ANGER IN PSYCHOTHERAPY PRACTICES:
A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

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

BY
AHMET EVRAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

AUGUST 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sadettin Kirazcı
Director (Acting)

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

_____

Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak-Berument
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. Faruk Gençöz
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Bahar Öz	(METU, PSY)	_____
Prof. Dr. Faruk Gençöz	(METU, PSY)	_____
Dr. Yağmur Ar-Karcı	(TEDU, PSY)	_____

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: Ahmet Evran

Signature :

ABSTRACT

ANGER IN PSYCHOTHERAPY PRACTISES:

A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Evran, Ahmet

M.S., Department of Psychology

Advisor: Prof. Dr. Faruk Gençöz

August 2019, 125 Pages

The purpose of the current thesis is to explore the constructions of anger in the context of psychotherapy from a social constructionist perspective. In contrast to the mainstream understanding of emotions, anger is treated as an emotion which is constructed and reconstructed by the speakers in the context of social bonds throughout human history. Being compatible with this perspective, discourse analysis is conducted to the transcriptions of psychotherapy sessions in order to explore discursive organization of anger in psychotherapy. Seven sessions were obtained, transcribed and coded for identifying relevant discourses, subject positions and discursive strategies used in psychotherapy. Identified strategies include distancing, blaming, generating alternatives, narrating, and comparison. Subject positions created by the speakers are tolerated/tolerating, evaluated/evaluating, capable/incapable, yielding, frustrated, and misunderstood subjects. Several discourse that are constructed during anger talk consists of general emotion discourses, anger as social threat, anger and control, the need to express anger,

injustice, and nonsensicality. Implications of and conclusion from analysis is discussed in association with relevant literature.

ÖZ

PSİKOTERAPİDE ÖFKE: BİR SÖYLEM ANALİZİ

Evran, Ahmet

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Faruk Gençöz

Ağustos 2019, 125 Sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı toplumsal inşacılık açısından psikoterapi bağlamında öfke kuruluşlarını incelemektir. Duygu konusundaki hakim eğilimin aksine öfke, tarih boyunca sosyal bağlar bağlamında insanlar tarafından inşa edilen ve yeniden inşa edilen bir duygu olarak alınmıştır. Psikoterapide öfkenin söylemsel organizasyonunu çalışmak amacıyla sosyal inşacılık bakış açısına uygun olarak psikoterapi görüşmelerinin transkripsiyonlarına söylem analizi uygulanmıştır. Elde edilen yedi seans, ilgili söylemleri belirlemek amacıyla kodlanmış ve analiz edilmiş; söylemler, özne pozisyonları ve söylemsel stratejiler belirlenmiştir. Stratejiler, mesafelenme, suçlama, alternatif üretme, öyküleme ve karşılaştırma olarak belirlenmiştir. Özne pozisyonları tahammül eden/edilen, değerlendiren/değerlendirilen, becerikli/becerikli olmayan, teslimiyetçi, hayal kırıklığına uğramış ve yanlış

anlaşılan özne olarak belirlenmiştir. Ortaya çıkan söylemler ise genel duygu söylemi, sosyal tehdit olarak öfke, öfke ve kontrol, öfkeyi dışa vurma ihtiyacı, adaletsizlik ve anlamsızlıktır. Analiz ve sonuçları ilgili alanyazının da katkılarıyla tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Duygu, Öfke, Toplumsal İnşacılık, Söylem Analizi, Psikoterapi Araştırmaları

To My Family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Anger and Related Concepts

Anger has been identified as one of the universal emotions across various cultures. Cassiello-Robins and Barlow (2016) states that anger is still unrecognized and understudied in psychopathology, although very common emotional disorders such as anxiety, depression and post-traumatic stress all involve some level of angry or irritable mood. Anger has been studies in connection to other commonly acknowledged disorders. For example, the role of anger in depression is well known for a long time (Mohr, Shoham-Salomon, Engle, & Beutler, 1991). Although consensus has not been arrived by researchers on what anger actually is, daily experience suggests that everybody feels anger at some point or another. Depending on the theoretical assumptions and orientations, anger definitions can be found in the emotion literature in broad variability. Averill (2012) describes anger as "an emotional state that involves both an attribution of blame for some perceived wrong and an impulse to correct the wrong or prevent its recurrence." (p. 137). Anger is usually referred in two modes: on the one hand, it is an umbrella term used for conveying a wide range of affective states (i.e. envy, frustration, hate, etc.); on the other hand, anger is a distinct emotional category within emotions such as the ones universally defined by Ekman (1992).

Confusion of anger and other related concepts seems to be preventing conceptualizations which may help researchers and clinicians in their work. Aggression, hostility, violence, and anger are sometimes used interchangeably, which further contributes to the confusion and lack of consensus. Assuming that it is even

possible whether an agreement can be reached in defining these concepts, it seems unlikely to arrive a conclusion regarding these phenomena. However, certain insightful papers analyzing this lack of clarity regarding these concepts can be found in the literature. In a very careful analysis of anger, Rothenberg (1971) claims that while hostility as a personality trait or attitude has the intention to destruct or destroy an object, anger lacks this intention as an affect. Similarly, distinction between anger and aggression can be drawn by referring to behavioral aspect of aggression. Aggression has observable elements of behaviors, whereas when someone is angry, it may not be seen, felt, or expressed. Bandura's (1973) view that aggression is a learned behavior is also worth mentioning since attribution of aggression to outside sources which allows learning through modelling fails to distinguish anger and aggression. In fact, he fails to identify elemental factors and precursors of aggression and generally equates angry affects closely with aggression. However, psychoanalytic theories regard aggression as drive, which is innate to humans, while other theories still emphasizes behavioral and observable aspects of aggression. Additionally, violence has the components of uncontrollability, and is generally associated with aggressive behaviors that are out of control and with hostile intention to harm an object or transgress a limitation.

1.2. Philosophical Foundations

Before proceeding to emotion theories and relevant literature regarding anger, laying a solid foundation can be helpful. As the precursor of psychology, philosophy has been dealing with passions for a long time. Averill's (1982) analysis of passions in philosophy sheds some light on the matter. Traditionally referred as passions, emotions and affects were seen as opposites of reason and rationality. Some authors still treat emotions irrational in some philosophical circles (Nussbaum, 2015). Averill (1982) reports that in the philosophical sense, passions are things which people suffer and which people should get rid of. By the help of etymology, he demonstrates the connection between the words of passion, pathos, and pathology we use today to better

grasp the meaning of passion. In a sense, passion is what people suffer from like a disease, and passion is located in opposition to action and reason since people get affected by passions, which positions them as passive in terms of agency. In the similar lines, Aristotle defines anger as "as an impulse, accompanied by pain, to a conspicuous revenge for a conspicuous slight directed without justification towards what concerns oneself or towards what concerns one's friends" (in Averill, 2012, p. 138). In other words, people get angry because someone tries to slight or down-rank them without justification, which creates a desire to seek revenge. By utilizing a baseline scenario from daily life, Nussbaum (2015) claims that contemporary meaning we can deduct from this definition involves that anger appears when people are threatened with their status, in other words, when they are threatened to lose the sense of security in social existence.

1.3. Historical Perspectives on Emotions and Anger

History of emotions goes back to Darwin and Freud's ideas in scientific literature (Spielberger & Reheiser, 2009). Darwin considered fear and anger as the universal emotions in the sense that these emotions facilitate behavior that is adaptable in the survival of the species. His description of anger conveys the original ideas of fight-or-flight response in the face of threat or an enemy. James defined emotions as the result of bodily excitation as opposed to previous views, including Darwin's which posits that emotions are preexisting in living creatures. The James-Lange theory of emotions by Cannon (1927) opposed this view, suggested that bodily arousal can be observed both while emotion was being experienced and not being experienced, and added that interpretation and evaluation of physiological effects are of great importance in experiencing emotions. This theory has given rise to behavioral and cognitive theories later developed. Frustration-aggression hypothesis was also worth mentioning since it is one of the most domineering views on anger. Originally developed by a group of social scientists (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939), frustration-aggression hypothesis was reformulated by Berkowitz (1962) by an inclusion of anger

as the link between frustration and aggressive acts. Freud and followers were later criticized for not paying much attention to affects in psychoanalytic theory, although his insights on unconscious produced explanations for (physiological) arousal states and emotions which occur without the person knowing about them. I will discuss psychoanalytical views later below.

It appears that until the "turn to language" in social sciences, perspectives of emotion revolved around a discussion of Cartesian body and mind dualism, that is, discussions revolve around whether physical or mental aspects come first. Whether emotions are inherent or caused by outside effects and whether they are pathological or not, these perspectives do not take cultural, social, and linguistic effects into consideration. Averill (2012) states that on the one hand, there are naturalists who assume that emotions are inherent part of humans and physiologically observable in the body; on the other, social constructionists take emotions as socially constructed entities or effects, which cannot be thought without proper social origin, context and functions.

1.4. Recent Perspectives on Anger

Building on philosophical and historical background, first, I will mention general perspectives on anger developed recently. Second, I will present social constructionist perspectives on anger. Since psychoanalysis has evolved over last century with influences of medicine, hermeneutics, and linguistics, I reserved a third title addressing emotion and anger from this perspective.

1.4.1. General Perspectives on Anger

General connotation of anger in the literature is negative and malignant. The assumptions that emotional states are thought to be distinct biological mechanisms that are adaptive, and that people are born hardwired with expressing and recognizing certain emotions (Ekman, 1992) are also prevalent in the literature. Assumptions

inherent to the anger definitions additionally seem to be problematic. Anger is defined as a syndrome that involves experiential, physiological, cognitive, and behavioral components (Edmondson & Conger, 1986), which implies a problem, not an emotional category. Rubin (1996) describes anger as

> the elicitation of one or more aggression plans by the combination of threat appraisal and coping processes. That is, adaptive actions frequently occur without an emotion as automatized plans for coping with potential dangers are elicited. However, during such automatized functioning, threat appraisal is vigilant (p. 116).

Inherent relation of anger and aggression is demonstrated in this definition, which assumes the association between anger and aggression from the beginning, and denies any possibility of questioning it. Rubin (1986) points out the ambiguity in definitions of anger up to that point in his review of literature on grounds of whether it is related to aggression and whether threat perception is present, and criticizes broadness of definitions.

Generally, cognitive and social psychological perspectives payed much attention to rumination, attributional biases, and threat appraisals, in similar lines with James-Lange theory of Emotion. Gardner and Moore (2008) found that anger is an experience which is usually avoided by persons, and when not experienced and expressed, rumination of anger and likelihood of aggression increase. Anestis, Anestis, Selby, and Joiner (2009) claims that anger rumination does not predict anger despite predicting aggressive behaviors in non-clinical sample. A well-known theory of anger was developed by Spielberger, Reheiser, and Sydeman (1995), which distinguishes between state and trait anger in personality. In simple terms, trait anger is an aspect of personality which increases the likelihood of experiencing anger and intensity of angry emotionality overall, while state anger represents changes in existence and intensity of anger depending on the circumstances. Trait anger individuals tend not to express their anger well or in a positive manner and experience negative consequences (Deffenbacher et al., 1996). Accumulative to previous research, Deffenbacher, Oetting, Lynch, and Morris (1996) defined many physical and verbal forms of expression in support for state-trait personality theory. Anger rumination and trait

anger is also found to be associated. Takabe, Takahashi, and Sato (2015) states that people with higher degree of anger rumination perceive situations as frustrating, and if they are inclined not to express anger, their likelihood of trait anger increases. These categorical distinctions of anger and anger-related phenomena seems valid enough from a statistical and empirical point of view; however, when examined from a distance, these hypotheses miss an important aspect of anger or emotion, which appears to be origin, function, or orientation of emotions. Temperament and personality research generally suffers from nature of methodologies since self-report measures may not represent reality. Additionally, relatively large section of research I encountered involves findings that include hostile attribution biases, faulty appraisals, and usually interpretation of stimuli as biased, which seems not a novelty but a continuation of previous views in different frameworks. Berkowitz and Harmon-Jones (2004) calls researchers to broaden their methodologies in conducting research on anger since they concluded that determinants of anger are plenty in number, ranging from muscle tension, biased appraisals to aversive stimuli such as pain or stress in the literature, and there is no consensus.

Few findings concerning anger imply interpersonal elements. In a study where it is stated that relational aspects of anger experience were understudied, Wyckoff (2016) found that when people put low relational value to someone, anger mediates desire to directly or indirectly aggress. Similarly, Yip and Schweitzer (2019) claimed that anger reduces perspective-taking in interpersonal contexts, which may lead to conflict and arguments as opposed to collaborative attitudes. Despite the fact that qualitative research is very low in number in the anger literature, Andrew and McMullen (2000) analyzed anger as interpersonal script. They studied therapy recordings which include incidents regarding anger experiences and coded them into clusters in a narrative analysis. They raise attention to the relational aspects of anger experience, between the subject and the other.

Overall, general perspectives regarding anger in the literature view anger as innate, observable or measurable in quantity, and an interpretation of bodily or mental stimuli. Assuming anger is naturally a part of human experience, studies are generally

conducted for discovering connections between anger-related cognitive or behavioral phenomena, which may be beneficial for quick interventions and short-term psychotherapy in clinical settings. Insufficiency of socio-cultural variables such as interpersonal aspects of anger, and thin number of qualitative research are also observed in general perspectives on anger.

1.4.2. Social Constructionist Perspectives on Anger

Thanks to "turn to language" movement in social sciences in middle to late 20th century, social constructionist perspectives on emotions also have gained acceleration. According to social constructionists, events and experiences that are called emotional are constituted within or between individuals in a cultural, historical and linguistic context. The importance and priority given to language practices over other phenomena such as physiological arousal and behaviors make constructionist perspectives unique. Changes in number of words describing the same object across cultures were exemplified famously by Whorf, Carroll, Levinson, and Lee (2012). In his paper titled "Science and Linguistics", Whorf argues that while English has the same word for snow for many types of snow, Eskimo has a large quantity of words describing it due to geographical conditions. According to Whorfian hypothesis, language has the power to shape and reflect the experience and the world for subjects. Built on this type of arguments, social constructionist influences increased in psychological science.

