Eurasian Journal of Educational Research 69 (2017) 37–54

Eurasian Journal of Educational Research
www.ejer.com.tr

The Predictive Role of Interpersonal Sensitivity and Emotional Self-Efficacy on Psychological Resilience Among Young Adults*

Bilge Nuran AYDOGDU[1] Hilal CELIK[2] Halil EKSI[3]

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 14 December 2016

Received in revised form: 12 April 2017

Accepted: 02 May 2017

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2017.69.3

Keywords

psychological resilience, interpersonal sensitivity, emotional self-efficacy, young adults

ABSTRACT

Purpose: In the face of adverse and traumatic events throughout their lives, individuals respond in different ways depending on their degree of resilience, factors of which include their individual resources for coping with those events. This study examined the predictive role of emotional self-efficacy and interpersonal sensitivity on psychological resilience among young adults in order to gain insights into psychological resilience and its protective factors. In particular, its purpose was to examine how perceiving emotions of the self and others, using emotions to facilitate thought, regulating emotions in the self and others, interpersonal awareness, need for approval, separation anxiety, timidity, fragile inner self, and understanding emotions, the emotional self, and others affect perceptions of the future, structural style, social competence, family cohesion, and social resources.

Method: Using the relational screening model, participants were selected via basic random sampling. The sample included volunteers—243 women (73.4%) and 88 men (26.6%)—with a mean age of 21.46 years. The Resilience Scale for Adults, Emotional Self-Efficacy Scale, and Interpersonal Sensitivity Measure were used as measuring instruments. **Findings**: Following simultaneous multiple regression analysis, psychological resilience could be predicted according to emotional self-efficacy and interpersonal sensitivity. **Conclusions and Recommendations:** Similar to earlier research in the field, this study showed that psychological resilience and its aspects can be explained in light of emotional self-efficacy and interpersonal sensitivity. However, since psychological resilience had not heretofore been examined in such detail, this study offers significant contributions to trauma and preventive psychological counselling studies.

*This study was partly presented at the 13th National Psychological Counselling and Guidance Congress in Mersin, 07 – 09 October, 2015

[1] Marmara University, Turkey, bilge.aydogdu@marmara.edu.tr

[2]Corresponding Author: Hilal CELİK, Marmara University, Turkey, hilalcelik@marmara.edu.tr, celikhilal@gmail.com

[3] Marmara University, Turkey, halileksi@marmara.edu.tr

Introduction

Within his or her lifetime, everyone encounters at least one stressful or traumatic event and responds differently. Whereas some become more vulnerable, others appear stronger. According to Fletcher and Sarkar (2013), such diverse responses result from different levels of resilience.

Resilience can refer to "a phenomenon or process reflecting relatively positive adaptation despite the experience of significant adversity or trauma" (Luthar, 2006, p. 742). In slightly different terms, it is a dynamic developmental process that promotes positive adaptation under stressful, adverse, and traumatic circumstances (Masten & Wright, 2010). From three different perspectives, resilience can be a positive outcome despite an individual's high-risk problems, good adaptation under stressful circumstances, and recovery from trauma (Masten, Best, & Garmezy, 1990). Hjemdal, Friborg, Stiles, Rosenvinge, and Martinussen (2006) stated that resilience consists of protective factors or functional mechanisms that promote good outcomes even when a person faces adverse life events. In other words, resilience is composed of protective factors that prompt the greater possibility of a positive outcome. Those protective factors help to prevent negative outcomes by strengthening coping skills and decreasing the effects of risky situations (Rutter, 1990). With the help of protective factors, individuals can generate positive outcomes despite adverse situations (Zautra, Hall, & Murray, 2010).

Although resilience does not prevent adverse life circumstances from emerging, it does provide the necessary tools for functionally coping with them (Hjemdal et. al., 2006). Protective factors of resilience can arise from various dimensions depending on personal and social differences. Those dimensions can be described as emotion regulation, positive emotion (Curtis & Cicchetti, 2007), family relationships (Bowlby, 1982), self-esteem, self-control (Wilson & Agaibi, 2006), and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1993). All of those dimensions have significant impacts on resiliency status because they prompt differences in individuals' judgments, emotions, thoughts, and perceptions related to coping skills (Curtis & Cicchetti, 2007). Accordingly, among other things, self-efficacy can contribute to an individual's level of psychological resilience.

When an individual faces adverse life events or experiences, self-efficacy play a significant role in determining his or her psychological status. *Self-efficacy* has been defined as the "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations" (Bandura, 1997, pp. 2). In other words, if people believe in their ability to cope with difficult circumstances, then they can plan their actions accordingly. Self-efficacy is a dynamic process that can change over time (Bandura, 1997) and affects individual motivation, affect, and action (Bandura, 1993). Therefore, how an individual judges his or her capabilities is significant in terms of motivational, affective, and behavioral aspects.

Self-efficacy comes in various types, including academic self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, and emotional self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Among them, emotional self-efficacy is a chief focus of this study. Emotional self-efficacy indicates an individual's

beliefs about the transformation of negative emotions in the face of adverse situations (Pool & Qualter, 2011). Emotion is a feeling that accompanies certain thoughts, psychological and biological situations, and tendencies toward actions (Goleman, 1995). Emotional abilities inform people about whether an issue is positive or negative, which in turn forms individuals' attitudes and behaviors. Emotions relay messages to individuals so they can evaluate situations, act on cues from their emotions, and make decisions accordingly (Greenberg, 2002). Although emotion has great importance for humans, the perception of an emotion is more significant than the emotion itself (Goleman, 1995) because how a person feels an emotion can depend on how he or she sees and experiences it. Therefore, the ability to believe in one's emotional competence—in order words, emotional self-efficacy—is important in the context of understanding attitudes and behaviors.

Altogether, self-efficacy can prompt considerable change in the power of an individual's resilience and thus the ability to change his or her resilience mechanisms. In turn, it can help individuals to protect themselves from depression, anxiety arousal (Bandura, 1993), problematic behaviors, addictive behaviors, panic attacks, and phobias (William, 1995), as well as promote health and the immune system (Bandura, 1997).

