 to 15, and a standard deviation of 1.21). The student sample of the study that was used to explore the criterion-related validity reliability of the Turkish version of "The Boundary Violations Scale," included 114 fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth graders who voluntarily completed the scale. Fifty-nine of these were girls (51.8%), and the remaining 55 students (48.2%) were boys; the students had a mean age of 12.2. Eighty-nine mothers (78.07%) and 25 fathers (21.93%) with a mean age of 37.9 made up the parent participant group of the study. 114 student participants' mothers or fathers created the parent participant group.

Their ages ranged between twenty-nine and fifty. Of the parent participants, 20% had only a primary school education, 15% had only a junior high education, 23% had only a high school education, 35% had only a college education, and 7% had a master's level education. The average yearly family income ranged from 3000 and 50000 dollars.

**Instruments**

Three instruments - The Boundary Violations Scale (BVS), O'Leary Porter (OPS) and Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) - were used as data collection tools for this research.

**The boundary violation scale (BVS)**

The BVS was developed by Madden-Derdich, Estrada, Updegraff and Leonard (2002) to measure the children's perceptions of intergenerational boundary violations. The scale includes a total of 12 items in the three different subscales of Promoting Maturity, Forming Coalitions, and Communicating as Peers. It was determined that 60 was the highest possible score and 12 was the lowest possible score on the BVS. When it came to subscales, 20 was the highest and 4 was the lowest possible score.

The Promoting Maturity Subscale assesses children's perceptions of their parents' behaviors that promote maturity and responsibility that surpass their developmental level. The Forming Coalitions subscale refers to children's insights that indicate that one of the parents tries to create an alliance with the child against the other parent. The third subscale, peer-like communication, demonstrates the children's perceptions about the mode of parent-child communication.

**O'Leary Porter Scale (OPS)**

This scale consists of 10 items and was developed to measure the frequency of children's exposure to overt parental disagreements (Porter and O'Leary, 1980). For each item, the parent participants are asked to respond on a 4-point Likert type scale that ranges from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). High scores indicate higher levels of child exposure to inter-parental conflict. The Cronbach's α for internal consistency is .86 and the test-retest reliability coefficient is .96.

The OPS was adapted to Turkish by Sümer et al. (2008) and five new items were added to the original scale. The results of an explanatory factor analysis demonstrated that the adapted scale is composed of one domain, inter-parental conflict, and 28.98% of the variance can be explained by this factor. After excluding two items because of their low communalities and factor loadings, the final Turkish version of the OPS included 13 items. Cronbach's α was .77, which indicates that the internal consistency of this scale was acceptable.

**Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS)**

The DAS, which was developed by Spanier (1976), is adapted to Turkish by Fışıloğlu and Demir (2000). This 32-item scale was designed to evaluate the relationship quality of married and cohabiting couples. Thirty of the items were assessed on a 5- to 7-point Likert scale with majority of the range from 0 to 7. The remaining two items were answered by checking either YES (0) or NO (1). The scale consists of four subscales: Dyadic satisfaction, Cohesion, Consensus, and Affectional Expression. The DAS also provides a total score that ranges between 0 and 151. Higher scores indicate a better adjustment to the relationship and marriage. Spanier (1976) reports that, although the total scale reliability is .96, the Cronbach's coefficient alpha ranges between .73 and .94 for the subscales. In an adaptation study of this scale to Turkish conducted by Fışıloğlu and Demir (2000) with a sample of 264 married couple, an explanatory factor analysis was used to investigate the construct validity of the scale, and it was determined that 45.5% of the variance can be explained by the four factors. Although the internal consistency of the scale was .92, the split-half reliability coefficient was .86. The reliability results for the subscales ranged between .75 and .83. Additionally, the correlation between the adapted DAS and the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment test was .82.