Social constructionist perspectives on emotions are observed to divide into two depending on the degree of involvement of linguistic and social factors. On the one hand, some studies on construction of emotions suggest that physiology and social aspects are complementary to each other in explaining emotional phenomena, yet with strong focus on social and linguistic aspects in determining emotions. For example, Averill (1982) claims that anger can be treated as a social role that people take in order to regulate social relationships according to some moral or normative rules defined by

specifically by a particular society. He defines anger in association to attribution of blame and moral judgements, and accusation for misdeeds, together with a function of correcting a perceived wrong; while criticizing many previous theories (frustration, arousal) for emphasizing other aspects of anger rather than social ones and for the implicit assumption that anger has negative consequences for the individual. Although alterations and reaction in a physiological sense (bodily changes, facial expression) is present during an emotional experience, functioning and appearance of these emotions rely strongly on socio-cultural contexts. On the other hand, some researchers see social and linguistics effects on construction of emotions as total. For example, Harre (1987) claims that roots of emotions cannot be traced to mere physiology alone. He criticizes earlier theories of emotion on the grounds that researchers assume that emotions are preexistent in the body or mind. To quote him (Harre, 1987),

> psychologists have always had to struggle against a persistent illusion that in such studies as those of the emotions, there is something there, the emotion, of which the emotion word is a mere representation (p. 4).

Similar views by Mancuso and Sarbin (1998) conveys that physiological changes cannot be taken as causes of and inherent to emotions but additional features of emotional experiences.

Taken together, both views suggests that language and social factors have defining effects on emotional and anger experience. In total, social constructive perspectives on anger raises attention to constitutional aspects of emotions, functions of anger, contextual dependence. In contrast to hormonal and biological changes that occur when faced to a threat in a hypothetical setting given by many textbooks for the purposes of explaining fight or flight response, these views regard interpersonal elements more in defining threats. For example, Averill (1982) found that anger occurs more often between people who love each other, are friends or relatives. Despite being undesirable, consequences of anger are generally found to be positive with the purpose of conveying a message to others. He points out the importance of language in humans as a species in contrast to others, implying that language in humans and communication in animals are two separate phenomena, and that emotions convey

8

complicated messages. Additionally, he claims that in most of the cases, expression of anger ends up not in aggression but in resolution with talk. Kassinove and Sukhodolsky (1995) see anger as an uncomfortable subjective experience and emotional state which is conscious and open to communication through verbal or bodily signals. In similar lines with constructionist approaches, Rothenberg (1971) claims that anger is not a manifestation of aggression, drive or learned behavior. In comparison with hostility and aggression, he states that anger rarely precedes a destructive act; in contrast, anger facilitates communication by conveying the message that there is an obstruction or a threat in the environment for both angry person and others in the environment, and opens a channel for conveying.

Overall, anger has been seen as a socially constituted emotion which emerges depending on the social context for the purpose of signaling a misdeed to oneself and to others, and which is usually constructive not destructive. Recent studies has also closely followed these perspectives. Influences of language over emotions in molding and shaping them is demonstrated recently (Gendron, Lindquist, Barsalou, & Barrett, 2012). Barrett (2011) thoroughly introduces recently developed Conceptual Act Model from constructivist tradition, emphasizing the emotion as a mental event as constructed from fundamental psychological and biological primitives with strong focus on effects of language over mind in terms of words in naming emotions and lexical connections intrinsic to language. This model treats emotions as dynamic, context-dependent, and interwoven with language practices.

To summarize, constructivist tradition regards anger as constituted within language in close connection to social practices. Instead of focusing on biological and physiological mechanisms as universal indicators and manifestations of emotional states such as anger, social constructivists see anger as subjectively and idiosyncratically emerging on social plain. Anger has transformational capabilities for the individual and in most of the cases, anger appears in interpersonal context (Eatough & Smith, 2006). Philosophical arguments of anger are also in favor of constructionist tradition. For example, Nussbaum (2015) states that anger is a transitional emotion

9

that provides motivation and hope for the future instead of inclination to revenge or retribution on a social level.

1.4.3. Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Anger

I take psychoanalysis as a strictly separate discipline from psychology, although discussions over definitions of and criteria for science are various in defining them. Psychoanalysis has been criticized from the beginning for not being scientific, while psychology tried to position itself as a positive science after following natural sciences. Although social constructivist tradition has affected psychology towards divergent paths, psychology still suffers from unrealistic expectations of being a positive science. Nonetheless, developed as a practice at the first place, psychoanalytic knowledge accumulated over the last century and took human beings as objects of study while interacting with a great number of sources and disciplines. Its endeavor to analyze and decipher human psyche created large volume of knowledge, which fundamentally feeds from clinical work. Psychoanalytic theory has also been criticized by many over the years because of neglecting affects. For example, Quinodoz (2005) criticizes psychoanalytic theory for the lack of a definition of affect since affects are seen by psychoanalysts as general emotional states. However, Freud updated his ideas concerning affects over the years, and his successor Lacan reinterpreted Freudian ideas related to affects, which I will now try to explain.

Freud considered affects as general emotional states and as separate from ideas or thoughts in early stages; nevertheless, later he took affects as representations and functions of the drive in connection with *libido*, or life energy (Freud, 1963). In this view, anxiety is thought to be originated from repressed thoughts, and taken as a general excess energy built-up which can be transformed into other emotions including anger. Towards the end of his career, he defined anxiety as the function of the ego (Hewitson, 2010). By placing ego as the source of anxiety in the face of a threat, he abandoned previous views of affects, and got closer to generally accepted idea that

anxiety is felt when faced to a danger, leaving behind no definite answer to what an affect is. In close examination of Freud's (1936) paper titled "*Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety*" written towards the end of his career, Lacan (2014) stated that only true affect is anxiety, and tried to reach conclusions on affects and emotions. Before continuing clarifying the position of affects in psychoanalytic theory, I should first give background on other influences that will help conceptualize affects in psychoanalytic theory, and partially in social constructionist tradition.

Origins of social constructionism and Lacanian psychoanalytic school can be traced back to Saussure's ideas on language. Considered to be the founder of structuralism, Saussure (1966) stated that language consists of units and symbolic rules, which produce a system that governs reality. In other words, linguistic features such as units (phonemes, letters) and sets of rules (grammar) provides a systems for the speakers to produce and reproduce what we call reality. What he called a *sign* consists of two parts: signifier and signified. Signifier is the part of sign, which is regarded as the physical aspect such as sound, phoneme, letter or symbol. Signified, on the other hand, is associated to meaning associated with that sign, which is agreed upon in social group that speaks the same language. Critical point that has given rise to further developments in structuralist tradition is that he defined the relationship between signifier and signified as arbitrary. Consequently, it is implied that there is no intrinsic, natural, mathematical, or logical connection between a mental representation (signified) and its sound (signifier) when we speak it out. That means nothing but the agreement among speakers of the language can determine the relations. In addition to these observations, he states that existence of signs depends on linear time, which prevents two signs to be used at the same time. Although this observation was very important in relation to the discovery of slip of the tongue since Freudian slips are regarded as unconscious manifestations, in a way that another system is interfering with conscious speech; unfortunately, Freud and Saussure's ideas were not able to come together until Lacan decided to reread Freudian discovery of the unconscious with influences from Saussurian Linguistics.

In what is called metaphysical papers, Freud (1963) mentions word-presentations and thing-presentation in a parallel connection to Saussure's signifier and signified, respectively. Psychoanalysis as practice, talking cure, was founded upon the idea that verbalization of unconscious thoughts and ideas makes them conscious which creates a linking between the original word-presentation/thought and original affect connected to it. In other words, affective problems stem from an unlinking process between an affect and the original thought that created affect in the first place. Unlinking process is called repression. It is also important to notice the nuances by which the repression operates. Only idea content, in other words, ideas, thought, word-presentation, or signifiers are repressed, related affect is set loose and connects to other word-presentations or signifiers. Lacan (2002) suggested the superiority of signifier over signified in his theory by claiming that signifiers or words are not entities that goes through people's mind, instead, words creates meaning in social backgrounds. Considerable effort put into language by Lacan in his rereading of psychoanalytic theory results from essential and constituent aspects of these processes, as opposed to an effort to produce definitions of many affective states because psychoanalysis is more concerned with treatment than with theory. Lacan (2014) states in his Seminar X that

> What on the contrary I did say about affect, is that it is not repressed; and that is something that Freud says just like me. It is unmoored, it goes with the drift. One finds it displaced, mad, inverted, metabolized, but it is not repressed. What is repressed are the signifiers which moor it (p. 14).

Although linguistic and symbolic operations were held in the center in Lacanian psychoanalysis, affects were also commented upon many times through his seminars and works. Soler (2016) refuses criticisms directed to Lacan for underestimation and understudy of affects by commenting that affects were actually *effects* of unconscious processes and drives. If we keep in mind that unconscious is a theory of memory (Lacan, 1997) and is structured like language as uttered famously by Lacan in many occasions, we can conclude that affects are in fact effects of language and linguistic practices due to symbolic rules that govern them. Recent perspectives of

psychoanalysis also very similar to those developed by Lacan. Pizer (2004) states that keeping in mind that linking and unlinking processes of affect and cognition are well known since Freud introduced his ideas, repression as the fundamental operation of psyche, which creates and shapes unconscious in the beginning, only deals with thoughts and cognitions. In other words, dissociating an unwanted idea results in disappearing of related affect, and reappearance of this affect by itself without originally repressed cognition or thought.

If I go a bit further, Lacan revitalizes psychoanalytic thought by claiming that symbolic structure of language that is arbitrary at best, is lacking. Due to this lack in the linguistic system that is essentially responsible for existence of subjects and reality also posits the lack into subjects and reality itself. This relationship between lack and anxiety is thoroughly discussed by Lacan (2014) in relation to other affects.

Special place given to anxiety by both Freud and Lacan indicates that anxiety is a universal affect that can be transformed to other affective states, stemming from unconscious drives in the form of general energy (Lacan, 2014). He defines anger in seminar VI as

> …and it is very difficult not to perceive that a fundamental affect like that of anger, is nothing other than that: the real which arrives at the moment that we have constructed a very nice symbolic framework, where everything is going well, order, law, our merit and our goodwill. One notices all of a sudden that things do not hang together. This is the normal operation of the affect of anger… (Unofficial translation by Gallager, p. 98)

In other words, anger is a discharge of energy, which appears when the symbolic laws, expected to hang together, does not hold together. Anger is an attack at "the very discursive agreements that have proven impotent to satisfy us" (Soler, 2016, p. 89). Consequently, anger is a transformation of (libidinal) energy when something disappointing happens or when we face a failure of reality in satisfying our demands, which otherwise would appear as anxiety. These arguments place anger at the level of demand while anxiety at level of desire. To put it in another way, anger is always a subjective experience which deals with subject's demands from themselves and the

others, while anxiety is fundamentally associated to the desire caused by the lack in the symbolic register constituted by the language into the subject, pointing out to a missing element in the system itself. Additionally, repetition of an original structural element in the psyche causes similar affective responses (i.e. anger) to reappear in different social contexts since the link is severed, and affect has attached itself to another signifier (Lacan, 2014). One vignette provided by Pizer (2004) claimed that especially anger has the effect of dissociating and associating or linking and unlinking processes over repression. These insights are similar to those developed by Lacan, who conceptualizes acting-out and passage to the act (see Evans, 1996).

Overall, psychoanalysis takes language as constructive of the subject and reality, in which subject positions, in terms of social, historical, and cultural relations. Affects are regarded as effects of linguistic operations, while anger is defined in relation to failure and disappointment resulting from discursive (i.e. social-relational) disagreements. It is generally accepted that although affects were not studied in an extensive and detailed way in psychoanalysis, clinical aspects of psychoanalysis, which have always been on the front as opposed to theory, focuses on the analysis and working through of subjective language in order to treat affective disorders. Anger is conceptualized as an emotion that is disruptive for social bond, and closely associated with frustration and disappointment on a subjective level.

1.5. Psychotherapy of Anger

Psychotherapy is considered a place where fundamental changes in character and in experience of self can be achieved (Martin, 2012). Howells et al. (2002) implies that anger as something manageable through psychotherapy. Avdi (2005) treats psychotherapy as a process of meaning-making and transformation of meaning from a social constructionist perspective. Psychotherapeutic interventions for anger in the literature are large in number yet proves less fruitful in quality. General theories that focus on cognitive and behavioral aspects of anger experience targets subjective

14

evaluation, attribution, and interpretation biases in therapy in order to remove angry affect (Quiggle, Garber, Panak, & Dodge, 1992; Hawkins & Cougle 2013), which can be interpreted as a relearning process for the patients. Anger management or control and cognitive-behavioral interventions are dominant in literature with small number of family therapies (Lee & DiGiuseppe, 2018). In a meta-analysis, Saini (2009) found that majority of psychological treatments are effective in treatment of maladaptive anger across different approaches in therapy. The same analysis revealed that psychodynamic therapies have higher effect sizes compared to other modes of psychotherapy. In the similar lines, Mayne and Ambrose (1999) in their review of literature claimed that long-term therapies such as psychodynamic therapy can help patients with anger problems in moderating angry affect, while cognitive therapy alone cannot because changes that are expected takes a long time. Paivio (1999) claims that different interventions are necessary in treating different modes of anger such as under regulated or over controlled.

Some studies concern themselves for not anger as outcome but anger as a threat to psychotherapy relationship. DiGiuseppe, Tafrate, and Eckhardt (1994) claimed that anger in psychotherapy can be harmful for the outcome, and anger of the patient may cause disagreement on the goals of therapy and hurt psychotherapeutic alliance. This worry not only places the anger on the patient's side exclusively, but also views anger as a threat. On the other hand, psychologists from social constructionist tradition see anger as something that is constructive in interpersonal relations in most cases, which is generalizable to psychotherapy relation. Similarly, psychoanalytic approach treats transference as a key to therapeutic outcome. Being careful to not equate transference with alliance or therapeutic relationship that develops over time between therapist and patient, it is also claimed that it is also on the therapist's side that transference cannot be dealt with properly so that outcome can become negative due to anger in the therapy room. For example, van Wagoner (2000) found that working on countertransference of the therapists in training is one of the efficient ways in dealing with patients' anger in group therapy. Relational aspects of therapy are emphasized especially in psychoanalytic and social constructivist traditions, yet studies conducted on relational

15

aspects of anger seem low in number. Laughlin and Warner (2005) suggest the inclusion of relational aspects in psychotherapy across different modalities can be beneficial in working with anger.