Another factor that may have an impact on resilience is interpersonal sensitivity. Social settings are essential in peoples' lives, and psychological statuses are affected by interpersonal relationships and social interactions (Aronson & Wilson, 2005). According to Luthar (2006, p. 780), "Resilience rests, fundamentally, on relationships." Positive relationships can enhance psychological resilience and provide external sources for it (Libório & Ungar, 2014). However, relationships can also be a factor of vulnerability when stressful bonding with others emerges. For that reason, the extent to which psychological resilience can undergo changes when relationships are not positive and when sensitivity to social interactions is high should be considered.

Boyce and Parker (1989) defined *interpersonal sensitivity* as a personality trait that leads people to misinterpret others' attitudes and behaviors. *Interpersonal sensitivity* can also refer to fearing others' possible rejection or criticism (Bell & Freeman, 2014). In some research, the term *interpersonal rejection sensitivity* is used instead of *interpersonal sensitivity* to prevent confusion of the concept (Stafford, 2007).

Research has shown that interpersonal sensitivity depends on many factors, one of which is attachment style. Cummings–Robeau, Lopez, and Rice (2009) detected a significant relationship between parental and adult attachment that affects interpersonal sensitivity. In addition, Masten and Wright (2010) demonstrated that people who experience low attachment to parents and friends tend to be more interpersonally sensitive, which prompts a decreased level of resilience. Individuals with a negative self-view and low self-esteem also tend to be more sensitive to interpersonal relations (Otani, Suzuki, Ishii, Matsumoto, & Kamata, 2008). From the other direction, as numerous studies have shown, interpersonal sensitivity can precipitate psychological problems (Bell & Freeman, 2014), including depression,

anxiety disorders, burnout, eating disorders, and social avoidance (Bianchi, Schonfeld, & Laurent, 2015).

As mentioned, facing stressful and traumatic events is an inevitable part of life, and as such, psychological resilience becomes a significant. After all, an individual's ability to cope depends on his or her power of resilience. According to the literature, emotional self-efficacy and interpersonal sensitivity can generate psychological resilience. In response to that knowledge, this study investigates the effects of emotional self-efficacy and interpersonal sensitivity on the psychological resilience of young adults. Its purpose was to examine how perceiving emotions of the self and others, using emotions to facilitate thought, regulating emotions in the self and others, interpersonal awareness, need for approval, separation anxiety, timidity, fragile inner self, and understanding emotions, the emotional self, and others affect perceptions of the future, structural style, social competence, family cohesion, and social resources. In line with that aim, following questions were sought:

1. Is there a significant relation between interpersonal sensitivity and emotional self-efficacy?
2. Is there a significant relation among interpersonal sensitivity, emotional self-efficacy and psychological resilience?
3. Do interpersonal sensitivity and emotional self-efficacy significantly predict psychological resilience of young adults?

Method

Research Design

This research employed the relational screening model, which is used to determine the relationship between two variables or two datasets and the extent to those variables or datasets are related (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000).

Research Sample

The population of the research included students attending Marmara University in Istanbul, Turkey, during the 2014–2015 academic year. Participants were selected from undergraduate and graduate students studying in 16 faculties of the university by simple random sampling. The names of all faculties were written on slips of paper, which were put in a bag. Eight faculties were selected, after which one department from each faculty was selected in the same way. Selected departments were the Atatürk Education Faculty, Faculty of Technical Education, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Arts and Science, Faculty of Business Administration, Faculty of Fine Arts, Faculty of Law, and Faculty of Engineering. Other departments were Department of Guidance and Psychological Counseling, Department of Printery, Department of Medicine, Department of Turkish Language and Literature, Department of Business of Administration, Department of Painting, Department of Law, and Department of Mechanical Engineering.

The sample included 243 women (73.4%) and 88 men (26.6%), all volunteers, with a mean age of 21.46 years (SD = 3.48 years). Simple random sampling was used to

select participants from various departments, including Guidance and Psychological Counseling (13.3%), Teacher Training in Printery (13.6%), Medicine (10%), Turkish Language and Literature (9.7%), Business Administration (16.3%), Painting (11.5%), Law (11.2%), and Mechanical Engineering (14.5%).

Research Instruments and Procedure

Interpersonal Sensitivity Measure. Interpersonal sensitivity was measured with the Interpersonal Sensitivity Measure (IPSM) scale developed by Boyce and Parker (1989). The IPSM is a 36-item, Likert-type questionnaire that assesses pervasive and heightened attention and sensitivity to interactions with others. The scale generates a total score ranging from 36 to 144, with higher scores indicating greater interpersonal sensitivity. The measure has five subscales: interpersonal awareness, need for approval, separation anxiety, fragile inner self, and timidity. The Turkish version was adapted by Erozkan (2005). The IPSM has been found to have high internal consistency (α = .86) and test–retest reliability (r = 0.70). In the Turkish version, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were from .73 to .76 for the subscales and .81 for the whole scale.

Resilience Scale for Adults. The Resilience Scale for Adults was developed by Friborg et al. (2003) and revised by them in 2005. The scale has 33 items in six subscales: structural style, perception of the future, family cohesion, perception of self, social competence, and social resources. The Turkish version of the revised scale was given to two different samples of students and personnel by Basim and Cetin (2011). Test–retest reliabilities of the subscales were from .68 to .81. Cronbach's alpha for the subscales ranged from .66 to .81 for students and from .68 and .79 for personnel. Cronbach's alpha was .86 in both samples for the scale as a whole.

Emotional Self-Efficacy Scale. The Emotional Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Kirk, Shutte, and Hine (2008). In its original form, the scale consists of 32 Likert-type items addressing perceiving emotions in the self and others (perceive), using emotions to assist thought (assist), understanding emotions and emotional knowledge in the self and others (understand), and regulating emotions in the self and others (regulate). The Turkish version was adapted by Totan, Ikiz, and Karaca (2011). Confirmatory factor analysis showed that the 4-factor structure of the scale was confirmed in a sample of Turkish university students. In that version, Cronbach's alpha was in the range of .70 to .83 for the subscales and .93 for the whole scale. The test–retest reliability was from .65 to .71 for the sub-scales and .62 for the whole scale.

