

외톨이 혹은 왕따 상태인 청소년 정신과 환자와
비외톨이 환자의 문제 행동 및
어머니의 양육 태도의 차이
- 예비 연구 -

THE DIFFERENCE OF THE BEHAVIORAL PROBLEM AND
MATERNAL REARING PATTERN BETWEEN ADOLESCENT
PSYCHIATRIC PATIENTS IN PEER NEGLECT OR REJECT
AND THOSE IN NON-NEGLECT
- A PRELIMINARY STUDY -

손 정 우*[†]

Jung-Woo Son, M.D.*[†]

연구 목적 :

연구 방법 : 25
가 (Child Behavior Checklist, CBCL) 8
(Maternal Behavior Research Instrument, MBRI)
15 - 10

결 과 :

1) CBCL 8 (p<.05), / (p<.05) (p<.01)
가 CBCL
8 (r=.516), / (r=.483), (r=.651),
(r=.517) CBCL (r=.414),
(r=.446), (r=.531)
2) , MBRI
MBRI

결 론 :

* Department of Neuropsychiatry, College of Medicine, Chungbuk
National University, Cheongju
[†]Corresponding author

중심 단어 : / 가 , 가 가 .

서론

. 3)

. 4)

. 5)

1). (friendship)
가
2)3). . 6) - ,
가
가
가
가
10). ,
4). ,
5), 가 12), 11), 13),
(social withdrawal) 14).
가
15).
(rejected) , (negl-
ected) , 6-8).
가
가
Newcomb⁹⁾
1) , 가 가?
. 2) ,
가
Parker¹⁶⁾ 가 가

(care - indifference), (overprotection - autonomy) , Shafer¹⁷⁾ (love - hostility) (control - autonomy)

1)

2)

3)

가 가 4)

가 가 5)

가 18)

가

19) 가

20)

21 - 25) 26)

27)

28 - 30)

연구 방법

1. 연구 대상

2000 10 2001 1 5

25

2. 연구 방법

1) 연구 도구

Shaefer¹⁷⁾ MBRI(Maternal Behavior Research Instrument) MBRI 4 () 4 (MBRI - love) 4 (MBRI - autonomy) 3

26) Cronbach's .6839, .6042, .7196

(1) 가 7 , 6 , 3 11 2 () 31) , , 가 5 13 11 Cronbach's .815 26) 가 6 Cr- (Child Behavior Checklist, onbach's CBCL) 8 .8607, Achenbach Edelbrock³³⁾ .7845, .8652 26) 34) CBCL 가 10 (aggression), (delinquency), / (depressed/anxious), (somatization), (withdrawal), 26) (thought problem), (attention problem), 15%(32) (social problem) 8 15% 15%(16) Achenbach Edelbrock (externalizing problem) / 15% 25 (internalizing problem) 10 (40%), 3 (12%), 12 (48%) 가 15 (60%)

3. 자료 분석

가

SPSS

0.05

Table 1. Comparison of the demographic characteristics between the peer neglect-reject group and the non-neglect group[†]

Variable	Peer neglect-reject group [§] N(%)	Non-neglect group ^{§§} N(%)	Value	p-value
Sex			0.03	.86
M	10(67)	7(70)		
F	5(33)	3(30)		
Occupation			1.06	.30
Middle school student	9(60)	8(80)		
High school student	6(40)	2(20)		
Grade			1.98	.15
Upper	0(0)	1(10)		
Middle upper	2(13)	3(30)		
Middle	4(27)	0(0)		
Middle lower	0(0)	4(40)		
Lower	9(60)	2(20)		
Socioeconomic status			0.47	.49
Upper	4(27)	4(40)		
Middle or lower	11(73)	6(60)		
School career of father			2.27	.13
High school	6(40)	2(20)		
University	7(47)	4(40)		
Post-graduate course	2(13)	4(40)		
Occupation of father			.07	.78
Experts	2(13)	1(10)		
Public officers	3(20)	0(0)		
Office workers	5(34)	6(60)		
Merchant/services	2(13)	2(20)		
Labors	3(20)	1(10)		
School career of mother			1.93	.17
Middle school	3(20)	0(0)		
High school	5(33)	3(30)		
University	6(40)	6(60)		
Post-graduate course	1(7)	1(10)		
Occupation of mother			.88	.35
Experts	1(7)	4(40)		
Public officers	1(7)	0(0)		
Merchant/services	4(26)	0(0)		
Housewife	8(53)	6(60)		
Etc.	1(0)	0(0)		