1.6. Discursive Approach to Emotions

There are different ontological and epistemological assumptions for differing methodologies in general conduct of scientific research. Mainstream psychology has historically adopted quantitative methods over qualitative ones yet many psychologists run their research on qualitative grounds today. Connecting roots of modern psychology as a science to Wundt's insights on laboratory research and directly observable phenomena of behaviorist traditions, psychologists shaped current understanding of psychological research by strong focus on empirical and statistical data. However, other social sciences are founded on or have adopted qualitative methods earlier compared to psychology. Starting from 1980s, psychology has accepted and used a variety of qualitative methods including discourse analysis, interpretative phenomenological analysis, and grounded theory.

Epistemological assumptions of methods differ between qualitative and quantitative methodologies. However, the main difficulty arises from the hardship of defining qualitative methodology based on common epistemological assumptions because qualitative methods have different ontological and epistemological assumptions within themselves. For example, interpretative phenomenological analysis and discourse analysis have common and uncommon epistemological foundations despite being categorized as qualitative methods. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) provided five main characteristics of qualitative research in comparison to quantitative methods. I will provide these characteristics and summarize their major arguments.

First, qualitative methods are more concerned with the richness and thickness of the data and more focus on description of phenomena. Direct focus on details, similarities and differences of accounts, daily experiences are much more important for qualitative

16

researchers. Similarly, Bryman (1988) also suggests that qualitative methods tend to produce more novel concepts and questions compared to mainstream way of hypothesis testing. Second, qualitative research tries to emphasize individual perspectives rather than generalizable results. Findings from qualitative research are often idiographic. Third, qualitative researchers embrace post-modern perspectives over positivism of natural sciences. Social phenomena that psychologists are interested in share one common factor: language. Post-structuralist traditions depict that there is no single reality but many versions of reality. Language has the ability to construct multiple versions of reality out of single phenomena or a real object of study; consequently, generalization in social research is not possible and realistic (Potter, 1996). Therefore, unlike natural sciences like physics and chemistry, social sciences may be committing an error following positivist foundations in conducting research. This argument also necessitates to draw some differences between qualitative and quantitative research tools. Qualitative research accepts the role of the researcher as a participant of the research. For example, these methods use unstructured or semi-structures interviews and talks of the researcher are used as a part of the data.

Similarly, fourth characteristic provided by Denzin and Lincoln (2000) is adherence to the post-modern sensibility. Individual accounts and daily experiences of real life are given more importance over laboratory conditions. Researcher admits from the beginning that he or she is a part of the study and has an influence on findings as an interpreter. Lastly, focusing on constraints of everyday life and details in participants' real life instead of an abstraction of participants thought processes, emotions, or behaviors distinguishes qualitative research. For example, instead of using questionnaires for the study of a concept with pre-given artificial categories, they focus on grounding their findings in everyday life. Therefore, real life applications of qualitative research is a major part of ethical and practical concerns in conducting research.

1.6.1. Discourse Analysis

As mentioned earlier, epistemological foundations of different methods within qualitative research have some differences among themselves. I will now introduce discourse and discourse analysis in connection to these assumptions.

Discourse is defined as "systems of meaning that are related to the interactional and wider sociocultural context and operate regardless of the speakers' intentions." (Georgaca & Avdi, 2012, p.147) Discourse consists of all types of written texts and spoken language, determining speakers' accounts, social actions, production of specific meanings, etc. while it is continuously reconstructed by those who speak the language. Three observations can be made about the nature of discourse as mentioned by Wiggins and Potter (2008). First, discourse is constructed by those who speak them and has linguistic and structural elements such as letters, words, sentences, intonation, and so on. More importantly, discourse is also constructive in the sense that it produces a version of reality. Discourses shape people's perceptions about phenomena and themselves continuously. Second, discourses are action-oriented. Every speech is an act or performance to accomplish something. While we talk, we greet, invite, blame, justify, etc. Finally, discourse is strictly dependent on a context. Same words with same sequential order may produce different results in different environments, in different parts of the same discourse or in different times in history within the same individual.

In broader terms, discourse analysis is the detailed study of language in use. Since discourse analysis is a relatively diverse field of qualitative research, it is not possible to clearly define it. Many disciplines make use of discourse analysis in varying degrees of depth and focus in research. However, Potter and Wetherell (1987) introduced discourse analysis into psychology as an alternative to quantitative methods which are widely accepted and used. While emerging as a separate field of research, discourse analysis (and discursive psychology) fed upon many other disciplines including ethnomethodology, sociology of science, anthropology, philosophy of language and linguistics. Putting a particular interest on language, discourse analysis focuses on use, function, variability and structure of language in use. Rather than seeing language as

a tool or medium to convey messages, discourse analysts take language as the primary topic of interest in research. As a strictly human practice, language lets people speak in order to perform things, to accomplish something, and to act in a certain way. For example, saying "Good morning" to an acquaintance is not about stating the status of that particular part of the day but about greeting and/or starting a conversation with that person. This simple example also demonstrates the action-orientation feature of discourses.

While epistemology is related to the question whether something is knowable or not, ontology deals with whether the object of the study does exist or not. In the case of discourse analysis, language is not a tool to express the lived experience but it constructs the experience; therefore knowledge is constructed through social interaction and processes. "For social constructionism, reality and identity are systematically constructed and maintained through systems of meaning and through social practices" (Georgaca & Avdi, 2012, p.148). Potter and Wetherell (1987) claim that researcher should not "use the discourse as a pathway to entities or phenomena lying 'beyond' the text." (p. 49). It assumes that language exists as an object of study, and knowledge represents the truth of the situation only partially. Potter and Wetherell (1987) criticizes realistic approaches to discourse, which suggest that discourses are consistent and singular; "…variation was pervasive and extreme even within the talk of the same participants." (p. 125). On the contrary, since language is constructive and constructed, same object can be described in multiple different ways; consequently, many accounts or subject positions are created regarding same phenomena. This relativistic view is widely accepted by many discourse theorists and by social constructivism in general. When conducting a discourse analysis, the emphasis is on the function, context and variation in a discourse. Organization of a discourse in general is main focus of discourse analysis in psychological research instead of entities such as emotions, behaviors, attitudes, etc (Georgaca & Avdi, 2012). Potter and Wetherell (1987) identified the first step of discourse analysis as

> …the suspension of the belief in what one normally takes for granted, as we begin to think about how a practice is constructed and what it assumes

rather than seeing it as a mere reflection of an unproblematic reality (p. 104).

1.6.2. Research Idea

Avdi and Georgaca (2007) states that qualitative research is needed in psychotherapy studies from constructionist perspective. When I reviewed the literature on qualitative analyses conducted on emotion, other social sciences were dominant in number. However, Edwards' efforts in creating a field of emotion discourse studies is noteworthy for the effort of qualitative research of emotional phenomena (1999). As one of the pioneers who conducted discourse analysis of emotions, he demonstrated that emotion discourses are produced for social actions by individuals in everyday talk and in psychotherapy. Edwards (1999) states that

> While conceptual oppositions and inconsistencies threaten an internally consistent cognitive model of the emotions (or just of anger, or even just of one angry reaction), they are marvelously designed for the rhetoric of alternative descriptions (p. 228).

Although mainstream psychological perspectives provide seemingly solid explanations for anger, discourse analysts suggest that every discourse can be critically evaluated, including cognitivist explanations and descriptions of anger. Therefore, indexical, rhetorical, and linguistic variations that are present in discourses are so great that people's emotional displays

> "can be treated either as involuntary reactions, or as under agentive control or rational accountability, as internal states or public displays, reactions or dispositions, that emotion discourse can perform flexible, accountability-oriented, indexically sensitive, rhetorical work" (Edwards, 1999, p. 228).

More specifically, his claims imply that instead of conducting research on emotions that are already categorized, studying emotion discourse in particular contexts can be more fruitful in understanding these phenomena. Avdi and Georgaca (2007) also suggests that there are only few studies that work on psychotherapy session transcripts from a qualitative research point. In their review of literature concerning discourse

analytic approaches that are compatible with social constructionism, psychotherapy appears as a place where meaning transformation takes place, shifts in subjective positions and constructions are observed, and power relations are reflected (Avdi & Georgaca, 2007). Although anger is studied through other qualitative methods in different context (Andrew & McMullen, 2000), research on anger in psychotherapy settings from a discourse analytic perspective was conducted only in a few studies. (Elliott, 2002). I am interested in constructions and functions of anger in psychotherapy since I am also a clinical psychologist in training. More specifically, I am interested in how anger is experienced, structured, and expressed in psychotherapy. Although general implication in the literature is that anger poses a problem in psychotherapy, psychotherapy research that is conducted on actual psychotherapy sessions from transcripts are few to conclude in this direction. I decided to study anger in psychotherapy context from social constructionist perspective by utilizing a discourse analytic approach. Close study of psychotherapy sessions on emotion discourse (in my case, anger discourses) will allow me critically reflect on possible implications for clinicians and theoreticians for working through anger.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1. Overview of Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is the detailed study of natural language in use. For this study, I employed discourse analysis for the investigation of anger talk in psychotherapy sessions. My purpose for utilizing discursive approach to psychotherapy includes to challenge preconceptions of anger and to broaden the views of problematic anger. Quality criteria for discourse analysis and stages I followed are explained below.

2.2. Quality Criteria for Discourse Analysis

A variety of quality criteria is provided over the years for discourse analysis. Since qualitative analysis in general and discourse analysis in particular have roots in different epistemological assumptions, quality criteria is different compared to tools that mainstream psychology employs. In the chapter eight of their book Potter and Wetherell (1987) claims that quality of discourse analysis can be assessed by taking four essential principles into account. These are *coherence of the analysis*, *participants' orientation*, *raising new questions*, and *fruitfulness*. Coherence of analysis refers to explanation of discourses in both macro and micro levels with general organization of discourses mentioned. Even the exceptional cases that do not belong to explained systems of meaning are valuable since they still provide information and raise new questions. Participants' orientation is about the attention given to participants' talk and their view of reality. This is accomplished mostly by providing excerpts and working through analysis one by one. Arising new questions and problems is one of the main goals of discourse analysis. However, fruitfulness is

given the highest importance among these criteria, which is associated with generating novel explanations and broadening analysis to better include new discourses.

After reviewing quality criteria for discourse analysis provided by many researchers, Georgaca and Avdi (2012) also suggest a list of quality criteria that have overlapping items. They claim that analysis should have *internal coherence* by the researcher's account, who also should be *rigorous* at analysis in order to achieve rich and diverse findings. Other criteria involves *transparency* of research process and *reflexivity* provided by the researcher as a part of the study. The last one is *usefulness* of the research, which refers to real-life applicability of research findings such as suggesting new therapeutic techniques and providing information for policy makers.

I tried to employ both views in conducting my research on anger discourse in psychotherapy. My ethical concern was on detailed examination of anger talk in order to generate rich ideas, and provide insights for therapists as well as researchers who are interested. I am a clinical psychologist in training, with particular interest in anger as emotion. When I reviewed the literature on anger, I felt disappointed to find nothing but a few insightful papers on anger as a topic of interest. Anger is also personally relevant for me; therefore, I had an urge to study it in depth, which led me to discourse analysis. Because of both personal and scientific reasons, I tried my best to follow guidelines by taking quality criteria mentioned above into account.

2.3. Stages of Discourse Analysis

Putting an emphasis on the interchangeable nature of steps involved in discourse analysis, Potter and Wetherell (1987) initially identified many stages of discourse analysis in the eighth chapter of their book. However, I will not only use their original guidelines, but also take advantage of Georgaca and Avdi's (2012) insights developed as levels of discourse analysis when applicable in my research since former focuses more on technical aspects while latter pays attention to coherence of content generated by the analysis.

2.3.1. Research Interest

As I mentioned above, anger is a relevant emotion both personally and intellectually. I decided to study anger when I first notice that it might cause a problem in my psychotherapy conduct when dealing with patients. When reviewed the literature, I found out that although researchers emphasized the insufficiency of research on anger, many theories were developed. Nevertheless, instead of a sufficient explanation on anger, there are multiple views on anger from behaviorist to cognitive theories to psychoanalytic ones. Since goals of discourse analysis include generating new questions and finding novel explanations for phenomena, I decided to study anger by conducting discourse analysis. Since my concerns are also about practice as a clinical psychologist, I decided to take my material from psychotherapy.

2.3.2. Data Collection and Procedure

Sample consists of many excerpts from seven psychotherapy sessions which include anger or anger talk. After obtaining ethical approval from Human Subjects Ethical Committee, these are collected by word of mouth among graduate students who also conduct therapy in Ayna Clinical Psychology Support Unit in Middle East Technical University as part of mandatory internship for the Clinical Psychology program. Therapist were asked to deliver sessions which contains angry affect and anger talk from their perspective. Since I am interested in anger in the discourse, whether anger belongs to patient or therapist ruled irrelevant when asking for session recordings. More specifically, therapist were asked to "deliver psychotherapy session recordings which contains angry affect or anger talk, which may be originated from both patient's and therapist's talk." In other words, inclusion of psychotherapy sessions depends on first therapist's opinion that their sessions include angry affect or anger talk, and second, my pre-analysis, which consists of listening to recordings many times in order

to identify and make sure that anger and anger talk is present in the recording. As obtained from the Ayna Clinical Psychology Support Unit's records, patients' reasons for application to therapy include suspiciousness and hardships in interpersonal relationships, attention and impulse control problems, and mood disorders. Patients ages were between 22 and 37. Psychotherapeutic orientation of these therapists is psychoanalytic and/or psychodynamic. They've been conducting therapy under supervision for at least two semesters when the data collection was completed.

A total of seven psychotherapy sessions were collected. After listening to recordings many times and time-stamping them, transcription of selected parts which are defined by anger talk is completed. Using MAXQDA Analytics Pro version 12, I coded the data and categorized the codes by color in terms of similarity. After the examination of levels of discourse analysis developed by Georgaca and Avdi (2012), I decided to utilize three levels of analysis, which are discursive strategies, subject positions, and constructed discourses. By the help of initial coding process and familiarizing with the data many times over by reading transcriptions, I identified a large number of strategies, positions and discourses. Qualitative research and discourse analysis in particular dictates the iterative process of coding and analysis. Keeping this in mind, I went over relevant excerpts, dialogues and quotations many times in order to achieve a final version of analysis, within which an interplay of discursive strategies, subject positions and discourses appeared. During this process, some of the data was ruled irrelevant for the purposes of space and coherence, and some categories are merged or divided. For example, a discourse created on social isolation in anger talk was identified; however, because another discourse on social threat was relevant, these two discourses were evaluated as close and similar in terms of function of anger, therefore, they were merged into one. Thanks to codes and many memos I have written down during analysis, I created a table that includes excerpts, their respective lines in raw data and category names just before going into writing process.