The researchers emailed the departments' instructors to obtain their consent to facilitate the study. After receiving approval, the researchers made arrangements with the instructors and conducted the study in their classes. First, the purpose of the research was explained to the students, and volunteers were recruited to participate. A research assistant was always available to provide assistance to the students and to ensure confidential, independent responses. The participants completed the scales in approximately 40 min.

Data Analysis

This study aimed to investigate the predictive roles of emotional self-efficacy and interpersonal sensitivity on psychological resilience. This main goal of the study was analyzed in two-step process. First the Pearson's correlational analysis was conducted to test relationship between predictor and independent variables. Second, simultaneous multiple regression analysis was performed to address the predictive power of independent variables.

During a simultaneous multiple regression analysis, the assumptions for regression were first examined. The relationship between predictor and independent variables was linear with a normal distribution. In accordance with the principle of multicollinearity, the tolerance value was greater than .20, and the variance inflation factor of the predictor variables did not have a high correlation.

Results

As results of Pearson's correlational analysis of the relationship between dependent and predictor variables, mean and standard deviation values were reported (Table 1). Pearson's correlational analysis showed that psychological resilience had a negative linear relationship with need for approval, separation anxiety, fragile inner self, and interpersonal awareness and a positive linear relationship with using emotions to assist thoughts, perceiving emotions, understanding emotions, and emotion regulation. Perception of the future had a positive linear relationship with using emotions to assist thoughts, understanding emotions, perceiving emotions, and emotion regulation and a negative linear correlation with need for approval, separation anxiety, and interpersonal awareness.

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations of the Six Dimensions of Psychological Resilience with Interpersonal Sensitivity and Emotional Self-Efficacy (n = *331)*

Dimensions	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Psychological resilience	126.62	17.91	-.12*	-.18***	-.13*	-.23**	.03	.41**	.51**	.49**	.50***
Structural style	3.51	.85	-.04	-.08	-.08	-.11*	.01	.23**	.22**	.19**	.19***
Perception of the future	3.92	.86	-.16**	-.19***	-.11	-.21***	.01	.22**	.31**	.31**	.29***
Family cohesion	3.84	.77	-.06	-.06	.023	-.14*	.08	.15*	.22**	.24**	.28***
Perception of self	3.71	.74	-.24***	-.29***	-.31***	-.31***	-.07	.46**	.51**	.43**	.40***
Social competence	3.83	.78	.03	-.06	-.07	-.11*	-.03	.38**	.50**	.44**	.46***
Social resources	4.07	.69	-.06	-.09	-.02	-.09	.11*	.26**	.36**	.41**	.44***

Note. 1 = Interpersonal awareness, 2 = Separation anxiety, 3 = Fragile inner self, 4 = Need for approval, 5 = Timidity, 6 = Emotion regulation, 7 = Using emotion to assist thought, 8 = Understanding emotions, 9 = Perceiving emotions
*p < .05, **p < .001, ***p < .000

Family cohesion had positive relationships with perceiving emotions, understanding emotions, using emotions to assist thoughts, and emotion regulation and a negative linear relationship with need for approval. Furthermore, perception of the self positively correlated with using emotions to assist thoughts, emotion regulation, understanding emotions, and perceiving emotions and negatively correlated with need for approval, fragile inner self, separation anxiety, and interpersonal awareness. Another dependent variable, social competence, had positive relationships with using emotions to assist thoughts, perceiving emotions, understanding emotions, and emotion regulation, yet a negative correlation with need for approval. Lastly, social resources positively correlated with perceiving emotions, understanding emotions, using emotions to assist thoughts, and emotion regulation and negatively correlated with timidity (Table 1).

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the best linear combination of interpersonal awareness, separation anxiety, fragile inner self, need for approval, regulating emotions in the self and others, using emotions to assist thought, understanding emotions in the self and others, and perceiving emotions in the self and others for predicting the score of psychological resilience and its protective factors. This combination of variables predicted psychological resilience, with three variables that significantly contributed to the prediction. Using emotions to assist thought contributed the most to predicting psychological resilience; need for approval and understanding emotions and emotional knowledge in the self and others also contributed to that prediction. The adjusted R^2 value was .34, which indicates that 34% of the variance in psychological resilience was explained by the model (Table 2).

Table 2

*Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Interpersonal Sensitivity and Emotional Self-Efficacy Predicting Psychological Resilience (*N = *331)*

Variable	B	SEB	β
Interpersonal awareness	-1.485	2.682	-.033
Separation anxiety	-3.453	2.661	-.084
Fragile inner self	2.532	1.670	.090
Need for approval	-6.742	2.673	-.173*
Regulating emotions	1.260	1.792	.044
Using emotions to assist thought	7.160	2.089	.259**
Understanding emotions	4.578	2.232	.167*
Perceiving emotions	4.139	2.373	.147
Constant	85.78	7.41	

Note. $R^2 = .34$; $F(8.322) = 22.05$, $p < .000$
*$p < .05$, **$p < .001$, ***$p < .000$

Structural style was not significantly predicted by need for approval, regulating emotions in the self and others, using emotions to assist thought, understanding emotions and emotional knowledge in the self and others, or perceiving emotions in

the self and others (F[5.325] = 4.95, p < .000). The adjusted R^2 value was .06, which indicated that 6% of the variance in structural style was explained by the model.

According to multiple regression, perception of the future was predicted by using emotions to assist thought (β = .187, p < .001) and understanding emotions and emotional knowledge in the self and others (β = .182, p < .05; F[7.323] = 8.71, p < .001). The adjusted R^2 value was .14, meaning that 14% of the variance in perception of the future was explained by the model.

Combinations of variables predicted family cohesion with two variables. Perceiving emotions in the self and others (β = .234, p < .05) contributed the most to predicting family cohesion, although need for approval (β = .129, p < .05) also contributed (F[3.325] = 6.94, p < .001). The adjusted R^2 value was .08, meaning that 8% of the variance in family cohesion was explained by the model.

