

## Strese Yatkinlığın Psikolojik Sağlamlığı Yordama Gücü

Özge Pişket \*, Eyüp Çelik \*\*

Makale Geliş Tarihi:17/06/2023

Makale Kabul Tarihi:09/08/2023

DOI: 10.35675/befdergi.1269839

### Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı psikolojik sağlamlığın strese yatkinlığı yordama gücünün incelenmesidir. Çalışma grubunu 21-53 yaşları arasında 289 birey oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada verilerin toplanması amacıyla Strese Yatkinlık Ölçeği ve Yetişkin Psikolojik Sağlamlık Ölçeği (YPSÖ-21) kullanılmıştır. Veriler korelasyon ve regresyon analizi ile incelenmiştir. Yapılan korelasyon analizi sonucu strese yatkinlık ile psikolojik sağlamlığın alt boyutları olan ilişkisel kaynaklar, bireysel kaynaklar ve ailesel kaynaklar arasında negatif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Regresyon analizi sonucunda strese yatkinlığı psikolojik sağlamlığın alt boyutlarından ilişkisel kaynaklar, kültürel ve bağlamsal kaynakların anlamlı derecede yordadığı görülmüştür. Ayrıca çalışmada strese yatkinlık puanlarının cinsiyete ve medeni duruma göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılık göstermediği bulunmuştur.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Psikolojik sağlamlık, stres, strese yatkinlık


## Predictive Power of Resilience to Stress Susceptibility

### Abstract

This study aims to examine the predictive power of resilience for stress susceptibility. The study group consists of 289 individuals between 21 and 53. The Stress Susceptibility Scale and the Adult Resilience Measure were used to collect data in the present research. Data were analyzed using correlation and regression analysis. The results of the correlation analysis showed a significant negative relationship between stress susceptibility and the dimensions of psychological resilience, such as relational sources, individual sources, and familial sources. The regression analysis results showed that the dimensions of psychological resilience, such as relational sources and cultural and contextual sources, significantly predicted stress susceptibility. Additionally, the study found that stress susceptibility scores did not show statistically significant differences according to gender and marital status.

**Keywords:** Psychological resilience, stress, stress susceptibility

\* MA. Sakarya University, Ministry of National Education, Sakarya, Turkey, ozge.pisket@ogr.sakarya.edu.tr, ORCID:0009-0008-3268-9224 

\*\* Assoc. Dr. Sakarya University, Faculty of Education, Guidance and Psychological Counseling, Sakarya, Turkey, eyupcelik@sakarya.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-7714-9263 

**Kaynak Gösterme:** Pişket, Ö., & Çelik, E. (2023). Predictive power of resilience to stress susceptibility. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(40), 1350-1365.

## Introduction

Stress susceptibility levels may be essential in coping with adverse and stressful events. Stress, a difficult-to-explain concept, is often described as a situation that causes distress, anxiety, and tension and can be seen as a threat to an individual's health and lead to difficulties in adapting (Kaya & Keskin, 2010). Stress is a body's response to negative factors encountered, and it is stated that constantly experiencing stress can result in harmful situations for the individual (Özcan et al., 2015). Although it is said that not being able to cope with stress can prepare the ground for psychological disorders, it is also stated that not every individual experiencing stress will have this result and that the individual can gain resilience against stress (Marcolongo-Pereira et al., 2022). On the other hand, stress susceptibility is characterized by a tendency to feel insufficient in coping with stress (O'Súilleabháin et al., 2019). According to the triple predisposition model, which is one of the models explaining susceptibility and is related to susceptibility to anxiety, genetic factors lead to biological predisposition, childhood experiences lead to psychological predisposition, and an individual's psychological predisposition is related to the emergence of anxiety against certain situations (Barlow, 2000). Zubin and Spring (1977) state that if the stress situation the individual face is beyond their tolerance limit, different psychological disorders may occur in the stress susceptibility model.

In literature, it has been stated that exposure to stressful, traumatic experiences in childhood may increase stress susceptibility in later periods (Southwick et al., 2005; Wade et al., 2019). Research has shown a relationship between stress susceptibility and depression (Bunevicius et al., 2008; De Almeida Vieira Monteiro & Serra, 2011; Ghita et al., 2022). Bunevicius et al. (2008) found that as the stress susceptibility level increases, the anxiety level also increases. A negative relationship was also found between stress susceptibility and personality traits (extroversion, conscientiousness, and emotional balance). Another study found a positive relationship between Type-A personality and stress susceptibility (Batıgün & Şahin, 2006). Erbay İnci (2021) found that stress susceptibility and obsessive beliefs have a positive relationship. In a study on smoking by Barut (2022), he concluded that stress susceptibility is related to anger. Another study found a positive relationship between stress susceptibility and social anxiety (Erdemir, 2021). A study on immigrants found a negative relationship between stress susceptibility and social support (De Almeida Vieira Monteiro & Serra, 2011). Similarly, in a study by Southwick et al. (2005), it was noted that social support has a positive effect on stress resilience. Ulubayram (2015) found a negative relationship between stress susceptibility, relationship satisfaction, and life satisfaction. Davarniya et al. (2019) concluded that psychological resilience, coping strategies, and social support predict stress susceptibility. Wilson Begeny, Boyle, Schneider, and Bennett (2011) conducted a study with elderly individuals and found a relationship between stress susceptibility and Alzheimer risk. Another study found a negative relationship between stress susceptibility and consisting of self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and psychological resilience (Caponnetto et al., 2022). The results of

the studies suggest that the level of stress susceptibility can vary from person to person and can be influenced by factors such as early life experiences and personality traits, which can lead to different problems. However, having a high level of psychological resilience that can reduce the likelihood of experiencing intense negative emotions in response to events is essential.