Psychotherapy sessions were in Turkish, and due to the value given to the natural aspect of language in discourse analysis, I placed extracts in original form without translating them into English, which may be a setback for those who are not fluent in

Turkish. Nevertheless, it seems more essential to not disturb the natural talk that is being analyzed. I put an effort to provide much context and information regarding the extracts I present, which hopefully compensates the lack of translation for non-native speakers. Since reliability of results presented in this research should be evaluated critically by the reader due to the involvement of subjectivity of the researcher, considering the guidelines I mentioned above, I warn the readers to pay attention to both demonstration of analysis as a process and results of the analysis as an end result at the same time.

2.3.3. Reflexivity

As a slippery term, reflexivity refers generally to influences researchers have over the studies they conduct in qualitative research practices. Similar to the importance given to reflexivity in discourse analytic research tradition as I mentioned above as a quality criteria, qualitative psychological research under the influence of social constructivism also dictates accepting the role and influences of the researcher on his or her research. Burr (2003) has two claims about reflexivity. First, because language has constitutive effects over reality, descriptions or accounts given by someone about an event are also aspects of that event. In simpler terms, observer has an influence on the event, while the person who tells about this event also reconstructs it during the talk. Second, research conducted with a social constructivist approach should be taken as a construction itself without making itself immune to criticism it provides. Willig (2008) suggests two versions of reflexivity which are of importance for qualitative research practice at different levels. On the one hand, personal reflexivity refers to personal characteristics of the researcher that may have an effect on the research, on the other hand, epistemological reflexivity is associated to the assumptions of the research method, in this case discourse analysis. I tried my best to describe the assumption of discourse analysis I employ in this research previously. Rather than placing only a reflexivity statement regarding my position in this research, I kept a reflexive position during analysis and writing of this piece of research. With the responsibility of

knowing this research is also a construction and recognizing I am part of this study as the researcher, I will provide a reflexive statement in order to reveal probable influences of myself over my research in addition to some statements I provide above about personal relevancy of anger and psychotherapy. I also included a reflexive evaluation of this research process as a whole in Chapter 4.

I am a student at Clinical Psychology Graduate Program in Middle East Technical University, who conduct psychotherapy under supervision. In a similar position to people I collected data, who are also in the same program and conduct therapy with the same approach, I tried my best to bracket my position as a psychotherapist in training and my approach as psychoanalytical when analyzing and presenting the data. Anger as an emotion is personally relevant to me as I mentioned earlier, and I am driven to anger as the topic of my thesis because of hardships I had dealing with angry patients in psychotherapy. More importantly, anger is a frequent emotion I face in my private life and in my psychotherapeutic processes. Although there was no parallelism between my personal experiences with anger and topics in psychotherapy sessions from which I obtained my data, anger and anger talk are very relevant personally.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

3.1. Analysis

As discussed in Chapter 2, traditional psychological research aims at reducing variability within data since generalizability and validity of findings strictly depend on statistical analysis. However, while conducting a discourse analysis, variability and inconsistency in the data are the main sources of information. In this regard, I rigorously tried to capture the variability present in the data during analysis. Therefore, these findings should not be regarded as generalizable in the traditional sense; instead, subjectivity of accounts created and the subjectivity involved in these kind of research should be approached critically by the reader. Some of the claims I make during my analysis and presenting my results may not be shared by others; nevertheless, I tried to maintain a certain amount of objectivity in the sense that I did not find something beyond the text given in the form of extracts.

Whether the speaker is angry or not during anger talk is ruled irrelevant for the most part in the selection and analysis of extracts. On the one hand, anger as emotion and anger in talk are two different things which are hard to separate clearly; anger as a single emotion isolated from other affects cannot be identified, on the other. Since discourses are constructed primarily by words, anger talk is given higher importance in the analysis.

I divided this section into three main titles after following the levels of analysis suggested by Georgaca and Avdi (2012). I first put forward discursive strategies applied by the speakers during anger talk. Second, I present subject positions, of which some appear in the form of dual pairs consisting of opposites. I finish this section by presenting discourses that I identified during my analysis and by putting strategies and

subject positions into the mix in order to demonstrate how discursive strategies and subject positions come together in discourses.

3.2. Discursive Strategies

3.2.1. Distancing

Distancing strategy I identified here is about how speakers talk about anger, either directly or indirectly. During the speech, certain decisions made by speakers put a distance between them and anger. I present more specific strategies under the general strategy of distancing but first I will give two examples about proximity. In the following excerpt, speaker repeatedly says that she got angry with the situation, mentions that she had to do breathing exercises after the incident. I identified this strategy as proximity as the opposite of distancing; however, there are only two accounts that I can clearly obtain from the data.

> …alışveriş merkezine gidicem ya yemekhanenin ordan dolmuşa binerim ya otostopla metroya giderim ya ring gelir metroya giderim ama giderim bi şekilde yani tamam alışveriş merkezine gideceğimi biliyosun ama sorgulama yani yolu sorgulama ben sana altı üstü dolmuşu sormuşun bu da beni hasta ediyo buna da sinirlendim buna da öfkelendim baya öfkelendim o an hatta hatta alışveriş merkezine gitti bi yarım saat nefes çalışması falan yapmaya çalıştım…

Another excerpt is below:

> T: evet ses tonunuz yükseldi nası acaba oldu
> P: tehdit hissettim
> T: hmm nası bi tehdit
> P: şöyle bişey hissettim üniversite sınavı dediniz ıı üniversite sınavı dediğinizde ıı benim her şeyimi üniversite sınavına bağlıyosunuz dediğinizde sanki hayatımdaki en önemli şey basit bi üniversite sınavıymış gibi hissettim kendimi değersiz hissettim buna saldırma ihtiyacı hissettim buna karşı bu yüzden bi tepki verdim

In this interaction, after therapist points out that the patient started to speak loudly, patient states that he felt threatened and worthless, he emphasizes the need to attack

29

these and therefore he reacted in that matter. Patient increases his proximity to these feelings and explains all that happens during the moment he got angry.

All the following data are about specific distancing strategies.

3.2.1.1. Renouncing

I identified four main categories of distancing strategies for the sake of clarity since putting all the distancing talk in the same title may confuse the reader. These include renouncing, devaluation, abstracting talk, and metaphorization. Following is the general example of renouncing:

> …ve yine mesela işte hani bu tip durumlarda farkına varıyorsun ki insan farkına varıyor ki ben varıyorum ki yine uzun bir yoldan geldim kendime neyse ııh hani ne kadar detaylı bi şekilde planlamaya çalışırsan çalış hani bu plan bir rasyonel zemine oturmuş olsa da ifade edilmesi gereken hani gereken iyi bir tabir değil de ifade etmek istediğin her şeyi zaten ifade etmiş olsan da yani bişiy hani bazen şu planları bozan bişiydir…

In this excerpt, patient starts to speak in a manner of avoiding himself while trying to explain something, and states that he came a long way to himself. His use of language suggests that there is dilemma between a necessity and a wish. He starts sentences with general statements and actively tries to change the way he expresses himself by altering the language use from general towards more personal.

3.2.1.1.1. Disowning

Renouncing strategies consists of two subcategories: disowning and avoiding confrontation. Disowning strategy is about whether the speaker talks about anger as an aspect or part of him/herself. I analyzed the use of the word "anger" or references to anger in the data and the following examples emerged.

T: peki bu söyleminizde ben biraz öfke de seziyorum
P: büyük ihtimalle öfke de var
T: öfkelendiğiniz şey ne olmuş oluyo peki

In the excerpt above, therapist suggests that she senses anger in patient's speech and patient replies in an uncertain tone. His choice of words suggests that there is a distance between himself and his anger. Also, instead of showing ownership of his anger, he speaks in a manner of pointing out his emotion from a distance. Therapist's next sentence counteracts the distance by asking the object of patient's anger.

o hüzün o öfke o işte istediklerini elde edememişlik o hayal kırıklığı kendini kullanılmış hissetme bunların hepsini susturmak istiyorum…

Similarly, in the excerpt above, patient talks about his anger, sadness, and frustration by pointing out to them without using possessive suffixes. In the following excerpt, the patient mentions his anger firstly by making his experience of getting angry into a noun (öfkelenme), and secondly by pointing it out as if his anger is not a part of himself. Peculiarly, he also says that he carried on with this anger for some time.

işle ilgili bir öfkelenme yaşadım… sonra bu öfkeden dolayı bu öfkeyi öğleye kadar sürdürdüm

In the following excerpt, the patient talks about his inability to understand his emotions and what they are signaling. He gives an example about pain and explains how meaningless to swear when you know what pain signals. He states that he has to change something so that his feeling changes accordingly yet he is unable to find the reason why he feels that way. In a session where patient speaks about his anger, he gives an example of pain and swearing, he generalizes emotion (herhangi bi duygu), and he points out in a general manner (bi duygu, bu duygu). By these, he accomplishes to distance himself from anger.

…yani onun bi nedeni olduğunun farkına varıyorum tamam bi nedeni anlamaya çalışıyorum bu duygunun bana ne anlatmaya çalıştığın çözümlemeye çalışıyorum şey örneği vermiştim soba yani o sobaya dokunduğunda acıyosa bunun bi nedeni var acıya küfretmenin bi anlamı yok orda yani çünkü o acı sana elini ordan çekmen gerektiğini hatırlatmak için var hissettiğim herhangi bi duygu da bana bişiy anlatmaya çalışıyo hani neyi

değiştirmek gerekiyo niye o duyguyu hissediyorum bişiy değiştirmeliyim ki o duygu değişsin

Following is a talk about a patient's anger towards her father:

itiraf da etmek istemiyorum yani ne diyim şimdi adam içimde ona karşı zaten hani bastırdığım belki de görmek istemediğim bir öfke var

By telling that she does not want to admit her feelings about her father, she covers anger up first, then she clearly states that she repressed her anger towards her father and tried to renounce it.

In these excerpts, speakers engage in their anger from a distance by avoiding the use of possessive suffixes, the word "anger", bringing uncertainty into the situation, and referencing to anger by general or indirect terms. These demonstrate how the use of language in a particular way can change how people experience anger or vice versa. Now, I will present examples for avoiding confrontation.

3.2.1.1.2. Avoiding Confrontation

Most of the distancing strategies identified in this section exemplify avoiding confrontation both with their own anger towards something and with other people who might get upset.

In the following excerpt, the patient speaks how he could not face his boss about leaving graduate school:

T: ne demek tepkisini ölçmek
P: yani direk bıraktım demek istemedim
T: niye
P: askıya aldığımı söylediğimde ne diyeceğini merak ettim önce bilmiyorum

He states that he first wanted to assess the possible response of his boss about patient's decision on leaving graduate school, and could not tell directly despite he left school already. Later in the session, the dialogue below takes place:

T: nasıl diyemediniz
P: ben yükseği bıraktım diyemedim
T: hm hm
P: bıraktım demek sanki onun ah yorumunu almadan hareket etmişim gibi bir izlenim bırakıp belki onu kızdırabilirdi ya da üzebilirdi

Patient talks about how his decision about leaving graduate school might upset or disconcert his boss; therefore, he could not directly tell the truth. By procrastinating this way, patient avoids confrontation and delays possible angry response. Another example is below:

P: bugünü bu duruma göre planladığım için başka planım zaten yoktu ona göre planlandı yarın ona göre planlandı öyle
T: ama sizi geçen haftalarda bahsettiğiniz gibi öfkelendiren bişey
P: hm hm o öfke oluyo bende doğru yani
(8)
T: dağılabiliriz falan
(gülmeler)

In a session where 15 minute delay is miscalculated, patient gets angry and emphasizes the importance of planning in his life, which is disrupted by these kind of misfortunes. Therapist point out that the patient might get angry since they have been talking about on these matters. Patient only confirms (hm hm) by distancing himself from anger and there is a significant silence after his response, which is followed by a joke made by the therapist and they laugh. Silence, joking, and laughing can be interpreted as methods of avoiding confrontation.

P: stresliyim sanırım biraz herkes de zaten gergin olduğumu söylüyo
T: hmm dışardan gergin olduğunuzu söylüyolar siz ordan psikolojim bozuk heralde diyosunuz
P: evet
T: hmm sizce
P: biraz gergin olduğumu hissediyorum gereksiz sinirleniyorum onun farkındayım hmm
(2.5)

In the dialogue above, patient states that she is stressed a bit and people have been telling her that she looked nervous. Therapist emphasizes how the patient acknowledge

her feelings by referring to other people's opinions and asks about the patient's opinion. The patient admits that she feels tense and unnecessarily angry. The patient's reference to other people's opinion and reluctance to admit her feelings in the beginning of the conversation exemplify another way of avoiding confrontation with anger.

> …işte tatil planları yapılıyo bi arkadaşımızın bi yerde evi var oraya gidecektik kız ayarladı birlikte dışlattığımız arkadaşım diyeyim ondan sonra e noldu tam gidicez tarihini konuşmuşuz iki ay önceden bilmem ne falan e benim param yok benim param yok arkadaş o zaman gidileceği belli iyi tamam dedim yani ben de daha ikiletmedim

In this speech, the speaker talks about how her colleagues bailed on her and her friend on a prearranged holiday plan. She sounds angry when she speaks on colleagues' excuse, and states that she accepted the situation as it is and did not say a word.

> aslında çok şey benzer şeyler bazen öfkeyi saklıyorum bazen sigara içtiğimi saklıyorum bazen bişeyi kırdığımı saklıyorum ıh aynı şey hani o an orda ıh yüzde yüz kendimmişim gibi davranmıyorum işte bu başkalarında bi hem kendimde hem başkalarında da bi ıhm bi algı yaratabilir mesela somurtkan bi izlenim verebilir ya da işte çok uzak duran böyle şüpheci bi izlenim bırakabilir

In the excerpt above, the speaker mentions that he sometimes hides his anger and things that might not be appreciated, but by hiding, he could not behave like himself. Avoiding facing his faults and anger, he says that he appears grumpy and suspicious to himself and to others.

Examples of therapy speeches given above suggests that renouncing anger can also be accomplished by avoiding confrontation with anger in self and others, together with putting delays on confrontational talks.

