THE RELATION OF FAMILY BOUNDARY VIOLATION TO SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AND TRAIT ANXIETY AMONG ADOLESCENTS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY
CEREN BEKTAŞ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

SEPTEMBER 2018
Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Cennet Engin Demir
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir
Supervisor

Exposing Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Hatipoğlu Sümer (METU, EDS) _____________
Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir (METU, EDS) _____________
Assoc. Prof. Dr. İbrahim Keklik (Hacettepe Uni., EBB) _____________
I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Ceren Bektaş

Signature:
ABSTRACT

THE RELATION OF FAMILY BOUNDARY VIOLATION TO SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AND TRAIT ANXIETY AMONG ADOLESCENTS

Bektaş, Ceren
MS, Department of Educational Sciences
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir

September 2018, 109 pages

The purpose of the study was to examine the relation of boundary violation to subjective well-being and trait anxiety among adolescents. The sample was consisted of 1305 early and late adolescents (582 male, 723 female) aged between 11 and 18. Boundary Violation Scale, Brief Multidimensional Student’s Life Satisfaction Scale, Positive and Negative Affect Schedule, Trait Anxiety Form of State-Trait Anxiety Scale for Children and a demographic information form were used to collect data. Pearson correlation analyses were conducted to measure the relationship between the dimensions of boundary violation -which include forming coalition, promoting maturity, communicating as peers-, and the dimensions of subjective well-being -which are composed of life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect-. The correlation analyses were also run to measure the relationship between the dimensions of boundary violation and trait anxiety. T-tests were performed for group comparisons. The results revealed that forming coalition was negatively correlated with life satisfaction, and positively correlated with trait anxiety and negative affect. On the other hand, promoting maturity and communicating as peers were identified...
separately to be positively correlated with life satisfaction and positive affect, and to be negatively correlated with trait anxiety. The results also indicated that females had higher trait anxiety and lower subjective well-being than males. Also, early adolescents had higher subjective well-being than late adolescents. The inconsistency between the dimensions of boundary violation in terms of their relationship with subjective well-being and trait anxiety might stem from a culturally nonsensitive measurement. Therefore, future research might consider to develop boundary violation scales that are compatible with the Turkish family environment.

**Keywords:** Boundary violation, family subsystems, subjective well-being, trait anxiety, adolescence.
ÖZ

AİLE İÇİ SINİR İHLALİNİN ERGENLERDE ÖZNEL İYİ OLUŞ VE SÜREKLİ KAYGI İLE İLİŞKİSİ

Bektaş, Ceren
Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi : Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir

Eylül 2018, 109 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı aile içi sınır ihlalinin ergenlerde öznel iyi oluş ve sürekli kayğı ile ilişkisini incelemektir. Çalışma grubu ön ergenlik ve ileri ergenlik döneminde bulunan, 11 ile 18 yaş arası, 723’ü kız ve 582’si erkek olmak üzere 1305 katılımcıdan oluşmuştur. Veri toplama aracı olarak Aile İçi Sınır Ölçeği, Pozitif Negatif Duygu Ölçeği, Öğrenci Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği Kısa Formu, Çocuklar İçin Durumluğ ve Sürekli Kaygı Ölçeği-Sürekli Kaygı Formu ve araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen demografik bilgi formu kullanılmıştır. Sınır ihlalinin boyutları olan koalisyon oluşturma, olgunluğu teşvik ve akran düzeyi iletişim ile öznel iyi oluşun boyutları olan yaşam doyumu, pozitif duygulanım ve negatif duygulanım arasındaki ilişkiyi ölçmek amacıyla ve yine sınır ihlalinin boyutları ile sürekli kaygı arasındaki ilişkiyi ölçmek amacıyla bir dizi Pearson korelasyon analizi gerçekleştirilmiştir. Katılımcıların öznel iyi oluş puanları ve sürekli kaygı puanlarını cinsiyet ve ergenlik evresi açısından karşılaştırılmak için t-test kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar koalisyon oluşturmanın; yaşam doyumu ile negatif, negatif duygulanım ve sürekli kaygı ile pozitif yönde ilişkili olduğunu ortaya koymmuştur. Öte yandan olgunluga teşvik ve vi

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Smır ihlali, aile alt sistemleri, öznel iyi oluş, sürekli kaygı, ergenlik.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

At the preamble of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, family is defined as a natural environment for its members’- especially child’s- growth and well-being. It is underlined that “The child, for the full and harmonious development of his or her personality, should grow up in a family environment, in an atmosphere of happiness, love, and understanding.” (p.45) (The United Nations, 1989). The existence of a warm and supportive parent is a chance for the adolescents in their developmental period. However, it would not be sufficient to conclude that the family environment of such adolescents is eligible enough to promote their well-being.

The family system asserts that the members and the subsystems of a family are interdependent (P. Minuchin, 1988). In other words, a behavioral pattern observed in an individual or a family subsystem can affect and can be affected by other individuals or family subsystem. Thus, the development of a child is influenced by multiple types of family interactions, including the ones that the child is not a direct participant (Emery & Tuer, 1993). As such, family researchers in their studies on adolescence also focus on examining the relationship between marital relationships and parenting, rather than focusing solely on the parent-adolescent relationship (Santrock, 2014).

The quality of the relationship between spouses has effects on adolescents. Santrock (2014) states that marital discord may decrease the efficacy of the parental behavior and it affects the behaviors of the adolescent. Easterbrooks and Emde (1988) also point out that parents exhibit more positive affect while interacting with their children when they have a warmer intimate relationship. Therefore, it may be concluded that
the adolescents can be affected by the characteristics of the relationship in a marital subsystem. The construct that determines to what extent an outside member of a subsystem will be affected by the dynamics of the subsystem is called boundary. While enmeshed and disengaged boundaries are related to the negative outcomes in family members, clear boundaries are conducive of their well-being.

As the current study focuses on the adolescents, it will be meaningful to establish the relationship between the characteristics of adolescence and the family boundaries. It is known that, gaining autonomy and achieving an identity are significant developmental tasks of the adolescence. Minuchin (1974) underlines that clear boundaries encourage child for autonomous exploration which is important for exploring the outside world and related with the others outside the family. Kağıtçibaşı (2007) stresses the importance of clear boundaries by referring to Minuchin and emphasizes that well-defined boundaries of the self are important for individuation-separation and for the healthy development of the self. When the identity formation is considered, Perosa and Perosa (1993) found that clear boundaries are related to successful identity achievement. In this context, families with clear boundaries ensure a supportive and encouraging environment for the transmission process from childhood to adulthood.

Considering the differences between the developmental tasks in different life stages, it can be reasoned that the autonomous exploration in adolescence has different characteristics than those in childhood. On the other hand, seeing the family as a secure base (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991) makes the discovery easier, just like in the childhood. It is, hence, important that the adolescent feels secure in the family even in the times when the family system is under stress. In the cohesive families that have clear boundaries (Minuchin, 1974), the adolescent continues to feel secure in the family including the stressful times of the family system (Forman & Davies, 2005). Moreover, Davies and Cummings (1994) reported that when the children observe their parents’ resolving the disputes in the marital relationship without disrupting the family harmony (which refers to a marital subsystem with a clear boundary), they feel
emotionally secure and it helps them regulate their subjective feelings and overt behavioral expressions of such feelings.

Although having clear boundaries provides support for adolescents at their developmental level, keeping the boundaries clear in such a transition may not be easy. Since the family is an interdependent unit, adolescence is a period that not only the adolescent but also the family should be adapted to. Minuchin (1974) notes that when a child emerges into adolescence, his or her relationship with the parents is altered. The parents’ interactions with the adolescent evolve from a parent-child level into a parent-young adult level. However, parents may resist such change. One of the parents, usually the mother may underestimate the adolescent’s autonomy in order to keep the old relationship pattern with her child. If the father takes side with the child against the mother during that period, a cross-generational coalition is formed which indicates a violated boundary.

As stated above, as the child grows up, the permeability of the boundaries should be modified, especially in order to give the child more room, so that the child can gain his or her autonomy and can differentiate from the parents. The failure in modifying family boundaries according to the child’s new developmental level may result in pursuing an emotionally over-involvement to the family (Minuchin, 1974), which refers to a low level of individuation. Fullinwider-Bush and Jacobvitz (1993) reported that the adolescents who experience boundary violation in their families are more likely to adhere to the parental values and expectations without evaluating alternative choices. Therefore, in pursuit of gaining autonomy period, parents should continue to be a more of an adult person than the child and should meet their emotional needs with their spouses rather than exhibiting boundary violating behaviors (Sroufe, Egeland, Carlson, & Collins, 2005).

Boundary violation is associated with unfavorable circumstances for adolescents. The related literature presents its relationship with well-being and psychopathology. Some of said studies are presented in the literature review part of the study. On the other
hand, the most significant study that provides a strong background for the current study is Minuchin’s. Minuchin (1974) displayed the effect of boundary violation on the adolescents in a laboratory environment. He worked with an intact family having two children including one early adolescent and one late adolescent. Firstly, the parents were subjected to a stressful condition and the children observed the conflict between their parents through a one-way mirror. Then, the children’s stress level measured by means of a blood test and the results showed a rising in the stress level. Secondly, the children were directly involved in the conflict and each parent tried to pull the children to their side against the other parent. The blood test results showed that in the second situation, the children’s stress level increased far more compared to the first one. More significantly, the stress level of one child did not turn back to the normal level for a long time. Moreover, the long-term effects of boundary violation on the adolescent well-being were reported. Boundary violation in early adolescence was found to be correlated with internalizing problems, externalizing problems, psychiatric symptoms, and lower self-worth in late adolescence (Shaffer & Egeland, 2011).

In the light of the existing literature, the current study focuses on the relation of family boundary violation to subjective well-being and trait anxiety. When the subjective well-being theory is considered, it is expected that subjective well-being will change depending on environmental factors. On the other hand, trait anxiety may be considered to be related to genetic factors rather than the environment as it is a predisposition. However, the existing literature presents its relation to family environment. As abovementioned, boundary violation in a family system prevents children from autonomous exploration. Especially enmeshed boundaries prevent them from gaining autonomy. Chorpita and Barlow (1998) state that children with lack of autonomy are in a tendency to perceive events as out of their control and that leads to a high level of trait anxiety. Therefore, adolescents who grow up in a family with boundary violation can be expected to develop a tendency towards anxiety in their early childhood years. Because trait refers to an enduring predisposition, it is also possible to observe trait anxiety in adolescence. Endler, Parker, Bagby, and Cox
(1991) state that some facets of trait anxiety are social evaluation, physical danger, ambiguity, and daily routines. Especially ambiguity refers to unclear boundaries and makes it reasonable to establish a hypothesis about a possible relationship between trait anxiety and boundary violation.

The current study focus on trait anxiety in the light of the state-trait conception (Spielberger, 1966), by ruling out state anxiety. The reason for the current study’s choice of the trait anxiety over the state anxiety in terms of family relations can be explained by comparing their typical characteristics. State anxiety emerges at the time of a specific situation. Therefore, measuring state anxiety during the class hours gives information about the instant experiences of the adolescents in the classroom. For example, state anxiety level of the adolescents might increase when the teacher announces a pop quiz just before the researcher enters the class. On the other hand, trait anxiety gives information regarding a longer period of time and a wide range of stressors. Trait anxiety predicts state anxiety in the psychological threat conditions (Reiss, 1997).

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The first purpose of the current study was to investigate the relationship between boundary violation and subjective well-being, and between boundary violation and trait anxiety. The second aim of the study was to compare the participants based on their gender and stage of adolescence in terms of subjective well-being and trait anxiety.

1.3 Research Questions

Considering the purpose of the current study, answers to the following research questions were sought:
1. Is there a significant relationship between the dimensions of boundary violation and subjective well-being?

2. Is there a significant relationship between the dimensions of boundary violation and trait anxiety?

3. Do subjective well-being and trait anxiety levels of the participants differ in terms of gender?

4. Do subjective well-being and trait anxiety levels of the participants differ in terms of stage of adolescence?

1.4 Significance of the Study

There is a high incidence of marriage in Turkey each year. Every year, a great number of people start new families to live “happily ever after”. When it comes to the divorce statistics, sadly, it can be said that a great incidence of marriage do not have a happy ending. According to the latest statistics obtained from the Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK, 2018), 128,411 couples have divorced in 2017. The calculations made based on the statistics derived from TUIK indicate that, 642,623 couples got divorced in the last five years, excluding the year of 2018. These statistics may provide an insight into the existence of an unhealthy family environment in Turkey. Taking into account the existence of the married couples that experience marital discord but still continue being married, the picture becomes more alarming for the children in Turkey. Therefore, the existence of the unhealthy family environment in our country should not be underestimated.

A great variety of research revealed that the marital discord has direct consequences for the children (e.g., Amato & Sobolewski, 2001; Gottman & Katz, 1989; Harold, Aitken, & Shelton, 2007). Feeling the disharmony within the family and hearing the arguments between the parents will be enough to make children feel distressed. On
the other hand, when compared to hearing the parents’ arguments, there is a bigger problem for the children, which is getting involved. In the Turkish culture, the family is seen as a whole, and therefore its subsystems—such as marital subsystem or sibling subsystem—may be ignored. When the marital subsystem and relatedly the parental alliance is not strong, the boundary between the parents and the child is under the risk of violation (Minuchin, 1974). When the marital subsystem and alliance between the parents is not strong enough, the parents may involve their child into their marital subsystem in order to share some parental responsibilities, to tell their spousal problems to the child as if the child was a peer or confidante, and to set up coalitions with their children against the other spouse. Parents use all of these abovementioned boundary violation patterns with the purpose of keeping their emotional stability and reducing stress in their marital subsystem. On the other hand, boundary violation may lead to negative outcomes for the child and in a broad sense, for the society.

Regarding Minuchin’s Structural Family Theory (1974), which is one of the family system theories, unclear boundaries and cross-generational coalitions in a family structure affect the child’s well-being. As another family system theory, Bowen’s theory (1978) argues that children transfer the emotions gained from the nuclear family to their new families as adults. Moreover, Jacobvitz, Morgan, Kretchmar, and Morgan (1991) found that the mothers who have an unclear boundary in the relationship with their mothers are more likely to show boundary violating behaviors while interacting with their children. Sroufe and colleagues (2005) also reported a significant continuity of parent-child boundary violation across two generations.

Because the children take their parents as role models, they may perceive boundary violation as a way of building a relationship. Sroufe, Bennett, Englund, Urban, and Shulman (1993) found that children whose boundaries were violated during the toddlerhood years by their mothers displayed more boundary violation behaviors toward their peers during preadolescence. As supported by the early study findings that are mentioned above, the said pattern may continue in adulthood and prevent the individual from building healthy relationships, affect the new family boundaries,
marital relationships, and parenting behaviors. So we can suggest that children who are raised in a family that has clear boundaries between its subsystems - in other words in a healthy family environment - are more likely to start a healthier family than others. As a result, it can be stated that the core of a healthy society is a healthy family environment. Accordingly, understanding boundary violation and its possible aversive effects on children is important to obtain a more peaceful society.