† : by Linear-by-Linear association test

§ : adolescent psychiatric patients that were either neglected or rejected by peer group

§§: adolescent psychiatric patients that were neither neglected nor rejected by peer group

Table 2. Comparison of the diagnosis between the peer neglect-reject group and the non-neglect group

	Peer neglect-reject group [§] (N)	Non-neglect group ^{§§} (N)
Schizophrenia	2	0
Depression	3	4
Bipolar I disorder	0	1
Brief psychotic disorder	1	1
ADHD	4	3
Developmental language disorder	3	0
Learning disorder	0	1
Oppositional defiant disorder	1	0
Tourette's disorder	1	0
Obsessive-compulsive disorder	2	1
Adjustment disorder	1	3
Social phobia	1	0
Kleptomania	1	0
Borderline personality disorder	1	0
Hysterical personality disorder	0	1
Avoidant personality disorder	0	1

§ : adolescent psychiatric patients that were either neglected or rejected by peer group

§§: adolescent psychiatric patients that were neither neglected nor rejected by peer group

Linear - by - Linear association test, Man - Whitney U test, Sperman 's correlation test

결 과

1. 대상자들의 사회인구학적 특성 (Table 1)

대상자들의 사회인구학적 특성을 살펴보면, 남학생 9명 (60%), 여학생 6명 (40%)으로 총 15명 (80%)이었다. 평균 연령은 15.2세 (표준편차 0.5)였다. 부모의 직업은 전문직 2명 (13.3%), 일반직 10명 (66.7%), 무직 3명 (20%)이었다. 부모의 학력은 고졸 10명 (66.7%), 대졸 5명 (33.3%)이었다. 대상자들의 사회인구학적 특성은 Table 1에 요약되어 있다.

60%, 30% 가 80% 53%, 가 (60% vs. 53%), (40% vs. 7%).

2. 청소년들의 진단 (Table 2)
DSM - 35) (comorbid disorder)

(developmental language disorder) 3 (schizophrenia) (brief psychotic disorder) 4, 1 (adjustment disorder) 1 3

3. 두 집단의 설문지 점수 비교 (Table 3)
8 (p<0.05), CBCL / (p<0.05), CBCL (p<0.01) 가

MBRI 2, 2

4. 외톨이 설문지, 왕따 설문지, CBCL간의 상관관계 (Table 4)
가 (r=.816). 가 CBCL 8 (r=.516), CBCL / (r=.438), CBCL (r=.651), CBCL (r=.517) 가

, CBCL (r=.414), 5. 외톨이 설문지, 왕따 설문지, 어머니의 자녀 양육 태도와
 CBCL (r=.446), CBCL (r=.531) . , MBRI, , MBRI,

Table 3. Comparison of the score of each scale between the peer neglect-reject group and the non-reject group[†]