Individuals often encounter situations that cause stress during the day and sometimes experience more bad experiences. Therefore, psychological resilience can be influential in healthily coping with these experiences without despair. All people may encounter difficulties in their lives and strive to overcome them. It is stated that their progress without giving up or giving up in the face of these difficulties is closely related to psychological resilience (Topcu & Demircioğlu, 2020). Psychological resilience is considered within the scope of positive psychology (Doğan, 2015). Unlike approaches that often involve intervening in problems, the positive psychology approach emphasizes creating or developing positive structures (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Psychological resilience is the ability to endure and cope with difficult life events (Durak, 2021). This situation can change through the experiences gained throughout life depending on individual characteristics and the environment (Karabulut & Balcı, 2017). In this context, it is stated that the level of psychological resilience may differ in life (Yaşar & Aybek, 2019). However, it has been stated that coping with and adapting to the difficulties encountered in life is not the same for everyone and can be experienced differently (Güleç, 2020).

In literature, studies on psychological resilience indicate that being hopeful increases psychological resilience (Aydın Sünbül & Aslan Gördesli, 2020; Batmaz et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2022), and studies show that as hopelessness increases, psychological resilience decreases (Gülerce & Maraj, 2021; Öztürk & Maçkalı, 2022). Additionally, there are studies indicating a positive relationship between psychological resilience and perceived social support (Makas & Çelik, 2022; Terzi, 2008), mindful awareness (Okan et al., 2020), general self-efficacy (Okur & Ümmet, 2021), and life satisfaction (Alibekiroğlu et al., 2018; Makas & Çelik, 2022). Studies show a negative relationship between stress and psychological resilience (Goncalves & Jesus, 2015; Rushton et al., 2015). Also, in their study, Goncalves and Jesus (2015) found a positive relationship between stress susceptibility, depression, anxiety, and stress. Yalcin-Siedentopf et al. (2021) found significant associations between psychological resilience, perceived stress, and social support. In addition, factors related to being able to withstand stressful experiences, such as receiving support from the environment and accessing needed resources, are also related to religion and spirituality (Southwick et al., 2005). In his study, Kasapoğlu (2020) found a negative relationship between psychological resilience and intolerance for uncertainty and a positive relationship with spirituality. Based on all this information, it can be said that the level of psychological resilience is vital in coping with and adapting to difficulties encountered throughout life.

Psychologically resilient individuals can approach events from different perspectives and handle difficult life events more easily (Okan et al., 2020). They are also said to have a more positive attitude towards events and to be more hopeful about the future (Polat, 2018). Based on these findings, individuals with high psychological resilience have a more positive outlook on events and the future and can recover quickly from problems. The level of stress susceptibility can decrease with high levels of psychological resilience. Another definition of psychological resilience refers to an individual's ability to develop coping mechanisms with the support of positive attributes and the support of their close environment in situations where they may feel troubled (Arslan, 2015). Based on this definition, there can be a relationship between the dimensions of psychological resilience, such as individual, relational, familial, cultural, and contextual sources, and stress susceptibility. For this reason, the study aims to examine the relationship between stress susceptibility and psychological resilience. As stress susceptibility has significant effects on mental health, this study is considered important for mental health experts and may contribute to studies on mental health. In this context, the following research questions were examined.

1. Is there a relationship between stress susceptibility and psychological resilience?
2. Does psychological resilience predict stress susceptibility?
3. Does stress susceptibility level differ according to gender and marital status?

### **Method**

The relational screening method was used to determine the relationship between stress susceptibility and psychological resilience. The relational screening method aims to reveal how variables are related (Burmaoğlu et al., 2013). Also, the Adult Resilience Measure Scale (ARM-21) and Stress Susceptibility Scale were used to collect data in the study. Data were analyzed using the SPSS program.

### **The Study Group**

The study group of the research consists of 289 volunteers aged 21-53. 231 (79.9%) of the data group are female, and 58 (20.1%) are male. 91 participants (31.5%) are married, and 198 (68.5%) are single. The individuals participated in the study on their own will.

### **Data Collection Tools**

#### ***Adult resilience measure (ARM-21)***

The child and Adolescent Resilience Scale (Ungar & Liebenberg, 2011) has been adapted for adults (Resilience Research Centre, 2018). Arslan (2015) translated the scale into Turkish, and its validity and reliability study were conducted. The scale has

a five-point Likert type, in the range of "Does not describe me at all (1)" and "Describes me completely (5)". A high score obtained from the scale indicates a high level of psychological resilience. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, it was concluded that the scale consisted of four factors: relational, individual, cultural, and familial resources. The factor load range of these four factors is .554-.756 for relational sources; .634-.787 for individual sources; .571-.832 for cultural and contextual resources; .508-.754 was found for familial sources. In the study, the relationship between the Adult Resilience Measure Scale and positive-negative emotions, self-esteem, and life satisfaction were examined in order to determine the criterion validity. As a result, it was found that there is a positive relationship between psychological resilience and life satisfaction, positive emotion and self-esteem, and a negative relationship with negative emotion. As a result of the reliability study, it was found that the Cronbach alpha value of the scale was .94, and the test-retest coefficient was .85 (Arslan, 2015).