While boundary violation between family subsystems is a well-developed concept in the West, its emphasis in Turkish literature is very brief. Thanks to the current study, defining the terms and explaining their relationships with well-being; bring light to a societal problem, raise the consciousness of parents and of significant others in the adolescents’ life. School counselors and other mental health professionals may benefit from the study to have a scientific evidence for identifying the adolescents’ worries and developing proper interventions for them. As the current study is one of the first attempts to investigate boundary violation in the family and its relationship with adolescent mental health, it may contribute to increasing awareness regarding the issue and may encourage future studies.

1.5 Operational Definition of the Terms

*Boundaries* are invisible barriers to a family system organizing the contact with others (Nichols & Schwartz, 2004). The boundaries of a subsystem are the rules defining the participants of such subsystem, and to what extend they will participate in it.

*Boundary Violation* refers to the inclusion of a family member in a family subsystem that he or she does not belong. In the present study, boundary violation refers to the inclusion of adolescents in the marital subsystem.

*Communicating as Peers* refers to that parents see their children like a peer and communicate with them in that manner (Madden-Derdich, Estrada, Updegraff, & Leonard, 2002). In the present study, communicating as peers represents one of the
three dimensions of boundary violation and is measured by the Communicating as Peers Subscale of Boundary Violation Scale (Avcı, Çolakkadıoğlu, Öz, & Akbaş, 2015).

*Forming Coalition* refers to parents’ effort to align themselves with their children against the other parent (Madden-Derdich et al., 2002). In the present study, forming coalition represents one of the three dimensions of boundary violation and is measured by the Forming Coalition Subscale of Boundary Violation Scale (Avcı et al., 2015).

*Life satisfaction* refers to cognitive appraisals of an individual about his or her quality of life. Life satisfaction represents the cognitive component of subjective well-being. In the present study, it is measured by the Brief Multidimensional Student’s Life Satisfaction Scale (Siyez & Kaya, 2008).

*Negative affect* refers to emotions and moods such as sadness, anger, stress, and guilt. Negative affect, together with positive affect, constitutes the affective component of subjective well-being. In the present study, it is measured by the Negative Affect Subscale of Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (Gençöz, 2000).

*Positive affect* refers to emotions and moods such as joy, love, pride, and excitement. Positive affect, together with negative affect, constitutes the affective component of subjective well-being. In the present study, it is measured by the Positive Affect Subscale of Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (Gençöz, 2000).

*Promoting Maturity* is an indicator that parents treat their children in a way that is not appropriate for the children’s developmental status (Madden-Derdich et al., 2002). In the present study, promoting maturity represents one of the three dimensions of boundary violation and is measured by the Promoting Maturity Subscale of Boundary Violation Scale (Avcı et al., 2015).
Stage of Adolescence, in this study, refers to the two-stage classification of UNICEF (2018), comprising of early and late adolescence.

Subjective well-being refers to how people evaluate themselves and their lives with positive terms (Diener & Suh 2000). In the present study, subjective well-being represents an outcome obtained by subtracting the negative affect score from the sum of life satisfaction score and positive affect score.

Trait anxiety refers to an individual’s predisposition to perceive objectively nondangerous situations as dangerous or threatening and to respond to these situations with an elevated state of anxiety (Spielberger, 1966). In the present study, it is measured by the Trait Anxiety Form of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (Özusta, 1995).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter firstly presents brief information about the two developmental stages of adolescence. Secondly, the theoretical backgrounds of boundary violation, subjective well-being, and trait anxiety are summarized. Lastly, it provides related research results from Turkey and abroad.

2.1 Developmental Stages of Adolescence

Adolescence can be defined as a transitional life stage from childhood to adulthood where a series of physical, cognitive, affective, and psychosocial changes occur in an individual. World Health Organization (WHO, 2018) defines adolescents as young people between the ages of 10 and 19. The adolescence is divided into different developmental stages. However, the classification of the stages is a controversial issue especially in terms of naming and age-range. United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF, 2018) defines two developmental stages of the adolescence as early adolescence (10-14 years) and late adolescence (15-19 years). Dividing adolescence into three stages as early, middle, and late is another well-accepted classification yet the age range of the stages differ from one study to another (e.g., Balk, 1995; Burrow, Tubman & Finley, 2004). The current study uses UNICEF’s two-stage classification to define the developmental characteristics of the participants.

Early adolescence can be defined as a transition from childhood to adolescence. Thornburg (as cited in Thornburg, 1983) states that, while early adolescence should
rely on childhood theories, it also forms a basis for understanding the characteristics of adolescence. The stage is especially characterized by consequent physical changes at the onset of the puberty (Nottelmann, Inoff-Germain, Susman & Chrousos, 1990). Therefore, adjustment to the new body image can be considered as one of the developmental tasks of early adolescence. Emotional separation from the parents also starts at that stage yet concrete thinking and early moral concepts remain their existence (Christie & Viner, 2005). The focal point of emotional distress among early adolescents is relatively early or late puberty compared to peers, and the differences in physical appearance due to it (Nottelmann et al., 1990)

While early adolescence is a transition to adolescence, late adolescence can be defined as a transition to young adulthood. In late adolescence, abstract thinking takes the place of concrete thinking, the level of autonomy rises, ability to distinguish law from morality increases, and intimate relationships become more important (Christie & Viner, 2005). In other words, cognitive, affective, and psychosocial developmental levels of the individual step up to the adult level. Risky behaviors such as substance abuse, violent crime or suicidal behaviors also increase in late adolescence (Rutter, 1990).

When the differences between the characteristics of the two developmental stages are taken into consideration, the difference between early adolescents and late adolescents in terms of some psychological aspects can be anticipated. In fact, there are study results justifying this anticipation. For example; Burrow, Tubman, and Finley (2004) found that the early adolescents were lower depression level, and higher self-esteem than the late adolescents. Rivlin and Faragher (2007) examined the anxiety levels of the individuals in a thermally injured adolescent group and found that the early adolescents were more vulnerable to different types of anxiety such as meeting a stranger, being bullied, blood or burn objects than the late adolescents.
On the grounds of the related literature presented above, the current study addresses the difference between the two developmental stage in terms of subjective well-being and trait anxiety.

2.2 Minuchin’s Structural Family Theory

Minuchin (1974) built his theory based on the idea that a family is a system and its structure determines how well it will function. He defined the family structure as “an invisible set of functional demands that organizes how family members interact with each other” (p.51). As stated by Nichols and Schwartz (2004) there are two structural requirements for a family system which are mutual accommodation and boundary making.

Mutual accommodation refers to a harmonious relationship that spouses’ sharing some everytime activities, having daily routines such as when to go to bed, and a flexible work sharing based on explicit and implicit negotiations (Nichols and Schwartz, 2004). The family system works through transactional patterns. As the transactions repeat, they turn into transactional patterns organizing how family members behave in the system (Minuchin, 1974). Transactional patterns based on mutual accommodation lead to an effective functioning in the family.

The second structural requirement for a well-functioning family structure is boundary making. From the perspective of Structural Family Theory, the family contains subsystems such as; individual subsystems, marital subsystem, parental subsystem, and sibling subsystem. As a big system, family sustains its functions via subsystems. Each family member is a part of more than one subsystems, and they have different roles in each of the subsystems they belong to. For example; a woman is a wife in the marital subsystem, a mother in the parental subsystem, and “she” in her individual subsystem. In each subsystem, family members have different levels of power, and they gain different skills based on their different roles (Minuchin, 1974). As aforementioned, transactional patterns regulate how one behaves in different
subsystems. Also, another construct called “boundary” determines how subsystems interact with and differentiate from each other.

2.2.1 Boundary violation

Each subsystem has a boundary regulating who participates to the subsystem, and the extent of such participation. There are three types of boundaries; clear boundary, disengaged boundary which is inappropriately rigid and seemingly unrelated, and enmeshed boundary which is diffuse and chaotic (Minuchin, 1974; Nichols & Schwartz, 2004). While clear boundary refers to a cohesive family, enmeshed and disengaged boundaries refer to enmeshed and disengaged families. Minuchin and Nichols (1993) stated that disengagement and enmeshment are reciprocal. “Enmeshed mother and disengaged father” pattern is seen commonly in families. In such a pattern, the father may be enmeshed with his job and disengaged with his marital and parental subsystem; and the mother may substitute her enmeshed relationship with her child for the marital subsystem.

For a healthy family functioning, boundaries must be clear. Two features of a clear boundary include being well defined and flexible which means that the boundary of a particular subsystem should not allow the interference of other family members, who do not belong to the subsystem, but should allow communication with other family members and subsystems. Based on that, boundaries serve as a regulator that prevents confusion of different roles and responsibilities of subsystems (Bascoe, 2012).

The common feature of both types of unclear boundaries is that they lack of clear authority lines (Nichols & Schwartz, 2004). In a well-functioning family structure, parents and children have different levels of authority, and there is a hierarchical line where parents are above children. Within the context of an intergenerational hierarchy, parents operate as a team and children obey the rules established by the team. Implying interference in a subsystem from an out family member, boundary
violation is an indicator of unhealthy family functioning and is observed when a subsystem has a diffuse/enmeshed boundary. In a family with enmeshed boundaries hierarchical structure is damaged; parents and children argue about who is in charge, and they share the responsibility of making parental decisions (Nichols & Schwartz, 2004).

There are several indicators of boundary violation in the family. The current study focuses on three of them, which are coalition formation, peer-level communication, and maturity promotion (Madden-Derdich et al., 2002). The present study dwells on the triadic relationship including both of the spouses and their child. Based on that, boundary violation refers to a child’s inappropriate interference to the marital subsystem.

Coalition refers to an alliance of some family members against other family members. Disengaged and enmeshed boundaries result in cross-generational coalition, which is a triangular structure (Minuchin, 1974). In a cross-generational coalition, child allies with one parent against the other parent. A typical cross-generational coalition constitutes the mother and the child, and excludes the father. As pointed out by Buchanan and Waizenhofer (2001), cross-generational coalition creates a conflict between the child and the outside parent. In this manner, the coalition may serve to change the direction of the conflict between the spouses. Childress (n.d) states that, a parent who has revengeful hostility toward the other parent may be holding their emotional stability through the child’s rejection of the other parent. Rejection of the one parent by the child may be used as evidence that the flawed one in the spousal relationship is not the allied parent, but the outside parent (Childress, n.d). As a result of such a point of view to the spousal problems, the original conflict between marital subsystem becomes difficult to resolve. Moreover, Bowen (1978) states that in such a triangular relationship, the most harmed family member is the third one, in other words, the child.
In *peer level communication*, parents communicate with their children as a peer or a confidante. In this manner, parents treat their children as their best friends, even they share information about their spousal relationships (Madden-Derdich et al., 2002). Based on such a relationship, children may be seen as an advisor and a support provider for their parents. In an attempt to decrease their parents’ worries, children may feel distressed in their lives (Brown, 2002).

In *maturity promotion* process, parents give their children more privileges and responsibilities beyond their peers, in other words, beyond their developmental stage. A connected concept with maturity promotion is *parentification* (Kerig, 2005). Parentification refers to parents’ developmentally inappropriate demands on childlike caring of the parents. Parentification is also an indicator of the child’s involving in the marital subsystem. Sharing some adult responsibilities gives the child a decision-maker and a problem-solver role, also spouses may see the child as an emotional resource while coping with their marital distress. Within the scope of SFT, Minuchin (1974) called a child overwhelming with such responsibilities as *parentified child*. The presence of a parentified child in family shows the existence of a reversed generational hierarchy that is unfavorable for a family structure.

Briefly, regarding the context of SFT; the boundaries between family subsystems must be clear, an intergenerational hierarchy must be set, and the roles of family members must be well defined in order to have a healthy family environment. The current study focuses on unhealthy family functioning with unfavorable boundaries in the light of SFT.

### 2.2.1.1 Research on boundary violation

Boundary violation is a well-developed concept in the West. When the related literature is reviewed, it can be observed that the terms such as boundary violation (Fish, Belsky & Youngblade, 1991; Madden-Derdich et al., 2002), generational boundary dissolution (Shaffer & Sroufe, 2005), boundary permeability (Morgan,
1991), enmeshment (Barber & Buehler, 1996), fusion (Bowen, 1978), and boundary diffusion (Perrin, 2010) are used interchangeably. There are also different dimensions within the scope of boundary violation such as cross-generational coalitions (Flemons & Tsai, 1992; Minuchin, 1974), triangulation (Bowen, 1978), parentification (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Spark, 1973), and spousification (Sroufe & Ward, 1980).

Boundary violation was found to be predominately linked with internalizing and externalizing problems. There is a small number of studies that directly measure the relation of boundary violation to subjective well-being. Therefore, it is useful to address the studies on internalizing and externalizing problems. Because it is well known that internalizing and externalizing problems affect an individual’s well-being, and also trait anxiety refers to an internalizing problem.

Working with 176 mother-child dyads to examine the relationship between boundary violation and the child’s internalizing and externalizing problems, Hiester (1993) found a positive relationship between boundary violation in early childhood and the internalizing and externalizing problems in early adolescence. It was stated that the early adolescents experiencing more boundary violation in childhood showed more externalizing behavior problems and found to be emotionally less healthy.

In another longitudinal study, Jacobvitz, Hazen, Curran, and Hitchens (2004) investigated the relationship between boundary violation and both internalizing and externalizing problems in middle childhood. They found that enmeshed family patterns in the infancy predicted the children’s depressive symptoms in the middle childhood. The results also showed that, while boys who experienced enmeshed family patterns developed ADHD symptoms more, girls experiencing enmeshment mostly developed depressive symptoms.

Amato and Afifi (2006) investigated the relationship between the parents’ effort to form cross-generational coalitions with their offsprings and the offsprings’ subjective well-being. The sample was consisted of 632 young adult offsprings. In the study,
forming coalition was found to be correlated with lower self-esteem, lower subjective well-being, lower quality of relationship with the parents, and higher psychological distress in the offsprings. The researchers also underlined that the individuals growing up in a family with higher conflict between their parents felt caught in the middle more and in turn, the subjective well-being of those was lower than the others.

Another study that was conducted by Flemons and Tsai (1992) focused on the well-being of the parents in terms of cross-generational coalition. The results revealed a negative relationship between the severity of cross-generational coalition and marital happiness, overall happiness, health, and well-being. On the other hand, coalition explained the little amount of the total variance in each outcome variables.

Although there is a high incidence of boundary violation studies in the West, there are few conducted in Turkey. One of the rare studies was conducted by Karagöbek (2014) who investigated the relationship between the mother’s history of parentification, children’s self-construal, mother’s attachment styles, and the children’s parentification behaviors in two types, including emotional parentification and instrumental parentification. She worked with 92 mother-child dyads. The results revealed that more relational children showed emotional parentification behaviors more, and more independent children showed less instrumental parentification behaviors. On the other hand, no significant correlation was found between parentification histories of the mothers and any of the other variables.