3.2.1.2. Devaluation

I also find anger talk demonstrating devaluation of anger and of the circumstances that lead to anger. In the following excerpt, the speaker talks about his sacrificial behavior in his job due to his wish to get better at what they are doing. Yet, since his efforts are

not seen, he characterizes the situation as absurd. By doing so, he devaluates his anger due to lack of affirmation expected of his colleagues, and emphasizes his contribution further, distancing from angry affect.

> …yani çünkü saçma sapan bi durum var ortada bana göre çünkü benim orda yapmaya çalıştığım tek bir şey var bir işi beraber yaptığımız işi daha iyi kalemlere taşımak istiyorum bunun için hem maddi gücümle hem zihin gücümle yardım etmeye çalışıyorum

The patient's speech below represents her inability to remember and to find the reasons why she gets angry. She emphasizes her anger as redundant (gereksiz yere) multiple times.

> kanım çekiliyomuş gibi gereksiz yere sinirleniyorum yani bazen gereksiz yere mesela kerime sinirlendim kerime neden sinirlendiğimi hatırlamıyorum yani neden sinirlendiğimin ortada yok sebebi

Another patient talks about a family situation where her parents get upset and even mad about her sister's behavior all the time, yet she does not want to be a part of this since her parents tend to unburden their troubles to herself. At the end of the quotation, she states that she finds this strange and redundant, she emphasizes that she should not actually be a part of this conflict.

> bağrışmaları çağrışmaları mesela ben odamdaysam bile onların sesini duyup sesinden rahatsız olabiliyorum ya da gelip bana dert yanmak mı denir bana tuğçeyi şikayet ediyolar ben napabilirim o benim çocuğum değil ki kendi çocukları değişik yani bu bana çok saçma geliyo beni ilgilendiren bişey yok çocuklarıyla kendileri arasında

Devaluation as a distancing strategy is done by characterizing the situation as redundant, emphasizing other aspects of the situation more, and distancing by removing oneself from the conflict.

3.2.1.3. Abstracting Talk

The following three examples are types of talks that are extremely abstract. By doing so, patients accomplish a distance from what is actually happening, and remove

themselves from the experience itself. The obvious lack of sentence structure and strolling between ideas and concepts demonstrate the method of abstracting. This type of talk can also be characterized by lack of evidence presented by the speakers which enables one to get a gist of the situation mentioned. Following example is a clear one.

> birkaç tane var hangisini anlatmak istediğimi hiçbirini anlatmak istemiyorum aslında şu anda ama hani şey değil bi yerden anlatcam heralde bunları da kendim detaylarını da hatırlamıyorum şeyden de çekiniyorum galiba öyle bi hissiyat geldi onu bak hemen söyleyeyim gelmişken biraz önce söyledim ya bişey böyle bi konuda kendimi anlaşılmış hissetmenin gerçekten neyi hissettiğimi gerçekten doğru biçimde ifade etmenin yolu onun kısıtlı o anki o duyguyu o anda sana yaşatan son damlanın da damladığı anı değil o bardağın nasıl o son damla damladığında taşacak noktaya geldiği noktayı anlatmak isteyen biriyim ya hep öyle olduğu zaman daha rahat anlaşılmış olma ihtimalimin daha yüksek olduğunu hissediyorum yani o mesela süreçleri yaşadığım yere kadar o kadar gelen bişey ki belki de üşeniyorum da anlatmaya yani hani çünkü hani şey bi tek onu anlatsam

Although therapist repeatedly asks what makes him angry earlier in the session, the patient generates this speech in response. Avoiding to answer the question, he continues to switch between ideas. Another example is below:

> hani ne kadar detaylı bi şekilde planlamaya çalışırsan çalış hani bu plan bir rasyonel zemine oturmuş olsa da ifade edilmesi gereken hani gereken iyi bir tabir değil de ifade etmek istediğin her şeyi zaten ifade etmiş olsan da yani bişiy hani bazen şu planları bozan bişiydir birden fazla insanın içinde olduğu planları yani karşı tarafın bunu anlamasını beklersin ve anlamaz anlamayabilir anlayacağını düşündüğün hissettiğin güvendiğin o seviyede bir deneyim ve iletişim paylaştığın biri olsa dahi karşıdaki o an onun kendi dünyasında ne olduğunu anlayamayabilirsin yani o her zamanki algısında olmayabilir ve senin anlayacağını varsaydığı şeyleri anlamayabilir bu yüzde gerçekten anlaşılmasını istediğim bişey varsa bu hayatta bunu ifade etmen gerekir ama bunu ifade etmiş olsan dahi diğer her şekilde rasyonel zemine oturtmuş olduğunu zannediyor olsan dahi en azından sonuçta insan kendinden şüphe duymalıdır her zaman ama ıı buna rağmen bir sonuca ulaşamayabilirsin yani hedeflediğin plan sonuca ulaşmak için yapılan bişeydir çünkü

This type of speech can be characterized as dispersed or almost disorganized because the lack of sentence structure is obvious compared to natural variation between written and spoken language, and clarity of meaning cannot be achieved by the listener easily. The last example is also very similar:

…o anda duygusal olarak gelen şey bu değil ama ben davranışımı bu duyguyla belirlemiyorum çünkü daha orta vadede düşündüğünüzde o anda göstereceğiniz o duygula olan tepki hayatınızın gidiş yönünde hepimiz için ekipçe pozitif bir yönde olma ihtimali çok düşük

3.2.1.4. Metaphorization

The use of metaphor generally serves to the purpose of telling something without saying it directly. To me, use of metaphors during anger talk is also about distancing. Application of metaphors in discourse creates certain effects depending on purpose of use with a considerable variety; however, examples given below represent metaphorization as a distancing strategy.

> T: ne anlamda sizin yoran kısım
> P: bu benim yani şimdi bak kendimi ide bıraksam tamam mı yani kavga ederiz
> T: ide bıraksam dediğiniz
> P: içsel içgüdülerim yani içimden o anda gelen şey hmm bunun da böyle analizini çıkartıp o zaman ben şöyle yaklaşayım özür dileyeyim ortam yatışsın şeklinde değil içimden gelen şey alıp bardağı kafasına gömmek istiyorum

In a situation where the patient got very angry, he uses psychoanalytical terms to express his anger and therapist asks what he intended to say by using these terms. After her question, the patient explains how he got angry that he wanted to physically harm the other person, yet he did not act on his instincts. Same patient continued to use same psychoanalytical framework to express himself:

> yani o böyle şeyde değil bi dönemden bahsetmiyorum aslında böyle bişey bi bi durum oluyo bişey oluyo mesela artık şey oluyosun hani o duygu durumu işte süper ego id ego dengeyi kuramıyosun tamam mı o duygu seni ele geçiriyo sanki böyle şeytanın ele geçirmesi gibi bi hani bi bir şeytanın birini ele geçirmesi posest olma durumu vardır ya bi duygu tarafından ele geçiriliyosunuz ve o anda siz siz değilsiniz yani hani o duygu sizi kendi istediği gibi yönetiyo

Yet, he continues to search and find new metaphors including possession by an emotion, similar to "possessed by the devil", to talk about his angry feelings. He adds further metaphor of what is similar to "the straw that broke the camel's back":

T: var mıydı hayatınızda böyle dönemler
P: e tabi var yani o yüzden böyle bişey tanımlıyorum ama hani yine bu tek bi olaydan şu oldu bu yüzden böyle oldu diye kısıtlayamazsın ama hani bardağı taşıran son damla diye bişey de var tabi
T: bardağı taşıran son damla
P: damlayı mı anlatayım
T: hı hı
P: (gülüyor)
T: var öyle bişey dediniz işaret ettiniz

Despite the efforts of the therapist to ground the talk, patient accomplishes a distance between events and his anger by continuous production of metaphors. Another patient uses an idiom intended for fear but for expressing her angry feelings:

kanım çekiliyomuş gibi gereksiz yere sinirleniyorum yani bazen gereksiz yere mesela kerime sinirlendim kerime neden sinirlendiğimi hatırlamıyorum…

Following excerpt exemplifies another metaphorical use for anger as being full of it but cannot empty it out by talking in therapy:

işte bu doluluğu ben nasıl boşaltacağımı bilemiyorum konuşmakla boşalmıyo daha çok böyle kasılıp gitmiş oluyorum

These small set of examples demonstrates the distancing power of metaphors by making anger distant yet very close at the same time. Finding different ways to express anger or produce angry talk can serve both purposes at the same time, yet it should be remembered that despite some metaphors achieves some proximity, they also put a distance between the subject and affects, at the same time.

3.2.2. Blaming

Among various strategies applied by speaker in anger talk, I will present blaming next. Some of the excerpts used many times throughout the result section under different titles so as to decrease the loss of data, and to show the inconsistencies and creativity of speakers in applying different strategies in anger talk. See the first dialogue:

T: neye sinirleniyosunuz
P: kardeşim eve geç geliyo annem ve babam tuğçeye söyleyemedikleri şeyleri bana söylüyolar
T: ne gibi
P: mesela tuğçe eve gelmiyo tuğçe nerede oysaki evde olmayan tuğçe hani tuğçeyi arayıp tuğçenin nerede olduğunu sorabilirler ama bana soruyolar
T: evet
P: bu da beni sinirlendiriyo haliyle ona soramadıkları için tuğçenin tepkisinden korktukları için hep bana soru soruyolar

The patient states that since her sister comes home late very frequently, her parents repeatedly ask and talk about the sister to her. She gives an explanation for their behavior yet blames them for taking her as if she is her sister, and emphasizes that she is not the addressee of these questions and talks. In short, she blames them for their misdirected attention towards herself. The excerpt below is about how a patient reconstructs her situation after hearing about her ex-boyfriend:

Eski sevgilimin evlendiğini çocuk sahibi olacağını falan filan öğrendim çok önden şeydi yani saçma bir ayrılık geçirmiştik beni niye etkiliyo çünkü ben şu anda ıh mutlu değilim bence kötü bi insan ve o mutluluğu yakaladı ya da yakalıyo hani içimde kalan hani böyle ah gibi aman evlendi ben evlenseydim keşke öyle bir duygu değil asla hiçbir şekilde şu kadar yanımda görmek istediğim bi karakter değil ama beni sömürmesi vicdanımı sömürmesi hani o aşırı derecede duygusal anlamda beni sömürdükten sonra bana o kadar kötülüğü dokunduktan sonra hani onun şey yapması böyle nihayetinde bir şekilde hayatını kurabiliyor ama benim hala kuramamış olmam bildiğiniz bütün inanç sistemimi sorguluyorum ben şu anda

She emphasizes that her boyfriend is someone evil, but she heard that he was getting married and having a child. She continues by stating the injustice done to her in an implicit way, by pointing out that he exploited her in the past and has done her bad but found happiness unlike the patient. Her blame towards her ex-boyfriend becomes a significant part of anger talk.

The following example includes a family incident reported by a patient where he got blamed for his behavior by his mother:

Yine defalarca aranmıştım ev tarafından biliyodum her hangi bi sorun da yok sadece nası olduğumu sorucaklar babam arar annem arar kemal arar babaannem arar defalarca ararlar en sonunda sinirlenip açtım babaanneme denk geldiği için annemle sonra görüştüğümde neden onunkini açtın da bizimkini açmadın şeyi var söylemi şikayeti var aralarında çekişme hala sürüyo

Another patient expresses self-blame after talking about some sensitive topic in therapy in the previous weeks:

T: öfkelendiğiniz şey ne olmuş oluyo peki
P: biraz kendim aslında bana karşıdaki kişinin anlattığım şeyi yargılıycanı düşünüyosun neden anlatıyosun bu bir
T: hm güvenle alakalı bişeyden bahsediyosunuz o zaman…

He emphasizes his expectation of being judged by others, which is similar in therapy, and states that he is angry with himself for talking about things he should not have talked.

As seen by these quotations, blame can be towards others or towards one's self but is not limited to. During anger talk, blame can also come from others towards the subject and become a topic of therapeutic talk. Although examples of blaming are plenty, I will now continue with another strategy.

3.2.3. Generating Alternative Scenarios

People often suggest different scenarios or ways of putting things forward in order to legitimize their anger. During anger talk in therapy, patients often offer alternative ways of saying or doing, as I will present below:

Bu problem koca bir şey haline geliyo yani bomba şeklinde bunu yapan kişi elli yaşlarında yani şunu bile düşünebilirsin aramızda on sekiz yaş fark var yani yeni jenerasyon deyip beni çok sallamayabilirsin bile

Speaker expresses her displease about an older colleague by putting an emphasis on the colleague's age and suggesting how she should not care about the patient since she is younger than her about 18 years. The following excerpt is from a patient who talks

40

about a professional presentation event and how he felt like being criticized during his presentation.

> mesela ıh bana söylediği şey şuydu ıh emin misiniz dedi başka şeyler de etki edemez mi sadece o söylediğiniz mi dedi şimdi bu yorum benim hoşuma gitmedi şöyle de diyebilirdi şunun niye etkisi yok diyebilirdi ya da bunun niye bir etkisi olmasın diyebilirdi demek ki o şey sanki böyle lafı dolandırıp emin misiniz işte şöyle de olmasın sanki böyle benim bi açığımı ararmış gibi konuşmaya çalıştı

After the talk about those events, he offers alternative ways of asking questions, contrary to questions he received during presentation. Another patient talks about how her friend reacted in an angry manner about an incident:

> hani mesela benim tavrımdan hoşlanmıyorsan çekmek zorunda değilsin neden öyle söylüyosun ben gayet keyif alıyorum diyebilirsin bi daha bunu söylemene gerek yok diyebilirsin

She immediately suggests different options that she could choose to say. Similarly, the excerpt below represents the same structural strategy:

> işin gelişme süreci bu tarz tanımlarla oluşmadığı için bana göre herkes hepimiz daha iyi nası götürebiliriz diye düşünmeli ve fikrini de oturup konuşabilmeli ve paylaşabilmeliyiz hani şunu diyebilir mesela bana ben buna bişey demem hani abi sen dışardan çok insan getirmeye meyil ediyosun ama ekibi çok da fazla büyütmeleyelim kontrol altında tutmamız gereken şeyler var hani gerek yok deseler hayır illa ben dediysem o gelicek demem

After an argument they had in the workplace, the patient first points out the importance of open communication between himself and his colleagues. Later, he offers alternative ways of saying and reacting. These quotations homogeneously exemplifies how people apply the strategy of generating alternatives to justify their anger. During analysis, I also noticed a subtext of not meeting one's expectations by others so they generate different alternatives that are compatible with their expectations of people and situations. Now I will present another strategy.