The combination of variables significantly predicted perception of the self, with four variables that significantly contributed to the prediction, as expected. Using emotions to assist thought contributed the most to predicting perception of the self; regulating emotions in the self and others, understanding emotions and emotional knowledge in the self and others, and separation anxiety also contributed to that prediction (Table 3). The adjusted R^2 value was .38, which means that 38% of the variance in perception of the self was explained by the model.

Social competence was significantly predicted by one variable (F[5.325] = 25.37, p < .000): using emotions to assist thought (β = .318, p < .000). The adjusted R^2 value was .27, meaning that 27% of the variance in social competence was explained by the model.

Social resources were significantly predicted by one variable (F[5.325] = 17.32, p < .000): perceiving emotions in the self and others (β = .310, p < .001. The adjusted R^2 value was .20, which indicates that 20% of the variance in social resources was explained by the model.

Table 3

*Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Interpersonal Sensitivity and Emotional Self-Efficacy Predicting Perception of the Self (*N = *331)*

Variable	B	SEB	β
Interpersonal awareness	-.155	.107	-.083
Separation anxiety	-.223	.106	-.131*
Fragile inner self	-.076	.067	-.065
Need for approval	-.176	.107	-.110
Regulating emotions	.194	.072	.163**
Using emotions to assist thought	.399	.084	.349***
Understanding emotions	.184	.089	.162*
Perceiving emotions	-.120	.095	-.103
Constant	2.904	.297	

Note: R^2 = .38; F(8.322) = 26.10; p < .000
*p < .05, **p < .001, ***p < .000

Discussion and Conclusion

The present research examined the effects of emotional self-efficacy and interpersonal sensitivity on psychological resilience among young adults. Psychological resilience and its dimensions were analyzed according to each aspect of emotional self-efficacy and interpersonal sensitivity. The results showed that emotional self-efficacy and interpersonal sensitivity significantly predicted psychological resilience.

First, analysis revealed that using emotions to assist thoughts, need for approval, and understanding emotions all predicted psychological resilience the best, in that order. Researchers have posited that emotional intelligence bears significance in psychological resilience (Buyukbayram, Arabaci, Tas, & Varol, 2016; Ozer & Deniz, 2014). Other than emotional intelligence, belief in the capability of emotion is also enhances resilience. In this study, emotional self-efficacy was the most powerful predictor of psychological resilience. According to the findings, two of emotional self-efficacy's dimensions (i.e., using emotions to assist thoughts and understanding emotions) had powerful impacts on psychological resilience. As Schwarzer and Warner (2013) have indicated, self-efficacy makes people more resilient to adverse events. To cope with traumatic experiences, individuals need to believe they have the ability to overcome the situation (Bandura, 1997). Kirk, Schutte, and Hine (2008) have defined *emotional self-efficacy* as the belief in one's ability to transform the negative emotions of negative life experiences. Thus, emotion can be a tool to transform the negative impacts of a certain experience to make oneself more resilient in stressful life events. That finding is consistent with the present research and indicates a positive relationship between emotional self-efficacy and psychological resilience.

Interpersonal sensitivity is another predictive factor of psychological resilience. Individuals become vulnerable to psychological disorders such as depression because of their excessive sensitivity to interpersonal relationships (Boyce, Hickie & Parker, 1991). People with high sensitivity in their social relationships have a greater tendency toward psychological disorders involving somatic symptoms, as well as depression, substance abuse, and Internet addiction (Erozkan, 2011; Yilmaz, Hacihasanoglu, & Cicek, 2006; Herken, Bodur, & Kara, 2000). Moreover, according to Earvolino–Ramirez (2007), interpersonal sensitivity is a protective factor for resilience. One of its dimensions, need for approval, had a significantly powerful impact on psychological resilience. As estimated in that study, higher scores on need for approval indicated lower resilience, due to the avoidance of social relationships and settings because of negative evaluations, humiliation, rejection, and exclusion, among other things. Need for approval from others can affect self-esteem and, depending on the situation, can be a vulnerability or protective factor (Rolf & Johnson, 1990). People who need excessive approval from others tend to accept others' opinions and act accordingly, which creates higher vulnerability and lower resilience. Rutter (1990) explained that positive, healthy relationships with others encourage people's beliefs in their self-capabilities. The results of all of those studies are consistent with the findings of the present study: that a greater need for approval signifies less resilience.

Second, perception of the future was predicted by using emotions to assist thoughts and by understanding emotions. Research has demonstrated that despite adverse life events, people with positive emotions are likely to be goal oriented in their plans (Moskowitz, Folkman & Acree, 2003). The ability to use emotion for cognitive processes and to understand complex emotions contributes to making sense of emotions and acting accordingly (Fredrickson, 2001). LeBlanc, McConnell, and Monteiro (2015) explained that emotions can significantly impact individuals' perceptions of the world and cognitive states, which can shape their decisions and goals. When people believe in their emotional capabilities, their perception of the future as a protective factor becomes stronger, and they view the future optimistically (Fredrickson, 2001).

Third, perception of the self was predicted by using emotions to assist thoughts, regulation of emotions, understanding emotions, and separation anxiety. Repeat emotional achievements during life events make people believe that they can deal with difficult situations in the future (Fredrickson, 2001). Hjemdal et al. (2006) found that emotional stability is importance for personal strength and self-perception. Therefore, being emotionally capable raises people's self-efficacy and self-esteem. The current study's results showed parallels with the findings of Brown and Marshall (2001), which demonstrated that self-esteem and self-perception were highly interrelated with emotions. Another factor predicting perception of self was separation anxiety, which can create vulnerability and increase the likelihood of anxiety and mood disorders (Manicavasagar, Silove & Hadzi–Pavlovic, 1998). Moreover, Prince–Embury and Saklofkse (2013) observed that resilience has relationships to feeling loved, feeling accepted by others, and having healthy interpersonal relationships with peers and adults.