### ***Stress Susceptibility Scale***

It is a Likert-type scale consisting of 20 items and evaluated on a scale of 1-5 (Miller et al., 1988). The score range is 20-100. As the scores obtained from the scale increase, the stress susceptibility increases. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be .74 (Şahin & Durak, 1994). As a result of the factor analysis, it was determined that the scale consisted of three factors: "Social support" ( $\alpha = .68$ ), "Taking time for yourself" ( $\alpha = .67$ ), "Activities for the body" ( $\alpha = .58$ ). Correlation of the scale with effective coping methods with stress was .35 ( $p < .001$ ), and correlation with ineffective coping methods was .24 ( $p < .001$ ) (Şahin & Batıgün, 1997).

### **Data Analysis**

The study examined the relationships between stress susceptibility and psychological resilience with Pearson correlation coefficient and multiple regression analysis. In addition, independent samples were determined by t-test, such as whether the stress susceptibility differed according to gender and marital status. In order to determine whether the data has a normal distribution, kurtosis, and skewness values were examined. In order to determine whether there is a multicollinearity problem between variables, the results of the correlation analysis, VIF, and CI values were taken into account. It was determined that the data had a normal distribution and no multicollinearity problem.

### **Findings**

Within the scope of the research, firstly, the data were examined in terms of normal distribution and regression assumptions. As a result of the examinations, it was concluded that the data had a normal distribution and met the regression assumptions.

Descriptive statistics and regression assumptions regarding the sub-dimensions of psychological resilience stress susceptibility are presented in Table 1.

Table 1  
*Findings on Descriptive Statistics and Regression Assumptions*

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Skew.	Kurt.	CI	VIF	DW
Stress Susceptibility	289	23	85	50.94	12.98	.205	-.403	1.000		
Relational Sources	289	8	30	23.42	3.97	-.699	1.016	9.99	2.48	
Individual Sources	289	10	25	20.77	2.81	-.787	1.144	15.52	1.62	1.129
Cultural and Contextual Sources	289	6	25	17.36	4.88	-.380	-.643	20.66	1.30	
Familial Sources	289	6	25	20.02	3.89	-.921	.823	27.09	1.69	

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that the kurtosis values of variables are between -.643 and 1.144, and skewness values are between -.921 and .205. This result indicates that the data have a normal distribution. In addition, the VIF value shows that there is no multicollinearity problem, and the DW result shows that there is no autocorrelation problem.

Correlation analysis was conducted to describe the relationships between the variables in the study, and the findings related to this analysis are given in Table 2.

Table 2  
*The Results of Pearson Correlations Coefficient Analysis*

	a	b	c	d	e
a: Stress Susceptibility	1				
b: Relational Sources	-.403**	1			
c: Individual Sources	-.336**	.612**	1		
d: Cultural and Contextual Sources	-.085	.471**	.236**	1	
e: Familial Sources	-.299**	.636**	.431**	.348**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 shows the relationships between stress susceptibility and sub-dimensions of psychological resilience. Accordingly, a statistically significant negative correlation was found between stress susceptibility and relational resources ( $r = -.403$ ,  $p < .05$ ), individual resources ( $r = -.336$ ,  $p < .05$ ), and familial resources ( $r = .299$ ,  $p < .05$ ), which are sub-dimensions of psychological resilience. Multiple regression analysis was performed to determine whether the sub-dimensions of psychological resilience predict stress susceptibility, and the findings are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

*Findings on Regression Analysis*

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i>	Adjusted <i>R</i> Square
	<i>B</i>	Std. Error	$\beta$				
(Constant)	88.041	5.464		16.114	.000		
Relational Sources	-1.106	.275	-.339	-4.028	.000		
Individual Sources	-.593	.314	-.128	-1.890	.060	.190	.179
Cultural and Contextual Sources	.346	.162	.130	2.139	.033		
Familial Sources	-.245	.232	-.073	-1.056	.292		

Dependent Variable: Stress susceptibility

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that relational sources ( $\beta = -.339$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and cultural and contextual sources ( $\beta = .130$ ,  $p < .05$ ) significantly predict stress susceptibility. It is seen that relational sources and cultural and contextual sources explain 13% of the change in stress susceptibility scores. According to the result of correlation analysis, cultural and contextual sources is uncorrelated with stress susceptibility; however, it predicted stress susceptibility. Table 4 shows the independent samples t-test results to determine whether the stress susceptibility scores differ according to gender.

Table 4

*Independent Samples Test Result related to Gender*

	Levene's Test		T-test for Equality of Means						
	<i>F</i>	Sig.	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>	Gender	N	Mean	SD
Stress Susceptibility	.470	.494	-1.162	287	.246	Male	231	50.49	12.66
						Female	58	52.71	14.18

As presented in Table 4, as a result of the independent samples t-test, performed to determine whether the stress susceptibility scores differ according to gender, it was found that the stress susceptibility scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to gender ( $t = -1.162, p > .05$ ).

The independent samples t-test, conducted to determine whether the stress susceptibility scores differ according to marital status, is given in Table 5.

Table 5

*Independent Samples Test Result related to Marital Status*

	Levene's Test			T-test for Equality of Means					
	<i>F</i>	Sig.	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>	Marital Status	N	Mean	SD
Stress Susceptibility	1.616	.205	.143	287	.887	Single	91	51.10	13.74
						Married	198	50.86	12.65

As presented in Table 5, as a result of independent samples t-test to determine whether the stress susceptibility scores differ according to marital status, it was found that the stress susceptibility scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to marital status ( $t = .143, p > .05$ ).