The other boundary violation study in Turkey was conducted by Kurşuncu (2016) who examined the relationship between triangulation and risk-taking behaviors in emerging adulthood. His sample was consisted of college students aged between 18 and 26. The results revealed no significant correlation between triangulation and high-risk involvement, or low-risk involvement. On the other hand, when triangulation was added to a model with personal authority, mother intimacy, and father intimacy, four of the variables together explained the low-risk involvement significantly.
2.3 An Overview of Human Well-Being

As it is known, traditional mental health models focus on the existence of psychopathology to define human functioning. In response to this negative standpoint on human mental health, a new trend called positive psychology has emerged. Although discussions on happiness date back to ancient times, research taking the importance of positive in human mental health into consideration have a few decades of history. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) defined positive psychology as “a science of positive subjective experience, positive individual traits, and positive institutions promise to improve quality of life and prevent the pathologies that arise when life is barren and meaningless” (p.5). On the scope of positive psychology, healthy human functioning cannot be evaluated with the nonexistence of psychopathology by itself. Rather, healthy human functioning is a combination of the absence of psychopathology and the existence of positive indicators of mental health (Greenspoon & Saklofske, 2001). From the perspective of positive psychology, positive indicators of mental health are the indicators of human well-being.

Well-being is a broad topic which different theories and models were created about. In positive psychology, mainly two philosophical ideas are discussed about human well-being which are hedonia and eudaimonia. Hedonia refers to pleasure, and pleasure mainly refers to happiness from the perspective of positive psychology (Diener 1984; Vitterso, 2013). Diener (1984) explains human well-being through hedonism and posits that there are three components of human well-being, including life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect within the term subjective well-being. However, eudaimonia suggests that human well-being cannot only be explained through pleasure, and eudaimonic well-being stresses virtue, optimal functioning, meaning and purpose in life, and self-actualization (Vitterso, 2013). Ryff (1989) is one of the theoreticians that emphasize eudaimonia through the term psychological well-being. Based on Ryff’s theory, there are six components of positive psychological functioning, which are self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth.
As the positive psychology research have increased in number, new theories explaining well-being have also emerged. Ryan and Deci (2000) dwelled on well-being through Self-Determination Theory and underlined three human needs for personal well-being, namely competence, belongingness, and autonomy. Csikszentmihalyi (1990) stressed the role of acting with total involvement in well-being and expanded his research under his Flow Theory. Seligman (2011) proposed a model for well-being called PERMA, which is comprised of five dimensions, including positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning, and accomplishment. Lastly, similar with but broader than PERMA, Huppert and So (2013) offered optimism, positive emotion, meaning, positive relationships, self-esteem, vitality, emotional stability, competence, engagement and resilience as the dimensions of “flourishing” Within multiple theories, the recent study focuses on subjective side of well-being.

2.4 Subjective Well-Being

Subjective well-being, what is popularly called happiness (Diener, Scollon & Lucas, 2009) refers to how people evaluate themselves and their lives with positive terms (Diener & Suh, 2000). As stated by Eid and Diener (2004), subjective well-being is an important indicator of the quality of life. SBW researchers advocate that objective/social indicators such as health, wealth, or level of crime in a society are not enough to explain quality of life; since all people have different subjective experiences, values, expectations, and based on that they react to and evaluate the same circumstances differently from each other (Diener & Suh, 1997; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999).

As stated by Diener (1984) the area of subjective well-being has three characteristics. First one is its being “subjective”; that is to say, it hinges on an individual’s experience. Secondly, subjective well-being is not only defined with the absence of
negative factors but also measures both positive and negative factors. Thirdly, subjective well-being aims to measure the global assessment of an individual’s life. Still, measures may offer different life settings such as “home” or “school”, and time periods such as “these days” or “last three weeks”.

Subjective evaluation of life includes both cognitive and affective components. Andrews and Withey (1976) propounded three dimensions of SWB as life satisfaction judgments, positive affect, and negative affect, contrary to the popular belief that Diener is the one. While life satisfaction stands for cognitive appraisal of life, positive affect and negative affect represent affective reactions to life events which vary from one person to another (Diener; 1984). Hereby, the dimensions of high SBW are life satisfaction, experiencing a high level of positive emotions, and low level of negative emotions (Diener, Lucas & Oishi, 2002; Myers & Diener, 1995).

2.4.1 Theories of subjective well-being

Throughout the history, different theories have been proposed about SBW, in another word happiness. Telic theories, top-down versus bottom-up theories, activity theories, set-point theory, and judgment theories can be counted as some of them.

Telic or endpoint theories suggest that happiness comes from reaching a goal or meeting a need. As Wilson (1960; 1967) stated, from the perspective of need theories happiness comes from the reduction of tension by the satisfaction of one’s needs. Satisfaction of biological and psychological needs brings happiness, conversely, nonfulfillment of needs causes unhappiness. A person may or may not be aware of those needs; however, either way, happiness comes from meeting them. On the other hand in goal theories, people have specific desires which they are aware of and making progress toward those desires and in the end, reaching their goals based on those desires results in happiness (Cantor and Sanderson, 1999; Emmons, 1986; Michalos, 1980). By means of desires and goals, people focus on the future and life becomes meaningful, thus happiness levels of people increase (Emmons, 1986).
Top-down versus bottom-up theories include two approaches which are top-down approach and bottom-up approach. Bottom-up approach argues that happiness is the sum of small different pleasures in one’s life, and the judgment of overall subjective well-being is related to the frequencies of momentary pleasures and pains (Diener, 1984). If it comes to explain life satisfaction in terms of bottom-up approach, it can be said that total life satisfaction is the sum of different domain satisfactions such as family, work, and school (Headey, Veenhoven, & Wearing, 1991). On the other hand, top-down approach regards happiness as a personality trait. The approach posits that individuals have a tendency to see life events as positive or negative and that propensity effects how individuals react to those life events (Diener, 1984). To sum up, while bottom-up approach suggests that the particular variables together lead to happiness, top-down approach advocates that SBW is a propensity, not an outcome and on the contrary, it produces outcomes (Headey et al., 1991).

Activity theories define happiness as “being in the way”. This can be explained through a mountain metaphor. Activity theories claim that climbing process by itself provide more happiness than reaching the summit (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2008). On the contrary of telic theories, activity theories suggest that happiness is not an end state, rather it is a by-product of human activity (Diener, 1984). As mentioned above, Csikszentmihalyi (1990) stresses the importance of acting on happiness and states that engaging in an activity, which results in losing the sense of time, brings happiness, and this ultimate level is called “flow”. When it comes to the type of activity it can be stated that in ancient times, activities bringing happiness were based on certain human abilities and performing those abilities perfectly, on the other hand in modern times, activity refers to hobbies, exercises, and social interactions (Diener, 1984). Nevertheless, according to Csikszentmihalyi (2014), each activity does not bring happiness. It should be congruent with individual’s skill level. In other words, if the activity is easy for the individual’s skill level, it may cause boredom, yet, if it is beyond the skill level, then the activity may cause anxiety. The true combination of flow is regarded as high challenges and high skills.
Set point or dynamic equilibrium theory argues that one’s happiness is bound to one’s temperament, or general life circumstances and that these elements constitute a set-point. Accordingly, one’s emotions, and appraisal about his or her life may change from time to time, however, in the end, SWB turns to the set point that is determined by the temperament or life circumstances (Diener, 1994).

Judgment theories basically suggest that happiness levels of people are based on the comparison between their conditions and standards. In other words, happiness is affected by the discrepancy between one’s desired condition/achievement and the current condition/achievement (Wilson, 1960). Standards may be designated depending on one’s self-concept, upbringing by parents, or comparing oneself with others (Diener, 1984). On the basis of the social comparison theory, individuals use other individuals as a standard and make judgments about their quality of lives based on others’ lives. As a result, comparing oneself to an individual from a lower socioeconomic status may increase SBW (Wills, 1981) and comparing oneself to a more fortunate person may lead to a decrease in SBW. Adaptation theory can be considered to be another approach under judgment theories. Adaptation theory maintains that adaptation to events may result in a loss of power on promoting happiness (Diener, 1984; Myers & Diener, 1995). In other words, as the event is repeated it does not produce happiness as much as it does the first time, and the standards of individuals scale up. The same thing is also valid for bad events and unhappiness (Diener, 1984; 1994).

2.4.2 Components of subjective well-being

As mentioned before, there are three dimensions of SBW, which include life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect. The three dimensions constitute two components of SWB which are cognitive aspect and affective aspect. The two components are not totally independent but are partly unique, and when assessed separately, they can provide complementary information about SWB (Pavot &
Dien, 1993). The following sections present more information about the three dimensions of SWB.

**2.4.2.1 Life satisfaction**

Life satisfaction is the cognitive component of SBW and refers to people’s evaluations of their quality of lives based on their chosen criteria (Schimmack, Diener, & Oishi, 2009; Shin & Johnson, 1978). Individuals make comparisons and conscious judgments about their lives, and report high life satisfaction when their present conditions match with their chosen or self-imposed standards (Pavot & Diener, 1993). As stated by Myers and Diener (1995), satisfaction with life is fed by satisfaction with different life domains such as family, work, school, friends, and love.

The information obtained from objective conditions is not enough to predict SWB unless one’s construal process is taken into consideration (Schwarz & Strack, 1999). This core assumption is the basis for being called as “subjective”. On the other hand, Diener (1994) underlines that measuring the exact level of life satisfaction is not possible since individuals’ judgments about their quality of lives are affected by their circumstances. Therefore, in order to obtain a long-term stable average, life satisfaction measurements should be performed in different circumstances. Still, it is presumable that life satisfaction judgment shows stability because of individuals’ keeping some stable judgments about particular aspects of their lives (Diener, 1994).

**2.4.2.2 Positive and negative affect**

As stated by Diener and friends (2009) individuals reflect their ongoing evaluations of the conditions in their lives through positive and negative affect. Positive affect refers to emotions and moods such as joy, elation, pride, love, excitement, and contentment whereas negative affect comprises of fear, guilt, shame, sadness, restlessness, anger, stress, loneliness, anxiety, and envy (Bradburn, 1969; Myers & Diener, 1995). Positive and negative affect together are called the hedonic level,
which depends on the frequency and length of pleasant and unpleasant affect (Diener, 1994).

As aforementioned, measuring the positive and the negative affect separately is one of the hallmarks of SBW. Research on measuring positive and negative affect revealed that there is not a significant negative correlation between positive and negative affect (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Bradburn, 1969; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen 1988) which suggests that the absence of one does not indicate the presence of the other. On the other hand, both positive and negative affect was found to be correlated with a global well-being judgment (Bradburn, 1969) verifying that both of them are separate key indicators of SBW.

Another discussion on SBW is about whether it is a momentary state or a long-term predisposition. This dilemma can be explained by the term “affect” that was chosen instead of mood, or emotion. “Affect” is used as an umbrella term to explain the place of human feelings on SBW. Moods and emotions together are called “affect” (Diener et al., 1999). As stated by Frijda (1999), emotions are short-time reactions and related to specific situations; on the other hand, moods are long-lasting and may not be related to specific events (Morris, 1999). In their research, Diener and Larsen (1984) revealed that both moods (referring personality traits) and emotions (referring life circumstances) are related to SWB. Accordingly, SBW can be conceptualized as a momentary state and an enduring trait at the same time (Diener, 1984).

2.4.3 Research on subjective well-being

Subjective well-being studies are spread over a wide range of areas. Demographic variables, personality traits, family functioning, relationship with others were investigated in terms of SWB and its dimensions. For over a decade, SWB has been also a popular research area in Turkey, and Turkish researchers have highly contributed to the related literature. In this section, considering the focus of the
present study, studies investigating the relationship between SWB and family environment are presented.

In their 6-year longitudinal study, Fosco, Caruthers, and Dishion (2012) examined the family relationship quality in terms of cohesion and conflict, and its relationship with adolescent’s SWB. The results revealed that, while cohesion was positively correlated with SWB, higher conflict was linked with lower SWB. Additionally, adolescents having more cohesive families sustained their effortful control levels, which had promoted their SWB over six years. Similarly, Hamama and Arazi (2012) investigated the relationship between family cohesion and SWB in an early adolescent group. They found that family cohesion was positively correlated with life satisfaction and positive affect. On the other hand it was not found to be negatively correlated with negative affect.

Joronen and Kurki (2005) investigated the factors contributing to the adolescents’ SWB. The study was conducted utilizing a qualitative approach. Semi-structured interviews were used to collect data from 19 adolescents and content analysis was used to analyze the data. The results revealed six categories contributing to the adolescent’s well-being, which include; “comfortable home” referring to the safety, “loving atmosphere” implying the closeness to the family members, “open communication” meaning trust and free communication, “familial involvement” representing togetherness, support, and supervision by parents, “external relations” referring to the balance between intrafamilial and external contacts, and “a sense of personal significance” implying feeling as an irreplaceable part of the family.

Another research was conducted to examine the relationship between SWB and experience of family violence among adolescents (Lepistö, Joronen, Astedt-Kurki, Luukkaala, & Paavilainen, 2012). The participants were consisted of 1393 adolescents aged between 14 and 17. The results yielded that adolescents living in nonviolent homes have higher SWB. Additionally, the adolescents who are living in nonviolent homes have safer family relationships, know how to increase their well-
being better, and have a stronger belief in God. On the other hand, the participants who are living in violent homes have stronger relationships with friends, and care school more than the others. The latter participants also reported that they see the outside world safer than their homes.

Eryılmaz (2011) aimed to reveal the relationship between adolescents’ SWB and family environment. The sample consisted of 252 Turkish adolescents. The results yielded a significant relationship between family environment and SWB among adolescents. The adolescents who feel togetherness in the family showed a higher level of SWB. On the other hand, the adolescents who live in a family with rigid rules and high parental control showed a lower level of SWB.

2.5 State-Trait Conception of Anxiety

There are different theoretical explanations regarding the reasons and types of anxiety. As the current research’s interest, one of them is the State-Trait conception of anxiety. This dual-structured conception basically posits that anxiety is seen in two related but distinct types, which are transitory state and stable trait. State anxiety refers to transitory and consciously perceived feelings of tension and apprehension occurring by the arousal of the nervous system which is triggered by an instant stimulus (Spielberger, 1966). Trait anxiety, on the other hand, refers to an individual’s predisposition to perceive objectively nondangerous situations as threatening and respond to these situations with an elevated state of anxiety (Spielberger, 1966).