Fourth, regarding family cohesion, results indicated that family cohesion was predicted by perceiving emotions and need for approval, in that order of effect. Family cohesion is a level of mutual emotional bonding among family members and is likely to become stronger when emotional closeness to children is provided (Carruth, Tate, Moffett, & Hill, 1997). Therefore, perceiving emotional cues in one's self and other family members can facilitate bonding among family members. Family members' attitudes, relationships, loyalty, and support for each other fulfill children's emotional needs and need for approval (Hjemdal et al., 2011). When children receive balanced emotional closeness, they can form an identity separate from their family while also feeling togetherness with the family. If they cannot achieve adequate approval and emotional satisfaction, then they may feel sensitive and vulnerable in their need to seek approval, first from family and second from others outside the family (Minuchin, 1975). Individuals who receive balanced emotional closeness can more easily adapt to environments and cope with situations (Metcalf, 2011). Therefore, when children's needs are not properly met, the family becomes a factor of vulnerability, though it might otherwise be a protective factor.

Fifth, the study examined social competence, which was predicted by using emotions to facilitate thought. Social interactions were affected by emotional status. Blair et al. (2015) stated that all social interactions involve emotional ability and that a

connection between them exists. Other studies have shown that negative emotions can decrease social competence increase difficulties in social relationships, and cause social anxiety (Schwartz, Snidman, & Kagan, 1999).

Sixth and lastly, results demonstrated that social resources were predicted by perceiving emotions. In the face of an adverse, traumatic situation, people need to share their emotions with significant others in order to receive support, empathy, and understanding, which contribute to their ability to cope with the events. The ability to perceive emotions in the self and others and receive support from other people increase social resources and strengthen relationships (Kumpfer, 1999). That thinking is consistent with the finding that social resources were predicted by perceiving emotions in the self and others.

Limitations and Recommendations

A few limitations of the study should be stated. First, participants were young adults living in Istanbul, Turkey. The researchers chose Istanbul for its ability to represent the Turkish population, since the city has a cosmopolitan structure. However, current circumstances vary among regions in Turkey, and different family structures, events, and immigration can affect resilience. Because of its geographic position and cultural dynamics (e.g., civil wars in neighboring countries, the impact of internal and external migration, economic and politic instability), people in Turkey have likely encountered more traumatic experiences than their counterparts in other European countries. In Turkey, the in-group mentality is crucial due to the collectivist society. In that regard, when individuals evaluate and infer from their life experiences, their interpersonal relationships and other people's viewpoints play a significant role.

Furthermore, since traditional family experiences are highly common in Turkey, starting from the early periods of an individual's life, a person learns to evaluate and react to an experience based on emotional processes instead of cognitive ones. In that context, interpersonal relationships, emotions, and forms of emotional expression play a substantial role in determining the meaning and importance of a life experience. For that reason, interpersonal relationships and emotions have an essential place in the development of psychological resilience, which is a vital phenomenon for coping with negative life experiences.

Despite those limitations, the study has several strengths. In preventive counselling field, the dimension of psychological resilience had heretofore not been examined in detail. Therefore, the study marks an important attempt to fill that gap. Furthermore, emotional self-efficacy is a developing concept, and existing research on the topic is inadequate. This study showed that emotions constitute a major phenomenon in supporting resiliency factors. For those reasons, the research is considered to have made contributions to trauma studies.

References

Aronson, E., & Wilson, T. (2005). *Social psychology* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*, 117–148. doi: 10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Basim, H. N., & Cetin, F. (2011). Yetiskinler icin psikolojik dayaniklilik olceginin guvenilirlik ve gecerlilik calismasi. [Reliability and validity studies of resilience scale for adults]. *Turk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, *22*(2), 104–114.

Bell, V., & Freeman, D. (2014). A pilot trial of cognitive behavioral therapy for interpersonal sensitivity in individuals with persecutory delusions. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, *45*(4), 441–446. doi:10.1016/j.jbtep.2014.06.001

Bianchi, R., Schonfeld, I. S., & Laurent, E. (2015). Interpersonal rejection sensitivity predicts burnout: A prospective study. *Personality and Individual Differences, 75*, 216–219. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.11.043

Blair, B. L., Perry, N. B., O'Brien, M., Calkins, S. D., Keane, S. P., & Shanahan, L. (2015). Identifying developmental cascades among differentiated dimensions of social competence and emotion regulation. *Developmental Psychology, 51*(8), 1062–1073. doi:10.1037/a0039472

Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss* (2nd ed.). London: Hogarth.

Boyce, P., Hickie, I., & Parker, G. (1991). Parents, partners or personality? Risk factors for post-natal depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 21*(4), 245–255. doi:10.1016/0165-0327(91)90004-c

Boyce, P., & Parker, G. (1989). Development of a scale to measure interpersonal sensitivity. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 23*, 341–351.

Brown, J., & Marshall, M. (2001). Self-esteem and emotion: Some thoughts about feelings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(5), 575–584. doi:10.1177/0146167201275006

Buyukbayram, A., Arabaci, L. B., Tas, G., & Varol, D. (2016). Ogrenci hemsirelerinin duygusal zekâ ve sosyotropi-otonomi kisilik ozellikleri ile psikolojik dayanikliliklari arasindaki iliski. [The relationship between the emotional intelligence and sociotropy-autonomy: Personality traits of nursing students and their resilience.] *Izmir Katip Celebi Universitesi Saglik Bilimleri Fakultesi Dergisi*, 1(3), 29–37.

Carruth, A. K., Tate, U. S., Moffett, B. S., & Hill, K. (1997). Reciprocity, emotional well-being, and family functioning as determinants of family satisfaction in

caregivers of elderly parents. *Nursing Research, 46*(2), 93–100. doi:10.1097/00006199-199703000-00006

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5 th ed.). London: Routledge- Falmer.