### Discussion

This study examines the relationship between stress susceptibility and psychological resilience. As a result of the correlation analysis found a statistically significant negative correlation between stress susceptibility and individual resources, familial resources, and relational resources, which are sub-dimensions of psychological resilience. Consistent with this finding, studies in the literature show a negative relationship between stress susceptibility and social support (Davarniya et al., 2019;



De Almeida Vieira Monteiro & Serra, 2011). Studies also show a negative relationship between perceived stress, which is a concept close to stress susceptibility, and perceived social support (Kavaklı & Yalçın, 2019; McLean et al., 2022; Yalcin-Siedentopf et al., 2021). In a study, perceived support from family and stress were negatively related (Vungkhanching et al., 2016). In addition, Goncalves and Jesus (2015) found in their study that there is a positive relationship between having insufficient social support and stress. Similarly, studies show a negative relationship between stress and perceived social support (Çetinkaya & Korkmaz, 2019; Vungkhanching et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2018). In addition, Ulubayram (2015) found a significant negative relationship between stress susceptibility, relationship satisfaction, and life satisfaction in his study. Also, a positive relationship was found between stress susceptibility and psychological and physical symptoms of stress, and a negative relationship was found between coping with stress effectively. It is seen that it can be mentioned that the individual's having strong resources in coping with stress may be a factor that reduces the level of stress susceptibility. In this context, it may be found that there is a negative relationship between stress susceptibility and relational resources, individual resources and familial resources, since the individual has strong ties, receives support from his/her environment, and gets satisfaction from the relationships he/she has established may be a factor that reduces the level of stress susceptibility.

Multiple regression analysis was performed to determine whether the sub-dimensions of psychological resilience predict stress susceptibility. According to the result of correlation analysis, cultural and contextual sources is uncorrelated with stress susceptibility; however, it predicted stress susceptibility. The reason for this may be the oppressive role of one or more of the sub-dimensions of resilience in the regression model. Furthermore, regression analysis showed that relational sources predicted stress susceptibility significantly. This finding is likely compatible with the literature. In parallel with this study, in the study of Davarniya et al. (2019), social support and psychological resilience were found to be predictors of stress susceptibility. Ulubayram (2015) concluded that stress susceptibility, coping with stress, and relationship satisfaction predicts psychological symptoms of stress. Another study found a negative and significant relationship between social support and anxiety and stress (Xiao et al., 2020). In line with this finding of the study, being in meaningful close relationships and having social support can reduce stress susceptibility. Therefore, in this study, relational sources may have been found to reduce stress susceptibility.

Kasapoğlu (2020), in his study, found a negative relationship between spiritual orientation and anxiety and a positive relationship between psychological resilience and spiritual orientation. This study found that the increase in the cultural and contextual resources variable led to an increase in the stress susceptibility score. Şahin (2006) stated in his study that he could experience stress related to religion. As the stress related to religion increased, there was a desire to turn to religious behaviors

more. Although the individual attaches importance to spirituality and religious beliefs, he may have difficulty fulfilling the requirements of religion or acting by these beliefs. In addition, traditions such as visiting relatives during the holidays and meeting with people who have not been seen for a long time and are only seen from holiday to holiday can create happiness in the individual, while on the other hand, people's comments and questions about the person, which can reach the level of criticism without empathy, can put pressure on that person and his family. According to the research conducted by Abay and Atila Demir (2014), while the meaning of special religious days is high in individuals over 55, the meaning of non-religious special days such as mother's day, etc. This may be because the individual spends time with people, they meet more often who understand and support them because people who do not understand, criticize, and are not in a close relationship may increase their stress level. For all these reasons, cultural and contextual sources may have been found to increase stress susceptibility in this study.

As a result of the independent samples t-test to determine whether the stress susceptibility scores differ according to gender, it was found that the stress susceptibility scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to gender. Studies support this finding of the research in the literature (Barut, 2022; De Almeida Vieira Monteiro & Serra, 2011; Erbay İnci, 2021; Erdemir, 2021). On the other hand, there are studies in which stress susceptibility differs significantly according to gender, and the stress susceptibility is higher in women than in men (Nur, 2011; Simionescu et al., 2022). It can be thought that this difference is due to the difference in the sample group.

As a result of the independent samples t-test samples to determine whether the stress susceptibility scores differ according to marital status, it was found that the stress susceptibility scores did not show a statistically significant difference according to marital status. Some studies support this finding of the research in the literature (Barut, 2022; De Almeida Vieira Monteiro & Serra, 2011; Erdemir, 2021).

In line with the findings of the study, it is seen that being psychologically resilient is a factor that reduces the level of stress susceptibility. This study may be important for professionals in the mental health field. Besides the contributions of the research, there are some limitations. The study is limited to the participation of 306 individuals between the ages of 17-53 and the answers given by the individuals to the scales used in the study. In the literature, it has been observed that studies on stress susceptibility are frequently conducted with healthcare professionals. In the future, the stress susceptibility levels of individuals working in different business environments (such as individuals working in special education and mental health workers) can be investigated. In addition, it is seen that studies of stress susceptibility are generally conducted with adult individuals. The study can be applied to investigate the stress susceptibility, regret, and hopelessness levels of individuals in old-age who are likely to experience feelings of being late, hopelessness, and preparation for retirement.

Mental health professionals can organize stress-coping programs about how they can turn to good resources to help individuals reduce their stress susceptibility.

