



## Ergenlerde Psikolojik Sağlık Düzeyinin Yordayıcısı Olarak Aile İçi İletişim Örüntüleri

## Family Communication Patterns as a Predictor of Psychological Resilience Level in Adolescents

Şeyda Işık Gökçe, Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Türkiye, sydaa2641@gmail.com, Orcid: 0009-0003-5096-6831  
Doç. Dr. Erhan Tunç, Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Türkiye, erhantunc25@gmail.com, Orcid: 0000-0002-6328-8545

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14228672>

Geliş Tarihi: 27.10.2024

Kabul Tarihi: 17.11.2024

Yayınlanma Tarihi: 27.11.2024

**Özet:** İlişkisel tarama modeliyle desenlenen bu çalışmada ile ergenlerde psikolojik sağlık düzeyi aile içi iletişim kalıpları açısından incelenmektedir. Çalışmaya, basit tesadüfi örnekleme ile ulaşılan, 333'ü kadın 181'i erkek olmak üzere toplam 514 ergen katılmıştır. Veri toplama araçları olarak Kişisel Bilgi Formu, Aile İletişim Kalıpları Ölçeği ve Çocuk ve Genç Psikolojik Sağlık Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada grubun normallik değerleri doğrultusunda analizler yapılmış ve elde edilen sonuçlar alan yazın ışığında tartışılmıştır. Yapılan analizler sonucunda; Diyalog boyutundan elde edilen puanların kardeş sayısı 2-3 olanlar, yüksek gelir düzeyinde algısı olanlar, annesi okur yazar olmayan ama babası üniversite mezunu olanlar, ebeveyni birlikte olanlar ve Anadolu lisesi türünde okulda öğrenci olanlar yönünde anlamlı derecede farklılaştığı görülmüştür. Uyum boyutundan elde edilen puanların 15 yaş grubunda olanlar, düşük algılanan düzeyinde algısı olanlar, annesi okur yazar olmayan ama babası üniversite mezunu olanlar yönünde anlamlı derecede farklılaştığı görülmüştür. Psikolojik sağlık puanlarının da kadınlar, yüksek algılanan gelir düzeyinde algısı olanlar, annesi okur yazar olmayan ama babası üniversite mezunu olanlar, ebeveyni birlikte olanlar ve Anadolu lisesi türünde okulda öğrenci olanlar yönünde anlamlı derecede farklılaştığı görülmüştür.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Ergenlik, psikolojik sağlık, aile iletişim kalıpları

**Abstract:** In this study, which was designed with relational screening model, the level of psychological resilience in adolescents is examined in terms of family communication patterns. A total of 514 adolescents, 333 females and 181 males, reached by simple random sampling, participated in the study. Personal Information Form, Family Communication Patterns Scale and Child and Youth Resilience Scale were used as data collection tools. In the study, the normality values of the group were analyzed and the results obtained were discussed in the light of the literature. As a result of the analyses, it was seen that the scores obtained from the Dialogue dimension differed significantly in the direction of those with 2-3 siblings, those with a high income level perception, those whose mother was illiterate but whose father was a university graduate, those whose parents were together and those who were students in Anatolian high school type school. It was observed that the scores obtained from the adjustment dimension differed significantly in the direction of those in the 15 age group, those with low perceived level of perception, those whose mother was illiterate but whose father was a university graduate. The psychological resilience scores were significantly differentiated in the direction of women, those with a high perceived income level, those whose mother was illiterate but whose father was a university graduate, those whose parents were together, and those who were students at Anatolian high school type schools.

**Key Words:** Adolescent, psychological resilience, family communication patterns

## Introduction

Many traumatic, challenging and disturbing life events are encountered throughout life. The perspectives and coping styles of individuals exposed to these events differ from each other. Some individuals may be affected by distressing events more quickly and experience emotional and behavioral problems and have to struggle with these problems for a long time. Some individuals, on the other hand, adapt to challenging life events in a short time, recover quickly and continue to lead a normal life. The ability of individuals to quickly adapt to changes in their lives and their potential to maintain their normal lives is expressed by the concept of psychological resilience. (Doğan, 2015). In order to talk about psychological resilience, individuals should face challenging life events and have risk factors. (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000) and should be able to get out of the negative situations in a short time and continue their normal life. (Ramirez, 2007). Similarly, according to Vanderpol (2002), psychological resilience is the ability not to deteriorate mentally after being exposed to traumatic experiences or to continue living without showing symptoms of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. Psychological resilience is discussed in terms of risk and protective factors. Garmezy (1993) stated that research on psychological resilience should be addressed in terms of two questions.

1. What are the risk factors from childhood, family and environment that distress and traumatize individuals?
2. What are the protective factors that facilitate adaptation to risk situations?

Gizir (2007) listed the familial risk factors addressed in psychological resilience research as follows: Having parents with chronic and serious illnesses, separation of parents or living with only one of the parents, adolescent pregnancy, being a mother during adolescence, being adopted, having a parent who has committed a crime or substance abuse, being abused by family members, parents' education level, inadequate communication within the family.

Kaygas and Özbay (2023) also reported a significant negative relationship between conflict frequency and relationship satisfaction.

Within the protective factors, family-related items are listed as follows:

**Parental Attitudes:** The attitude of the family while raising children, respecting the different aspects of the child and acting in an accepting manner are important for psychological resilience (Kararmak, 2006; Çataloğlu, 2011).

**Home Environment:** Family members who are not crowded and maintain their functions in a healthy way will have higher psychological resilience (Masten & Reed, 2002, Çataloğlu, 2011).

**Specific Family Members:** Establishing a more intimate relationship with at least one family member, emotional closeness is important for psychological resilience. This family member was found to be mostly the mother (Çataloğlu, 2011).

