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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.
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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 ($\alpha = .86$) 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, and emotion regulation and a negative linear correlation with need for approval, separation anxiety, and interpersonal awareness.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological resilience</td>
<td>126.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural style</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the future</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.16***</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family cohesion</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of self</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social competence</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social resources</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.44***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 and emotional knowledge 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

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

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 \( (\beta = .187, p < .001) \) and understanding emotions and emotional knowledge in the self and others \( (\beta = .182, p < .05; F[7.323] = 8.71, p < .001) \). 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 \( (\beta = .234, p < .05) \) contributed the most to predicting family cohesion, although need for approval \( (\beta = .129, p < .05) \) 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 \( (\beta = .318, p < .000) \). 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 \( (\beta = .310, p < .001) \). 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)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal awareness</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation anxiety</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.131*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragile inner self</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for approval</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulating emotions</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.163**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using emotions to assist thought</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.349***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding emotions</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving emotions</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (Eroçkan, 2011; Yilmaz, Hacihasanoglu, & Cicok, 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 realistically (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 important 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 Saklofske (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.
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**Genç Yetişkinlerde Psikolojik Dayanıklılığın Duygusal Öz-Yeterlik ve Kişilerarası Duyarlılık Perspektifinden İncelenmesi**

**Atıf:**

**Özet**


Bu açıdan 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 duyarlığın genç yetişkinlerin psikolojik dayanıklılıkları üzerinde bir etki gücünde olup olmadığı ve sahipse bu etkinin derecesini inceleme üzerine yapılandırılmıştır.


**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 alt boyutları toplam varyansının %14’ünü, onaylanma ihtiyacı ve duygular algılama alt boyutları birlikte olanların toplam varyansının %8’ini, ayrılma anksiyeti, duyguları düzenlemeye, duyguları düşünceye destekleyici olarak kullanma ve duyguları algılama alt boyutları birlikte kendiliğin alt boyutlarını toplam varyansının %38’ini, duyguları düşünceye destekleyici olarak kullanma alt boyutları toplam varyansının %27’ini ve son olarak duyguları algılama alt boyutları birlikte olanların toplam varyansının %20’ini anlamlı şekilde yordamıştır. Buna karşın psikolojik dayanıklılığın diğer alt boyutlar olan yapalı situ, duygusal öz-yeterlik ve kişilerarası duyarlılık tarafından anlamlı bir şekilde açıklanamamıştır.


Araştırmada elde edilen bir diğer sonuç ise duyguların ani ve onaylanma ihtiyacı üzerindeki yordayıcı etkisidir. Çocukların ihtiyaçlarını tam karşılayan aile, koruyucu bir faktör olması gereken aile ne yazık ki bir savunmasızlık/kırılganlık faktörüne dönüşür. Çalışmanın bir diğer bulgusu ise duyguları anlama ve onaylanma ihtiyacı üzerindeki yordayıcı etkisidir. Duygular, sosyal etkileşimler üzerinde belirleyicidir. Tüm sosyal etkileşimler duygusal yeteneği içerir ve aralarında güçlü bir bağlılık vardır. Olumsuz duygular sosyal yeterlilik azalmasına, sosyal ilişkilere güçlükler yaşamasına ve sosyal kaygıyı yol açar.

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


Anahtar Sözcükler: Psikolojik dayanıklılık, kişisel gelişimli duyarlılık, öz-yeterlilik, genç yetişkinler.