### Compliance of Ethical Standard Statement

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee. In this context, ethical permission was obtained from Sakarya University Ethics Committee. Document Number: 05.04.2022 - E-61923333-050.99-124068

### References

- Abay, A. R., & Atila Demir, S. (2014). Belli parametrelere göre kuşaklararası sosyal değişme (Aile değerleri üzerine bir karşılaştırma). *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*, 9(1), 125-151. <https://doi.org/10.17550/aid.06480>
- Alibekiroğlu, P. B., Akbaş, T., Bulut Ateş, F., & Kırdök, O. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinde yaşam doyumu ile psikolojik sağlık arasındaki ilişkide öz anlayışın aracı etkisi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 27(2), 1-17.
- Arslan, G. (2015). Yetişkin Psikolojik Sağlık Ölçeği'nin (YPSÖ) psikometrik özellikleri: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 162, 344-357. <https://doi.org/10.12984/eed.45159>
- Aydın Sünbül, Z., & Aslan Gördesli, M. (2020). Self-compassion and resilience in parents of children with special needs: The mediating role of hope. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 49(2), 690-705. <https://doi.org/10.14812/cufej.749645>
- Barlow, D. H. (2000). Unraveling the mysteries of anxiety and its disorders from the perspective of emotion theory. *American Psychologist*, 55(11), 1247-1263. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003066x.55.11.1247>
- Barut, M. F. (2022). *Sigara kullanan bireylerin strese yatkınlıkları ile öfke durumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Tunceli Çemişgezek ilçesi örneği* (Tez No. 723120) [Yüksek lisans tezi, İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi, İstanbul]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Tez Merkezi.
- Batıgün, A. D., & Şahin, N. H. (2006). İş stresi ve sağlık psikolojisi araştırmaları için iki ölçek: A-tipi kişilik ve iş doyumu. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 17(1), 32-45.
- Batmaz, H., Doğrusever, C., & Türk, N. (2021). The mediating role of hope and loneliness in the relationship between meaningful life and psychological resilience in the Covid-19 pandemic during. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(5), 1403-1420. <https://doi.org/10.18506/anemon.895199>.
- Bunevicius, A., Katkute, A., & Bunevicius, R. (2008). Symptoms of anxiety and depression in medical students and in humanities students: Relationship with big-five personality dimensions and susceptibility to stress. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 54(6), 494-501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764008090843>
- Burmaoğlu, S., Polat, M., & Meydan, C. H. (2013). Örgütsel davranış alanında ilişkisel analiz yöntemleri ve Türkçe yazında aracılık modeli kullanımı üzerine bir inceleme. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 13(1), 13-26.
- Caponnetto, P., Platania, S., Maglia, M., Morando, M., Gruttadauria, S. V., Auditore, R., ... Santisi, G. (2022). Health occupation and job satisfaction: The impact of psychological capital in the management of clinical psychological stressors of healthcare workers in the COVID-19 era. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(10), 6134. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19106134>.

- Çetinkaya, F. F., & Korkmaz, F. (2019). Algılanan sosyal destek ile stres düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Üniversite öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(1), 91-103.
- Davarniya, R., Shakarami, M., & Zahrakar, K. (2019). Resilience, coping strategies, and social support: important predictors of students' susceptibility to stress. *Journal of Research and Health*, 9(1), 90-94. <https://doi.org/10.29252/jrh.9.1.90>
- De Almeida Vieira Monteiro, A. P. T., & Serra, A. V. (2011). Susceptibility to stress in migratory contexts: A study with Eastern European immigrants residing in Portugal. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 13(4), 690-696. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-011-9451-z>
- Doğan, T. (2015). Kısa Psikolojik Sağlık Ölçeği'nin Türkçe uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *The Journal of Happiness & Resilience*, 3(1), 93-102.
- Durak, İ. (2021). Psikolojik sağlık ile yaşam doyumu arasındaki ilişkide öz yeterliğin aracı etkisi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(78), 1175-1190. <https://doi.org/10.17755/esosder.816639>
- Erbay İnci, E. (2021). *Obsesif inanış düzeylerinin bireylerin yaşam kalitesi, tükenmişlik düzeyi ve strese yatkınlığı üzerindeki etkisi* (Tez No. 674721) [Yüksek lisans tezi, İstanbul Kent Üniversitesi, İstanbul]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Tez Merkezi.
- Erdemir, M. (2021). *İstanbul'da öğrenim gören üniversite öğrencilerinde öz yeterlilik ve strese yatkınlık düzeylerinin sosyal fobiye yordamadaki rolü* (Tez No. 700857) [Yüksek lisans tezi, İstanbul Okan Üniversitesi, İstanbul]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Tez Merkezi.
- Ghita, I., Handra, C. M., Naghi, E., Gurzu, I. L., & Chirila, M. (2022). Susceptibility to stress and depression risk related to occupational exposure to aluminum. *Occupational Diseases and Environmental Medicine*, 10(4), 262-270. <https://doi.org/10.4236/odem.2022.104020>
- Goncalves, E., & De Jesus, S. N. (2015). Susceptibility and resilience to stress and immune and neuroendocrine function in Portuguese subjects with psychic anomaly (anxiety and depression). *Open Journal of Psychiatry*, 5(4), 362-373. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojpsych.2015.54041>
- Güleç, S. (2020). Lise öğrencilerinde bilişsel esneklik ile psikolojik sağlık arasındaki ilişkide yaşam amaçlarının aracı rolü. *Gelişim ve Psikoloji Dergisi (GPD)*, 1(1), 27-35.
- Gülerce, H., & Maraj, H. A. (2021). Resilience and hopelessness in Turkish society: Exploring the role of spirituality in the Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, 63, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.26650/JECS2020-0075>
- Karabulut, N., & Balcı, A. (2017). Okul yöneticilerinin yılmazlık düzeyi ve denetim odağı ile ilişkisi. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 196-214.
- Kasapoğlu, F. (2020). COVID-19 salgını sürecinde kaygı ile maneviyat, psikolojik sağlık ve belirsizliğe tahammülsüzlük arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 15(4), 599-614.
- Kavaklı, M., & Yalçın, S. B. (2019). İnternet bağımlılığı ve algılanan stres ilişkisinin algılanan sosyal destek açısından incelenmesi. *Bağımlılık Dergisi*, 20(4), 175-184.
- Kaya, M. D., & Keskin, G. (2010). Yöneticilerin yönetsel stres kaynakları ve strese yatkınlık düzeyleri: Erzurum'da bir araştırma. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11(1), 371-388.
- Lin, T., Yi, Z., Zhang, S., & Veldhuis, C. B. (2022). Predictors of psychological distress and resilience in the post-Covid-19 era. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 29(4), 506-516. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-021-10036-8>.
- Makas, S., & Çelik, E. (2022). Yaşam doyumunun duyguları ifade etme, kendini toplama gücü ve algılanan sosyal destek açısından incelenmesi. *Yaşadıkça Eğitim*, 36(2), 252-263. <https://doi.org/10.33308/26674874.2022362359>