To explain the difference between state and trait anxiety, Spielberger (1966) likens these concepts to two different types of energy. State anxiety, like kinetic energy, takes place “now” and at a certain level of intensity, whereas trait anxiety, like potential energy, refers to a latent inclination that can be activated by an appropriate -in other words an adequately stressful- stimulus. As one of the main focuses of the current study, it is presented more information about trait anxiety in the next section.
2.5.1 Trait anxiety

In order to define trait anxiety, understanding the term *trait* is important. According to Allport (as cited in Endler & Kocovski, 2001) trait means a generalized and an enduring predisposition that causes a consistent response to many situations. This consistency does not mean an absolute consistency referring an individual’s tendency to react with the same level of anxiety across all situations, rather it implies relative consistency which means consistency of an individual’s rank order across all situations in the face of anxiety (Endler & Kocovski, 2001).

The history of the term trait anxiety dates back to Freud. He was the first one to point out the concept of trait anxiety through the term *neurotic anxiety*. He defined two types of anxiety as objective anxiety and neurotic anxiety. While objective anxiety relies on realistic dangers like physical attacks, in neurotic anxiety unconscious materials are threatening to enter consciousness and neurotic anxiety indicates the presence of trait anxiety (Reiss, 1997). However, these two types are not totally independent from each other. People with a high level of trait anxiety also experience a higher level of state anxiety in the face of threatening situations (Spielberger, 1966).

An important point at the aim of conceptualizing TA clearly is to distinguish it from *anxiety sensitivity*. The terms are used interchangeably in the literature yet they are slightly different from each other. While TA means a propensity to perceive a wide range of stressors as dangerous, anxiety sensitivity refers to a propensity to react fearfully to the anxiety sensations (McNally, 1989). Briefly, anxiety sensitivity can be conceptualized as the fear of the sensations of anxiety (Reiss, 1997).

Another important point in the conceptualization of trait anxiety is to mention heredity-environment controversy. Since trait anxiety is a predisposition, it may be thought that it is related to heredity rather than environmental factors. On the other hand, scientific evidence has proven the opposite. Especially twin studies have revealed that both genetic and environmental factors are effective in the formation of
trait anxiety. For example, Silove, Manicavasagar, O’Connell, and Morris-Yates (1995) worked with twins and reported that environmental factors, including family and social environment, explained 70% of the total variance in trait anxiety. Legrand, McCue, and Iacono (1999) conducted a study with early and late adolescent twins, and reported that heredity had moderate effect on trait anxiety. Although family is a shared environment in most of the twin studies, the results prove that it is insufficient to explain trait anxiety only through heredity by ignoring the environmental factors. Family is the first environment where children begin to interact with others. As such, trait anxiety studies consider family environment as a research interest.

2.5.1.1 Research on trait anxiety

Throughout the history of psychology, the notion of anxiety has been used in a wide range from explaining the basic motivation of human functioning to identifying psychopathology. Therefore, anxiety was examined by being linked with a great variety of concepts. However, given the current study, this section presented related literature on the relationship between trait anxiety and family environment. Although a wide range of studies preferred to investigate both state and trait anxiety at the same time, considering the structure of the current study, only trait anxiety results of the sample studies were presented.

Niggemeyer-Hall (2001) investigated the relationship between family interactions, family structural domains, and trait anxiety among female adolescents. The results yielded that higher trait anxiety is related to lower family cohesion, lower family expressiveness, higher family control, and higher family conflict. The high anxiety group of the study expressed lower maternal and paternal care and higher maternal and paternal protection than the low anxiety group. Family cohesion and family expressiveness explained most of the total variance in trait anxiety. Additionally, maternal care and paternal care significantly predicted trait anxiety. A similar study was conducted by Palinsky (1996) with a sample comprising of early adolescents and
late adolescents. The results showed that TA was positively correlated with perceived family control after controlling for self-presentation.

Stark, Humphrey, Crook, and Lewis (1990) examined the relationship between perceived family environment and anxiety among early adolescents. The results revealed that adolescents with higher level of anxiety reported lower cohesion and higher enmeshment in the family.

Peleg-Popgo and Klingman (2002) investigated the family environment, the discrepancy between the actual and desirable environment, and trait anxiety among early adolescents. They examined the family environment in three dimensions: communication, encouragement of personal growth, and maintenance of system. They found that trait anxiety was positively correlated with the discrepancy between the “actual” and the “desirable” environment. They also reported that each of the three dimensions of family environment is negatively correlated with trait anxiety.

Co-parenting refers to a strong parental subsystem in the family. Katz and Low (2004) examined the relationship between child anxiety and co-parenting. The researchers observed the triadic parent-child interactions to measure co-parenting behaviors of the spouses. They reported that there is a positive relationship between hostile-withdrawn co-parenting and child anxiety.

Duman (2008) investigated the relationship between trait anxiety and parental attitudes among early adolescents. The results revealed a positive relationship between trait anxiety and both demanding attitude and authoritarian attitude of the parents. On the other hand, democratic attitude of the parents was found to be negatively correlated with trait anxiety. It was also underlined that the adolescents from intact families have lower trait anxiety than the adolescents from divorced families.
2.6 Summary of the Literature Review

The existing literature indicates that family environment is associated with both subjective well-being and trait anxiety among family members. Many studies have reported that the concepts referring to family environment such as; family cohesion, enmeshment, disengagement, parental control, parental attitudes, co-parenting, and marital conflict were found to be linked with subjective well-being and trait anxiety among adolescents.

The boundary violation literature highly emphasizes its relationship with internalizing and externalizing problems. On the other hand, research on boundary violation in a non-clinical sample is limited. Nevertheless, as an indication of an unhealthy family environment, boundary violation is also a significant phenomenon that various family studies have addressed. In fact, cohesion, enmeshment, and disengagement directly refer to the family boundary types. Thus, the body of research presented above on the relationship between family environment and adolescent’s well-being might also suggest a relationship between family boundary violation and well-being of adolescents.

In conclusion, the existing literature demonstrates that unhealthy family environment with unfavorable family boundaries is associated with psychologically undesirable outcomes for the family members. In the light of the existing literature, the current study focuses on the relation of boundary violation to subjective well-being and trait anxiety among adolescents.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter firstly presents the overall design of the study. Secondly, it presents detailed information on the demographic features of the participants and the sampling procedure. Thirdly, it provides the information about the data collection instruments and their psychometric properties. Lastly, it presents the data collection procedure, and discusses the limitations of the study.

3.1 Research Design

The study was conducted utilizing quantitative research approach and correlational research design. The data were collected using four self-report instruments and one demographic information form. The scores of the dimensions of boundary violation were gathered using Boundary Violation Scale (Avcı et al., 2015). The scores of the dimensions of subjective well-being were obtained using Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (Gençöz, 2000), and Brief Multidimensional Student’s Life Satisfaction Scale (Siyez & Kaya, 2008). The trait anxiety score was gathered using Trait Anxiety Form of State-Trait Anxiety Scale for Children (Özusta, 1995). The data were collected through printed-out questionnaires. 1305 early and late adolescents were constituted the study sample. A series of Pearson’s correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between boundary violation and subjective well-being, and between boundary violation and trait anxiety separately. Independent sample t-tests were conducted to compare genders in terms of subjective well-being and trait anxiety. Similarly, t-tests were used to compare two stages of adolescence in terms of subjective well-being and trait anxiety.
3.2 Participants and Sampling

The target population of the study was adolescents aged between 11 and 18 who were living with both of their parents in the same house in Turkey. In order to compare different stages of adolescence, the age was kept in a wide range, and both middle-school and high-school students became the targets of the study. The accessible population is adolescents who are between 11 and 18, living with both of their parents on the European side of İstanbul. As İstanbul is a cosmopolite city, it was assumed to be a convenient representative of the country.

In order to make sure that the sample contained participants from different socioeconomic statuses (SES), three districts of the European side of the city were chosen from high, middle, and low SES based on a “quality of life index” research (Şeker, 2015). Beşiktaş, Bahçelievler, and Esenler constituted the sample from high, middle, and low SES respectively. One middle school and one high school from each of the districts were chosen by considering their distance from the researcher’s workplace which refers to convenience sampling (Frankel, Wallen and Hyun, 2012). In order to keep sample size nearly equal in each district, an extra one high school was chosen from Beşiktaş. The principals and school counselors were contacted by phone to be briefly informed about the study, and a meeting was requested. Instead of the schools that did not accept to join the study, additional samplings needed to be done. The data were collected from the classes where the school counselors thought that the students and teachers might agree to collaborate.

3.2.1 Demographic characteristics of the participants

The data were collected from three districts of İstanbul, including Beşiktaş, Bahçelievler, and Esenler. The rates regarding the distribution of the participants by districts were nearly equal to each other. Respectively being from high, middle, and low SES, 31.2% of the participants reside in Beşiktaş (n = 407), 32.2% are from Bahçelievler (n = 420), and 36.6% are from Esenler (n = 478). 55.4% of the
participants are females \((n = 723)\), and 44.6\% of them are males \((n = 582)\). The age range of the sample is between 11 and 18 \((M = 15, \ SD = 1.61)\). 1.6\% of the participants are 11 years old \((n = 21)\), 4.6\% are 12 years old \((n = 60)\), 15.9\% are 13 years old \((n = 207)\), 17.2\% are 14 years old \((n = 225)\), 13.3\% are 15 years old \((n = 174)\), 26.4\% are 16 years old \((n = 344)\), 20.5\% are 17 years old \((n = 268)\), and 0.5\% are 18 years old \((n = 6)\). 513 out of the 1305 participants \((39.3\%)\) are between the ages of 11 and 14, and they constitute the “early adolescence” group of the study. The remaining 792 participants \((60.7\%)\) are between 15 and 18, and they represent the “late adolescence” group of the study. The percentage of the ages within their groups are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Within Group Age Distribution Based on Adolescence Stage of the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Age Distribution of Early Adolescence Group</th>
<th>Age Distribution of Late Adolescence Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the educational level of the participants’ parents, 3.4\% of the mothers have never been to school \((n = 45)\). 28.4\% of them are elementary school graduates \((n = 371)\), 20.1\% are secondary school graduates \((n = 262)\). 25.9\% are high school graduates \((n = 338)\), 19.6\% of them graduated from a University \((n = 256)\) and only 2.5\% of them hold a degree of Graduate School \((n = 33)\). When it comes to fathers,
0.5% of them have never been to school \((n = 6)\). 20% of them are elementary school graduates \((n = 261)\), 23.2% are secondary school graduates \((n = 303)\), 28.4% are high school graduates \((n = 371)\), 23.1% of them graduated from a University \((n = 302)\) and 4.8% of them hold a degree of Graduate School \((n = 62)\).

### 3.3 Data Collection Instruments

In the present study, four self-report instruments namely; Boundary Violation Scale (see Appendix A), Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (see Appendix B), Brief Multidimensional Student’s Life Satisfaction Scale (see Appendix C), and State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children - Trait Anxiety Form (see Appendix D) were used to collect data. Additionally, the Demographic Information Form (see Appendix E) which was developed by the researcher, was used to collect additional information about the participants. Psychometric properties of the scales are presented in the following sections.

#### 3.3.1 The Demographic Information Form

The Demographic Information Form was developed by the researcher in order to gather additional information about the participants’ age, gender, and the education level of the parents. In the form, there are two options for gender (female or male), two options for living in the same house with both of the parents (yes or no), and six options for the education level of parents for both mother and father separately (never been to school, elementary school, secondary school, high school, university, graduate school). The form also includes two open-ended questions asking the age, and with whom the participants live together in the same house if not with both of their parents.
3.3.2 The Boundary Violation Scale

The Boundary Violation Scale (BVS) was developed originally by Madden-Derdich and colleagues (2002) based on Minuchin’s Structural Family Theory. The scale is a self-report instrument and it aims to reveal the child’s perception of intergenerational boundary violations between family subsystems. The 12-item scale has three subscales, namely Promoting Maturity (PM), Forming Coalition (FC), and Communicating as Peers (CAP). Each subscale represents a dysfunctional family structure feature.

The items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “not at all” to “very much”, and each subscale has 4 items. The lowest possible score is 12 and the highest possible score is 60 on the scale. Higher scores represent higher intergenerational boundary violation between family subsystems. Factor analysis results of the scale revealed that the scale explains 62.8% of the total variance. PM, FC, and CAP subscales explain 21.8%, 20.6%, and 20.4% of the total variance respectively. Cronbach’s alpha values for the PM (.79), FC (.75), and CAP (.79) indicated that the internal consistency for each of the subscales is ensured.

The Turkish version of the BVS was adapted, and its validity and reliability studies for Turkish context were conducted by Avcı and colleagues (2015). As the original form of the BVS, the Turkish version (BVS-T) has 12 items, three subscales named Coalition Forming, Promoting Maturity, and Communicating as Peers, and each subscale has 4 items. The BSV-T is a 5-point Likert scale, the highest possible score is 60 and the lowest possible score is 12 on the scale.

The adaptation study was conducted with a sample of 511 volunteer students aged between 10 and 15. Moreover, 89 mothers and 25 fathers of the 114 participating students created the parent sample of the study. Factor analysis results indicated that the factor loadings of the items change between .66 and .92. CAP (Factor 1), FC (Factor 2) and PM (Factor 3) explained 30.0%, 21.0%, and 14.94% of the variance.
respectively. The three factors together explain 66.1% of the total variance. In order to test the criterion-related validity, the correlation coefficient between the Turkish version of Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Fişiloğlu & Demir, 2000), O’Leary Porter Scale which was adapted to Turkish by Sümmer and colleagues (as cited in Avcı et al, 2015) and the subscales of BVS-T were calculated. The results indicated a positive correlation between O-Leary Porter Scale and BVS-T, and a negative correlation between the Dyadic Adjustment Scale and the BVS-T. The results were found consistent with the theoretical framework. In order to investigate the reliability of the BVS-T, test-retest reliability, Cronbach’s alpha for inner consistency, and item-total correlations were used (Avcı et al, 2015). The Cronbach’s alpha for inner consistency was found to be .86; regarding the three factors (Factor 1, Factor 2, and Factor 3), alpha values were found to be .95, .91, and .89 respectively. The correlation coefficients for test-retest reliability were found to be .68, .78, and .61 for the three factors respectively. Lastly, the correlations between the items and the total score change between .32 and .72. All of the statistical results indicate that the BVS-T meets the reliability requirements.

3.3.3 The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) was developed by Watson and colleagues (1988). PANAS has 20 items with two subscales named Positive Affect Scale (PA), and Negative Affect Scale (NA), and there are 10 items in each subscale. PANAS basically asks to what extent people experience various positive and negative feelings in a specific time interval (e.g., during the past week). Answers to the items ranged from “very slightly or not at all”, to “extremely” on a 5-point structure.

The scale was given to the participants based on seven different time instructions (e.g., past few days, year, general). Within the seven-time instructions, Cronbach’s alpha for internal consistency ranged between .86 and .90 for PA, and between .84 and .87 for NA. The researchers concluded that reliability of the scale was not affected by the time instructions. For test-retest reliability, each of seven PANAS scales was retested
in an eight-week interval. Alpha coefficient ranged between .47 and .68 for PA, and between .39 and .71 for NA. The results revealed that PANAS has a significant stability level in an eight-week interval and can be used as a trait measure of positive and negative affect.