3.2.4. Narrating

3.2.4.1. General Narrating

First of all, psychotherapy can be viewed as a place for narrating one's past and life in general; nevertheless, in the face of therapists' simple questions, some patients emphasizes their need to narrate:

> P:…bir iş yapılıyor ve çok hepimiz herhangi bir maddi karşılık beklemeden hani inandığımız bişeyi hani daha iyi hale getirmeye çalışıyorum ama
> T: baskı dediğiniz, baskı var demiştiniz
> P:gelicem oraya tabi hikaye örüntüsünde vaktimiz kısıtlı detaylara girmemek lazım diyosunuz anladım öyle mi diyosunuz
> T: yani baskı dediğiniz şey ııı önemli
> P:onu anı tanımlayabilmek için bütün bunları anlatabiliyor olmam lazım yine bi not düşelim burda benim olaylara bakış açım bu şekilde olur hani
> T: nasıl?
> P:baskı nedir diyosunuz baskı şudur değil bu hikayesi nedir bu baskı tanımlamasına kadar geçmişten gelen hikayesi nedir onu anlatmam lazım ki size
> T: tabii

In the dialogue above, therapist emphasizes a point made earlier by the patient, but the patient states that although he is aware of time limitation of the session, he needs to tell the whole story and adds that for him to answer this simple question, he needs to give details of the story first. In the following excerpt, when the therapist implies that about what the patient got angry may be of importance, the patient immediately starts to give details of a recent event that took place.

> T: neye öfkelendiğinizi anlamak nasıl bişey olur peki
> P: geçen cuma neye öfkelendim şey arkadaşlarımla oturduk okulda dedim ki alışveriş merkezine gidicem dolmuşlar yurtların ordan mı kalkıyo hani belli bi saatten sonra kalkmıyo ya farklı bi yerden kalkıyo galiba ondan sonra sadece bunu sordum dediler ki yurtların ordan kalkmıyo yemekhanenin ordan kalkıyo ben de tamam dedim sonra ayrıldık gidiyoruz vedalaştık öpüştük koklaştık ece diyo ki nereye gidiyosun yemekhaneye mi gidiyosun hani neyle gidicemi sorguluyo yemekhaneye gidip dolmuşa binip binmeyeceğimi kontrol ediyo ne yapıyo anlamıyorum ben de dedim ki o tarafa gidiyorum dedim hani

In general, these examples identify the basic need to narrate things in therapy, which is a very common discursive strategy in anger talk. For what purpose people need to tell a story is of no interest here, they may be procrastinating, avoiding the question, or remembering what has happened; yet, they resort to narrating very frequently.

3.2.4.2. Negotiation within Subject

If we put general strategy of narrating aside, the following examples demonstrates a negotiation happening within subject. While narrating things, speakers also come to decisions about themselves, reconstructing and redefining themselves:

> Şimdi benim kafam yapım şöyle baktım o zaman çözeyim çözmeden kapatmayayım kapattığım zaman çözdüm zannediyorum ama çözmemiş oluyorum ama tekrar da açma istemiyorum yani bu iş bu kadar zorsa bilmiyorum altı üstü yaşadığım bir problemi kendi kendime çözmekte mantıksal olarak bişeyi çözmekte bu kadar zorlanıyosam diyorum allahım diyorum kaç kere açacağız bunu belki de çok uzun süreç belki de başka bişey sıkıntı benim daha net sonuç alabilmem mesela öfke kontrolümü daha rahat yapıyor olabileceğim bi nokta yapamıyorum ama sonuçta sizin elinizde sihirli değnek yok hani puf deyip yapacak haliniz yok ama bu bende uzun süreç etkileri olmadı mı çok mutluydum özellikle konuşamadığım ya da düşünmediğim şeyleri hem burda konuşup hep düşünüyodum bişeyleri görebiliyodum ve faydasını gördüm ama hani belki benim başlarkenki beklentim çok büyüktü onu alamadım iş bana düşünce aslında alamadım iş bana düştü

In a session where patient's decision on leaving psychotherapy, she visits many topics and narrates her thinking process. She first expresses her desire to solve her problems, but she switches to her inability to solve them despite her initial belief. Later, she states that she needs to manage her anger control, and adds that therapist does not have a magical wand to make that happen. She switches how she is now able to think and talk about many topics which are hard to speak about after initial therapy sessions. She states that her expectation was very great at the beginning; nevertheless, ends up deciding that she could not take her own responsibility in anger management. This quotation clearly demonstrates how the patient narrates the psychotherapy from her

own point of view, putting emphasis on important points and making a final decision that she could not take her own responsibility. Another one is below:

> P:...demek ki ben birlikte çalışılabilirlik konusunda insanların duygu durumunu negatif etkileyebiliyo bu tip eğilimlerim aldığım kararlar insiyatifler demek ki benim tamamen tek amacım var nasıl daha güzel olur onu nasıl yaparız bu böyle daha güzel olur bunları konuşalım daha iyiye götürelim ama karşılığını aldığım tepki yapma bunları düşünme her şeyi sen niye yapıyosun onu diye düşünüyosun bize bişey kalmıyo o zaman ben de bi bok yapmamayım falan
> T: size bişey kalmıyor kısmı evet karşısındaki insanlara bişey kalmıyor hissi
> P: evet öyle bişey yaratıyorum gibi
> T: siz ne düşünüyosunuz öyle bişey oluşuyo mudur o şeylerin konuşulduğu ortamlarda
> P: ya belli ki oluşuyo yani o benim yani onun duygu durumunda oluşan şeyi o tanımlıyosa o şekilde zaten oluşmuştur benim söyleyecek bişeyim yok işte o yüzden benim de demek ki daha farklı yöntemler bulmam gerekiyo düşündüklerimi ifade etme konusunda

After mentioning the conflict between himself and his colleagues, this patient draws lessons from his earlier behaviors and reactions he gets from other people. He explains how this process occurs by the help of emphasis given by the therapist. He admits that he might be faulty at how he behaves, and he decides that he has to find different ways of communicating with people. In short, he gives details about people's reactions and his intentions at behaving in a certain way, then reaches a final decision to change.

In summary, people express their need to narrate in both overt and covert ways. They negotiate within themselves during angry talk to work through their anger. To achieve a certain goal, which is generally an espousal or a decision, they narrate events and negotiate them, which reconstructs their subjectivity and reality during psychotherapy.

Now I will present the final strategy identified in anger talk in psychotherapy.

3.2.5. Comparison

In my analysis, I repeatedly noticed that people in therapy compare or parallel themselves with other people in constructing their identity or reality they are in. Regard the following example:

> Zaten benim sorunum bu sürekli haksızlığa uğruyorum buna takılıyorum sürekli bişey geliyo falan filan sorunum bu yani hak haksızlık yani neden bi sürü insan haksızlığa uğruyo ama yok bana koyuyo çok koyuyo

In this excerpt where the speaker is talking about injustice that happened to her, she compares herself with other people who always face unjust circumstances in their lives, and states that she gets tremendously affected by it unlike other people. Another example is below:

> Ben de tamam dedim o anda çok bağardı falan ben mesela bağırmadım etmedim bi ara bi dertlendim ben de tamam bi daha da bi fikir öneri getirirsem dedim küfürlü falan konuştum hani ama sonra durdum o bi süre daha devam etti ben hani tamam seni anlıyorum dedim hani bu kadar etkilendiğinin üzüldüğünün sinirlendiğinin farkına varamadım…

In this quotation, the speaker talks about a conflict. He says that other person shouted at him and got really angry, but he did not behave in this manner and apologized saying sorry. Comparing himself with the other, he creates a contrast in the discourse.

> O zaman da şöyle bişey geliyo aklıma ya da demin aklıma gelen şey yani zekam bu kadar mı düşük yani bu kadar çok insanın geçebildiği üniversite sınavında normal bi insanın kapasitesi ben aşmak zorundayım demek ki aykum sandığımdan daha düşük kendimin değersizliğyle alakalı bişey geliyo aslında yine orda da sandığım kadar yüksek aykulu değilim normal sıradan bi insanın aykusuna sahibim gibi bişey

In the quotation above, the patient talks about his feelings of worthlessness, by putting an emphasis on how he put so much effort for university entrance exams and on that his capacity and intelligence are ordinary compared to other people. By comparing himself with others, feelings of worthlessness is being justified in anger talk.

Comparison as a strategy is also very common to come by in psychotherapy sessions, so I chose the most representative talks. Since people's subjectivity may refer to how

they think, behave, and feel, by comparing themselves with others, they achieve clarity about themselves and sources of their anger.

I identified and grouped these strategies in order to accomplish the largest variability within strategies without any confusion that can take place between major strategies. As mentioned earlier, many of the excerpts appear repeatedly throughout this section although for different purposes. To decrease the possible confusion, I tried my best to explain the parts that are of importance in terms of specific strategies.

3.3. Subject Positions

In my analysis, I identified many subject positions created by speakers. Positioning themselves in a certain way, people construct discourses that shape reality and their subjectivity according to their intentions. Intersubjective dimension of positioning also is of importance in that speakers often position themselves as someone as opposed to someone else. Therefore, I decided to put some subject positions emerged in my data as oppositions rather than single positions whenever available. For example, when someone constructs himself as tolerated subject, their speech also has components of putting others as the tolerating party. Additionally, some subject positions emerged as not oppositions but as single so I put them as they appear.

This section includes, on the one hand, the analysis of subject position, and discursive strategies which are applied by the speakers, on the other. By adding levels of analysis one on top of another, I tried to accomplish a comprehensive discursive study of anger in psychotherapy; so I will also put strategies and subject position together in the analysis of discourses. Now I will present subject positions which appear as oppositions first.

3.3.1. Tolerated vs Tolerating Subject

Subject positions regarding tolerance implies that speakers position themselves as either someone who tolerates or someone who is being tolerated. During anger talk, this position emerged frequently. See the first excerpt:

> başlıca ailem özellikle babam belki de babamın uygulamış olduğu baskı ama sürekli olarak görüşürken bir insanla onun hatalı olduğunu bilmek ve artık aynı evin içinde ona tahammül edebilmek çok zor olduğu için onu da bulmak istemiyorum

Speaker starts her talk by putting emphasis on the coercive behavior of his father towards herself. Still seeing him home every day, she says she knows that her father is faulty of his coercive attitude, and she tolerates his presence at home with great difficulty. Another one is below:

> özünde bundan mı bahsediyorum öyle anlaşılıyorsa öyledir belki de ama daha ziyade şu yani bu benimle ilgili bişey değil bak o o o anda içinden geldiği gibi davranmış bana bağırmak çağırmak sinirlenmiş öfkelenmiş kendini tehdit altında hissetmiş ve bunu içinden geldiği gibi davranmış ben de içimden geldiği gibi davranırsam ortaya çıkacak sonuç o anda yaşanan duyguların ortaya çıkardığı travmatik bişey olucak ben onu yumuşatmaya çalışıyorum bu içimden gelen içimden gelmese yani bunu ben buna zorunlu olduğum için böyle davranmıyorum sonuçta…

After a fight he had in the workplace, the speaker states that other person acted impulsively, showed anger and shouted at the speaker. He later states that he himself did not acted impulsively not because he could not, but because he does not want to make a scene. By making comparison, he positions himself as someone who tolerates impulsive and angry attitude, and other party as someone who is being tolerated. Same speaker uses an idiom in order to express his level of tolerance at the later part of the session in order to distance himself by the application of metaphorization:

> P: e tabi var yani o yüzden böyle bişey tanımlıyorum ama hani yine bu tek bi olaydan şu oldu bu yüzden böyle oldu diye kısıtlayamazsın ama hani bardağı taşıran son damla diye bişey de var tabi
> T: bardağı taşıran son damla

His use of idiom in similar lines with "last straw to break the camel's back" also creates a position who tolerates a lot. Another example is below:

> P: Onlar bana katlanıyolar belki ben benim gibi birine katlanamayabilirdim benim gibi davranan birine
> T: Katlanıyolar
> P: Yani şuana kadar hiç ben böyle davrandığım zaman bi küstükleri darıldıkları kötü davrandıkları olmadı
> T: küsmek darılmakla arada nası bi ilişki var
> P: yapabilirlerdi yani kırıcı davrandığım oluyo kötü bişey söylemiyorum belki ama mesela doruğa direk orda sunumu paslamam doğru değildi

In this dialogue, the patient talks about his colleagues who put up with him. He states that he could not tolerate someone who behaves like himself since he tends to hurt people or act irresponsibly. He positions himself as someone who is being tolerated while positions others as people who tolerate his attitude. These examples demonstrate that people generate subject positions during anger talk, where they position themselves as either the tolerating or tolerated party. With specific intention in mind, they either avoid responsibility of their actions or take and face them.