	Peer neglect-reject group [§] mean ± S.D.	Non-reject group ^{§§} mean ± S.D.	p-value
Peer neglect scale	43.53 ± 10.45	23.10 ± 3.41	.000***
Peer reject scale	20.20 ± 12.10	6.00 ± 1.45	.000***
Part of CBCL	145.38 ± 20.38	124.78 ± 15.01	.021*
CBCL-externalizing problem	42.54 ± 5.01	38.80 ± 4.47	.099
CBCL-delinquency	13.57 ± 1.55	12.90 ± 1.85	.256
CBCL-aggression	28.79 ± 4.11	25.90 ± 3.87	.106
CBCL-internalizing problem	57.21 ± 12.81	49.11 ± 10.37	.088
CBCL-depressed/anxious	29.57 ± 6.31	24.30 ± 5.33	.040*
CBCL-withdrawal	13.57 ± 3.94	11.60 ± 3.53	.181
CBCL-somatization	14.07 ± 3.85	12.44 ± 4.18	.156
CBCL-attention problem	18.93 ± 3.89	16.80 ± 3.12	.051
CBCL-thought problem	11.27 ± 2.74	8.20 ± 1.32	.004**
CBCL-social problem	14.20 ± 3.84	11.50 ± 4.12	.062
MBRI	19.79 ± 3.26	19.80 ± 2.20	.905
MBRI-love	11.86 ± 2.25	11.90 ± 1.73	.953
MBRI-autonomy	8.07 ± 1.53	7.90 ± 1.29	.841
Concern-social	23.20 ± 4.65	21.60 ± 2.83	.594
Concern-friend	16.67 ± 3.42	18.80 ± 3.26	.065

† : by Mann-Whitney U test

§ : adolescent psychiatric patients that were either neglected or rejected by peer group

§§ : adolescent psychiatric patients that were neither neglected nor rejected by peer group

 : sum of 8 subscales from CBCL

 : subscale for maternal concern about the social life of their own patients

 : subscale for maternal concern about the friendship of their own patients

* : p<0.05, ** : p<0.01, *** : p<0.001

Table 4. Results of correlation among the scores of the peer neglect scale, the peer reject scale, and part of CBCL[†]

	Peer neglect scale	Peer reject scale	Part of CBCL [§]	CBCL-ext	CBCL-int	CBCL-del	CBCL-agg	CBCL-dep/anx	CBCL-som	CBCL-wit	CBCL-att	CBCL-thou	CBCL-soc
Peer neglect scale	1.000	0.816***	0.516*	0.121	0.382	0.169	0.083	0.438*	0.264	0.350	0.393	0.651***	0.517**
Peer reject scale	0.816***	1.000	0.367	0.114	0.178	-0.015	0.172	0.251	0.193	0.236	0.414*	0.446*	0.531**

† : by Spearman's correlation test

§ : sum of 8 subscales from CBCL

CBCL-ext : CBCL-externalizing problem subscale, CBCL-int : CBCL-internalizing problem subscale

CBCL-del : CBCL-delinquency subscale, CBCL-agg : CBCL-aggression subscale

CBCL-dep/anx : CBCL-depressed/anxious subscale, CBCL-som : CBCL-somatization subscale

CBCL-wit : CBCL-withdrawal subscale, CBCL-att : CBCL-attention problem subscale

CBCL-thou : CBCL-thought problem subscale, CBCL-soc : CBCL-social problem subscale

* : p<0.05, ** : p<0.01, *** : p<0.001

27) Symptom Checklist - 90 - Revision (SCL - 90 - R) 가 MBRI

SCL - 90 - R 가

SCL - 90 - R 가

27) (Parental Bonding Instrument, PBI) PBI, PBI

CBCL 8 - , PBI -

(r=.861)가 가

26) (r=.39)

CBCL / , CBCL 가

CBCL , CBCL 가

CBCL 가

CBCL 가

26) 71

가 가 , 가

가 / 가

(negative attribution)

가

MBRI

가

MBRI,

26)