PANAS was adapted to Turkish for the first time by Dürü (1998). Subsequently, PANAS was adapted to Turkish again by Gençöz (2000) based on Dürü’s translation yet by changing one of the items that had high factor loads for both PA and NA. The Turkish version of PANAS is a 5-point Likert type scale. The scale has 20 items including 10 for positive affect and 10 for negative affect. The validity and reliability studies of the Turkish version were conducted with a sample of 199 university students. In the validity and reliability studies, participants were given “during the past week” statement as time instruction.

Cronbach’s alpha for internal consistency was found to be .83 for PA, and .86 for NA. Test-retest reliability study was performed in a three-week interval and correlation coefficient was found to be .54 and .40 for PA and NA respectively. In order to check criterion-related validity, Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI) were used. Results indicated negative correlations between PA and BDI, and a negative correlation between PA and BAI. As consistent with the literature, results revealed positive correlations between NA and BDI, and positive correlation between NA and BAI. All abovementioned statistical results indicated that PANAS fulfilled the validity and reliability requirements in Turkish context (Gençöz, 2000).

### 3.3.4 The Brief Multidimensional Student’s Life Satisfaction Scale

The Brief Multidimensional Students’ Life Satisfaction Scale (BMSLSS) was originally developed by Seligson, Huebner, and Valois (2003) to examine students’ life satisfaction (LS) on a five domains model consisted of family, friends, self, school, and living environment. BMSLSS is a 7-point Likert scale ranging from
“terrible” to “delighted”. It has six questions evaluating five life satisfaction domains with one question for each domain and an additional global life satisfaction question. Global life satisfaction question (GLLS) was added to the form by the researchers in order to check validity. General life satisfaction score is obtained by summing up five domains in BMSLSS.

For the original study, the alpha coefficient for internal consistency was found as .75 with an early adolescent sample. Item total correlation for the five items varied from .65 to .73. Multiple regression analysis results indicated that the five domains of BMSLSS accounted for 56% of the total variance in GLLS scores. In order to examine construct validity, Positive and Negative Affect Schedule-Children (PANAS-C; Laurent et al., 1999) was used and the results revealed a negative correlation between BMSLSS and PANAS-C Negative Affect subscale, and positive correlation between BMSLSS and PANAS-C Positive Affect subscale.

BMSLSS was adapted to Turkish, and its validity and reliability studies were conducted by Siyez and Kaya (2008). As the original one, The Turkish version of the scale represents five life satisfaction domains (family, friends, self, school, and living environment) and includes the additional item about global life satisfaction. The 7-point Likert scale ranges from “terrible” to “delighted”. The highest score that can be obtained from the scale is 35 and the lowest score is 5. General life satisfaction score can be calculated by summing up five items, and the additional item is not added to the total score. A higher score represents higher life satisfaction.

Validity and reliability studies of the Turkish version were conducted with a sample of 394 elementary and middle school students from fourth to eighth grade (Siyez & Kaya, 2008). For the Turkish version, Cronbach’s alpha for internal consistency was found to be .89. Item total correlations for the five items range from .56 to .78, and intercorrelations among five life satisfaction domains range between .20 and .53. The researchers interpreted the results concluding that the children are able to differentiate between the five different domains of life satisfaction. The test-retest reliability study
was conducted in a two-week interval, and the correlation coefficient was found as .82. All of the analysis confirmed that the Turkish version of BMSLSS is a reliable instrument. In order to check the construct validity, exploratory factor analysis was run, and the result revealed that the instrument has one factor explaining 48% of the total variance. Factor loadings were ranged from .49 to .82. Criterion-related validity checked by using the Turkish version of Children’s Depression Inventory (CDI), and the Turkish version of Piers-Harris Self-Concept Inventory (SCI). The results revealed that there is a positive correlation between BMSLSS and SCI, and a negative correlation between BMSLSS and CDI. The results were found to be consistent with the literature. However, there was no information obtained about the correlation between the additional item and total life satisfaction score in the study.

3.3.5 The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children - Trait Anxiety Form

The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC) was originally developed by Spielberger (1973) in order to measure state and trait anxiety in children. The scale consists of two form measuring state anxiety, and trait anxiety separately. The trait anxiety form of the inventory was used in the study; therefore, reliability and validity information of the inventory were presented only for the trait anxiety form. Trait Anxiety Form of STAIC (A-Trait) is a 3-point Likert type scale consisting of 20 items and one factor. The aim of the scale is to investigate how children generally feel apart from a specific situation. On the A-Trait, the possible highest score is 60 and the possible lowest score is 20. Higher scores represent higher trait anxiety in children. Test-retest correlations for A-Trait were found as .65 for boys and .71 for girls. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .78 for boys and .81 for girls.

The adaptation, validity, and reliability studies of the STAIC for Turkish context were conducted by Özusta (1995). The Turkish version of A-Trait is a 3-point Likert scale. The scale consists of 20 items and one factor as the original form. 615 normal children aged between 9 and 12 created the sample of the adaptation study. In order to
investigate the internal consistency of the A-Trait, Cronbach’s alpha was calculated and found to be .81. Additionally, a test-retest reliability study was conducted with 99 of the children and the result was found as .65 for A-Trait. In order to test the criterion validity, three different groups (diagnosed with anxiety disorder, other psychiatric disorders, and the norm group) were compared in terms of trait anxiety scores. The results revealed that A-Trait is able to differentiate between the three groups.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

The data were collected during the spring semester of the 2017-2018 academic year. Firstly, permissions were taken from Middle East Technical University Human Subjects Ethics Committee (see Appendix F), and Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education (see Appendix G). Secondly, the schools were informed about the study and asked for their permission. The study was conducted in the schools where principals and school counselors had accepted to collaborate. For the secondary school students, Family Consent Form was given to the students by the school counselors. Because the Ministry of Education forbids to request the parents’ signatures, each parent was requested to write down the school numbers of their children on the Family Consent Form to be able to identify which of the children were permitted to join the study and which were not.

The scales were conducted during the class hours. In each class, required information about how to fill out the scales was given by the researcher, and volunteer and anonymous nature of the study were underlined. In order to ensure confidentiality, participants were warned not to give any identifying information. It was underlined that there is not any correct answer for the items and the items do not measure the success; hence, participants were asked to only engage in the form in front of them and to fill out the scales individually. Then the scales were given to the volunteer participants. The scales were filled out when both the researcher and the class teachers were present in the classroom. The application lasted about 25 minutes, including the
researcher’s explanations. It was stated that the individual results would not be given due to the anonymous nature of the research. Rather e-mail addresses of the school counselors were noted to share their school results with them.

The aim of the Boundary Violation Scale is to determine the boundary violations between family subsystems, and for this purpose, there should be a spousal subsystem in the family. The question of “Do you live with both of your parents at the same house?” was added to the Demographic Information Form in order to exclude the participants whose family system does not include a spousal subsystem. BVS-T scores of the participants who answered the question as “No” were not calculated. Additionally, the ones who have never known one of their parents or whose parents are not alive informed the researcher and left the BVS-T blank.

3.5 Data Analyses

In the present study, a series of Pearson correlation analyses were run to examine the relationship between the dimensions of boundary violation (FC, PM, CAP) and the dimensions of subjective well-being (LS, PA, NA, Total-SWB) among adolescents. Secondly, Pearson correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between the dimensions of boundary violation and trait anxiety. In order to compare the gender groups in terms of their SWB and TA, two independent sample t-tests were carried out. Similarly, t-tests were performed to compare SWB scores and TA scores of the participants with regard to their stage of adolescence. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 23.0) was used for data analyses.

3.6 Limitations of the Study

The current study was conducted only on the European side of Istanbul. When the cultural and socioeconomic differences between the districts of Turkey are considered, despite the cosmopolite structure of Istanbul, generalizability of the results emerges as a limitation. Due to the sampling method, the schools in the three
districts did not have equal chances to be chosen. Moreover, the data were collected only from regular secondary schools and Anatolian high schools, all of which were public schools. Therefore, individuals from different types of schools could not have a chance to be selected for the study.

The other limitation of the study may be the fact that the participants might have given their responses based on social desirability. The scales include questions about family relations. As Turkish culture advises the individual not to reflect the bad situations in the family to those outside the family, the participants may have shown a tendency to choose the culturally ideal options. Another limitation is that the data were collected only quantitatively. As a result, the interpretation of results is limited to the quantitative information given by the scales used, and qualitative methods are required to obtain deeper knowledge of the relationship between the variables.

As known adolescence is a developmental stage in which individuals often experience emotional fluctuations. Adolescents may be affected by an instantaneous state whether it is good or bad, and getting out of the feeling and cognitive appraisals arising from that state may take longer for adolescents than adults. Therefore, measuring SWB of adolescents may not give exact information about their true level of well-being. In other words, we cannot be sure whether the participants are on their set-points or under the effect of a situation that they had experienced a couple of hours or weeks ago.

Above all, the greatest limitation of the study, as the results have revealed, is that the BVS-T scale does not seem compatible with Turkish culture. The items do not appear to be boundary violation for Turkish adolescents. Rather the items of the two subscales (PM, and CAP) seem to suggest something positive for the Turkish context and the items may represent a protective factor for adolescents. The reliability of FC and PM subscales was also found low for the sample of the current study. Although this finding may be due to a small number of items in the subscales, being unable to obtain a high reliability coefficient can be seen as a limitation.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter firstly presents the preliminary analyses of the data. In the following parts, the results of group comparisons and correlation analyses are reported.

4.1 Preliminary Analyses

4.1.1 Data screening and missing value analysis

Following the data collection period, a total number of 1483 participants were reached for the study. So as to be able to meet the condition of “living in the same house with both of the parents”, 97 of the participants, who answered the related question as “No” were excluded from the sample. Additionally, 4 of the participants were eliminated as they did not answer the said question. During the data collection period, it was realized that the 10-year-olds had a difficulty in understanding the items and fill out the scales; therefore, 12 participants at the age of 10 were also eliminated from the sample.

After the data counting process, missing values for each scale were detected and a total of 52 cases with missing values of more than 5% (both for each scale and for the total number of items) were excluded from the sample (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As the patterns of the missing values were random, the rest of the missing values were replaced with their means, thus additional case loss was prevented. As one of the aims of the study is to compare two different stages of adolescence in terms of the variables, the dataset was divided into two datasets as “early adolescents” and “late adolescents”, and the missing data of each group were replaced with their own means.
In order to detect the univariate outliers, z scores for each variable were computed. 13 of the cases having a z value outside the range of -3.29 to 3.29 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) were removed from the sample. At the end of the data cleaning process, the final sample consisted of 1305 participants.

4.1.2 Test of normality

After detecting and eliminating the outliers from the sample, the normality assumption was checked through Histogram, Q-Q plots, and Skewness and Kurtosis values. An absolute value of .3 for skewness and .8 for kurtosis is acceptable for normality (R. B. Kline, 2015). Table 4.1 demonstrates that nearly each of the variables is normally distributed.

Table 4.1

Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Maturity</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming Coalition</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating as Peers</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anxiety</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Well-Being</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the skewness values, the data do not seem to be normally distributed for forming coalition and negative affect variables. On the other hand, based on the Central Limit Theorem, in big samples (n > 30) the sampling distribution tends to be normal regardless of the shape of the collected data (Field, 2009). Moreover as can
be seen in Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2, there is no dramatic deviation from the normality for both of the variables.

Figure 4.1: The histogram and the normal Q-Q plot of Forming Coalition.

Figure 4.2: The histogram and the normal Q-Q plot of Negative Affect.

4.1.3 Internal consistency of the scales in the study sample

The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for internal consistency were calculated to test the reliability of the scales used in the study. The alpha coefficients were computed for the early adolescence group, the late adolescence group and the entire study group
separately. Although BVS-T was not used to compare two stages of adolescence in the current study, the reliability results of the groups were obtained in order to provide benefit for future studies. The results are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2
Internal Consistency of the Scales in the Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Study Group</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BVS-T</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming Coalition</td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVS-T</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Maturity</td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVS-T</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSLSS</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anxiety</td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAIC</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anxiety</td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although an alpha value above .7 is desirable for the reliability of a measurement, values below .7 are expected when measuring psychological constructs (P. Kline, 1999). Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson (2010) argue that an alpha value above .6 is also acceptable. When the alpha values presented above are considered, it can be said that all of the scales except for the forming coalition and promoting maturity subscales have satisfactory values.

4.2. Descriptive Statistics and Group Comparisons of the Variables

In the following sections, means and standard deviations of the study variables are presented. Based on the research questions, t-test results for group comparisons according to gender and stage of adolescence are indicated. Before conducting the analyses, in order to check the homogeneity of variance assumption, Levene’s test was run and the results validated the assumption for most of the study variables. On the other hand, homogeneity of variances was not assumed while interpreting the t-test results regarding negative affect in terms of gender ($p = .001$) and life satisfaction in terms of stage of adolescence ($p = .001$).

4.2.1 Descriptive statistics of the study variables

The means and the standard deviations of the study variables were investigated for the total sample. Descriptive statistics indicated the mean score ($M$) of the trait anxiety as 37.58 with a standard deviation ($SD$) of 7.44. The results indicated the means and the standard deviations of the boundary violation subscales as follows: forming coalition ($M = 8.02, SD = 2.98$); promoting maturity ($M = 13.36, SD = 2.88$); and communicating as peers ($M = 11.89, SD = 3.59$). For the dimensions of SWB and Total-SWB, the means and the standard deviations were found to be as such: positive affect ($M = 30.38, SD = 7.41$); negative affect ($M = 21.20, SD = 6.96$); life satisfaction ($M = 24.14, SD = 5.48$); Total-SWB ($M = 33.31, SD = 15.03$).
4.2.2 Gender differences in subjective well-being and trait anxiety

In order to compare two groups of gender in terms of SWB and TA, t-tests were run and the results are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

Means, Standard Deviations and t-Test Results of Subjective Well-Being and Trait Anxiety in terms of Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$t_{(1303)}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PANAS Positive Affect</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>32.08</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>-7.59</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS Negative Affect</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>24.87</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>-4.37</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Subjective Well-Being</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>36.38</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>-6.80</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anxiety</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>39.01</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>35.82</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *$p$<.01

As can be seen in the table, the group differences for all of the variables were found significant. First of all, in terms of positive affect, male participants are in a more favorable position ($M = 32.08$, $SD = 7.11$) than the females ($M = 29.00$, $SD = 7.41$),...
Similar to that, the males feel less negative affect ($M = 20.57$, $SD = 6.57$) than the females ($M = 21.72$, $SD = 7.22$), ($t_{(1303)} = 3.02$, $p < .01$). Moreover, the males have higher life satisfaction ($M = 24.87$, $SD = 5.46$) than the females ($M = 23.55$, $SD = 5.42$), ($t_{(1303)} = -4.37$, $p < .01$), and as a result of affection and life satisfaction the males have higher subjective well-being ($M = 36.38$, $SD = 14.13$) than the females ($M = 30.83$, $SD = 15.28$), ($t_{(1303)} = -6.80$, $p < .01$). Lastly, the females feel higher trait anxiety ($M = 39.01$, $SD = 7.42$) than the males ($M = 35.82$, $SD = 7.09$), ($t_{(1303)} = 7.87$, $p < .01$).