Adolescence is an important turning point where the existence of individuals develops and many developments about life occur. (Santrock, 2012). During adolescence, the individual experiences strong physical and hormonal differences in his/her body and these differences lead to an emotional adaptation process. At the same time, mental, intellectual and logical changes also occur. (Bayhan & Işıtan, 2010) Changes experienced during this period may cause some adaptation problems for adolescents (Santrock, 2012). Individuals learn many basic characteristics reflected in their behaviors, thoughts and social characteristics from their families, and the contribution of the family to the child's psychological, physical and cognitive development is very important. The existence of a family structure that respects the child's personality and ideas, establishes healthy communication and provides opportunities will ensure the healthy development of the child. (Vural, 2004). When parents allow and support children to express themselves, children become active in their social life and become individuals with high self-esteem (Tezel, 2004). However, it is very difficult for parents to understand their children during adolescence. Many adolescents feel that they are not

understood by their parents when parents judge their children, emphasize their mistakes and try to correct them instead of trying to understand them. In this way, during adolescence, there may be some breakdowns in communication within the family. Adolescents may be in conflict with their families and the intensity of these conflicts may cause permanent damage in the family in the future (Zarrett & Eccles, 2006). For this reason, it can be said that adolescents' psychological resilience is important in this period and their psychological resilience should be increased.

As it is understood from the reviewed literature, it has been observed that the concept of family communication patterns and psychological resilience are related at many points. When the literature was examined, it was seen that the studies on psychological resilience were mostly related to parental attitudes (Özen, 2019; Çalışkan, 2020; Karakoç, 2022, Balaban Öztürk, 2023) and attachment styles (Gündaş, 2013; Kır, Özteke Kozan & Koç, 2021; Bilge, 2019; Karadeniz Özgeniş, 2024) rather than studies in which the concept of family communication patterns and the concept of psychological resilience are together. There are also studies examining the level of psychological resilience in terms of family functions (Ekinci, 2017; Topbay, 2016). According to Topbay (2016), individuals with healthy family functions had higher levels of psychological resilience than those with unhealthy family functions. Çetintaş (2021) evaluated psychological resilience in terms of family life satisfaction and concluded that as the family life satisfaction of adolescents increased, their psychological resilience increased. From this point of view, it is seen that the effect of family on psychological resilience is quite high.

In this context, looking at the protective and risk factors, it is noteworthy that the family can both positively affect psychological resilience in the individual's life and can be a threat to psychological resilience. Family, which is the first communication sources of individuals, is important for the development of psychological resilience as the environment where the individual learns to cope with interpersonal relationships, harmony and problems. In this direction, it is seen that communication patterns within the family are related to the psychological resilience of the individual. In this study, in which family communication patterns were examined as a predictor of psychological resilience levels of adolescents, psychological resilience and family communication levels were also examined in terms of some demographic variables (gender, number of siblings, monthly income of the family, mother's educational status, father's educational status, and school of education).

## **Method**

### ***Research Model***

In this study, in which intra-familial communication patterns were examined as a predictor of adolescents' psychological resilience levels, psychological resilience and intra-familial communication levels were examined in terms of some demographic variables, quantitative research design was used and it was designed on the basis of the relational screening model within the screening model.

### ***Research Group***

The population of the study consists of adolescents between the ages of 14-18. Since reaching the people who make up the research population would cause difficulties in terms of time and economy, a sample was taken from the population. The sample consists of 514 people selected by "simple random sampling" method among adolescents representing the research population.

### ***Data Collection Tool***

In the study, the Informed Consent Form, which includes information about the content of the study, the Personal Information Form developed by the researcher to reach the demographic characteristics of the participants, the Family Communication Patterns Scale adapted into Turkish by Erdoğan and Anık (2018) to determine the intra-family relations of adolescents, and the Child and Youth Resilience Scale

adapted into Turkish by Arslan (2015) to determine the psychological resilience levels of adolescents were used. Permissions were obtained for the scales used in the study by the researchers who adapted them into Turkish.

### ***Personal Information Form***

The Personal Information Form developed by the researcher consists of 8 questions about gender, age, number of siblings, perceived level, mother's education level, father's education level, parents' relationship status and the type of school attended.

### ***Family Communication Patterns Scale***

The Family Communication Patterns Scale adapted into Turkish by Erdoğan and Anık (2018) was used to determine the family relationships of adolescents. The scale has two sub-dimensions, Dialog orientation and Compliance orientation, and consists of 26 items. The first 15 items measure the Dialog orientation and the next 11 items measure the Compliance orientation dimension. The scale items are as follows: Strongly disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neutral (3), Agree (4) and Strongly agree (5). Scores obtained from Dialogue Orientation and Adaptation Orientation sub-dimensions are evaluated separately and the scale is scored. The minimum score for the Dialog Orientation sub-dimension is 15 and the maximum score is 75, while the minimum score for the Adaptation Orientation sub-dimension is 11 and the maximum score is 55. A high score on the Dialog Orientation sub-dimension represents a high dialog orientation, while a low score represents a low dialog orientation. Likewise, a high score on the Agreeableness orientation sub-dimension represents a high agreeableness orientation, while a low score represents a low agreeableness orientation. It is said that a high score on the Harmony and Dialogue orientation subscale indicates a consensus-based family structure, a low score on the Harmony and Dialogue orientation subscale indicates a liberal family structure, a high score on the Harmony orientationsubscale and a low score on the Dialogue orientation subscale indicates a protective family structure, and a high score on the Dialogue orientation subscale and a low score on the Harmony orientation subscale indicates a pluralistic family structure. In the original scale, the cronbach alpha value for reliability was found to be .84 for the Dialog orientation sub-dimension and .76 for the Adaptation orientation sub-dimension, and .71 for the Dialog orientation sub-dimension and .81 for the Adaptation orientation sub-dimension with test-retest. The cronbach alpha values of the scale adapted into Turkish were calculated as .88 for the Dialogue orientationsub-dimension and .81 for the Adaptation orientation sub-dimension. (Erdoğan & Anık, 2018).

As a result of the reliability analyses conductedfor this study, the Cronbach's alpha value for the Dialogue orientation sub-dimension of the FamilyCommunication Patterns Scale was .91 and the Cronbach's alpha value for the Complianceorientation sub-dimension was .85.

### ***Child and Youth Resilience Scale***

In order to determine the psychological resilience levels of adolescents, the Child andAdolescent Psychological Resilience Scale adapted into Turkish by Arslan (2015) was used. The items of the scale are as follows: It does not define me at all (1), It defines me very little (2), Itdefines me a little (3), It defines me quite well (4),It defines me completely (5) and a high score obtained from the scale means that the level of psychological resilience is high. The scale consistsof a single dimension and there are no reverse items. In the original form of the scale, the cronbach alpha value was found to be .84 and the cronbach alpha value of the scale adapted to Turkish was calculated as .91. (Arslan, 2015). As a result of the reliability analysis conducted for this study, the cronbach alpha value was calculated as .86.