**PROCEDURES**

**Language validity**

First, Kimberly A. Updegraff was contacted, and the necessary permissions were obtained before undertaking the adaptation of the BVS. Having secured the permissions, the translation process was started. The survey was translated from English to Turkish independently by two faculty members who specialize in linguistics and are proficient in both languages and three faculty members in the field of Counseling who are proficient in English. Then, the translations were examined by the authors. After determining the items translated to Turkish differently, a meeting was held with the translator faculty members to discuss the possible versions in terms of meaning and sentence structure and the scale items were chosen. Later, these statements were translated back to English by the faculty member who specializes in Counseling, and the translation was compared by the linguists to the original scale. Then, the Turkish form was administered to a sample of 20 students. After ensuring that each item was understood by the pilot participants, the scale was given its final form.

**Data collection and analysis**

After providing information related to the purpose and content of the study, only the volunteering child participants were given the information sheets and the scale. They were requested to answer all the items. The administration of the scale took 10 min on average. In public schools, parent meetings were held by the researchers. In these meetings, the parents were provided with information about the study and volunteers were asked to complete the scales. Eighty parents in the public schools participated in the study. In private schools, the scales were sent to the students' homes in closed envelopes with the information sheets on the purpose of the study and informed consent forms for indicating the parents' desire to take part and their permission for their children to participate in the study. The parents' responses were also received back in closed envelopes. Of the 49 sets of scales that were sent,
Table 1. Factors and factor loadings for exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation of the boundary violation scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My mom talks to me about her relationship with my dad.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mom talks to me like a close friend.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dad talks to me about his relationship with my mom.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dad talks to me like a close friend.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my mom and dad have a disagreement, I feel pressured by mom to take her side.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my mom and dad have a disagreement, I feel pressured by my dad to take this side.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mom tells me secrets that I am not supposed to tell my dad.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dad tells me secrets that I am not supposed to tell my mom.</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mom treats me like a grown up.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dad treats me like a grown up.</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more privileges than most other kids my age.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more responsibilities than most other kids my age.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained variance</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total explained variance</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 were returned, yielding a response rate of 69%. Before starting the analysis, the data were evaluated for missing and excessive values. As a result of the evaluation it was determined that there was no missing and excessive values. Additionally, the study sample demonstrated a normal distribution.

The construct validity of the BVS was investigated by using an explanatory factor analysis. The correlations between the scores on the subscales of the BVS, the O’Leary Porter Scale and the DAS were calculated for criterion-related validity. To determine the reliability of the scale, a subgroup of original volunteer students sample (n=114) were administered the scale again three weeks later to compute the test-retest reliability coefficient. Additionally, the item-total correlation coefficients and internal consistency coefficients were evaluated. SPSS.17 was used for the statistical analysis.

FINDINGS

This section provides information on the construct validity of the Turkish version of BVS (BVS-T), correlations between the subscales and the criterion related validity and reliability values.

Construct validity

For the concept of structure validity, explanatory factor analysis, and for analyzing factor structure, Principle Components Analysis and Varimax vertical rotation techniques are utilized. To determine the construct validity of the BVS-T, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted. Explanatory factor analysis is one of the most commonly used techniques to verify the construct validity and the validity of a hypothesis (Erkuş, 2003). The suitability of the data set for proceeding with the factor analysis was examined by using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test (KMO) and Bartlett’s test of sphericity. To be able to use the data, the KMO measure should be greater than .60, and the calculated chi-square value of the Barlet test should be statistically significant (Büyüköztürk, 2004). For the Turkish version of the BVS, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of adequacy is .67, and the Barlett Test $\chi^2$ value is 3360.36 ($p<.001$). These results demonstrate that the data set is suitable for a factor analysis, and the varimax vertical rotation technique is utilized to test the hypothesis that the factors in the scale are unrelated. Deciding whether an item is suitable for a factor, predication on that factor loading should be at least .32 and the difference between the factor loadings should be .15 or above (Tabachnick and Fidel, 2001). The factor loadings of the scale items are shown in Table 1. Similar to the original scale, the adapted scale demonstrated a three-factor structure. It was observed that the scale items loaded onto factors with the values of the factor loadings varying from .66 to .92. The analysis results revealed that Factor 1 (Communicating as Peers) had an eigenvalue of 3.60, Factor 2 (Coalition Forming) had an eigenvalue of 2.52 and Factor 3 (Promoting Maturity) had an eigenvalue of 1.79; this explained 30.0%, 21.0% and 14.94% of the variance, respectively. The three factors together explain 66.1% of the total variance. To investigate the relationships among the subscales, correlation coefficients were calculated and are presented in Table 2.