In order to measure the effect size of the gender in terms of the dimensions of SWB and TA, eta square was calculated for the significant group differences. The results revealed that gender explained 5% of the total variance in the TA ($\eta^2 = .045$). Only 1% of the total variance in the LS ($\eta^2 = .014$), and 1% of the total variance in the NA ($\eta^2 = .01$) were explained by gender. When it comes to PA and Total-SWB, it was revealed that 4% of the total variance in PA ($\eta^2 = .042$), and 3% of the total variance in Total-SWB ($\eta^2 = .034$) were explained by gender. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), all of the eta squared values can be interpreted as a small effect.

**4.2.3 Stage of adolescence differences in subjective well-being and trait anxiety**

The comparison of the two stage of adolescence in terms of SWB and TA revealed that the early adolescents and the late adolescents differ in terms of SWB; yet, it could not be concluded for TA. The results are presented in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4

Means, Standard Deviations and t-Test Results of Subjective Well-Being and Trait Anxiety in terms of Stage of Adolescence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t(1303)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PANAS Positive Affect</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS Negative Affect</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Subjective Well-Being</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>37.91</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anxiety</td>
<td>Early Adolescence</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>37.48</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Adolescence</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>37.65</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .01

Firstly, late adolescents feel more negative affect \( (M = 22.21, SD = 6.66) \) than early adolescents \( (M = 19.65, SD = 7.12) \), \( t_{(1303)} = 6.62, p < .01 \) and feel less positive affect \( (M = 29.29, SD = 7.11) \) than early adolescents \( (M = 32.06, SD = 7.57) \), \( t_{(1303)} = 6.70, p < .01 \). Similarly, early adolescents have higher life satisfaction \( (M = 25.50, SD = 5.74) \) than late adolescents \( (M = 23.27, SD = 5.11) \), \( t_{(1303)} = 7.15, p < .01 \), and higher subjective well-being \( (M = 37.91, SD = 15.43) \) than late adolescents \( (M = 30.34, SD = 13.99) \), \( t_{(1303)} = 9.16, p < .01 \). However, the difference between the two groups in terms of trait anxiety \( t_{(1303)} = -.40, p = .69 \) was not found significant.
When the Eta results are considered, the stage of adolescence explained 3% of the total variance in PA ($\eta^2 = .033$) and in NA ($\eta^2 = .032$). When it comes to LS, 4% of the total variance explained by the stage of adolescence ($\eta^2 = .039$). Finally, the stage of adolescence explained 6% of the total variance in Total-SWB ($\eta^2 = .06$). It can be stated that the stage of adolescence has a small effect on SWB (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

4.3 Relationship between the Dimensions of Boundary Violation, Subjective Well-Being, and Trait Anxiety

Based on the aim of the current study, the relationship between the dimensions of boundary violation (FC, PM, CAP), and the dimensions of subjective well-being (LS, PA, NA, Total-SWB), secondly between the dimensions of boundary violation and trait anxiety were investigated. As stated earlier, the BVS-T has three subscales called forming coalition, promoting maturity, and communicating as peers. In the original study, it is stated that summing up the three scores gives total boundary violation score. On the other hand, current study results revealed that, while forming coalition is related with negative outcomes, promoting maturity and communicating as peers seem more related with positive outcomes for Turkish adolescents which is contrary to the related literature. This fact made the researcher think that the BVS-T might not be congruent with the Turkish culture; hence, conducting analyses with a total boundary violation score became risky for the interpretation of the results in a reasonable way. As a consequence, total boundary violation score was not treated as a study variable.

Subjective well-being has three dimensions, including life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect. Based on the knowledge gathered from the related literature (Antaramian, Huebner, Hills & Valois, 2010; Sheldon, Kasser, Houser-Marko, Jones & Turban, 2005; Suldo & Shaffer, 2008), total subjective well-being score of an individual can be computed with the formula: Total-SWB = LS + PA - NA. Based on the formula, Total-SWB was computed for each case and was treated
as a study variable. In order to investigate the relationship between the dimensions of boundary violation and the dimensions of subjective well-being, and that between the dimensions of boundary violation and trait anxiety, a series of Pearson correlation analyses were conducted. Bonferroni correction was used to reduce the risk of Type 1 error and the new significance level was set at .006 (.05/8).

The results revealed significant positive correlation between promoting maturity and positive affect \((r = .264, p < .006)\), promoting maturity and life satisfaction \((r = .159, p < .006)\) promoting maturity and Total-SWB \((r = .176, p < .006)\), and a negative correlation between promoting maturity and trait anxiety \((r = -.106, p < .006)\). Promoting maturity was not found to be correlated with negative affect. As for communicating as peers dimension, the results revealed significant positive correlation with positive affect \((r = .252, p < .006)\), with life satisfaction \((r = .262, p < .006)\), with Total-SWB \((r = .269, p < .006)\), and significant negative correlation with negative affect \((r = -.106, p < .006)\) and with trait anxiety \((r = -.131, p < .006)\). Lastly, forming coalition was found to be negatively correlated with life satisfaction \((r = -.075, p < .006)\), and positively correlated with negative affect \((r = .152, p < .006)\) and with trait anxiety \((r = .162, p < .006)\). On the other hand, forming coalition did not reveal a significant relationship with Total-SWB, and with positive affect.

Additionally, regardless of the research questions, the relationship between subjective well-being and trait anxiety were investigated to observe whether the results are consistent with the existing literature. The results revealed that trait anxiety was negatively correlated with positive affect \((r = -.261, p < .006)\), with life satisfaction \((r = -.511, p < .006)\), with Total-SWB \((r = -.585, p < .006)\), and positively correlated with negative affect \((r = .583, p < .006)\).
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This chapter is created to discuss the study findings in the light of the existing literature. In the following pages, the implication of the results and recommendation for further studies are presented.

5.1. Discussion of the Results

The purpose of the current study was to examine the relationship between boundary violation and subjective well-being, and that between boundary violation and trait anxiety among Turkish adolescents. More specifically the study examined the relationship between the three components of boundary violation based on Minuchin’s Structural Family Theory (Minuchin, 1974), three components of subjective well-being (Diener, 1984) and trait anxiety (Spielberger, 1966). The second aim of the study was to examine group differences (i.e., gender, stage of adolescence) in terms of the dimensions of SWB and trait anxiety. The discussion of the results is presented in the following sections for correlation analyses and for group differences separately.

5.1.1 Discussion of the correlation analyses

In order to answer the related research questions, a series of Pearson correlation analyses were run. First of all, the relationship between forming coalition and positive affect, negative affect, life satisfaction, Total-SWB, and trait anxiety was examined. The results revealed that forming coalition is negatively correlated with life satisfaction, and positively correlated with negative affect and trait anxiety. These
findings are consistent with the related literature. For example, Flemons and Tsai (1992) reported that overall well-being decreases as the severity of intergenerational coalition increases in the family. Jacobvitz and Bush (1996) found that both mother-daughter coalition and father-daughter coalition in childhood contributed to the development of anxiety in female college students. Amato and Afifi (2006) also found that children with high marital conflict among their parents feel compelled to take sides more and that predicts lower SWB in children.

In the current study, Total-SWB was found to be negatively correlated with FC but not significantly. The result might arise from the fact that there is also a positive correlation between positive affect and FC. Although the positive relationship between FC and PA is very small and not significant, it might have affected the total SWB point and might have decreased its significance. Due to the current findings, the question of “How FC is positively related to both positive and negative affect at the same time?” may be raised. Even though the positive relationship between FC and PA is not significant, this question is worth explaining. SWB theory suggests that positive affect and negative affect are not totally independent especially in a shorter period of time, and the one that affects the well-being is the intensity and the frequency of these affects (Diener & Emmons, 1984). Adolescence is known for its features of intense emotions, and emotional ups and downs. For this reason, when adolescents are asked how they feel during last two weeks, their reporting both negative emotions and positive emotions intensively is expected, since a two-week interval is too short for emotional stability in the adolescence.

One unanticipated finding was that Communicating as Peers as a type of boundary violation was found to be positively correlated with subjective well-being and negatively correlated with trait anxiety. This result can be approached from two different points of view. First of all, SWB studies revealed that while happiness is related mostly with “reaching a goal” in Western culture, it is more related with “quality of interpersonal relationships” in Eastern culture (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2008). When the items of CAP subscale are considered, (e.g. My mother talks to me
like a close friend) it can be stated that the items do not sound such a bad thing, even it is more like an indication of “ideal parent” for Turkish culture. The developmental psychology underlines that children already have friends and what they need is to have parents who can be a true role model, as well as a guide for them; however, Turkish TV series and movies canonized the peer-like parents throughout the modernization process of the Turkish family. As a result, “being like a friend with offspring” has become an indicator of the quality of the relationship between parent and child.

More importantly, Turkish culture is collectivistic rather than individualistic. As Kağıtçibaşı (2005) stated, families from collectivistic cultures tend to promote emotional connectedness and interdependency. Therefore, instead of being seen as boundary violation, an enmeshed relationship between parent and child is supported by the collectivistic culture. As a result, an adolescent who grows up in a family embracing collectivistic values may perceive emotional support from this enmeshed relationship, which may contribute to the adolescent’s well-being. Moreover, regardless of the cultural diversities, Madden-Derdich and friends (2002) state that the items of CAP might not reflect a discomfort for the adolescents and future modification of the items is needed. Furthermore, autonomy-seeking is one of the main features of adolescence. Hence, the peer-like relationship between adolescent and parent in this life stage may be a result of the autonomy-seeking and therefore may not be as harmful as other types of boundary violation (Jurkovic, Jessee, & Goglia, 1991). Furthermore, based on their study results, Madden-Derdich and friends (2002) proposed that communicating as peers might be used as a strategy by parents during early adolescence. When CAP is evaluated under the “boundary violation” term, current study findings may not seem reasonable. On the other hand, when the quality of items, the features and the developmental tasks of adolescence, and the correlates of happiness in Turkish culture are considered, it can be stated that obtaining the current findings is not surprising.
Similar to CAP, promoting maturity (a.k.a., parentification) was found to be positively correlated with life satisfaction, positive affect, and Total-SWB and negatively correlated with trait anxiety. There are study results contradicting these findings. For example, Stein, Riedel, and Rotheram-Borus (1999) found a positive relationship between promoting maturity and adolescents’ emotional distress. Similarly, Champion and friends (2009) reported a positive relationship between parentification and anxiety in adolescents. On the other hand, Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark (1973) argue that the projection of adult responsibilities to children is not enough for parentification, and that child’s active participation is required for it. The items of BVS-T do not seem adequate to detect active participation of the child. For example, it is not possible to define to what extent the child plays an adult role through an item like “My mother treats me like an adult”. In other words, treating a child like an adult or giving him or her adult responsibilities do not mean that the child accepts the role and fulfills those responsibilities.

Furthermore, children may take advantage of the promoting maturity experience in their developmental process, the point to watch out for is intensity, degree, and duration of the experience (Barnett & Parker, 1998). Therefore, while PM subscale measures a developmentally beneficial experience for one child, it may be an indication of negative family functioning for the other. It is possible that the results were affected by this contradiction. Considering the cultural variations, in collectivistic cultures like Turkish culture, each member of the family is seen as a contributing member of the family unit. Therefore, children who grow up in Turkish culture may not perceive the responsibilities given to them as a burden. Comparing one collectivistic and one individualistic culture in terms of boundary violation, a cross-cultural study supported this idea and revealed that the Indian college students reported more parentification and perceived it more positively than USA college students (Jackson, Raval, Bendikas-King, Raval, & Trivedi, 2016). Additionally, as adolescence is a transition from childhood to adulthood, adolescents want to be treated as adults while forming their new identities. Hence, to be treated as an adult may be desirable for them and may promote their well-being.
Finally, the results revealed a negative relationship between trait anxiety and PA, LS, Total-SWB and positive relationship between trait anxiety and NA as expected. The findings were found to be consistent with the existing literature. For example, Öztürk and Siviş-Çetinkaya (2015) reported the same results with the current study for each dimension of SWB in college students. Pu, Hou, and Ma (2017) found that there is a negative relationship between SWB and trait anxiety among late adolescents. Sharma and Khullar (2013) reported the same results with that of Pu and friends in an adult group. Also, Siebel and Johnson (2001) found a negative correlation between life satisfaction and trait anxiety in college students.

5.1.2 Discussion of the group differences

The current study questioned whether there is a significant difference between genders in terms of subjective well-being and trait anxiety. With respect to the question, the results revealed significant differences in favor of male participants regarding most of the variables. Starting with subjective well-being, male participants have significantly higher life satisfaction, feel positive affects more and negative affects less than their female peers, although the means are slightly different from each other. As a result, the males have higher subjective well-being than the females. This finding reflects that of Kaye-Tzadok, Kim and Main (2017) who also found that females have lower subjective well-being than males in an early adolescent group. Similarly, Nordlander and Stensota (2014) found significant differences between genders in favor of males in their study group including early adolescents and adolescents. Ben-Zur (2003) also reported higher negative affect in female adolescents than males. However, there are study results contradicting with this finding. For example, Sezer (2011) conducted his study with an adolescent group and found that females have higher subjective well-being than males. There are also study results reporting the non-significant difference between two genders in terms of subjective well-being (Certel, Bahadir, Saracoğlu & Varol, 2015; Eryılmaz, 2010; Uçan & Kıran-Esen, 2015).
Comparison of two adolescence stage in terms of SWB revealed that early adolescents have significantly higher means than late adolescents in each dimension of SWB and in Total-SWB points. Different explanations are available about the relationship between age and SWB. One of such explanations suggests that there is a U-shaped relationship between age and well-being (Blanchflowers & Oswald, 2008). In other words, the young and the old are happier than the middle-aged. Deaton (2008) compared 132 countries and stressed that life satisfaction declines with increasing age in most of the countries, which confirms the present finding. He also added that, there is a U-shaped relationship for very-highest income countries such as USA, Canada, and New-Zealand. Considering the Turkish culture, Selim (2008) supported the Deaton’s finding and reported that the younger age group (aged between 15 and 24) is happier than the older groups. By taking into account the stage of adolescence, Larson and Lampman-Petraitis (1989) found that late adolescents reported more negative affect than early adolescents and a reduction of 50 percent were found in happiness level of adolescents from fifth grade to ninth.