Cummings-Robeau, T. L., Lopez, F. G., & Rice, K. G. (2009). Attachment-related predictors of college students' problems with interpersonal sensitivity and aggression. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *28*(3), 364–391. doi:10.1521/jscp.2009.28.3.364

Curtis, W., & Cicchetti, D. (2007). Emotion and resilience: A multilevel investigation of hemispheric electroencephalogram asymmetry and emotion regulation in maltreated and non-maltreated children. *Development and Psychopathology, 19*, 811–811. doi: 10.1017/s0954579407000405

Earvolino-Ramirez, M. (2007). Resilience: A concept analysis. *Nursing Forum, 42*(2), 73–82.

Erozkan, A. (2005). Universite ögrencilerinin kişilerarasi duyarlilik ve depresyon duzeylerinin bazi degiskenlere gore incelenmesi. [Reliability and validity studies of resilience scale for adults.]. *Mugla Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi, 14,* 129-155.

Erozkan, A. (2011). Sosyal kayginin kaygi duyarligi, benlik saygisi ve kisilerarasi duyarlık acisindan incelenmesi. [Investigation of social anxiety with regards to anxiety sensitivity, self-esteem, and interpersonal sensitivity.]. *İlkogretim Online, 10*(1), 338-347.

Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Psychological resilience: A review and critique of definitions, concepts, and theory. *European Psychologist, 18*(1), 12–23. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000124

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 218–226. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Greenberg, L. (2002). *Emotion-focused therapy: Coaching clients to work through their feelings*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Herken, H., Bodur, S., & Kara, F. (2000). Universite ogrencisi kizlarda madde kullanimi ile kisilik ve ruhsal belirti iliskisi. [Assessment of the relationship between personality and psychiatric symptoms and substance abuse in the female university students.]. *Klinik Psikiyatri Dergisi, 3*, 40–45.

Hjemdal, O., Friborg, O., Braun, S., Kempenaers, C., Linkowski, P., & Fossion, P. (2011). The resilience scale for adults: Construct validity and measurement in a Belgian sample. *International Journal of Testing, 11*, 53–70. doi:10.1080/15305058.2010.508570

Hjemdal, O., Friborg, O., Stiles, T., Rosenvinge, J., & Martinussen, M. (2006). Resilience predicting psychiatric symptoms: A prospective study of protective factors and their role in adjustment to stressful life events. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy, 13*(3), 194–201. doi: 10.1002/cpp.488

Kirk, B. A., Schutte, N. S., & Hine, D. W. (2008). Development and preliminary validation of an emotional self-efficacy scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *45*(5), 432–436. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.06.010

Kumpfer, K. L. (1999). Factors and processes contributing to resilience: The resilience framework. In M. D. Glantz & J. L. Johnson (Eds.), *Resilience and development: Positive life adaptations* (pp. 179–224). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

LeBlanc, V. R., McConnell, M. M., & Monteiro, S. D. (2015). Predictable chaos: A review of the effects of emotions on attention, memory, and decision making. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 20*(1), 265–282. doi:10.1007/s10459-014-9516-6

Libório, R., & Ungar, M. (2014). Resilience as protagonism: Interpersonal relationships, cultural practices, and personal agency among working adolescents in Brazil. *Journal of Youth Studies, 17*(5), 682–696. doi:10.1080/13676261.2013.834313

Luthar, S. S. (2006). Resilience in development: A synthesis of research across five decades. In D. Cichetti & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental Psychopathology Volume 3: Risk Disorder and Adaptation* (2 nd ed., pp. 696–739). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Manicavasagar, V., Silove, D., & Hadzi-Pavlovic, D. (1998). Subpopulations of early separation anxiety: Relevance to risk of adult anxiety disorders. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 48*, 181–190. doi:10.1016/S0165-0327(97)00170-5

Masten, A., Best, K., & Garmezy, N. (1990). Resilience and development: Contributions from the study of children who overcome adversity. *Development and Psychopathology, 2*, 425–425. doi:10.1017/S0954579400005812

Masten, A., & Wright, M. (2010). Resilience over the lifespan: Developmental perspectives on resistance, recovery, and transformation. In J. Reich, A. Zautra, & J. Stuart (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience* (pp. 213–237). New York: Guilford Press.

Metcalf, L. (2011). *Marriage and family therapy a practice-oriented approach*. New York, NY: Springer Pub.

Moskowitz, J. T., Folkman, S., & Acree, M. (2003). Do positive psychological states shed light on recovery from bereavement? Findings from a 3-year longitudinal study. *Death Studies*, *27*, 471–500. doi:10.1080/07481180302885

Minuchin, S. (1975). A conceptual model of psychosomatic illness in children. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 32*(8), 1031.doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1975.01760260095008

Otani, K., Suzuki, A., Ishii, G., Matsumoto, Y., & Kamata, M. (2008). Relationship of interpersonal sensitivity with dimensions of the temperament and character inventory in healthy subjects. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *49*(2), 184–187. doi:10.1016/j.comppsych.2007.09.004

Ozer, E. & Deniz, M. E. (2014). Universite ogrencilerinin psikolojik saglamlik duzeylerinin duygusal zeka acisindan incelenmesi. [An investigation of university students' resilience level on the view of trait emotional EQ.]. *Ilkögretim Online*, *13*(4), 1240–1248.

Pool, L. D., & Qualter, P. (2011). The dimensional structure of the emotional self-efficacy scale (ESES). *Australian Journal of Psychology, 64*(3), 147–154. doi:10.1111/j.1742-9536.2011.00039.x

Prince-Embury, S., & Saklofske, D. (2013). Translating resilience theory for application: Introduction. In S. Embury & D. Saklofske (Eds.), *Resilience in children, adolescents, and adults: Translating research into practice* (pp. 3–7). New York: Springer Science Business Media.