- Marcolongo Pereira, C., Castro, F. C. D. A. Q., Barcelos, R. M., Chiepe, K. C. M. B., Rossoni Junior, J. V., Ambrosio, R. P., ... Pesarico, A. P. (2022). Neurobiological mechanisms of mood disorders: Stress susceptibility and resilience. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 16, 1006836. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2022.1006836>.
- McLean, L., Gaul, D., & Penco, R. (2022). Perceived social support and stress: a study of 1st year students in Ireland. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-021-00710-z>
- Miller, L. H., Smith, A. D., & Mehler, B. L. (1988). *The stress audit manual*. Bookline
- Nur, D. (2011). Kamu hastanelerinde çalışan sağlık personelinde iş doyum ve stres ilişkisi. *Klinik Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 14(4), 230-240.
- Okan, N., Yılmaztürk, M., & Kürüm, B. (2020). Bilinçli farkındalık ve psikolojik sağlamlık arasındaki ilişkide temel empati becerilerinin aracı rol etkisinin incelenmesi. *IBAD Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (8), 319-335. <https://doi.org/10.21733/ibad.735391>.
- Okur, S., & Ümmet, D. (2021). The relationship between psychological resilience and perceived stress in adults: The mediating role of general self-efficacy. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 11(60), 67-84.
- O'Suilleabháin, P. S., Hughes, B. M., Oommen, A. M., Joshi, L., & Cunningham, S. (2019). Susceptibility to stress: Personality facet of susceptibility is associated with cardiovascular adaptation to recurring stress. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 144, 34-39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2019.06.013>.
- Özcan, E. M., Ünal, A., & Çakıcı, A. B. (2015). Sağlık çalışanlarında işe bağlı stres: Konya numune hastanesi saha çalışması. *Aksaray Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 125-131.
- Öztürk, Ö., & Maçkalı, Z. (2022). Umutsuzluk ile psikolojik dayanıklılık arasındaki ilişkide problem odaklı baş etme stratejilerinin aracı rolü. *Klinik Psikoloji Dergisi*, 6(1), 94-107. <https://doi.org/10.5455/kpd.26024438m000058>
- Polat, D. D. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin yılmazlık düzeyleri ile iş doyum, mesleki tükenmişlik, örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri ve örgüt iklimi algıları arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi* (Tez No. 518605) [Yüksek lisans tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Tez Merkezi.
- Resilience Research Centre. (2018). *CYRM and ARM user manual*. Halifax, NS: Resilience Research Centre, Dalhousie University. [https://cymr.resilienceresearch.org/files/CYRM\\_&\\_ARM-User\\_Manual.pdf](https://cymr.resilienceresearch.org/files/CYRM_&_ARM-User_Manual.pdf)
- Rushton, C. H., Batcheller, J., Schroeder, K., & Donohue, P. (2015). Burnout and resilience among nurses practicing in high-intensity settings. *American Journal of Critical Care: An Official Publication, American Association of Critical-Care Nurses*, 24(5), 412-420. <https://doi.org/10.4037/ajcc2015291>
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5>.
- Simionescu, M., Bordea, E. N., & Pellegrini, A. (2022). How did the COVID-19 pandemic impact the stress susceptibility of employed and non-employed nursing students in Romania? *Plos One*, 17(3), e0264920. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0264920>
- Southwick, S. M., Vythilingam, M., & Charney, D. S. (2005). The psychobiology of depression and resilience to stress: Implications for prevention and treatment. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 1, 255-291. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.1.102803.143948>
- Şahin, A. (2006). Din kaynaklı stres üzerine bir araştırma. *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(21), 147-180.