To sum up, study results vary on SWB in terms of gender, and stage of adolescence. Considering the SWB theory, it can be stated that the current study findings are not completely consistent with the SWB literature. SWB theory underlines its subjectivity. It implies that SWB is not associated with demographic variables, rather it is an individual experience and is affected mostly by personality traits, and quality of relationship with significant others (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2008; Diener & Lucas, 1999; Huebner, 1991)

The result of gender comparison in terms of trait anxiety revealed that the females had higher trait anxiety than the males. This finding matches those found in earlier studies (Abdel-Khalek, 2002; Demiriz & Ulutaş, 2003; Kozina, 2014; Özusta, 1995; Özyürek & Demiray, 2010; Rodrigues, Pandeirada, Bem-Haja, & França, 2018). Many social scientists link psychological gender differences to social factors rather than biological factors (Santrock, 2014). For example, Brody (1999) mentions “gender-related display rules” and underlines that in most culture, females are more
emotionally expressive and are expected to show a higher level of both positive and negative emotions. Considering this, the results might arise from the fact that the girls are more comfortable than the boys while expressing their fears and worries. Therefore the boys might not have reflected their true level of anxiety on the scale. Also, due to such an implicit social rule, when females have more internalizing problems like anxiety, males have more externalizing problems like anger (Brody, 1999), which can be an additional explanation for the current finding.

The finding can also be explained in the cultural context. As is known, patriarchal societies like Turkish society implicitly declare to a woman that she has to make more effort than a man to get what she wants in her life. Growing up by being exposed to such an implicit message from society may lead to a predisposition to anxiety in childhood and may also decrease subjective well-being. On the other hand, there are studies that demonstrate no significant difference between genders in terms of trait anxiety in Turkish culture (Gürsoy, 2006; Karataş, 2012); therefore, any assumption should be made carefully related to gender and anxiety.

As for comparing the two stages of adolescence in terms of trait anxiety, the results showed that there was no significant difference between the early adolescent group and the late adolescent group. There are study findings contrary to the current finding; yet, those findings are also contradicting with each other. For example, Rivlin and Faragher (2007) reported higher anxiety in early adolescents than late adolescents. On the other hand, Kozina (2014) found in her four-year study that 14-year-olds have higher trait anxiety than 10-year-olds and the anxiety level of participants increased in a four-year period. Also, Twenge (2000) reported that children’s anxiety levels increase as time passes.

5.2 Implications

Boundary violation concept within the family is a neglected research area in Turkey. The current study is one of the first studies to investigate the concepts of boundary
violation and it is the first study to examine the adolescents’ subjective well-being and trait anxiety in terms of the concepts of boundary violation. Therefore, this study can be seen as one of the first steps in the introduction to the Structural Family Theory studies in Turkey. Hopefully, future research can take advantage of the current findings while discussing the boundary violation and its possible effects in the context of Turkish culture.

The weakening of parental subsystem leads to coalition formation and, as the current study has revealed, it is related with the adolescent well-being. The results support that counselors working with adolescent clients should consider the family structure of the client while conceptualizing the problem. Moreover, in order to promote adolescent well-being, strengthening the parental subsystem becomes critical. Therefore, including the spouses to counseling sessions and working on the spousal problems will be an appropriate strategy in the way of increasing the adolescent’s well-being. Moreover, strengthening the sibling subsystem can be considered to reduce boundary violation. (Nichols, 1986).

When the socioeconomic status of the families is considered, getting private counseling services is not possible for every adolescent. However, each adolescent can take advantage of his or her school counselor. As the results support, seeing the emotional problems of an adolescent as a general feature of the adolescence will not be a right point of view. Rather, school counselors can develop programs to inform parents about boundary violation and teach some communication strategies to parents in order to prevent boundary violation between family subsystems. For example, clarifying to what extent the peer-like communication can be beneficial for adolescents is important for adolescents to feel emotionally more secure in their family environment. Moreover, school counselors can hold seminars to inform adolescents about boundary violation and about how to take a position at the same distance to each of their parents, or what kind of responsibilities are beyond their developmental level.
Since a positive change in family structure leads to a positive change in the individual making the pavement to a positive change in the society in the long-term, consciousness-raising about the relationship between well-being and boundary violation becomes important for the overall well-being of the society. Therefore, policymakers may consider the current study results with the aim of promoting the society’s well-being. The society’s consciousness about boundary violation can be raised by means of the government sources such as public service ads, and open sessions arranged by the municipalities.

Considering the gender differences in subjective well-being and trait anxiety, empowerment of females in the society becomes important. As stated previously, the basis of a social change is a change in the family. Therefore, the transformation of the patriarchal family structure into a more egalitarian structure becomes important. Thus, females can perceive themselves in the same hierarchical position as males, so that they may evaluate themselves and their lives with more positive terms. For this purpose, parents may share their family responsibilities equally and may consider giving equal privileges and responsibilities to their sons and daughters. Additionally, policy makers should ensure gender equality in society through consciousness-raising and the introduction of effective new laws.

5.3 Recommendations for Future Research

The only measure in the Turkish language that examines the boundary violation within the family is BVS-T. The scale was originally developed with a USA sample and adapted to Turkish. As stated in the discussion part of the study results, BVS-T did not give congruent results with the structural family theory, which made the researcher think that the scale might not be culturally sensitive and that there is an obvious need for a new scale considering the cultural structure of the Turkish family. Therefore, it is firstly recommended that, the researchers interested in the family system theories may develop alternative boundary violation scales. Thus, the concept of boundary violation can be discussed in terms of culture, such that as Kağıtçıbaşı.
manifested to psychology world in her masterpiece “Family, Self and Human Development Across Cultures” (2007), the individuals cannot be truly evaluated apart from their cultural context.

Due to the need for a marital subsystem, the current study eliminated the adolescents from the sample if they do not have an intact family. While removing the scales of such adolescents, it was observed that some of the participants took notes on the Demographic Information Form such as “I stay with my mother for a couple of months and with my father for the other couple of months”, “I stay with my mother at weekdays and with my father at weekends”, or “I live with my mother but also I see my father frequently”. Even if the mother and the father do not live at the same house, such family interactions may also predict boundary violation. For example, adolescents might be used by the parents to carry messages between each other, or there might be a competition between parents to gain the adolescent’s sympathy so that the parent can prove that he or she is worth loving and the other spouse is not. These sorts of relationships are also indicators of boundary violation and may be investigated in future studies. Furthermore, different types of boundary violation can be studied in cases where only one parent is alive. For example, Johnston (1990) reported that promoting maturity predicts some negative outcomes in children from one-parent families. Even, forming coalition does not have to refer to the relationship between parents and children. It may also be observed in different forms, such as the grandparent and child’s coalition against the mother.

The current study findings did not present an opportunity to make more complex analyses, especially because the sub-dimensions of boundary violation did not reveal compatible results with each other in terms of subjective well-being and trait anxiety. Future studies may consider measuring the boundary violation with more of its dimensions like infantilization (Kerig, 2005), scapegoating (Vogel & Bell, 1968), or spousification (Sroufe & Ward, 1980).
As subjective well-being is a broad concept, the attempt to explain the adolescents’ well-being solely with boundary violation may not be sufficient, which is in fact proved by the current study results. As pointed out in the literature review part of the study, there are a great variety of studies explaining SWB in terms of different variables. In the light of the existing literature, future studies may add those variables to their studies with the aim of predicting the SWB on boundary violation. Particularly, personality traits and attachment styles may mediate the relationship between boundary violation and SWB.

Finally, as mentioned in the discussion part of the study, adolescents need to feel distressed in order to perceive a relationship pattern as boundary violation. Hence, to determine the boundary violation more accurately, qualitative data may be gathered by interviewing adolescents. In addition, collecting qualitative data from parents can also be considered for further investigation of boundary violation.
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**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A: Sample Items from Boundary Violation Scale**

Açıklama: İnsanların aile içi ilişkileri konusunda ne düşündüğünü ve hissettiğini belirlemek için oluşturulan bu ölçeğe, her soruda verilen seçeneklerden kendinize en yakın davranış biçiminde olduğu ifadeye ait kutucuğa (X) işareti koyunuz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hiçbir Zaman</th>
<th>Çok Az</th>
<th>Ara Sıra</th>
<th>Çoğu Zaman</th>
<th>Her Zaman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annem bana bir yetişkin gibi davranır.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annem benimle yakın bir arkadaş gibi konuşur.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annem ve babam fikir ayrılığı yaşadığında annem tarafından kendi yanında olmam</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Sample Items from Positive Negative Affect Schedule

Açıklama: Bu ölçek farklı duyguları tanımlayan bir takım sözcükler içermektedir. Son iki hafta nasıl hissettiğinizi düşünüp her maddeyi okuyunuz. Lütfen size en çok uyan ifadeye ait kutucuğa (X) işaretli koyunuz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Çok az veya Hiç</th>
<th>Biraz</th>
<th>Ortalama</th>
<th>Oldukça Fazla</th>
<th>Çok Fazla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heyecanlı</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutsuz</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Güçlü</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Sample Items from Brief Multidimensional Student’s Life Satisfaction Scale

**Açıklama:** Aşağıda yaşamımızın çeşitli alanlarından memnuniyetiniz ile ilgili altı ifade bulunmaktadır. Lütfen size en çok uyan ifadeye ait kutucuğa (X) işaret koyunuz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Berbat</th>
<th>Mutluz</th>
<th>Çoğu zaman memnun değil</th>
<th>Memnuniyetiniz ve memnuniyetinizin eşit</th>
<th>Çoğu zaman memnun</th>
<th>Hemen her zaman memnun</th>
<th>Harika</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aile yaşamına ilgili memnuniyetimi yandaki gibi tanımlayabilirim;</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkadaşlık ilişkilerimle ilgili memnuniyetimi yandaki gibi tanımlayabilirim;</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okul yaşamına ilgili memnuniyetimi yandaki gibi tanımlayabilirim;</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Sample Items from State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children - Trait Anxiety Form

Kızların ve erkeklerin kendilerini anlattıkları bazı cümleler aşağıda verilmiştir. Her cümleyi okuyun ve hangisinin sizin için en doğru olduğunu karar verin. ‘Hemen hemen hiç’ mi , ‘bazen’ mi yoksa ‘sık sık’ mı. Daha sonra sizi en doğru anlatan ifadenin önündeki kutucuğa (X) işareti koyun. Yanlış
ya da doğru cevap diye bir şey yok. Herhangi bir cümle üzerinde fazla zaman geçirmeyin. Genellikle
nasıl hissettiğinizi en iyi anlatan ifadeyi seçmeyi unutmayın.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yanlış yapacağım diye endişelenirim.</th>
<th>□ hemen hemen hiç</th>
<th>□ bazen</th>
<th>□ sık sık</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aklımdan engelleyemediğim önemsiz</td>
<td>□ hemen hemen hiç</td>
<td>□ bazen</td>
<td>□ sık sık</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>düşünceler geçer ve beni rahatsız eder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalbimin hızlı hızlı çarptığını fark ederim.</td>
<td>□ hemen hemen hiç</td>
<td>□ bazen</td>
<td>□ sık sık</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. GİRİŞ

Çocuk Hakları Sözleşmesi’nin önsözünde aile, aile üyelerinin özellikle de çocuğun gelişimi ve iyi oluşu için doğal bir ortam olarak tanımlanmakta ve “Çocuk, kişiliğinin uyum içinde ve tamamen gelişebilmesi için, mutluluk, sevgi ve anlayışın hakim olduğu bir aile ortamında büyümeli” (s.45) (Birleşmiş Milletler, 1989) ifadesi vurgulanmaktadır. Şefkatli ve destekleyici bir ebeveyn sahip olmak erge

ön bir şanstır. Ancak, aile sistemi kuramları açısından bakıldığında, bu tarz bir ebeveyn sahip olmak, ergenlerin iyi oluşunu arttırmak için yeterli bir aile ortamında olduğunu göstermez.


1.1 Çalışmanın Amacı

Bu çalışmanın amacı, sınır ihlali ile öznel iyi oluş ve sınır ihlali ile sürekli kaygı arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaktır. Çalışmanın ikinci amacıysa, cinsiyet ve ergenlik dönemi evresine göre katılımcıları öznel iyi oluş ve sürekli kaygı bakımından karşılaştırmaktır.

1.2 Çalışmanın Önemi

kurarken sınır ihlali yaratan davranışlar daha fazla sertilemektedir. Dahasi, Sroufe, Egeland, Carlson ve Collins (2005), ebeveyen-çocuk sınır ihlalinin iki nesil boyunca anlamlı bir sürekliliğe sahip olduğunu belirtmiştir.


2. YÖNTEM

Bu araştırmada nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden biri olan ilişkisel araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada, her bir sınır ihlali boyutunun öznel iyi oluş ve sürekli kaygı ile ilişkisi ayrı olarak ölçülmüştür.

2.1 Araştırma Soruları

Bu çalışma kapsamında aşağıdaki 4 soruya cevap aranmıştır:

1. Sınır ihlalinin alt boyutları ve öznel iyi oluşun alt boyutları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki var mıdır?
2. Sınır ihlalinin alt boyutları ve sürekli kaygı arasında anlamlı bir ilişki var mıdır?
3. Katılımcıların öznel iyi oluş düzeyleri ve sürekli kaygı düzeyleri cinsiyete göre farklılık göstermektedir mi?
4. Katılımcıların öznel iyi oluş düzeyleri ve sürekli kaygı düzeyleri ergenlik evrelerine göre farklılık göstermektedir mi?

2.2 Örneklem

Araştırmanın hedef evreni Türkiye'de iki ebeveynleri ile aynı evde yaşayan 11-18 yaş aralığındaki ergenlerdir. Ergenliğin farklı evrelerini karşılaştırmak üzere yaş aralığı geniş tutulmuş ve orta okul ve lisede öğrenim gören öğrenciler hedeflenmiştir. Kozmopolit bir şehir olan İstanbul'un Türkiye'nin uygun bir temsilcisi olduğu varsayılmış ve İstanbul Avrupa yakasında, iki ebeveyn ile birlikte aynı evde yaşayan 11-18 yaş arasındaki ergenler çalışmanın evrenini oluşturmıştır.

Çalışmaya farklı sosyo-ekonomik düzeylerdeki katılımcıların dahil olduğundan emin olmak için, İstanbul Avrupa yakasında bulunan, "yaşam kalitesi endeksine" göre (Şeker, 2015) düşük, orta ve yüksek sosyo-ekonomik düzeyden üç farklı ilçe seçilmiştir. Kolaylıkla Bulunabildi Örnekleme (Convenience Sampling) yöntemleri

2.2.1 Katılımcıların Demografik Özellikleri

Çalışmaya İstanbul’un düşük, orta ve yüksek sosyo-ekonomik düzeyeye sahip ilçelerinde iki ebeveynleri ile birlikte yaşayan 11-18 yaş aralığındaki 1305 orta okul ve lise öğrencisi katılmıştır. Veri İstanbul’un Beşiktaş, Bahçelievler ve Esenler ilçelerinden toplanmıştır. Katılımcıların ilçelerindeki dağılımı birbirine benzerdir. Katılımcıların %31,2'si (n = 407) Beşiktaş'ta, %32,2'si (n = 420) Bahçelievler'de ve %36,6'sı (n = 478) Esenler'de yaşamaktadır. Katılımcıların %55,4'ü (n = 723) kız, %44,6'sı (n = 582) erkektir. Katılımcıların yaş ortalaması 1,61 standart sapma ile 15'tir. Katılımcıların %39,3'ü (n = 513) 15-18 yaşları arasındadır ve çalışmanın ön ergenlik grubunu oluşturmaktadırlar. Katılımcıların kalan %60,7'si (n = 792) ise 15-18 yaşları arasındadır ve çalışmanın ileri ergen grubunu oluşturmaktadırlar.