### ***Data Analysis***

The data collected with the Personal Information Form, Family Communication Patterns Scale, and Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale were checked for missing and inaccuracies and entered into the SPSS 22 (Statistical Packet for The Social Science22) program and the necessary statistical calculations were made. Before analyzing the data, the data set was examined for outliers. According to the results obtained from Family Communication Patterns Scale Dialogue Orientation and Adaptation Orientation sub-dimensions and Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale, it was determined that there werenoutliers. It was determined that the distributionspread between -3 and +3 in terms of all

three scores. In the skewness kurtosis coefficient analysis conducted to determine the normality of the distribution, it was determined that the distribution of Family Communication Patterns Scale Dialogue Orientation and Adaptation Orientation sub-dimensions and Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale scores was distributed between -1 and +1, so the distribution showed normal distribution characteristics. Therefore, parametric tests were used in the analyses and the significance of the difference between the groups was examined. Reliability assessment of the participants' responses to the scale items was made by cronbach alpha analysis. The value obtained from the dialog orientation sub-dimension of the Family Communication Patterns Scale was .91. The value obtained from the Turkish adaptation of the scale for this sub- dimension was .88. The value obtained from the Family Communication Patterns Scale AdaptationOrientation sub-dimension was .85. It was seen that the value obtained in the study in which the scale was adapted to Turkish for this sub- dimension was .81. The value obtained from the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale was calculated to be .86, and the cronbach alpha value was .91 in the study adapted to Turkish.

### Findings and Comments

In this section of the study, the findings obtained as a result of analyzing the data collected within the scope of the research and the interpretation of the findings are presented. Within the scope of the study, the relationship between the mean scores of adolescents from the Family Communication Patterns Scale and the Child and Adolescent Psychological Resilience Scale was evaluated by Pearson Correlation Analysis and the results of the analysis are given in Table-1.

**Table 1.** Correlation values between variables

	Harmony	Psychological Resilience
Dialogue	-,531**	,680**
Harmony		-,462**

19

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that Dialogue dimension and Cohesion dimension of Family Communication Patterns Scale are inversely proportional, Cohesion dimension of Family Communication Patterns Scale and Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale are inversely proportional, Dialogue dimension of Family Communication Patterns Scale and Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale are directly proportional.

The results of the independent samples t-Test on whether the average scores of the adolescents obtained from the data collection tools differed according to gender are given in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Results of t-test analysis according to gender

Scales	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	S.x	t	p
Dialogue	Woman	333	45,489	12,500	1,844	,066
	Male	181	43,364	12,432		
Harmony	Woman	333	36,933	8,945	-,124	,901
	Male	181	37,033	8,093		
Psychological Resilience	Woman	333	40,834	8,645	2,457	,014*
	Male	181	38,707	10,599		

\*p<.05

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference between the scores obtained from the Dialogue and Harmony sub- dimensions of the Family Communication Patterns scale

according to the gender of the adolescents, while there is a significant difference in favor of women according to the results obtained from the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience scale.

The results of the ANOVA Test on whether the average scores of adolescents from the data collection tools differed according to age are given in Table 3.

**Table 3.** ANOVA test analysis results according to age

Scales		Sum of squares	Mean squares	Sd.	F	p	Significant difference
Dialogue	Intergroup	570,105	142,526	4	.911	.457	
	In-group	79658,481	156,500				
	Total	80228,586					
Harmony	Intergroup	781,164	195,291	4	2,645	.033	15>17
	In-group	37578,338	73,828			*	
	Total	38359,502					
Psychological Resilience	Intergroup	400,287	100,072	4	1,128	.343	
	In-group	45167,947	88,739				
	Total	45568,233					

\*p<.05

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference between the scores obtained from the Dialogue dimension, which is a sub-dimension of the Family Communication Patterns Scale, and the Child and Adolescent Psychological Resilience Scale according to the age of the adolescents, while there is a significant difference between the scores obtained from the Cohesion dimension, which is a sub-dimension of the Family Communication Patterns Scale, according to age. As a result of the Post Hoc test (Scheffie) conducted to determine the source of the significant difference in the Adaptation dimension of the Family Communication Patterns Scale, this difference was found to be higher between the 15 and 17 age group in the direction of the 15 age group.

The results of the Independent Samples t-test on whether the average scores of the adolescents from the data collection tools differed according to the number of siblings are given in Table 4.

**Table 4.** ANOVA test analysis results according to the number of siblings

Scales	Number of siblings	N	$\bar{X}$	S.S	t	p
Dialogue	2-3 brothers	265	46,350	12,342		
	More than 3	249	43,028	12,474	3,035	,003*
Harmony	2-3 brothers	265	35,856	8,580		
	More than 3	249	38,152	8,577	-3,032	,003*
Psychological Resilience	2-3 brothers	265	40,626	8,994		
	More than 3	249	39,510	9,848	1,343	,180

\*p<.05

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference between the scores obtained from the Dialogue and Harmony sub- dimensions of the Family Communication Patterns scale according to the number of siblings of the adolescents, and that there is a high difference in the dialogue dimension in the direction of those with 2-3 siblings, and in the harmony dimension in the direction of those with more than 3 siblings. Child and Youth Psychological Resilience scale There was no significant difference between the scores obtained according to the number of siblings.

The results of the ANOVA Test on whether the average scores of adolescents from the data collection

tools differed according to their perceived level are given in Table 5

**Table 5.** ANOVA test analysis results according to perceived income level

Scales		Sum of squares	Mean squares	Sd.	F	p	Significant difference
Dialogue	Intergroup	1650,199	825,100	2	5,366	,005*	High>Medium>Low
	In-group	78578,386	153,774				
	Total	80228,586					
Harmony	Intergroup	569,598	284,799	2	3,851	,022*	Low>High>Medium
	In-group	37789,904	73,953				
	Total	38359,502					
Psychological Resilience	Intergroup	1625,715	812,759	2	9,451	,000*	High>Medium>Low
	In-group	43942,715	85,994				
	Total	45568,233					

\*p<.05

When Table 5 is examined; it is determined that there is a significant difference between the scores obtained from the Dialogue and Cohesion dimension, which are the sub-dimensions of the Family Communication Patterns Scale, and the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale according to the perceived level of the adolescents. As a result of the Post Hoc test (Scheffie) conducted to determine the source of the significant difference, it was found that this difference was high in the direction of those with high income level in the Dialogue dimension, high in the direction of those with low perceived level in the Adaptation dimension, and high in the direction of those with good perceived level in the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience scale.