As it is seen in Table 2, there is a significantly positive relationship between PMS and FCS ($r=.58; p<.01$), between PMS and CAPS ($r=.55; p<.01$), and between FCS and CAPS ($r=.48; p<.01$). Consequently, a positive correlation is found between the subscales.

Criterion-related validity

The criterion-related validity of the BVS was evaluated by
examining the correlation coefficients between the DAS and the O'Leary Porter Scales (OPS) and the subscales of the BVS. Statistical analyses demonstrated that the OPS is positively correlated with the Coalition Formation ($r=.68$, $p<.001$), Promoting Maturity ($r=.62$, $p<.001$) and Communicating as Peers ($r=.40$, $p<.001$) subscales; however, the DAS was negatively correlated with the Coalition Formation ($r=-.59$, $p<.001$), Promoting Maturity ($r=-.44$, $p<.001$) and Communicating as Peers ($r=-.70$, $p<.001$) subscales.

Reliability

The reliability of the BVS was evaluated by calculating Cronbach’s alpha inner consistency coefficient, item-total correlations and test-retest reliability. Cronbach’s alpha inner consistency coefficient for the BVS is .86. When the subscales were investigated individually, the Cronbach’s alpha was .89, .91, and .95 for Promoting Maturity, Coalition Forming and Communicating as Peers, respectively. To test the test-retest reliability of the scale, the measure was administered to the same group of participants twice in 3 weeks. The correlation coefficient between the two administrations for Promoting Maturity, coalition forming and Communicating as Peers were $r = .61$ ($n=114$, $p<.01$), $r = .78$ ($n=114$, $p<.01$), and $r = .68$ ($n=114$, $p<.01$), respectively.

In the context of this study, the BVS-T items’ power to predict the total score, which refers to the correlation between the total scale score and the score over the scale items, was analyzed. It is necessary to have a correlation value of .30 or above for a scale to have an adequate predictive power (Büyüköztürk, 2004). As it is seen in Table 3, the correlation between the items and the total score varies from .32 to .72, and each test item is strongly related to the total scale score ($p<.001$).

**DISCUSSION**

Family counselors in Turkey have long felt the absence of an objective measure of intergeneration boundary violation. The BVS, which was developed by Madden-Derdich, Estrada, Updegraff and Leonard, (2002) has already been shown to be valid and reliable internationally. To meet the great need in our country, the BVS was adapted to Turkish. The Turkish version of the BVS (BVS-T) was evaluated for its language, structure, criterion-related validity, test-retest reliability and Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency. Additionally, an item-total correlation item analysis was conducted to determine each item’s power to predict the total scale score.

As is in the original work, an explanatory factor analysis was conducted for the BVS-T’s factor structure. The results revealed that items were identified under three factors and these factors accounted for 66.1% of the total variance. Having an explained variance over 30% is considered acceptable in scale adaptation studies (Büyüköztürk, 2004). Moreover, the factor value loads of the items vary from .66 to 0.92.