References

- 1) Asher SR, Parker JG(1989) : The significance of peer relationship problems in childhood. In : Social Competence in Developmental Perspective, Ed. by Schneider BH, Attili G, Nabel J, Weissberg RP, Amsterdam, Kluwer Academic Publishing, pp5-23
- 2) Erwin P(1998) : Friendship in childhood and adolescence. New York, Routledge
- 3) Newcomb AF, Bagwell CL(1996) : The developmental significance of children's friendship relations. In : The Company They Keep, Ed. by Bukowski WM, Newcomb AF, Hartup WW, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp289-321
- 4) 이시형(1998) : 왕따현상에 대한 이해와 해결 : 왕따현상에 대한 이해와 상담접근. 서울특별시 청소년종합상담실 개원 1주년 기념 심포지움 자료집
- 5) 이수일(1999) : 학교폭력에 대한 교육부의 역할 및 대처방안. 한국 심리학회 심포지움 자료집. pp 87-89
- 6) Asher SR(1990) : Recent advances in the study of peer rejection. In : Peer Rejection in Childhood, Ed. by Asher AR, Coie JD, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp3-14
- 7) Coie JD, Dodge KA, Kupersmidt JB(1990) : Peer group behavior and social status. In Peer Rejection in Childhood, edited by Asher AR, Coie JD, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp17-59
- 8) Ramsey PG(1991) : Making friends in school : Promotion peer relationships in early childhood. New York, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- 9) Newcomb AF, Bukowski WM, Pattee L(1993) : Children's peer relations : A meta-analytic review of popular, rejected, neglected, controversial, and average sociometric status. Psychological Bulletin 113 : 99-128
- 10) Coie JD, Kupersmidt JB(1983) : A behavioral analysis of emerging social status in boy's groups. Child Development 54 : 1440-1416
- 11) Kurdek LA, Krile D(1982) : A developmental analysis of the relation between peer acceptance and both interpersonal understanding and perceived social self-competence. Child Development 53 : 1485-1591
- 12) Asher SR, Parkhurst JT, Hymel S, Williams GA (1990) : Peer rejection and loneliness in childhood. In : Peer Rejection in Childhood, Ed. by Asher AR, Coie JD, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp 253-273
- 13) Vosk B, Forehand R, Parker JB, Rickard K(1982) : A multimethod comparison of popular children. Developmental Psychology 18 : 571-575
- 14) Lubin KH, LeMare LJ, Lollis S(1990) : Social withdrawal in childhood : Developmental pathways to peer rejection. In : Peer Rejection in Childhood, Ed. by Asher AR, Coie JD, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp217-249
- 15) Dodge KA, Schlundt DC, Schocken I, Delugach JD(1983) : Social competence and children's sociometric status : The role of peer group entry strategies. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly 29 : 309-336
- 16) Parker G, Tupling H, Brown LB(1979) : A Parental Bonding Instrument. Br J Med Psychol 52 : 1-10
- 17) Shaefer ES(1959) : A circumplex model for maternal behavior. Journal of Psychology, pp226-235
- 18) 최유경(1999) : 부모간 양육태도, 출생순위, 형제 자매 유무에 따른 친구관계와 인기도 차이. 이화여자대학교 대학원 석사학위논문
- 19) 김윤경(1997) : 인기, 무시, 배척 집단의 사회 기술 및 부모 양육태도에 관한 연구. 연세대학교 대학원 석사학위논문
- 20) Poznanski EO, Krahenbuhl V, Zrull JP(1976) : Childhood depression : a longitudinal perspective. J Am Acad Child Psychiatry 15 : 491-501
- 21) 구본용(1998) : 청소년 집단따돌림의 원인과 지도 방안 : 따돌리는 아이들, 따돌림당하는 아이들. 청소년 대화의 광장