The results of the ANOVA Test regarding whether the average scores of the adolescents from the data collection tools differed according to their mother's education level are given in Table 6.

21

**Table 6.** ANOVA test analysis results according to mother's education level

Scales		Sum of squares	Mean squares	Sd.	F	p	Significant difference
Dialogue	Intergroup	3806,064	951,516	4	6,337	,000*	Illiterate < Secondary School, High School
	In-group	76422,522	150,142				
	Total	80228,586					
Harmony	Intergroup	1321,662	330,416	4	4,541	,001*	Illiterate < High school
	In-group	37037,840	72,766				
	Total	38359,502					
Psychological Resilience	Intergroup	1687,203	421,801	4	4,893	,001*	Illiterate < Secondary School, High School
	In-group	43881,031	86,210				
	Total	45568,233					

\*p<.05

When Table 6 is examined; it was determined that there was a significant difference between the scores obtained from the Dialogue and Harmony dimension, which are the sub-dimensions of the Family Communication Patterns Scale, and the Child and Adolescent Psychological Resilience Scale according to the mother's education level of the adolescents. As a result of the Post Hoc test (Scheffie) conducted to determine the source of the significant difference, it was seen that in the Dialogue dimension, those with illiterate mothers were lower than those with secondary and high school education, and those with primary school education were lower than those with high school education. In the Adaptation dimension, it was seen that those with illiterate mothers were higher than those with high school education. According to the psychological resilience scale, it was seen that those with illiterate mothers were lower than those with middle and high school education.

The results of the ANOVA Test regarding whether the average scores of the adolescents from the data collection tools differed according to their father's education level are given in Table 7.

**Table 7.** ANOVA test analysis results according to father's education level

Scales		Sum of squares	Mean squares	Sd.	F	p	Significant difference
Dialogue	Intergroup	5292,721	1323,180	4	8,988	,000*	Illiterate < Primary School, Secondary School, High School, University
	In-group	74935,864	147,222				
	Total	80228,586					
Harmony	Intergroup	853,893	213,473	4	2,897	,022*	University > Primary school
	In-group	37505,609	73,685				
	Total	38359,502					
Psychological Resilience	Intergroup	1053,111	263,278	4	3,010	,018*	Illiterate < University
	In-group	44515,123	87,456				
	Total	45568,233					

\*p&lt;.05

When Table 7 is examined; it was determined that there was a significant difference between the scores obtained from the Dialogue orientation and Adaptation orientation dimensions of the Family Communication Patterns Scale and the Child and Adolescent Psychological Resilience Scale according to the father's education level. As a result of the Post Hoc test (Scheffie) conducted to determine the source of the significant difference, this difference was found to be higher in the Dialogue orientation dimension than those whose father's educational status was secondary school, high school and university graduates, higher in those whose father's educational status was university graduates than those who were primary school graduates, and higher in the Adaptation orientation dimension than those whose father's educational status was illiterate and university graduates. When the source of the significant difference in the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale was examined, it was found that those whose fathers' educational status was university graduates were higher than those who were illiterate.

22

The results of the Independent Sample t-test on whether the average scores of the adolescents obtained from the data collection tools differed according to their parents' relationship status are given in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Results of t-test analysis according to parental relationship status

Scales	Cohabitation Status of Parents	N	$\bar{X}$	Sx	t	p
Dialogue	Together	462	45,216	12,214	2,582	,010*
	Separate	52	40,519	14,294		
Harmony	Together	462	36,809	8,590	-1,246	,213
	Separate	52	38,384	9,103		
Psychological Resilience	Together	462	40,571	9,072	3,522	,000*
	Separate	52	35,769	11,328		

\*p&lt;.05

When Table 8 is examined; it was found that there was a significant difference between the scores obtained from the Dialogue sub-dimension of the Family Communication Patterns scale according to the cohabitation status of the parents of the adolescents and this difference was higher in those whose parents were in cohabitation. It was found that there was no significant difference according to the Harmony dimension. According to the results obtained from the Child and Adolescent Psychological Resilience scale, it was determined that there was a significant difference according to the cohabitation status of the parents and this difference was higher in those whose parents were in cohabitation.

The results of the ANOVA Test on whether the average scores of the adolescents obtained from the data collection tools differed according to the type of school attended are given in Table 9.

**Table 9.** ANOVA test analysis results according to school type

Scales		Sum of squares	Mean squares	Sd.	F	p	Significant difference
Dialogue	Intergroup	1974,398	987,199	2	6,446	,002*	Anatolian High Schools > Science – Social – Other High Schools
	In-group	78254,188	153,139				
	Total	80228,586					
Harmony	Intergroup	437,892	218,946	2	2,950	,053	
	In-group	44500,137	74,211				
	Total	38359,502					
Psychological Resilience	Intergroup	1068,096	534,048	2	6,133	,002*	Anatolian High Schools > Other High Schools
	In-group	44500,137	87,084				
	Total	45568,233					

\*p&lt;.05

When Table 9 is examined; it is determined that there is a significant difference between the scores obtained from the Dialogue dimension, which is the sub-dimension of the Family Communication Patterns Scale, and the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale according to the type of school the adolescents attend. As a result of the Post Hoc test (Scheffie) conducted to determine the source of the significant difference, it was found that this difference was higher between the type of school attended in the Dialogue dimension between Anatolian High School and other high schools, in the direction of those studying at Anatolian High School, and according to the results obtained from the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience scale, the type of school attended was higher between Anatolian High School and other high schools, in the direction of those studying at Anatolian High School.