According to structural family theory, as the relationship between parents weakens, the adjustment and hierarchical order in the family also deteriorate. Therefore, risk of boundary violations increases (Minuchin, 1974; Minuchin and Fishman, 1981). Parents manage the inadequate partnership and support-related instability and stress by forming intergenerational coalitions including the children. In such situations, children become involved in the triad with an effort to bring the conflicting parents’ relationship to a balanced state (Madden-Derdich et al., 2002). Similar issues are seen among Turkish families. According to a recent report some of the most important relationship-related problems in Turkish families are; lack of face-to-face verbal communication between family members, generational differences and children witnessing conflict between parents (Republic of Turkey, Prime Minister’ Family and Social Research General Directorate, 2011).
In this framework and coincident with the original study, the relationship between the BVS-T, the OPS and the DAS was evaluated in the present study. As was indicated theoretically, there is a positive relationship between the OPS and the Collation Forming, Promoting Maturity and Communication as Peers subscales. Within this scope, it is suggested that as mothers’ perceived conflict level increases, occurrences of boundary violations also increase. When it comes, adolescent wellbeing family boundaries plays an important role in Turkey. It was found that a strong positive relationship in a family is a good indicator of an adolescent’s subjective well-being in Turkey. Turkish adolescents feel especially happy when they feel safe enough to open themselves to others and there is open communication in the family, and when there is family boundaries that are neither too loose or too stringent (Eryılmaz, 2010).

Correspondingly, a statistically significant negative correlation was found between the mother rated DAS and the subscales of the BVS. Keriğ (1995) states that, in comparison to families with detouring and cohesive parents, there is a higher level of marital conflict and lower level of marital satisfaction intrigual family forms that are characterized by intergenerational coalitions formed between parents and children. Keriğ (2005) explains that in unhappy marriages parents displace their attention onto their children in a pursuit of a parent, a friend, a surrogate spouse, a mirror, a scapegoat, an ally or a purpose in life. It is consistent with theoretical knowledge and the original study that the existence of boundary violations decrease as mothers’ perceived adjustment in marriage increases.

The reliability of the BVS-T was evaluated by calculating the internal consistency coefficient. The scale’s internal consistency is .86, and the factors have a reliability coefficient of .89 or above. The item-total correlation values of the items ranged from .32 to .72. The test-retest reliability of the subscales varied from .61 to .78. Thus, it can be concluded that the BVS-T is reliable in terms of both Coranbach’s alpha inner consistency and test re-test reliability coefficients. In the light of these results, the BVS-T seems to be a reliable measure of intergenerational boundary violations. Furthermore, the results of the item-total correlation showed that each item is consistent with the scale as a whole.

As with the English version of the scale, the Turkish version is comprised of 12, 5-point Likert scale items that range from ‘not at all’ to ‘very much’. The BVS consists of three subscales, and each subscale included four items. The sums of the four items in each subscale provide the subscale score, and the sum of the 3 subscale scores provide the total score for the entire BVS. Although this study provides the first intergenerational BVS adapted to Turkish and offers a valid and reliable tool for future research studies, it is also important to discuss some of the limitations of this study. First, the study participants were composed of only children between the ages of 10 and 15. Thus, the generalizability of the study results was not examined for other age groups. In future studies, the BVS scale should be tested with children and adolescents in other age groups. Second, it is crucial to remember that the borders between generations can vary across family structures. It would be beneficial to test the psychometric qualities of the adapted scale on participants from various social, cultural and ethnic backgrounds in Turkey. Another future research area would be administering the survey in various countries and comparing the patterns of boundary violations among these cultures. Such a study would help us to better understand how boundaries in families are structured in various countries.

Consistent with the original study, the correlation between children’s perceived boundary violations and mothers’ perceived parent relationships is investigated in the present study. Including fathers’ perceived parent relationships in future studies would provide a different perspective for the researchers.

In summary, the BVS-T meets the validity criteria for translations and language. The present study provides evidence of the structure and criterion-related validity of the BVS-T. This research contributes to the area of family counseling by providing an objective tool to measure intergenerational boundary violations. Having an adapted version of the scale also provides a foundation for future cross-cultural research studies and facilitates collaboration between researchers in various countries.

**Conflict of Interests**

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

**REFERENCES**