3.3.2. Evaluated Subject vs Evaluating Subject

During anger talk, speakers often mention some topic related to evaluation, criticism, or feelings of being judged. In these type of discourse, they put themselves and others on the pivotal point of criticism. See the quotation below:

> …dolayısıyla ölçme ve değerlendirmeye dönüyor o soracakları saçma soruları toplantıda soruyorlar öncesinde de sorabilirler ama sormuyolar bir süre sonra böyle şey oluyor sanki beni eleştiriyomuş gibi sanki yaptığım çalışmada kalitesiz bi taraf arıyomuş gibi davranmaya başlıyolar

The speaker talks about his presentation at workplace, stating that his presentation turned into a test which will be evaluated by the listeners. He devaluates the opinions of the audience and generates alternative scenarios about possible ways of asking question. He says that he felt as if someone was criticizing him and looking for ways

of denigrating him. He positions himself as someone who is being evaluated and the audience as the critical party. Another excerpt from the same anger talk is below:

> …beşbuçuktan sonra Mehmet abiye meil attım şefime böyle böyle can sıkıcı şeyler oluyo ve bu can sıkıcı şeyler benim motivasyonumu çok düşürüyo dedim
> T: böyle böyle dediğiniz
> P: sabahki olay gibi yani biraz eleştirisel yazdım bu sistem konusunda çok tecrübesiz olduğunu varsaydığım bu kişi böyle böyle yorumlar yapıyo ve bu da bizim yaptığımız çalışmayı hiçe sayar gibi bi izlenim bırakıyo bende ben de o yüzden rahatsız ediyo dedim motivasyonumu düşürüyo dedim…

He continues to speak the events that took place at the workplace. He says that he sent an e-mail to his boss in a critical tone, stating that he had felt demotivated and disturbed due to critical tone of the audience. In the first quotation, he position himself as the subject who is being evaluated while in the second he becomes the evaluating subject. Even within the same anger talk spoken by the same person, subject positions change within this discourse, which exemplifies the reconstructive nature of the discourses. Examine the following excerpt where the patient's decision on ending psychotherapy is being discussed with the therapist:

> P: yani burda rahat davranamıyorum burda rahat şey bilmiyorum terapinin asıl olması gerekeni nedir ama ben çok geriliyorum terapide her hafta her hafta anlattığım bir başka şeyde farklı bi gerilim yaşıyorum karşıdaki kişi benim hakkımda ne düşündü acaba bunu söyledim bu şöyle mi söyleseydim acaba bunu böyle bi söyleseydim acaba annemi yanlış mı tanıttım acaba anneme karşı sinirli davrandığımı söylemeseydim mesela acaba acaba ne düşüncek karşımdaki kişi terapistim falan gibi bişey
> T: hmm kendinizi yanlış tanıtmak yanlış anlaşılmak
> P: karşıdaki kişinin ne dediğini çok önemsemek ve karşımdakinin dediklerine göre kendimi düzenlemek
> T: ve yargıçtan bahsediyosunuz
> P: yargılanmak

Patient first underlines his feelings of nervousness and anxiety by emphasizing the importance he gives to other people's opinions, judging his own behavior and words constantly. He states that he heeds other people's attitude and opinions and acts according to others. Patient-therapist couple agrees on that the patient feels as if he is

49

being judged. He positions himself as the subject who is constantly evaluated by others.

By attaching importance to gaze of others, these quotations display how speakers evaluate themselves and feel evaluated by others. They position themselves by use of comparison, generating alternative scenarios, etc.

3.3.3. Capable Subject vs Incapable Subject

This subject position is connected to the concepts of ability, competence, and skill. People positions themselves and others as either capable or incapable in comparison to other's opinions. See the first excerpt:

> kerimdeki paramı istedim bana paramı vermiyo sen diyo şu an çok sinirlisin bütün paranı harcayabilirsin ne kadar ihtiyacın varsa o kadar söyle o kadarını vereyim diyo sanki ben kendi paramı kontrol edemicek bi insan mıyım hani şimdiye kadar nasıl geldiysem şimdi de o şekilde ilerleyebilirim

In a conversation with her partner, the speaker explains her ability to spend her money responsibly when her partner refused to let her do so by rendering her incapable due to her present anger. The speaker is being positioned as incapable due to her anger by her boyfriend. Another excerpt is below:

> …Ciddi bir sağlık problemim var ortada zaten ve hani daha ziyade kendi iradem hayatta kalmak üzere hani plan yapmak üzere değil o dönem bunları planlayabilecek bir psikolojik ve fizyolojik durum içerisinde değilim ve dolayısıyla senin yerine başkası plan yapıyo ve buna da sen farkına vardığında böyle bişeyin gelişiyo olduğunun farkına vardığında da artık biraz geç kalınmış bi durum oluyo ve o dönemde kendini ifade etme yeteneklerinde henüz gelişmemiş daha farklı bi seviyede hani bunu bu kadar aklı başında şekilde ifade edemiyosun bir çatışma aile içi bi çatışmaya dönüşüyo o çatışmalarda da ben baya bi dezavantajlı durumdayım ve ben muhtacım onlara tek başıma hareket edemeyecek
> T: ne demek muhtaçlık
> P: e beyin ameliyatları geçiriyorum hastayım bakıyolar yatalağım epilepsi krizleri geçiriyorum yani bu muhtaçlık şey değil hani soyut bi muhtaçlıktan bahsetmiyorum hani bir orda bir durum var bir hastalık var ve bunla ilgili bir çocuksun zaten hani her şeyin sağlıklı olsa bile bir bakım gerekiyo birinin sana

50

yemek yapması lazım çamaşırını yıkaması lazım ve vs vs bi çocuksun sonuçta ve bütün bunların yanında hastalık olunca orda bir muhtaçlık durumundan bahsedilebilir diye düşünüyorum böyle bu örnek üzerinden bu

By narrating his history of physical illness, this patient elucidates his incapability on many levels including meeting his own basic needs and expressing his true self. By emphasizing his health condition during adolescence, he generates a discourse of neediness and destitution. He states that he is unable to plan ahead, to express his needs clearly, and to stand on one's own feet. He accomplishes to create a position of incapability. Another example is below:

> P: ekipman alıcam mesela niye alcaksın ki bendeki kamera niye yetmiyo ki falan hani anlatabiliyor muyum o zaman ben gelmiyeyim hiç falan hani bu aslında ben tek amacım var yani Mustafayı elemek veya olayın dışında bırakmak değil zaten ben bi ekipman alsam da o ekipmanı beraber kullanıcaz veya hani ben birini çağırsam da onun verdiği fikirleri beraber uyguluycaz ve hani
> T: Elemek dediğiniz nerden geldi
> P: nasıl
> T: Elemek gibi bi amacım yok
> P: o öyle diyo yani o zaman ben gelmiyeyim diyo yani nasıl anlayayım ki bunu işte elemek lafı burdan geliyo
> T: o neyden kaynaklı böyle bir şey anlıyo o zaman ben gelmiim diyo
> P: yani işte bunu ona sormak lazım hani
> T: siz ne düşünüyosunuz
> P: işte benim düşüncem şu benim onun en yetkin olduğunu düşündüğü ve hissettiği anda çok fazla fikir üretiyo olmam ve onun şu anda yapıyor olduğundan daha iyi sonuçlar alacağımız bi şekilde bi öneriyle geliyo olmam onun durumunu aşağı çekiyor olabilir hatta diğer arkadaşlar da işte sinirlendi kalktı masadan bi ara Mustafa

During an argument about a project in work, this patient mentions the effort he puts in for this project. His desire to accomplish more and better quality in this project is emphasized a couple of times. However, his colleagues' protest against his attitude creates an antagonism within group. The patient's choice of words suggests that he was inclined to disqualify others by being more than capable although he refuses to admit that his attitude can be understood as an attempt to rule others' part in the project out. He states that his actions created an angry response. By use of comparison and narrating the event took place, this patient creates a capable position for himself and

51

underlines the necessary position of incapability generated in the others. He maintains this position in another speech:

> evet yani onun durum pozisyonunu gereksiz kılıyormuş yani ona gerek yokmuş hissi veriyor olabilirim diye düşünüyorum yani hani çünkü görüntü işlerini onlardan daha iyi halledeceğim için…

He expresses that his actions may create an effect of redundancy of others, decreasing their will to participate in the project by emphasizing his competence in many parts of the job.

> o zaman da şöyle bişey geliyo aklıma ya da demin aklıma gelen şey yani zekam bu kadar mı düşük yani bu kadar çok insanın geçebildiği üniversite sınavında normal bi insanın kapasitesi ben aşmak zorundayım demek ki aykum sandığımdan daha düşük kendimin değersizliğiyle alakalı bişey geliyo aslında yine orda da sandığım kadar yüksek aykulu değilim normal sıradan bi insanın aykusuna sahibim gibi bişey

The quotation above represents a position of incapability produced by the speaker. By laying stress to his personal characteristics such as intelligence and aptitude, he creates an incapable subject position for himself by comparing to others who do not have any difficulty in academic achievement, which makes them capable subjects.

As seen in quotations above, capable vs incapable subject positions are created during anger talk by the speakers. This positioning is related to angry responses and angry mood in one way or another. The comparison strategy is the most frequent strategy used by speakers who position themselves by either capable or incapable subject. The following subject positions appeared as single.

3.3.4. Yielding Subject

During anger talk, this subject positions has first emerged as the opposition of active vs passive subject positions; however, considering some other associated subject positions, I decided to merge some of them under the title of yielding subject. I use the term "yielding" in the following connotation: A person who yields is someone who is

52

passive in terms of agency and mastery, who submits to others' desires, and who easily admits that he/she could be only an observer of events. Additionally, inability to accept a situation and to espouse a truth about oneself is a part of this subject position since admitting one's responsibility for oneself and outside circumstances is associated to the concept of activity. See the quotation below:

> o duygu seni ele geçiriyo sanki böyle şeytanın ele geçirmesi gibi bi hani bi bir şeytanın birini ele geçirmesi posest olma durumu vardır ya bi duygu tarafından ele geçiriliyosunuz ve o anda siz siz değilsiniz yani hani o duygu sizi kendi istediği gibi yönetiyo hani

In this excerpt, the speaker talks about feelings of being possessed by an emotion. During anger talk, by referring to anger as in the general form of emotion and without any possessive suffixes, the speaker puts a distance between himself and his anger. The preference to use a metaphor of possession by devil allows the speaker to construct himself as a yielding subject who submits to a strong affect and who is being governed by it. I should underline the importance of loss of will and desire constructed within this discourse. See the next excerpt:

> T: noluyo da sizi bu kadar sinirlendiriyo acaba sizde nası bi yere dokunuyo olabilir
> P: kontrol ediliyomuş gibi hissettim yani
> T: nası bişey ki sizin için kontrol ediliyo olmak
> P: yönlendirilmiş gibi heralde
> T: hmm yönlendirilmek geçen seansta güdülmekle ilgili bişeyden bahsetmiştiniz öyle bi yerlerde durmuştuk
> P: heralde öyle gene öyle bişey hissettim galiba çünkü müdehale ediliyomuş gibi mi bilemiyorum

This patient's choice of words in order to talk about the reasons why she gets angry constructs her as someone who is being oriented, controlled, and manipulated by others. She mentions the feelings of interference from others. She positions herself as a passive subject who yields to others, which makes her upset and angry.

Yielding subject positions has two distinct versions, which are subject who falls into dispute and subject who cannot reconcile.

3.3.4.1. Subject Who Falls into Dispute

Yielding subjects talk about situations as if they are not part of it, which are often situations including conflict or dispute. The first quotation is below:

> mesela bu bu çekişme hala daha devam ediyo, babaannem arıyo mesela beni nasıl olduğumu soruyo iyiyim sen nasılsın iyiyim dersler nasıl güzel on onbeş saniyelik bi konuşma sonrasında annem arıyo o mu aradı seni işte hala şunu söyler bak rol yapıyo işte halanın çocuklarını senden daha çok seviyo ama işte böyle davranıyo nasıl da rol yapıyo domuz bilmem ne bana da hafiften trip atıyo hani niye onu aradığımı aradığına cevap veriyosun da benim aradığıma cevap vermiyosun bikaç kere olmuştu bu

The speaker mentions a family dispute which is going on for a long time especially between his mother and grandmother. His use of language suggests that he is an observer of this conflict and unwilling to partake in it, yet he finds himself caught up.

> anlayamadığım bir şekilde bi grubun aslında birlikte takıldığımız insanların böyle değişik tavırlarına böyle saçma saçma çocuk çocuk böyle değişik tavırlarına maruz kalıyorum hatta bi arkadaşımla beraber maruz kalıyoruz ana tema şu biz onları beğenmiyormuşuz birlikte yiyoruz içiyoruz geziyoruz eğleniyoruz tozuyoruz ama beğenmemiş oluyoruz

In the excerpt above, speaker talks about a dispute taking place at work. Expressing her inability to understand the situation clearly, she blames some of her colleagues for lack of professional manners. Her use of language proves that she is someone who is exposed to a certain type of negative attitude generated by her colleagues. She appears as if she has no part in this dispute. A similar example is below:

> …bağrışmaları çağrışmaları mesela ben odamdaysam bile onların sesini duyup sesinden rahatsız olabiliyorum ya da gelip bana dert yanmak mı denir bana tuğçeyi şikayet ediyolar ben napabilirim o benim çocuğum değil ki kendi çocukları değişik yani bu bana çok saçma geliyo beni ilgilendiren bişey yok çocuklarıyla kendileri arasında ama hani tavırlarını tuğçe geldiği zaman da gösterseler anlıycam annem önce sinirleniyo sonra ağlama krizine giriyo sonra tuğçe geliyo tuğçe gelince de ağlamaya devam ediyo ama sinirli kısmından hiç eser kalmamış bütün sinirini zaten bana atıyo söyleyeceklerini tuğçeye karşı söyleyeceklerini bana söylüyo…

Narrating a family conflict including her sister, the speaker emphasizes her discomfort stemming from her parents' yelling and shouting since her sister did not come home on time. After stating her role as a listener of her parents' complaints, she puts an emphasis on the idea that she is not part of this conflict and addressee of parents' behaviors. Blaming other family members, and devaluating the situation as something redundant, she tries to position herself as someone unrelated.

3.3.4.2. Subject Who Cannot Reconcile

In relation to yielding position, subjects who cannot reconcile with changing circumstances will appear in this section. Reconciliation with one's own personal truth, past, and outside influences over one's life involves the major themes for this subject position. By not accepting these, they maintain a position of non-agency instead of willing to adopt and embrace the situation as it happens. Examine the quotation below:

> beni sömürmesi vicdanımı sömürmesi hani o aşırı derecede duygusal anlamda beni sömürdükten sonra bana o kadar kötülüğü dokunduktan sonra hani onun şey yapması böyle nihayetinde bir şekilde hayatını kurabiliyor ama benim hala kuramamış olmam bildiğiniz bütün inanç sistemimi sorguluyorum ben şu anda

By comparing herself to her ex-boyfriend with an emphasis on the achievements he has, this patient expresses her inability to reconcile with the circumstances and her own faults. She states that learning about him caused her to cast doubt on her faith. Although her expressions can be interpreted as constructing an incapable subject position, she more importantly emphasizes that she cannot accept her own inability to make a good life for herself. Another excerpt is below:

> yani tam olarak aradığımı bulamamak gibi değil bunun bana daha çok hani kötü enerji vereceğini düşünmemiştim yani anlatırım ve rahatlatırım gibi öyle de oldu ancak zaman içerisinde öyle saçma sapan şeylerin beni yaraladığını görüyorum ki hala yaraladığına inanamıyorum şey yapmak istemiyorum böyle bi hani hayatın normal gidişatına kapılıp hani bi uzaklaşmak istiyorum

Discussing to terminate the psychotherapeutic process which started recently, this patient speaks her therapy experience as something which causes her bad feelings and nervousness. She ventilates how ludicrous she finds the reasons which caused her pain and hurt. Emphasizing the lack of her will to continue discovering herself this way, she positions herself as someone who cannot embrace the truth about oneself. Additionally, she accomplishes this subject position by adopting strategies of devaluating what she discovers and distancing by removing oneself from therapy.