Rolf, J. & Johnson, J. (1990). Protected or vulnerable: The challenges of AIDS to developmental psychopathology. In J. Rolf, A. Masten, D. Cicchetti, K. Nuechterlein, & S. Weintraub (Eds.), *Risk and protective factors in the development of psychopathology* (pp. 384–404). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Rutter, M. (1990). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. In J. Rolf, A. Masten, D. Cicchetti, K. Nuechterlein, & S. Weintraub (Eds.), *Risk and protective factors in the development of psychopathology* (pp. 181–214). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Schwartz, C. E., Snidman, N., & Kagan, J. (1999). Adolescent social anxiety as an outcome of inhibited temperament in childhood. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 38*, 1008–1015. doi:10.1097/00004583-199908000-00017

Schwarzer, R., & Warner, L. M. (2013). Perceived self-efficacy and its relationship to resilience. In S. Prince-Embury & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.), *The Springer series on human exceptionality: Resilience in children, adolescents, and adults: Translating research into practice* (pp. 139-150). Springer New York.

Stafford, L. (2007). Interpersonal rejection sensitivity: Toward exploration of a construct. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 28*(4), 359–372. doi:10.1080/01612840701244250

Totan, T., Ikiz, E., & Karaca, R. (2011). Duygusal oz-yeterlik ölceginin Turkceye uyarlanarak tek ve dort faktorlu yapisinin psikometrik ozelliklerinin incelenmesi [Turkish adaptation of the emotional self-efficacy scale: Psychometric properties of the single and four-factor structure.]. *Buca Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, *28*, 71–95.

William, S. (1995). Self-efficacy and anxiety and phobic disorders. In J. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation and adjustment: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 69–107). New York: Plenum Press.

Wilson, J. & Agaibi, C., & (2006). The resilient trauma survivor. In J. Wilson (Ed.), *The posttraumatic self-restoring meaning and wholeness to personality* (pp. 369–399). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

Yilmaz, S., Hacihasanoğlu, R., & Cicek, Z. (2006). Hemsirelerin genel ruhsal durumlarinin incelenmesi. [The Analysis of the General Psychological Conditions of Nurses.]. *Sted, 15*(6), 92–97.

Zautra, A., Hall, J., & Murray, K. (2010). Resilience: A new definition of health for people and communities. In J. Reich, A. Zautra, & J. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience* (pp. 3–34). New York: Guilford Press.

Genç Yetişkinlerde Psikolojik Dayanıklılığın Duygusal Öz-Yeterlik ve Kişilerarası Duyarlılık Perspektifinden İncelenmesi

Atıf:

Aydogdu, B. N., Celik, H., & Eksi, H. (2017). The predictive role of interpersonal sensitivity and emotional self-efficacy on psychological resilience among young adults. *Eurosian Journal of Educational Research*, *69*, 37-54. http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2017.69.3

Özet

Problem Durumu: Yaşamın kaçınılmaz gerçeklerinden biri travmatik yaşantılardır. Faklı gelişim dönemlerinde hemen hemen herkes şu veya bu şekilde travmatik sayılacak düzeyde deneyimlerden geçer. Bu deneyimlere karşı verilen tepkiler, dışsal ve içsel faktörlere göre değişiklik gösterir. Olumsuz deneyimlerin olumlu sonuçlara dönüştürülmesi için sahip olunması gereken koruyucu faktörler, psikolojik dayanıklılık kavramını gün yüzüne çıkarır. Psikolojik dayanıklılık, pek çok faktöre bağlı olarak gelişen bir mekanizmadır. Bu mekanizmayı etkileyen önemli faktörlerden biri, travmatik olaylar sonucunda oluşabilecek olumsuz duyguları dönüştürebilme inancı olarak kabul edilen duygusal öz-yeterliliktir. İnsanların duygularını algılaması, duygularını anlaması, bunları düşünceye yardımcı bir araç olarak kullanması ve duygularını düzenleyebilmesi duygusal öz-yeterliği oluşturan temel bileşenlerdir. Psikolojik dayanıklılık üzerinde etkisi olduğu düşünülen bir diğer faktör ise kişilerarası duyarlılıktır. Kişilerarası duyarlılık diğer kişilerin tutum ve tavırlarının yanlış yorumlamasına neden olan kişilik özelliği olarak tanımlanır. İlişkilerde olumlu ve sağlıklı iletişime sahip olmak, güçlü kişilerarası bağlantıların oluşumuna zemin hazırlar. Bu durum, psikolojik dayanıklılıkları açısından bireylere koruyucu bir faktör olarak kalkan görevi görür. Öte yandan başkalarıyla kurulan olumsuz ve gerginlik unsuru olan bağlar, psikolojik dayanıklılık için risk faktörü olarak kabul edilir. Bu açılardan değerlendirildiğinde, duygusal öz-yeterlik ve

kişilerarası duyarlılığın, psikolojik dayanıklılık üzerinde önemli bir etki gücü olduğu düşünülmektedir.

Amaç: Bu bağlamda bu çalışma, duygusal öz-yeterlik ve kişilerarası duyarlılık özelliklerinin genç yetişkinlerin psikolojik dayanıklılıkları üzerinde bir etki gücüne sahip olup olmadığı ve sahipse bu etkinin derecesini inceleme üzerine yapılandırılmıştır.

Yöntem: Araştırmanın örneklemini 2014-2015 eğitim öğretim döneminde Marmara Üniversitesi'nde öğrenim görmekte olan genç yetişkinlerden oluşturmaktadır. Basit seçkisiz örnekleme yönteminin kullanıldığı çalışmada, yaşları 18-34 arasında değişen *(ss:3.48,* $\overline{X}$ *: 21.26)* 331 genç yetişkine (243 bayan, 88 bay) ulaşılmıştır. İlişkisel tarama modelinin kullanıldığı bu çalışmada araştırmanın amaçlarını test etmek için Eş Zamanlı Çoklu Regresyon analizinden yararlanılmıştır.