## Discussion and Conclusion

23

The effect of family communication patterns on psychological resilience in adolescents and whether there is a difference in family communication patterns and psychological resilience scores according to demographic information were examined. As a result of the correlation test, it was seen that the scores obtained from the psychological resilience scale had a moderate positive relationship with the dialogue sub-dimension of the family communication patterns scale and a moderate but negative relationship with the scores obtained from the harmony sub-scale. The relationship between harmony and dialogue sub-dimensions was found to be moderately negative and this result can be interpreted as family communication patterns can differentiate within themselves. The significant relationship between psychological resilience and the sub-dimensions of the family communication patterns scale is in line with the related literature (Hillaker, Brophy-Herb, Villarruel, & Haas, 2008, Carr & Kellas, 2018, Yüksel, 2019). According to a study conducted by Carr & Kellas (2018) with married individuals, it was observed that those who grew up in families with quality communication were more resilient in the face of difficulties. Similarly, in another study (Hillaker, Brophy-Herb, Villarruel, & Haas, 2008) according to the results of the current research, the fact that there is a positive relationship between the dialogue dimension and the Child and Youth Resilience Scale can be said to positively affect psychological resilience with the increase in dialogue in the family, the realization of quality communication, the ability of individuals in the family to express their feelings and thoughts comfortably, and the presence of social support. The fact that there is a negative relationship between the compliance dimension and the Child and Youth Resilience Scale is interpreted as a family structure in which there is a hierarchy in the family, communication is weak, obedience is at the forefront, feelings and thoughts are not expressed comfortably, and psychological resilience will be negatively affected. According to Garmezy (1993), social support, and according to Gizir (2007), effective communication between family members and having a caring parent are among the protective factors in terms of psychological resilience and support the result of the current research. The result of the research can be explained as the communication patterns established within the family, which is one of the social support areas of adolescence, is an important factor in the development of psychological resilience of adolescents.

According to the scores obtained according to gender, adolescents' orientations towards family

communication patterns do not differ according to gender. There are studies supporting this research in the literature (Şıklahızada, 2023; Çakar, 2024). Unlike the result of the current research, according to the studies conducted by Bireda & Pillay (2018) and Başaslan (2020), women's family communication orientations were found to be higher than men, and according to the result of Özkurt's (2018) research, it was concluded that men perceived family communication as more supportive than women. In Erkılınç's (2020) study, while there was no significant difference in terms of gender variable according to adaptation orientation, according to dialog orientation, women's scores were found to be higher than men's. Similarly, in Özey's (2022) study conducted with adolescents, it was found that girls had a higher level of dialog orientation than boys. Therefore, this difference in research results may be due to factors such as place of residence, economic status of the family, educational level, and cultural differences. According to the scores obtained from the psychological resilience scale according to gender, the psychological resilience level of women was found to be higher than that of men. The results of the studies conducted by Hannah & Morrissey (1986), Yokuş (2015), Viyanak & Judge (2018), Tok & Ünal (2020), Yıldırım & Çelikkol (2023) are in parallel with this study. There are also studies in the literature (Açıkgöz, 2016; Doğan & Yavuz, 2020; Karal & Biçer, 2021; Kılınç, 2023) in which the psychological resilience level of men is higher than that of women. When the literature is examined, there are also studies in which the level of psychological resilience does not differ significantly according to gender variable (Özcan, 2005; Topbay, 2016; Aydın, 2018; Aydın & Egemberdiyeva, 2018; Üzülmmez, 2021; Çiçek, 2021; Üvey, 2022). The higher level of psychological resilience of women in the current study may be an indication that women adapt to adolescence more easily than men and can manage stress better by asking for more support from their social environment when faced with negative situations. In addition, it can be said that men's economic future concerns have a negative effect on their psychological resilience levels. At the same time, men's early entry into working life in the region may have a psychologically corrosive effect.

According to the scores obtained from the Family Communication Patterns Scale according to age; it was determined that there was no significant difference between the scores obtained from the dialogue orientation sub-dimension, while the scores obtained from the harmony orientation sub-dimension were higher in the direction of the younger age group. According to the results of this research, it may be due to factors such as the decrease in attachment to the family as the age increases in adolescence and the fact that the social support area is the friendship environment rather than the family. In the study conducted by Ünal, Kaya, Akgün, Yıkılhan & İşgör (2007), the physical change experienced by adolescents also causes them to move away from their families, to want to make their own decisions and to behave freely, and thus shows that the adaptation to the family decreases and shows a parallelism with the research result. Similar to the research result, Çakar (2024) found no significant difference according to the sub-dimension of dialogue orientation, while a significant difference was found according to the sub-dimension of adaptation orientation. Erkılınç (2020), on the other hand, found a positive correlation between adaptation orientation and age, and a negative correlation between dialogic orientation and age. According to Özey (2022), no significant difference was found according to age variable. As can be understood from the reviewed literature, the research results show a great variety. This difference in research results may be due to factors such as place of residence, economic status of the family, educational level, and cultural differences. There was no significant difference in the scores obtained from the Child and Youth Resilience Scale according to age. There are various studies (Dawwas & Thabet, 2017; Sezgin, 2012; Üzülmmez, 2021) that support the research results. In the literature, there are studies in which the level of psychological resilience decreases with increasing age (Hannah & Morrissey, 1986; Turgut, 2015) and studies in which the level of psychological resilience increases with increasing age (Aydın & Egemberdiyeva, 2018; Yıldız Türker, 2018). The reason why age was not an effect factor in the current study may be that the experiences were similar for the age groups examined. This can be seen as the reason why the psychological resilience levels of the individuals in the study group did not differ significantly depending on the age variable.

According to the scores obtained from the Family Communication Patterns Scale according to the number of siblings, it was observed that the significant difference was higher for those with 2-3 siblings in the dialogue dimension and higher for those with more than 3 siblings in the harmony dimension. This result can be explained by the fact that families with more siblings have less communication with their children, a more permissive family structure prevails, and the level of interest decreases as the number of children increases. As a different result, according to the results of the research conducted by Özey

(2022) and Şıklahızada (2023), it was determined that there was no differentiation according to the number of siblings. It was seen that there was no significant difference between the scores obtained from the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience scale according to the number of siblings. The results of the research conducted by Açıkgöz (2016) and Cavga (2019) are in parallel with this study. In the study conducted by Çiçek (2021), it was concluded that as the number of siblings increases, the level of psychological resilience also increases. This result can be interpreted as an increase in social support with an increase in the number of siblings. In Aydın and Egemberdiyeva's (2018) study, the level of psychological resilience decreases as the number of siblings increases. This result can be interpreted as a decrease in the interest seen by the parents with the increase in the number of siblings, and the crowded family structure and financial structure are affected.