Ebeveynlerin eğitim düzeylerine bakıldığında; annelerin %3,4'ü (n = 45) hiç okula gitmemiştir, %28,4'ü (n = 371) ilkokul mezunu, %20,1'i (n = 262) ortaokul mezunu, %25,9'u (n = 338) lise mezunu, %19,6'sı (n = 256) üniversite mezunu ve %2,5'i (n = 33) lisansüstü bir dereceye sahiptir. Babaların %0,5'i (n = 6) hiç okula gitmemiştir, %20,0'sı (n = 261) ilkokul mezunu, %23,2'si (n = 303) ortaokul mezunu, %28,4'ü (n = 371) lise mezunu, %23,1'i (n = 302) üniversite mezunu ve %4,8'i (n = 62) lisansüstü bir dereceye sahiptir.
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2.3 Veri Toplama Araçları


**Sınır İhlali Ölçeği**: Ölçek, "hiçbir zaman" ile "her zaman" arasında değişen 5'li Likert tipi bir özbildirim ölçeğidir. Ölçek 12 maddeden oluşmaktadır ve 4'er maddeden oluşan olgunluğa teşvik, koalisyon oluşturma ve akran düzeyi iletişim olmak üzere 3 alt ölçeği bulunmaktadır. Ölçekten alınabilecek en düşük puan 12 ve en yüksek puan ise 60'tır.


**Pozitif ve Negatif Duygu Ölçeği**: Ölçek, "çok az veya hiç" ile "çok fazla" arasında değişen 5'li Likert tipi bir öz bildirim ölçeğidir. Ölçek, 10'ar maddelik pozitif duygulanım ve negatif duygulanım alt ölçeklerinin bulunduğu 20 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Ölçekten alınabilecek en düşük puan 20 ve en yüksek puan ise 100'dür.

Türkçeye uyarlanmış formunun güvenilir bir ölçme aracı olduğunu göstermektedir. Ölçeğin örnek maddelerine Appendix B’den ulaşılabılır.

Çok Boyutlu Öğrenci Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği Kısa Formu: Ölçek, "berbat" ile "harika" arasında değişen 7'li Likert tipi bir özcebirem ölçebileğidir. Ölçek her bir yaşam doyumu alanını inceleyen 1 madde olmak üzere toplam 5 madde ve puanlamaya eklenmeyip geçerlilik çalışması için kullanılan ek bir global yaşam doyumu maddesi ile toplam 6 maddenin oluşmaktadır. Ölçkten alınabilecek en düşük puan 5 ve en yüksek puan ise 35'tir.


Çocuklar İçin Durumlu-Sürekli Kaygı Ölçeği Sürekli Kaygı Formu: Sürekli kaygı formu “hemen hemen hiç”, “bazen” ve “sık sık” seçeneklerini içeren 3'lü Likert tipi, 20 madde ve bir faktörden oluşun bir özcebirem ölçebileğidir. Ölçekten alınabilecek en düşük puan 20 ve en yüksek puan ise 60'tır.


Demografik Bilgi Formu: Katılmıcılardın yaş ve cinsiyet bilgileri ayrıca ebeveynlerin eğitim düzeyleri hakkında bilgi toplamak için araştırmacı tarafından oluşturulmuştur. Formda cinsiyet için 2 seçenek (kız, erkek), 2 ebeveynle birlikte aynı evde yaşayan olma durumu için 2 seçenek (evet, hayır) ile anne ve babanın eğitim düzeyleri için ayrı ayrı oluşturuulmuş 6 seçenek (hiç okula gitmemiș, ilkokul mezunu, orta okul

2.4 Veri Toplama Süreci


2.5 Veri Analizi

Bu çalışmada, sınır ihlalinin boyutlarıyla olan koalisyon oluşturma, olgunlaşma teşvik ve akran düzeyi iletişim ile öznel iyi oluşun boyutları arasında yaşam doyumu, pozitif duygulanım, negatif duygulanım, ve toplam öznel iyi oluş puanı arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek için bir dizi Pearson korelasyon analizi yapılmıştır. Ayrıca, sınır ihlali boyutları ve sürekli kaygı arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek için Pearson korelasyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Cinsiyet gruplarına öznel iyi oluş ve sürekli kaygı açısından karşılaştırmak için iki bağımsız örneklem t testi uygulanmıştır. Benzer şekilde,
katımcıların ergenlik dönemleri ile ilgili olarak öznel iyi oluş ve sürekli kaygı puanlarını karşılaştırmak için t-testi kullanılmıştır. Veri, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 23.0) programı kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir.

2.6 Çalışmanın Sınırlılıkları

Çalışma sadece İstanbul Avrupa yakasında ve yine sadece devlet okullarında orta okul ve Anadolu liselerinde uygulanmıştır. Bu bağlamda sonuçları genelleme açısından bazı sınırlılıklar mevcuttur. Çalışmada sadece nicel veri toplandığı, nitel yöntemler kullanılmamıştır. Bir diğer sınırlılık, Türk kültür yapısı gereği öğrencilerin ailelerindeki sorunları yansıtmak yerine ideal cevapları ya da istekleri yönündeki cevapları seçmiş olabilmeleri durumudur. Çalışmadaki en büyük sınırlılık ise kullanılan sınır ihlali alt ölçeklerin ergen iyi oluş açısından birbirleri ile ve alan yazının uyumlu sonuç vermemesinden yola çıkarak, Türk kültürüne uygunluğunun tam olmaması olabilir.

3. BULGULAR

Öncelikle, mevcut çalışma, öznel iyi oluş ve sürekli kaygı açısından cinsiyetler arasında ve ergen grupları arasında anlamlı bir fark olup olmadığını sorgulamıştır. Öznel iyi oluş açısından bakıldığında, erkek katılımcıların kızlara göre yaşam doyumlarının daha yüksek olduğu, pozitif duyguları daha fazla, negatif duyguları ise daha az hissettikleri bulunmuştur. Sonuç olarak erkeklerin toplam öznel iyi oluşlarının kızlarınindenden fazla olduğu görülmüştür. Ergenlik evresine göre incelendiğinde, ön ergen grubun öznel iyi oluşunun ileri ergen grubu göre daha yüksek olduğunu bulunmuştur. Sürekli kaygı açısından bakıldığında, sürekli kayığın kızlarda erkelere göre daha yüksek olduğu bulunmuş ancak ergenlik evresine göre bakıldığında ön ergen ve ileri ergen grup arasında sürekli kayığın açısından bir fark olmadığı görülmüştür.
Çalışmada sınır ihlali ile sürekli kaygı ve yine sınır ihlali ile öznel iyi oluş arasında yapılan korelasyon analizleri, sınır ihlalinin alt boyutları açısından bakıldığında farklılık göstermiştir. Öncelikle, koalisyon oluşturma yaşam doyumu ile negatif ilişkili, negatif duygulanım ve sürekli kaygı ile pozitif ilişkili olduğu bulunmuştur. Öte yandan koalisyon oluşturma ile negatif duygulanım ve toplam öznel iyi oluş puani arasında anlamlı düzeyde bir ilişki bulunmamıştır. Sınır ihlalinin bir diğer boyutu olan akran düzeyi iletişim; yaşam doyumu, pozitif duygulanım ve toplam öznel iyi oluş ile pozitif yönde ilişkili, negatif duygulanım ve sürekli kaygı ile negatif yönde ilişkili bulunmuştur. Sınır ihlalinin son boyutu olan olgunluğa teşvik ise yaşam doyumu, pozitif duygulanım ve toplam öznel iyi oluş ile pozitif yönde ilişkili, negatif duygulanım ve sürekli kaygı ile negatif yönde ilişkili bulunmuştur. Kısacası, sınır ihlalinin koalisyon oluşturma boyutu ergenlerde olumsuz durumlarla ilişkili, olgunluğa teşvik ve akran düzeyi iletişimın olumlu durumlarla ilişkili olduğu görülmüştür.

4. TARTIŞMA

erkeklerinkinden daha yüksek olduğu sonucunu elde etmiştir. Öznel iyi oluş bakımından iki cinsiyet arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığı sonucuna ulaşan araştırmalar da mevcuttur (Certel, Bahadir, Saracoğlu ve Varol, 2015; Eryılmaz, 2010; Uşan ve Kiran-Esen, 2015).

Öznel iyi oluş bakımından iki ergenlik evresinin karşılaştırılması sonucunda ise, öznel iyi oluşun her boyutunda ve toplam öznel iyi oluş puanında, ön ergenlerin ileri ergenlerden daha yüksek ortalama sahibi olduğunu ortaya çıkmıştır. Yaş ile öznel iyi oluş arasındaki ilişki hakkında yapılan çeşitli açıklamalardan birine göre, yaş ile iyi oluş arasında u-biçimli bir ilişki vardır (Blanchflowers ve Oswald, 2008). Yani, gençler ve yaşlılar orta yaşılardan daha mutludur. Larson ve Lampman-Petraitis (1989) tarafından ergenlik evresi dikkate alınarak yapılan çalışmada, ileri ergenlerin ön ergenlerden daha fazla negatif duygulananım gösterdiği ve beşinci sınıftan dokuzuncu sınıfta doğru ergenlerin mutluluk düzeyinde % 50’lik bir azalma olduğu görülmüştür.


Ön görülmeyen bir bulguysa, bir sınır ihlal türü olan akran düzeyi iletişim ile öznel iyi oluş arasında pozitif ilişki saptanırken, sürekli kayğı ile arasında negatif ilişki bulunması olmuştur. Bu sonuç iki farklı açıdan ele alınabilir. Öncelikle, öznel iyi oluş araştırmalarına göre mutluluk Batı’da daha çok “hedefe ulaşmayıla” ilişkilidir, Doğu kültüründe daha çok “kişiler arası ilişkilerin kalitesi” ile ilişkilidir (Diener ve


5.2 Uygulama Yönelik Öneriler


Ailelerin sosyoekonomik durumu göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, özel psikolojik danışma hizmetlerinden faydalanılması her ergen için mümkün değildir. Öte yandan, her ergen okulunda bulunan psikolojik danışmanlardan yararlanabilir. Okul psikolojik danışmanları, sınır ihali konusunda anne babaları bilgilendirmek adına programlar hazırlayabilir ve aile alt sistemleri arasında sınır ihalini önlemek amacıyla ebeveynlere bazı iletişim stratejileri öğretabilirler. Örneğin; akran düzeyi iletişimin ergen için ne kadar yararlı olabileceğinin netliğe kavuşturulması, ergenlerin aile ortamında duygusal olarak daha güvende hissetmesi için önemlidir. Aynı zamanda okul psikolojik danışmanları ergenlere yönelik seminerler düzenleyip sınır ihalı, anne babalarının her ikisine de aynı derecede nasıl mesafe alabilecekleri veya gelişim seviyelerini aşan sorumlulukların türleri konularında ergenleri bilgilendirebilirler.

Aile yapısındaki olumlu bir değişim, öncelikle bireyde olumlu bir değişime yol açarken, uzun vadede toplumda olumlu bir değişimi sağlar. Bu nedenle, iyi oluş ve sınır ihlali arasındaki ilişki hakkında bilincin kazandırılması, toplumun genel iyi oluşu için önemli hale gelmektedir. Politikaya yön verenler de, toplumun refahını artırmak amacıyla bu çalışmanın sonuçlarını dikkate alabilirler. Toplumun sınır ihalini hususundaki bilinci, kamu hizmeti reklamları gibi devlet kaynaklarının kullanılmasıyla ve belediyeler tarafından düzenlenen açık oturumlarla geliştirebilir.

5.3 Gelecek Araştırmalar için Öneriler


Evlilik alt sistemine duyulan ihtiyaç sebebiyle, mevcut çalışmada iki ebeveyniyle aynı evde yaşamayan ergenler önemlendenden elenmiştir. Bu katılmcıların ölçekleri ayıranırken, katılmcıların bazıları Demografik Bilgi Formu üzerinden “Birkaç ay annemle birkaç ay da babamla kalıyorum,” veya “Annemle yaşıyorum ama babamla da sık sık görüşüyorum,” gibi notlar aldığı fark edilmiştir. Aynı yaşaman ebeveynleri ile bu tür yaşantısı olan ergenler ebeveynleri tarafından birbirlerine mesaj taşımak için kullanılabilir. Dahası, eşler sevilmeyi hak etmeyenin kendisi değil, diğer eş olduğunu kanıtlamak amacıyla ergenin sempatisini kazanmak için bir yazı içersinde...

Özellikle sınır ihlalinin alt boyutları, özel iyi oluş ve sürekli kaygı ile ilişkileri bakımından birbiriyile tutarlı sonuçlar ortaya koymadığı için mevcut çalışma bulguları daha ileri analizler yapmaya fırsat vermemiştir. Gelecek çalışmalarında sınır ihlali; çocuk muamelesi yapma (infantilization) (Kerig, 2005), günah keçisi ilan etme (scapegoating) (Vogel ve Bell, 1968) veya eş halini alma (spousification) (Sroufe ve Ward, 1980) gibi diğer boyutları dahil edilerek ölçülebilir.

Öznel iyi oluş kapsamlı bir kavramdır ve bu çalışma sonuçlarının da ortaya koyduğu üzere, ergenlerin iyi oluşunun yalnızca sınır ihlaliyle açıklanmaya çalışılması yeterli olmayabilir. İlgili literatür incelemesinde özel iyi oluşun farklı değişkenler bakımından açıklanması rastlanmaktadır. Bu mevcut literatür ışığında, gelecek araştırmalarda söz konusu değişkenler çalışmaya eklenmekte olabilir. Özellikle, kişilik özellikleri ve bağlanma stilleri, sınır ihlali ve özel iyi oluş arasındaki ilişkiye aracılık edebilir.

Son olarak, çalışmanın tırtılsı kısmında da bahsedildiği üzere, bir ilişki örntüsüne sınır ihlali diyebilmek için öncelikle ergenin bunu sınır ihlali olarak algılaması gerektiğini belirtmektedir. Bu yüzden gelecek çalışmalarında, sınır ihlalinin daha doğru bir biçimde belirleme adına ergenlerle bireysel görüşmeler yapılırak nitel veri toplanabilir. Ayrıca ailede sınır ihlalinin daha derinlemesine araştırılabilme adına ebeveynlerden de nitel veri toplanması önerilebilir.
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