Bulgular: Araştırmanın amaçları doğrultusunda yapılan analizler neticesinde duygusal öz-yeterlik (duyguları anlama ve duyguları düşünceye destekleyici olarak kullanma alt boyutları) ile kişilerarası duyarlılığın (onaylanma ihtiyacı alt boyutu) birlikte, psikolojik dayanıklılığın toplam varyansının % 34'ünü açıkladığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Psikolojik dayanıklılığın alt boyutlar bazında ise elde edilen bulgular şu şekildedir: duyguları düşünceye destekleyici olarak kullanma ve duyguları anlama birlikte gelecek algısının toplam varyansının %14'ünü, onaylanma ihtiyacı ve duyguları algılama boyutları birlikte aile uyumunun toplam varyansının %8'ini, ayrılma anksiyetesi, duygu düzenleme, duyguları düşünceye destekleyici olarak kullanma ve duyguları anlama boyutları birlikte kendilik algısının toplam varyansının %38'ini, duyguları düşünceye destekleyici olarak kullanma boyutu tek başına sosyal yeterliliğin toplam varyansının %27'sini ve son olarak duyguları anlama boyutu yine tek başına sosyal kaynakların toplam varyansının %20'sini anlamlı şekilde yordamıştır. Buna karşın psikolojik dayanıklılığın diğer alt boyutu olan yapısal sitil, duygusal öz-yeterlik ve kişilerarası duyarlılık tarafından anlamlı bir şekilde açıklanmamıştır

Sonuç ve Öneriler: Bu çalışma genç yetişkinlerin duygusal öz-yeterlik ve kişilerarası duyarlılıklarının sahip oldukları psikolojik dayanıklılık özellikleri üzerinde belirleyici etkilerinin olduğunu açıkça ortaya koymaktadır. Travmatik deneyim karşısında yaşanan zorluklarla başa çıkabilmek için, insanlar durumun üstesinden gelme yeteneğine sahip olduklarına inanmak zorundadırlar. İnsanlar kişilerarası ilişkilere aşırı duyarlı hale geldikleri zaman çeşitli psikolojik rahatsızlıklar karşısında savunmasız kalırlar. Kişilerarası ilişkilerde beklenilen onaylanma ihtiyacı, düşük düzey dayanıklılığın bir göstergesidir. Bu durum ise olumsuz değerlendirilme, küçük düşürülme, reddedilme, dışlama vb. nedenlerden ötürü sosyal ilişkilerden kaçınma ve uzaklaşmaya yol açar. Araştırmanın önemli bulgularından biri, duyguları düşünceye yardımcı bir araç olarak kullanma ve duyguları anlamanın gelecek algısı üzerindeki belirleyici etkisidir. Duygular kişinin bilişsel algılarını dolaysıyla kararlarını ve hedeflerini belirler, dolayısıyla gelecek algısını şekillendirir. Araştırmanın bir diğer önemli bulgusu duyguları düşünceye yardımcı bir araç olarak kullanma, duygu düzenleme, duyguları anlama ve ayrılma anksiyetesinin birlikte

kendilik algısın üzerinde yordayıcı etkisi olduğu yönündedir. Yaşam olayları karşısında duygusal başarıların tekrarlanması, insanları gelecekte zor durumlarla baş edebileceklerine inanmalarını sağlar. Duygusal açıdan tutarlı ve istikrarlı olmanın kişisel güç ve kendilik algısı üzerinde belirleyici bir rolü vardır. Bu nedenledir ki, duygusal açıdan yetenekli olabilme insanların öz-yeterlik ve benlik saygısı olumlu yönde etki eder. Buna karşın kişilerarası ilişkilerde deneyimlenen ayrılma anksiyetesi benlik algısını zayıflatır. Çünkü ayrılma kaygısı insanlar için savunmasızlık yaratır, kaygı ve duygudurum bozuklukları olasılığını artırır.

Araştırmada elde edilen bir diğer sonuç ise duyguları anlama ve onaylanma ihtiyacının aile uyumu üzerindeki yordayıcı etkisidir. Çocukların ihtiyaçları tam karşılanmadığında, koruyucu bir faktör olması gereken aile ne yazık ki bir savunmasızlık/kırılganlık faktörüne dönüşür.

Çalışmanın bir diğer bulgusu ise duyguları düşünceye yardımcı bir araç olarak kullanmanın sosyal yeterlik üzerindeki yordayıcı etkisidir. Duygular, sosyal etkileşimler üzerinde belirleyicidir. Tüm sosyal etkileşimler duygusal yeteneği içerir ve aralarında güçlü bir bağlantı vardır. Olumsuz duygular sosyal yeterliliğin azalmasına, sosyal ilişkilerde güçlükler yaşanmasına ve sosyal kaygıya yol açar.

Bu çalışmada elde edilen son bulgu ise duyguları anlamanın psikolojik dayanıklılığın alt boyutlarından sosyal kaynaklar üzerinde yordayıcı etkisinin olduğu yönündedir. Olumsuz ve travmatik bir durum karşısında, insanların duygularını başkalarıyla paylaşarak destek alabilmeleri gerekebilir. Kendinin ve başkalarının duyguları algılama ve diğer insanlardan destek alma sosyal kaynakları artırır ve ilişkileri kuvvetlendirir.

Coğrafi konumu nedeniyle savaş ve terör olaylarıyla karşılaşma, sosyo-politik alandaki hızlı ve beklenmedik değişimler ve aile içindeki dalgalanmalar gibi etmenler ülkemizdeki bireylerin travmaya maruz kalma olasılıklarını ne yazık ki güçlendirmektedir. Bu noktada psikolojik dayanıklılığın önemi daha da güçlü olur. Bu çalışma genç yetişkinlerin psikolojik dayanıklılık özelliklerinin duygusal öz-yeterlik ve kişilerarası duyarlılık özelliklerine göre şekillendiği açıkça ortaya koymaktadır. Ne var ki psikolojik dayanıklılık bu bağlamda ele alınarak ayrıntılı bir şekilde incelenmemiştir. Bu çalışma alandaki bu boşluğu bir açıdan doldurabilecek niteliktedir. Ayrıca, duygusal öz-yeterlik gelişmekte olan bir kavramdır ve amprik çalışmalarla desteklenmesine ihtiyaç vardır. Bu çalışma duyguların, psikolojik dayanıklılığı açıklamada temel olgu olduğunu işaret etmekte olup alanda yapılacak yeni çalışmalarla desteklenmesi gerekmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Psikolojik dayanıklılık, kişilerarası duyarlılık, öz-yeterlik, genç yetişkinler.