According to the scores obtained from the Family Communication Patterns Scale according to the perceived level, a significant difference was observed for both sub-dimensions. The source of this difference was found to be high in the direction of those with good perceived level in the dialog dimension and high in the direction of those with low perceived level in the harmony dimension. According to this, the family can live a life in comfortable conditions by meeting the needs with the presence of financial means. Thus, it is possible that the stress level of family members will decrease and they will be able to establish quality communication with each other. Unlike the research result, according to Yüksel (2019) and Özey (2022), family communication patterns do not show a significant difference according to the perceived status of the family. According to the scores obtained from the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale, as the perceived level increases, the level of psychological resilience also increases. According to the studies conducted by Açıkgöz (2016), Cavga (2019); Üzülmez (2021) and Üvey (2022), psychological resilience differs according to the perceived level. Unlike the result of the research, in the studies conducted by Topbay (2016) and Kılınç (2023), it was concluded that the perceived level of the family has no effect on psychological resilience. When the result of the current research is evaluated; the level of economic welfare can provide people with self-confidence and keep them away from stress as they can obtain their needs. Having financial opportunities enables individuals to have the opportunity to develop themselves and to live more comfortably, thus it is interpreted as a factor that increases psychological resilience. On the other hand, the lack of financial opportunities with a low perceived level may cause a sense of inadequacy, difficulty, and consequently unhappiness and future anxiety in individuals. According to Gizir (2007), while financial difficulties are counted among environmental risk factors, the presence of financial opportunities is counted among the factors affecting the level of psychological resilience by being among the protective factors and supports the results of the research.

According to the scores obtained from the Family Communication Patterns Scale according to the mother's education level, it is seen that as the mother's education level increases, dialog increases and harmony decreases. This result can be explained by being more conscious about raising children and being able to communicate more healthily with increasing education level. The study conducted by Bilgici & Deniz (2021) also supports the research result. According to Özey (2022) and Şıklahızada (2023), mother's education level does not predict family communication patterns orientation. According to the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale, it is seen that the level of psychological resilience increases as the mother's education level increases. As a similar result, in the study conducted by Prince Embury (2009), it was determined that the psychological resilience level of children with parents with higher levels of education were higher. There are also many studies (Açıkgöz, 2016; Ergün, 2016; Topbay, 2016; Aydın, 2018; Cavga, 2018; Çiçek, 2021; Üvey, 2022; Kılınç, 2023) in which the mother's education level has no effect on psychological resilience. According to the current study, it can be thought that as the mother's level of education increases, her perspective on events, her ability to interpret and analyze also increases. It is expected that a child who grows up with a conscious parent who is a role model for him/her will also have a high perspective on events, a high ability to interpret and analyze, and therefore a high level of psychological resilience. It is also possible that mothers with low levels of education may be inadequate in the process of raising their children.

According to the scores obtained from the Family Communication Patterns Scale according to the father's education level, it is seen that as the father's education level increases, dialog increases and harmony decreases. This result can be explained by being more conscious about raising children and being able to communicate more healthily with increasing education level. The study conducted by

Bilgici & Deniz (2021) also supports the research result. According to Özey (2022) and Şıklahızada (2023), father's education level does not predict family communication patterns orientation. According to the Child and Adolescent Psychological Resilience Scale, it is seen that the level of psychological resilience increases as the father's education level increases. As a similar result, in the study conducted by Prince Embury (2009), it was determined that the psychological resilience levels of children with parents with higher education levels were higher. There are also many studies (Topbay, 2016; Aydın, 2018; Cavga, 2018; Çiçek, 2021; Üvey, 2022; Kılınç, 2023) in which there is no effect of father's education level on psychological resilience. According to the current study, as the father's level of education increases, it is expected to be a more conscious parent with an increase in the level of knowledge, and the communication between the child and the parent is expected to be high, and accordingly, the child's psychological resilience level is expected to be high.

According to the scores obtained from the dialog sub-dimension of the Family Communication Patterns Scale according to parental cohabitation status, it was determined that the scores of those whose parents were in cohabitation were higher. This can be explained by the stronger family structure of those who grew up with their parents, the presence of open communication, the easy expression of feelings and thoughts, and the presence of a warm and safe family environment. It was found that there was no significant difference according to the adaptation dimension. The results of Rickardson & McCabe's (2001) study also show that children whose parents are separated have weaker family communication, which is in line with the results of the current study. According to Özey (2022), parents' union status does not predict family communication patterns orientation. According to the results obtained from the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience scale, it was concluded that the psychological resilience levels of people whose parents are in a relationship are higher. The studies conducted by Özcan (2005) and Şahin (2018) are in parallel with the results of this study. According to Çiçek (2021) and Kılınç (2023), parental cohabitation status has a significant effect on psychological resilience. Unlike the results of the current study, according to the results of the research conducted by Açıkgöz (2016), Cavga (2019), Ergün (2016) and Üvey (2022), it was concluded that parental cohabitation status did not have a significant effect on the level of psychological resilience. According to the current research, children who grow up in an environment of solidarity and family integrity are likely to be more psychologically resilient because they feel safer and grow up sharing with both parents. In addition, the separation of parents is considered among familial risk factors and affects psychological resilience (Gizir, 2007).

According to the scores obtained from the Family Communication Patterns Scale according to the type of school attended, the dialogue scores of students studying at Anatolian High School were found to be higher than those of students studying at other high schools (Anatolian Imam Hatip High School, Vocational and Technical Anatolian High Schools, etc.). The reason for this is that the academic achievement of students studying at Anatolian High Schools is higher than other high schools and this achievement is related to growing up in a family structure with effective communication, being motivated and supported by family members. According to the adaptation sub-dimension, no differentiation was found according to the type of school attended. In the study conducted by Özey (2022), family communication patterns orientation levels did not differ significantly according to the type of school attended. According to the scores obtained from the Child and Youth Psychological Resilience Scale according to the type of school attended, the psychological resilience levels of students studying at Anatolian High School were found to be higher than the students studying at other high schools (Anatolian Imam Hatip High School, Vocational and Technical Anatolian High Schools, etc.). In the study conducted by Gürsu (2012), the psychological resilience levels of students studying at Science High School were found to be higher than those of students studying at Anatolian High School. Considering that the level of psychological resilience increases as the level of the school increases, this research supports the current research. In the study conducted by Cavga (2019), it was concluded that the psychological resilience of students with high academic achievement was higher than students with low academic achievement. According to the result of the research conducted by Dayıoğlu (2008), psychological resilience does not differ significantly according to the type of school attended. When the current research is evaluated, students' academic achievement and the environment in which they study may have an effect on their psychological resilience. In addition, it can be thought that students who study in successful schools are more motivated in terms of success and accordingly, they can achieve success more easily and indirectly increase their psychological resilience levels.