- Şahin, N. H., & Durak, A. (1994, 17-22 July). Occupational stress and job satisfaction the case of the banking personnel. *23 rd. International Congress of Applied Psycholog*, Madrid, Spain.
- Şahin, N. H., & Batıgün, D. A. (1997). Bir özel hastahane sağlık personelinde iş doyumunu ve stres. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, *12*(39), 57-71.
- Terzi, Ş. (2008). Üniversite öğrencilerinin psikolojik dayanıklılıkları ve algıladıkları sosyal destek arasındaki ilişki. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, *3*(29), 1-11.
- Topçu, Z. G., & Demircioğlu, H. (2020). Ekolojik sistemler perspektifinden psikolojik sağlamlık. *Gelişim ve Psikoloji Dergisi (GPD)*, *1*(2), 125-147.
- Ulubayram, G. (2015). *Tüberküloz hastalarında stres ve stresle ilişkili faktörler* (Tez No. 407319) [Yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Tez Merkezi.
- Ungar, M., & Lienbenberg, L. (2011). Assessing resilience across cultures using mixed methods: Construction of the Child and Youth Resilience Measure. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *5*(2), 126-149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689811400607>
- Vungkhanching, M., Tonsing, J. C., & Tonsing, K. N. (2016). Psychological distress, coping and perceived social support in social work students. *British Journal of Social Work*, *47*(7), 1999-2013. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcw145>
- Wade, M., Zeanah, C. H., Fox, N. A., Tibu, F., Ciolan, L. E., & Nelson, C. A. (2019). Stress sensitization among severely neglected children and protection by social enrichment. *Nature communications*, *10*(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13622-3>
- Wilson, R. S., Begeny, C. T., Boyle, P. A., Schneider, J. A., & Bennett, D. A. (2011). Susceptibility to stress, anxiety, and development of dementia in old age. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *19*(4), 327-334. <https://doi.org/10.1097/jgp.0b013e31820119da>
- Xiao, H., Zhang, Y., Kong, D., Li, S., & Yang, N. (2020). The effects of social support on sleep quality of medical staff treating patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in January and February 2020 in China. *Medical Science Monitor: International Medical Journal of Experimental and Clinical Research*, *26*, e923549-1-8. <https://doi.org/10.12659/MSM.923549>.
- Yalcin Siedentopf, N., Pichler, T., Welte, A. S., Hoertnagl, C. M., Klasen, C. C., Kemmler, G., Siedentopf, C. M., & Hofer, A. (2021). Sex matters: Stress perception and the relevance of resilience and perceived social support in emerging adults. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, *24*(3), 403-411. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-020-01076-2>
- Yaşar, M., & Aybek, E. C. (2019). Üniversite öğrencileri için bir yılmazlık ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi: Madde tepki kuramı temelinde geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *İlköğretim Online*, *18*(4), 1687-1699. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2019.635031>.
- Zhang, M., Zhang, J., Zhang, F., Zhang, L., & Feng, D. (2018). Prevalence of psychological distress and the effects of resilience and perceived social support among Chinese college students: Does gender make a difference? *Psychiatry Research*, *267*, 409-413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.06.038>
- Zubin, J., & Spring, B. (1977). Susceptibility; a new view of schizophrenia. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *86*(2), 103-126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.86.2.103>.

### Genişletilmiş Özet

Literatürde çocukluk döneminde zorlayıcı, stresli yaşantılara maruz kalmanın ileriki dönemde strese yatkınlığı artırıcı bir faktör olabileceği belirtilmiştir (Southwick ve diğerleri, 2005; Wade ve diğerleri, 2019). Yapılan araştırmalarda strese yatkınlık ile depresyon arasında bir ilişki

olduğu bulunmuştur (Bunevicius ve vd., 2008; De Almeida Vieira Monteiro ve Serra, 2011; Ghita ve diğerleri, 2022). Bunevicius ve diğerleri (2008) tarafından yapılan çalışmada strese yatkınlık düzeyi arttıkça anksiyete düzeyinin de arttığı belirlenmiş ve ayrıca strese yatkınlık ile beş faktör kişilik özelliklerinden dışa dönüklük, sorumluluk ve duygusal denge arasında negatif ilişki olduğu bulunmuştur. Başka bir çalışmada da A tipi kişilik ile strese yatkınlık arasında pozitif bir ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir (Batıgün & Şahin, 2006). Erbay İnci (2021), strese yatkınlık ile obsesif inanışların pozitif ilişkili olduğunu saptamıştır. Barut (2022), sigara kullanımıyla ilgili yaptığı araştırmasında strese yatkınlık ve öfkeyle ilişkili olduğu sonucuna ulaşmıştır. Başka bir çalışmada da strese yatkınlık ile sosyal kaygı arasında pozitif ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir (Erdemir, 2021). Göçmenlerle yapılan bir çalışmada strese yatkınlık ile sosyal destek arasında negatif yönlü bir ilişki bulunmuştur (De Almeida Vieira Monteiro & Serra, 2011). Benzer şekilde Southwick ve diğerlerinin (2005), yaptıkları çalışmada da sosyal desteğin strese dayanıklılık üzerinde olumlu bir etkisi olduğu belirtilmiştir. Ulubayram (2015), strese yatkınlık ile ilişki memnuniyeti ve yaşam memnuniyeti arasında negatif bir ilişki bulmuştur. Davarniya ve diğerleri (2019), çalışmasında psikolojik sağlık, başa çıkma stratejileri ve sosyal desteğin strese yatkınlığı yordadığı sonucuna ulaşmıştır. Wilson ve diğerleri (2011), yaşlılık dönemindeki bireylerle bir araştırma yürütmüştür ve strese yatkınlık ile Alzheimer riski arasında bir ilişki bulmuşlardır. Yapılan başka bir çalışmada da öz yeterlik, umut, iyimserlik ve psikolojik sağlık boyutlarından oluşan psikolojik sermaye ile strese yatkınlık arasında negatif bir ilişki bulunmuştur (Caponnetto vd., 2022). Yapılan araştırmalardan anlaşılıyor ki stresten etkilenme düzeyinin kişiden kişiye değişim gösterebileceği ve strese yatkınlığın erken dönem yaşantıları, kişilik özellikleri gibi faktörlerden etkilenebilirken beraberinde farklı problemlerin yaşanmasına yol açabileceği söylenebilir. İlgili araştırmalar ve stresle ilgili çalışmalar genel olarak değerlendirildiğinde strese yatkınlığın olaylar karşısında yoğun olumsuz duygular yaşama ihtimalini azaltabilecek psikolojik sağlık düzeyini de yordayabilir.