- 22) 박경숙(1998) : 학생의 왕따현상에 관한 연구. 한국교육개발원
- 23) 손진희, 홍지영, 양재혁(1998) : 따돌림당하는 아이들을 위한 집단상담프로그램 개발 : 왕따현상에 대한 이해와 상담접근. 서울특별시 청소년종합상담실 개원1주년 심포지엄 자료집
- 24) 이시형(1998) : 왕따현상에 대한 이해와 해결 : 왕따현상에 대한 이해와 상담접근. 서울특별시 청소년종합상담실 개원1주년 심포지엄 자료집
- 25) 한영주(1999) : 중고등학교 집단따돌림(왕따) 가해자 및 피해자의 특성에 관한 연구. 이화여자대학교 석사학위논문
- 26) 이시형, 김은정, 김미영, 김진영, 이규미, 구자경(2000) : 외톨이 청소년의 심리사회적 특성과 부적응. 삼성생명공익재단 사회정신건강연구소 보고서 제2000-2호
- 27) 손정우, 김은정, 홍성도, 이시형, 홍강의(2000) : 청소년 정신과 환자 중 외톨이 혹은 왕따 특성을 보이는 환자에 대한 예비 연구. 소아청소년정신의학 11(2) : 240-251
- 28) 전성일, 이정호, 이기철, 최영민(1996) : 청소년의 우울증과 우울 행동 장애에서의 부모 양육 태도에 관한 연구. 소아청소년정신의학 7(1) : 34-43
- 29) 김자성, 이정섭, 홍강의(1994) : 틱 장애아들의 동반 정신병리와 부모양육태도에 관한 연구. 소아청소년정신의학 5(1) : 150-151
- 30) 진혜경, 김정빈, 이종일(1998) : 청소년 품행장애와 부모양육행동과의 관계에 관한 연구. 소아청소년정신의학 9(1) : 67-81
- 31) 신성웅, 권석우, 신민섭, 조수철(2000) : 학교폭력 피해자의 정신병 실태 조사. 소아청소년정신의학 11 : 124-143
- 32) 송지영(1992) : 한국판 부모-자녀 결합 형태 검사(PBI) : 신뢰도 및 타당도 검증. 신경정신의학 31 : 979-990
- 33) Achenbach TM, Edelbrock CS(1983) : Manual for the Child Behavioral Checklist and Revised Child Behavioral Profile. Burlington, University of Vermont, Department of Psychiatry
- 34) 오경자, 이해련, 홍강의, 하은혜(1997) : 아동·청소년 행동평가척도. 서울 : 중앙적성출판사
- 35) American Psychiatric Association(1994) : Diagnosis and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorder, 4th ed., Washington DC, American Psychiatric Press

**THE DIFFERENCE OF THE BEHAVIORAL PROBLEM
AND MATERNAL REARING PATTERN BETWEEN ADOLESCENT
PSYCHIATRIC PATIENTS IN PEER NEGLECT OR
REJECT AND THOSE IN NON-NEGLECT
- A PRELIMINARY STUDY -**

Jung-Woo Son, M.D.

Department of Neuropsychiatry, College of Medicine, Chungbuk National University, Cheongju

Objectives : The major goal of this study was to investigate and compare the behavior problems and mothers' rearing pattern between adolescent psychiatric patients either neglected or rejected by peer and those who were neither neglected nor rejected by peer.

Methods : Adolescent psychiatric patients (N=25) performed peer neglect scale, peer reject scale. And their mothers performed the part of Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), Maternal Behavior Research Instrument (MBRI), the scale for the maternal concern about the social life of their own patients, and the scale for maternal concern about the friendship of their own patients. According to the score of the peer neglect scale and the peer reject scale, we divided the patients into 'peer neglect-reject' group (n=15) and 'non-loneliness' group (n=10), and compared the scores of other scales between each group. Also, we investigated the correlation among all scales.

Results :

1) The scores of the part of CBCL ($p < .05$), depressed/anxious subscale of CBCL ($p < .05$) and thought problem subscale of CBCL ($p < .01$) in peer neglect-reject group were significantly higher than those in non-neglect group. The score of peer neglect scale was significantly correlated with that of the part of CBCL ($r = .516$), depressed/anxious subscale of CBCL ($r = .483$), thought problem subscale of CBCL ($r = .651$), social problem subscale of CBCL ($r = .517$). And the score of peer reject scale was significantly correlated with that of attention subscale of CBCL ($r = .414$), thought problem subscale of CBCL ($r = .446$), social problem subscale of CBCL ($r = .531$).

2) But, each group was not significantly different on the scores of MBRI, the scale for the maternal concern about the social life of their own patients, and the scale for maternal concern about the friendship of their own patients. And there were no significant correlation between the scores of peer neglect / peer reject scale and those of scales for maternal rearing pattern.

Conclusion : The thought problem and depression/anxiety problem of adolescent psychiatric patients neglected or rejected by peer were estimated more higher than those of adolescent psychiatric patients neither neglected nor rejected by peer. But, from the view of maternal rearing pattern, each 2 groups seemed not to be different. Further research using more subjects will be needed.

KEY WORDS : Peer neglect · Peer reject · Adolescent psychiatric patient · Behavioral problem · Rearing pattern.