Based on the results of the research, suggestions for researchers and field workers for future studies are as follows:

1. As a result of the literature review, it was determined that there is a limited number of studies related to the current research. Research on the subject can be increased.
  2. Different variables may mediate the relationship between family communication patterns and psychological resilience.
  3. Therefore, the role of different variables in the relationship between these two variables can be examined.
  4. The research can be extended by using different samples.
  5. It is thought that a contribution to the literature will be made by examining demographic characteristics different from the demographic characteristics used in the current study.
  6. The current research is a quantitative research and a qualitative research can be conducted on the 5th topic.
  7. This research topic can also be examined with different age groups.
- Seminars and psychoeducation activities can be organized for adolescents and their parents on family communication and psychological resilience.

## Bibliography

27

Açıkgöz, M. (2016). *Çukurova üniversitesi tıp fakültesi öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlık ile mizah tarzları ve mutluluk düzeyi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çağ Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Arslan, G. (2015). Çocuk ve Genç Psikolojik Sağlamlık Ölçeği'nin (ÇGPSÖ-12) psikometrik özellikleri: Geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 16(1), 1-12 <https://doi.org/10.12984/eed.23397>

Aydın, E. (2018). *Çocukluk çağı travmatik yaşantılarının psikolojik sağlamlık ve depresyon belirtileri üzerine etkisi*. [Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakıf Üniversitesi.

Aydın, M. & Egemberdiyeva, A. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Türkiye Eğitim Dergisi*, 3(1), 37-53.

Balaban Öztürk, G. (2023). *Ergenlik döneminde psikolojik sağlamlık ve algılanan anne-baba tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin ekolojik sistem kuramı çerçevesinde incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Başaslan, Z. (2022). Özel okullarda aile iletişiminin sınav dönemi gençlerinin akademik başarıları üzerindeki etkileri: Gaziantep örneği. *Anadolu Türk Eğitim Dergisi*, 4(1), 34-44.

Bayhan, P & Işıtan, S. (2010). Ergenlik Döneminde İlişkiler: Akran ve Romantik İlişkilere Genel Bakış. *Sosyal Politika Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 20(20), 33-44.

Bilge, Y. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinde ruh sağlığı belirleyicisi olarak bağlanma stillerinin incelenmesi. *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(16), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.33692/avrasyad.543621>

Bireda, A., & Pillay, J. (2018). Perceived Parent–Child Communication and Well-Being Among Ethiopian Adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 23(1), 109-117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2017.1299016>

Carr, K., & Kellas, J. (2018). The role of family and marital communication in developing resilience to family-of-origin adversity. *Journal of Family Communication*, 18(1), 68-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2017.1369415>

Cavga, Z. (2019). *Lise öğrencilerinde aile yaşam doyumu ile psikolojik dayanıklılık ve sosyal medya kullanım bozukluğu arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Çakar, F. (2024). *Genç yetişkinlerde problem çözme becerisi ve otomatik düşüncelerin aile iletişim kalıpları üzerindeki yordayıcılığının incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ahi Evran Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Çalışkan, Ü. (2020). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde anne baba tutumu ile psikolojik sağlık arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Çataloğlu, B. (2011). *Madde kullanan ve kullanmayan ergenlerin psikolojik sağlık ve aile işlevleri açısından karşılaştırılması*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Çetintaş, A. (2021). *Ergenlerde aile yaşam doyumu ile psikolojik sağlık ve duygusal özerklik arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Çiçek, F. (2021). *Lise öğrencilerinin dijital oyun bağımlılığı ile psikolojik sağlık düzeyi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ufuk Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Dawwas, M., & Thabet, A. (2017). The relationship between traumatic experience, posttraumatic stress disorder, resilience, and posttraumatic growth among adolescents in Gaza strip. *Global Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disabilities Symptoms*, 3(3), 1-10. Doi: 10.19080/JOJNHC.2017.05.555652

Doğan, T. (2015). Kısa Psikolojik Sağlık Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 3(1), 93-102. <https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.181073>

Doğan, T., & Yavuz, K. (2020). Yetişkinlerde psikolojik sağlık, olumlu çocukluk deneyimleri ve algılanan mutluluk. *Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar* (12), 312-330. <https://doi.org/10.18863/pgy.750839>

Ekinci, D. (2017). *Suriyeli lise öğrencilerinin algılanan sosyal destek ve aile işlevleri açısından psikolojik sağlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Üsküdar Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Erdoğan, Ö., & Anık, C. (2018). Aile iletişim kalıpları ölçeğinin türkçe formunun geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türkiye İletişim Araştırmaları Dergisi*(29), 21-46. doi:10.17829/maruid.340460

Ergün, O. (2016). *Ergenlerde psikolojik sağlık ile duygusal zekâ özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Arel Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Erkılınç, M. (2020). *Aile iletişim kalıpları, benlik kavramı ve evlilik uyumu arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Işık Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Garnezy, N. (1993). Children in poverty: Resilience despite risk. *Psychiatry*, 56(1), 127-136. Doi: [10.1080/00332747.1993.11024627](https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1993.11024627)

Gizir, C. (2007). Psikolojik sağlık, risk faktörleri ve koruyucu faktörler üzerine bir derleme çalışması. *Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 3(28), 113-128.

Gündaş, A. (2013). *Lise öğrencilerinde psikolojik sağlamlığın yordayıcısı olarak benlik kurgusu ve bağlanma stilleri*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Gürsu, O. (2012). Ergenlerde psikolojik sağlığın demografik değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim Dergisi*, 5(1), 110-130.