Psikolojik açıdan daha sağlam olan bireylerin olaylara farklı perspektiflerden yaklaşabildiği ve böylece zorlu yaşam olaylarıyla daha rahat bir şekilde başa çıkabildiği (Okan vd., 2020), ayrıca olaylara karşı daha olumlu yaklaşıtları ve geleceğe dair daha umutlu oldukları ifade edilmektedir (Polat, 2018). Tüm bunlardan yola çıkarak psikolojik sağlık düzeyi yüksek olan bireylerin olaylara ve geleceğe karşı bakış açıları daha pozitif olduğu ve problemler karşısında daha hızlı kendilerini toparlayabildikleri söylenebilir. Bununla birlikte psikolojik sağlık düzeyinin yüksek olmasıyla strese yatkınlık düzeyinin azalabileceği ifade edilebilir. Psikolojik sağlamlığın başka bir tanımına bakıldığında bireyin sıkıntı duyabileceği durumlarda sahip olduğu olumlu özellikleri ve yakın çevresinin desteğiyle uyum geliştirebilme yeteneği olarak ifade edilmektedir (Arslan, 2015). Bu tanımdan hareketle psikolojik sağlamlığın alt boyutları olan bireysel, ilişkisel, ailesel, kültürel ve bağlamsal kaynaklar ile strese yatkınlık arasında ilişki olabileceği düşünülmektedir. Bu nedenle çalışmada strese yatkınlık ile psikolojik sağlık arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Strese yatkınlığın ruhsal sağlık üzerinde önemli etkileri olduğundan dolayı bu çalışmanın ruh sağlığı uzmanları için önemli olabileceği ve ruh sağlığıyla ilgili yapılan çalışmalara katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Bu araştırmada strese yatkınlık ile psikolojik sağlamlık arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemek amaçlanmış olup ilişkisel tarama yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çünkü ilişkisel tarama yönteminde değişkenler arasında nasıl ilişkilerin olduğu ortaya çıkarılmasının amaçlandığı belirtilmektedir (Burmaoğlu ve diğerleri, 2013).

Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu yaşları 17-53 arasında olan gönüllü 306 birey oluşturmaktadır. Veri grubunun 247'si (%80.7) kadın, 59'u (%19.3) erkektir. Katılımcılardan 92 kişi (%30.1) evli, 214 kişi de (%69.9) bekarıdır. Araştırmaya bireyler kendi istekleriyle katılım göstermişlerdir. Araştırmada verilerin toplanması amacıyla Strese Yatkınlık Ölçeği ve Yetişkin Psikolojik Sağlamlık Ölçeği (YPSÖ-21) kullanılmıştır.

Veriler korelasyon ve regresyon analizi ile incelenmiştir. Yapılan korelasyon analizi sonucu strese yatkınlık ile psikolojik sağlamlığın alt boyutları olan ilişkisel kaynaklar, bireysel kaynaklar ve ailesel kaynaklar arasında negatif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Regresyon analizi sonucunda strese yatkınlığı psikolojik sağlamlığın alt boyutlarından ilişkisel kaynaklar, kültürel ve bağlamsal kaynakların anlamlı derecede yordadığı görülmüştür. Ayrıca çalışmada strese yatkınlık puanlarının cinsiyete ve medeni duruma göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılık göstermediği bulunmuştur.

Araştırmanın bulguları doğrultusunda psikolojik sağlamlık düzeyinin yüksek olması strese yatkınlık düzeyini azaltan bir faktör olduğu görülmektedir. Bu çalışmanın ruh sağlığı alanında çalışan profesyoneller için önemli olabileceği söylenebilir. Araştırmanın katkıları yanında bazı sınırlılıkları bulunmaktadır. Araştırmaya 17-53 yaşları arasındaki 306 bireyin katılımıyla ve bireylerin araştırmada kullanılan ölçeklere verdiği yanıtlarla sınırlıdır. Literatürde strese yatkınlıkla ilgili araştırmaların sağlık çalışanlarıyla sıkça yapıldığı gözlenmiş olup gelecekte farklı iş çevrelerinde çalışan bireylerin (özel eğitim alanında çalışan bireyler, ruh sağlığı çalışanları gibi) strese yatkınlık düzeyleri araştırılabilir. Buna ek olarak strese yatkınlık çalışmalarının genellikle yetişkin bireylerle yapıldığı ve emeklilik dönemine hazırlık, geç kalmışlık, umutsuzluk hisleri yaşanma ihtimali olan yaşlılık dönemindeki bireylerin strese yatkınlık, pişmanlık, umutsuzluk düzeyleri araştırılabilir. Ruh sağlığı çalışanları bireylerin strese yatkınlık düzeylerini azaltmaları konularında yardımcı olmak amacıyla onlara iyi gelen kaynaklara nasıl yönelebilecekleriyle ilgili de olarak stresle baş etme programları düzenleyebilir.