Hannah, T., & Morrissey, C. (1986). Correlates of psychological hardiness in Canadian adolescents. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 127(4), 339-344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1987.9713713>

Hillaker, B., Brophy-Herb, H., Villarruel, F., & Haas, B. (2008). The contributions of parenting to social competencies and positive values in middle school youth: Positive family communication, maintaining standards, and supportive family relationships. *Family Relations*, 57(5), 591-601. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00525.x>

Karadeniz Özgeniş, S. (2024). *Geç ergenlikte bağlanma stilleri ve psikolojik iyi oluş ilişkisinde öz-şefkat ve psikolojik esnekliğin aracı rolü*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Trabzon Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Kararımak, Ö. (2006). Psikolojik sağlamlık, risk faktörleri ve koruyucu faktörler. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 3(26), 129-142. <https://doi.org/10.17066/pdrd.22262>

Karakoç, Ö. (2022). *Yetişkinlerdeki psikolojik dayanıklılık ile anne baba tutumu arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Karal, E., & Biçer, B. (2021). *Salgın hastalık dönemindeki üniversite öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hasan Kalyolcu Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Kaygas, Y. ve Özbay, Y. (2023). ‘Do Conflicts Strengthen My Relationship?’ The Role of Relational Resilience on Conflict Frequency and Relationship Satisfaction from the Viewpoint of Turkish Women, *Turkish Psychological Counseling And Guidance Journal* 2023, 13 / 69, 202-215.

Kılınç, B. (2023). *Ortaokul öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeylerinin sosyal ilişkiler, okula aidiyet ve özyeterlik açısından incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi. <https://doi.org/10.53444/deubefd.1271996>

Kır, Ö., Özteke Kozan, H.İ., & Koç, H. (2021). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeylerinin bağlanma stilleri ve duygu düzenleme becerileri açısından incelenmesi. *Current Research and Reviews in Psychology and Psychiatry*, 1(1), 1-17.

Luthar, S., & Cicchetti, D. (2000). The construct of resilience: Implications for interventions and social policies. *Development and psychopathology*, 12(4), s. 857-885. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004156>

Masten, A., & Reed, M. (2002). Resilience in development. *Handbook of positive psychology*, 74-88. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195135336.003.0006>

Özcan, B. (2005). *Anne-babaları boşanmış ve anne-babaları birlikte olan lise öğrencilerinin yılmazlık özellikleri ve koruyucu faktörler açısından karşılaştırılması*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Özen, D. (2019). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin anne-baba tutumlarının psikolojik sağlamlık üzerine etkisi. *Akademik Tarih ve Düşünce Dergisi*, 6(3), 1428-1449.

Özey, B. (2022). *Ergenlerin duygusal okur-yazarlık düzeylerinin yordanmasında aile içi iletişim ve akrana ilişkilerinin rolü*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Özkurt, Y. (2018). *Ortaokul öğrencilerinin aile içi iletişimlerinin ve sosyal uyum durumlarının incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Prince Embury, S. (2009). The Resiliency Scales for Children and Adolescents as Related to Parent Education Level and Race/Ethnicity in Children. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 24(2), 167-182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0829573509335475>

Ramirez, M. (2007). Resilience: a concept analysis. *Nurs Forum*, 42(2), s. 73-82. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6198.2007.00070.x.

Richardson, S., & McCabe, M. (2001). Parental Divorce During Adolescence and Adjustment in Early Adulthood. *Adolescence*, 36(143), 467-489.

Robin, A., & Foster, S. (1989). *Negotiating Parent-Adolescent Conflict A Behavioral-Family Systems Approach*. Guilford Press.

Santrock, J. (2012). *Adolescence*. McGraw-Hill Companies.

Sezgin, F. (2012). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin psikolojik dayanıklılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 2, 489-502.

Şıklahızada, A. (2023). *Ön ergenlik dönemindeki bireylerde duygusal güvenlik algısı, aile iletişim kalıpları ve kaygı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Şahin, S., & Aral, N. (2012). Aile içi iletişim. *Ankara Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(3), 55-66. [https://doi.org/10.1501/Asbd\\_00000000029](https://doi.org/10.1501/Asbd_00000000029)

Tezel, A. (2004). Aile İçi İletişim. *Journal of Human Sciences*. 8(1), 1-6.

Tok, Y., & Ünal, M. (2020). Examining the correlation between resilience levels and math and science process skills of 5-year-old preschoolers. *Reserch in Pedagogy*, 7(3), 203-228. <https://doi.org/10.5937/IstrPed2002203T>

Topbay, Y. (2016). *Ortaokul öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeylerinin algılanan sosyal destek ve aile işlevleri açısından incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Beykent Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Topbay, Y. (2016). *Ortaokul öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeylerinin algılanan sosyal destek ve aile işlevleri açısından incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Beykent Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Turgut, Ö. (2015). *Ergenlerin Psikolojik Sağlamlık Düzeylerinin, Önemli Yaşam Olayları, Algılanan Sosyal Destek ve Okul Bağlılığı Açısından İncelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Ünal, P., Kaya, Ç., Akgün, T., Yıkılhan, H., & İşgör, A. (2007). Birinci basamakta ergen sağlığına yaklaşım. *Türkiye Klinikleri Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi*, 27(4), 567-576.

Üvey, D. (2022). *Lise öğrencilerinin siber mağduriyeti, siber zorbalıkla başa çıkma becerileri ile psikolojik sağlamlık ilişkisi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çağ Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Üzülmez, E. (2021). *İlk ve orta ergenlik dönemlerindeki bireylerin psikolojik sağlamlık ve yaşam doyumu düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkide algılanan aile bütünlük duygusunun aracı rolü*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Vanderpol, M. (2002). Resilience: A missing link in our understanding of survival. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 10, 302-306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10673220216282>

Viyanak, S., & Judge, J. (2018). Resilience and empathy as predictors of psychological wellbeing among adolescents. *International Journal of Health Sciences and Research*, 8(4), 192-200.

Vural, B. (2004). *Öğrencinin başarısı için aile-okul birlikteliği*. Hayat Yayınları.

Yıldırım, Ö., & Kılıçaslan Çelikkol, A. (2023). Özel yetenekli öğrencilerin psikolojik sağlamlık, öz-yeterlik ve algılanan sosyal destek düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 25(2), 127-140. d <https://doi.org/10.21565/ozelegitimdergisi.1195044>

Yıldız Türker, N. (2018). *Yetişkinlerde Dindarlık ve Psikolojik Sağlamlık İlişkisi Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Uludağ Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

Yokuş, T. (2015). The relation between pre-service music teachers psychological resilience and academic achievement levels. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10(14), 1961-1969. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2015.2320>

Yüksel, M. (2019). *Ergenlerin yılmazlık düzeyleri ile aile işlevleri ve aile iletişim kalıpları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.

---

Zarrett, N., & Eccles, J. (2006). The passage to adulthood: Challenges of late adolescence. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 111, 13-28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.179>