> T: hmm nası bi tehdit
> P: şöyle bişey hissettim üniversite sınavı dediniz ı üniversite sınavı dediğinizde ıı benim her şeyimi üniversite sınavına bağlıyosunuz dediğinizde sanki hayatımdaki en önemli şey basit bi üniversite sınavıymış gibi hissettim kendimi değersiz hissettim buna saldırma ihtiyacı hissettim buna karşı bu yüzden bi tepki verdim
> T: hmm bu kadar basit bişeye bağlanıyo gibi
> P: aynen herkesin hayatında geçirdiği basit bişey benim hayatımda yaşadığım en zorlu şey mi bu kadar basit miyim basit olmak istemiyorum

After taking a question asked by the therapist as threat, this dialogue follows in the lines of not embracing a perspective on how ordinary patient could be. Patient underlines how the feelings of worthlessness caused him to feel threatened. He emphasizes his inability to face how ordinary he could be in comparison to others by trying to avoid confrontation.

Yielding subject position may appear a bit more complex than other positions emerged from the data. People position themselves as yielding by use of a variety of strategies mentioned earlier. Speakers may construct themselves as yielding by focusing on many aspects including a lack of desire or will. They often express this position either by referring to their lack of agency during a dispute and conflict or by emphasizing their role as redundant and passive. I claim that the variety of strategies used to accomplish a yielding position may be of importance since yielding position implies not taking one's desire's responsibility, but I will discuss this later. Now, I will continue my analysis with another subject position.

3.3.5. Frustrated Subject

Frustration may appear as an emotion at first, including affective connotations of disappointment, sadness, anger, and discomfort. However, when taken as a subject position, it tends to emerge with a strong focus on expectations and how people's expectations are not met the way they wish them to. Emotion discourse found in the data will be examined later in this section while I preferred to include feelings of frustration as a subject position because anger talk with frustration themes concentrate more on not achieving satisfaction and not meeting expectations. See the quotations below:

> çok mutluydum özellikle konuşamadığım ya da düşünmediğim şeyleri hem burda konuşup hep düşünüyodum bişeyleri görebiliyodum ve faydasını gördüm ama hani belki benim başlarkenki beklentim çok büyüktü onu alamadım

This patient who is trying to decide whether to terminate therapeutic process or not first emphasizes positive aspects of therapy and benefits she gained from therapy; nonetheless, she states that she began psychotherapy with great expectations which are not fulfilled. She continues this discourse at a later part of the session as seen in the following quotation:

> o hüzün o öfke o işte istediklerini elde edememişlik o hayal kırıklığı kendini kullanılmış hissetme bunların hepsini susturmak istiyorum şu an hiç yapabileceğimi düşünmüyorum

She names many emotions one by one, including sadness, anger, and frustration, together with dissatisfaction she felt when she could not obtain what she desires. She repeats the wish to end psychotherapy sessions. Even the emergence of termination of psychotherapy can be interpreted as angry behavior towards oneself or towards therapist at first sight. I find it curious when the patient names many emotions and affective states one by one since she talks without possessive suffixes and tries to distance herself from those.

sonuçta ben orda şeyi yaşıyorum aslında bi potansiyel var önümde benim kaçırmadığım fırsatlarla getirdiğim kendime içine yedirdiğim bi durum var daha iyi hale getirebilmenin yolları var ben de bunu ve biz de aslında bunu yapabilecek kapasite var ekipçe yani tamam mı ama bunu nasıl yapabileceğimiz konusunda benim o anda ürettiğim fikirler var ve bu fikirleri ürettiğim için azar işitiyorum yani hatta olay hakaret noktasına geliyor

In the excerpt above, patient talks about a project which he appropriates greatly, and which requires a team work. He emphasizes the potential and opportunities he has with this project and underlines his role as someone who generates ideas for betterment of this job. However, towards the end of this part, he states that his colleagues' reaction towards patient's attitude holds aggressive remarks with reprimand and insults. He generates a position of dissatisfaction with the result and a position whose expectations are not met in order to produce a discourse of injustice, which I will present in detail later. Another example is below:

hmm ona da kızdım sonra benim kerimde param var kendime almak istediğim bişey var ya ayakkabı alcaktım ya mont alcaktım ondan sonra ayakkabıyı istediğim numara bi türlü bulamadım montu da ne oldu montta buldum ama çok pahalıydı mont sonra sinirlendim kerimdeki paramı istedim bana paramı vermiyo sen diyo şu an çok sinirlisin bütün paranı harcayabilirsin ne kadar ihtiyacın varsa o kadar söyle o kadarını vereyim diyo sanki ben kendi paramı kontrol edemicek bi insan mıyım hani şimdiye kadar nasıl geldiysem şimdi de o şekilde ilerleyebilirim

This patient narrates the events took place recently involving her boyfriend. During a part of her speech where angry affect frequently appears, she blames her boyfriend for not allowing her to take her own money he keeps in a savings account. She begins her talk with how she could not find the correct size of shoes she wanted to buy, continues on how expensive the coat she liked is, and how her boyfriend refused to lend her money. By bringing in the dissatisfaction due to small hassles she encountered first, and adding the frustration she felt after discussing with her boyfriend, she creates a frustrated subject position to justify her anger. By blaming and narrating events in detail, she achieves a construction of justified frustration.

Frustrated subjects, in sum, create a focus on dissatisfaction due to not meeting one's expectations for the reasons of finalizing a decision, judging the situation as unjust, and justification of angry affect.

3.3.6. Misunderstood Subject

To understand and to be understood are some of the very fundamental human needs, which are not even questionable for most people. I repeatedly encountered people constructing themselves as misunderstood subjects within anger talk. I named this position misunderstood subject; however, this position has connotations of perception of not being understood by another person, miscommunication, and a lack of sympathy. Look at the first example where the speaker tries to directly communicate these feelings and thoughts:

> onu bak hemen söyleyeyim gelmişken biraz önce söyledim ya bişey böyle bi konuda kendimi anlaşılmış hissetmenin gerçekten neyi hissettiğimi gerçekten doğru biçimde ifade etmenin yolu onun kısıtlı o anki o duyguyu o anda sana yaşatan son damlanın da damladığı anı değil o bardağın nasıl o son damla damladığında taşacak noktaya geldiği noktayı anlatmak isteyen biriyim ya hep öyle olduğu zaman daha rahat anlaşılmış olma ihtimalimin daha yüksek olduğunu hissediyorum

This patient speaks his need to feel as someone who is understood and need to express himself truly. He states that he wants to narrate all that took place up to a certain point in order to feel understood. Communicating what he has been through, felt, and experienced is constructed as of tremendous importance. In a style of abstracting talk, he positions himself as someone who possibly will be misunderstood unless he narrates everything. Next quotation demonstrates misunderstood subject position by application of distancing via abstracting talk again:

ifade etmek istediğin her şeyi zaten ifade etmiş olsan da yani bişiy hani bazen şu planları bozan bişiydir birden fazla insanın içinde olduğu planları yani karşı tarafın bunu anlamasını beklersin ve anlamaz anlamayabilir anlayacağını düşündüğün hissettiğin güvendiğin o seviyede bir deneyim ve iletişim paylaştığın biri olsa dahi karşıdaki o an onun kendi dünyasında ne olduğunu anlayamayabilirsin yani o her zamanki algısında olmayabilir ve senin anlayacağını varsaydığı şeyleri anlamayabilir bu yüzde gerçekten anlaşılmasını istediğim bişey varsa bu hayatta bunu ifade etmen gerekir ama bunu ifade etmiş olsan dahi diğer her şekilde rasyonel zemine oturtmuş olduğunu zannediyor olsan dahi en azından sonuçta insan kendinden şüphe duymalıdır

The speaker mentions that although what he wishes to express freely is being expressed by him, other people may not understand. He exemplifies the connection he makes with other people by feelings of trust, a higher level of open communication, shared experiences, etc. However, he continues to produce a strong possibility of misunderstanding and impossibility of complete understanding between two people. His choice of words reveals an inherent impossibility of communication together with implicit themes of lack of sympathy. His construction of himself as misunderstood subject is paired with an assumption of necessity to connect with people on a deeper level. Another example is below:

ben de tamam dedim o anda çok bağardı falan ben mesela bağırmadım etmedim bi ara bi dertlendim ben de tamam bi daha da bi fikir öneri getirirsem dedim küfürlü falan konuştum hani ama sonra durdum o bi süre daha devam etti ben hani tamam seni anlıyorum dedim hani bu kadar etkilendiğinin üzüldüğünün sinirlendiğinin farkına varamadım hani ben sadece işi daha iyi bi seviyeye çekmeye çalışıyodum senin şahsınla ilgili bişeyden bahsetmiyorum özür dilerim dedim biri de bıdı bıdı yaptı işte ondan sonra da sakinleşti falan hani o küsmeden kavga etmeden ayrılmayı balanse etmeyi başardık ama bu beni çok yoruyo

During an argument at work with his colleagues, speaker compares and creates a contrast between himself and his colleague. He states that other person acted impulsively and shouted at him while the patient stayed relatively calm and apologized, emphasizing that he communicated openly how he understands and sympathizes with other person. He puts his colleague in misunderstood subject position while he constructs himself as someone who understands. Following dialogue

60

represents the production of misunderstood subject position in an outside event which is spoken in therapy session:

> T: konuşa konuşa sinirlendirdi
> P: evet yani arabayla bi yerden bi yere gidiyolar telefonla beni aradı yanında ali var normalde on dakka konuşacağımız yere konuşup kapatacağımız yere kırk dört dakika konuştuk kırk dört dakika çok fazla hani en sonunda sinirlendim haliyle
> T: siz de konuşuyosunuz bi yandan
> P: kapatalım diyorum yok diyo kapatmak istemiyorum ben şu an seni konuşmak istiyorum diyo konuşmayı devam ettiriyo hani yüzüne de kapatmak istemiyorum kapatmak istediğimi de söylüyorum yok diyo sen şu an sinirlisin diyo ben seni anlıycam diyo falan
> T: sizi anlamak istiyo
> P: yani bi noktada anlamak istiyo

Patient mentions an argument that took place between her and her boyfriend. After narrating the incident that involves a phone conversation with her boyfriend, she states that despite being unwilling to resume conversation, she spoke on the phone for a long time since her boyfriend wanted to understand why she is angry. In this quotation, misunderstood subject position is created by a conversation between a couple and brought into therapy during anger talk. Therapist emphasizes the need of the boyfriend to understand her, and she approves this comment, and accepts misunderstood subject position.

I attempted to present my analysis and results on subject position by supporting my analysis with discursive strategies I presented earlier. Some of the excerpts demonstrate purely a certain subject position while some others also contain strategies applied by speakers. Although a portion of subject positions emerged from the data are removed for the reasons including lack of space and underrepresentation, I will try to maintain a relatively broad variability in accounts while presenting discourses produced during anger talk in the following chapter.

3.4. Discourses

During the coding stage of analysis, a large number of discourses emerged from the data; however, I identified several of them to present here according to frequency and quality. In other words, although many more discourses were identified during early stages of the analysis, I selected discourses that I present here because they are produced very often by the speakers and because selected texts represent discourses clearly. Some of the discourses revealed during analysis are merged into one category. For example, discourse of control showed itself sometimes as to be in control of anger, sometimes a need to control anger, and some other times as justification of anger due to uncontrollable, outside circumstances. I preferred to present them under the same title in order to better capture the variability within the data. I will first present emotion discourse which includes many other emotive and affective components together with anger or produced during anger talk.

3.4.1. Emotion Discourse

The lack of discursive studies in the field of emotion pushed me to present how discourses produce and reproduce emotion before I go into specific emotion discourses I identified. The first dialogue exemplifies how regret is produced in psychotherapy.

> T: burda paylaşabildiniz
> P: çünkü çok rahatsız oldum kafamın içinde büyük büyük bi rahatsızlık veriyodu o bilgi
> T: sizi sonra pişman eden ne oldu acaba
> P: yargılanma aynı şekilde haksız yere yargılanma o zaman birleştirince aslında
> T: kim yargılıycak sizi
> P: siz ve insanlar saçma sapan bi dünyanın içine giricem o yüzden ben size şakanın gerçeğe dönüşmesi kelimesini kullanmıştım saçma sapan testler bişeyler ne olur bilmiyorum nası bi kafa yaşanır bilmiyorum ama olduğumdan çok daha büyütülcek bi anlam ifade ettiğimi falan düşünüyorum yani söylediğim kelimelerin

After admitting a sensitive topic, the patient emphasizes the importance of this matter by suggesting how disturbing it was when he keeps it to himself. The therapist introduces the notion of regret by asking why the patient was regretting the decision to speak this matter openly. The patient positions himself as evaluated subject by referencing to feelings of being judged and to possible repercussions of disclosing this information. By devaluating the sensitive topic that causes anxiety and anger at the latter part of the dialogue, patient accomplishes to generate a discourse of regret with the help of the therapist. Another example where shame is constructed is below:

> P: …bilmiyorum burayı bırakmak istiyorum şu an mesela şeyden hiç bahsetmedim burda hep bahsetmek istiyodum hiç bahsetmedim annemle çok sık kavga ederiz anneme çok bağırırım çünkü utanç hissettim eğer burda böyle bişey yapıp hayatımdan bişeyi anlatamıyosam burası bana nası bi verim sağlayabilir siye düşünüyorum mesela
> T: anlatamıyosam dediğiniz
> P: ağzımdan çıkmıyo çünkü utanıyorum annesinin yanında yaşıyo hala ve annesiyle kavga ediyo annesi ona yemek yapıyo falan bunlar beni çok utandırıyo mesela ama terapide söylene bunları utanarak da söyleyebiliyosam demek ki burda fazla çekiniyorumdur demek ki
> T: yani şu anda söylüyosunuz
> P: yani bırakmak istediğimi söylediğim için biraz aslında gelecek hafta gelicek olma kaygısı var

After disclosing his intentions of leaving psychotherapy, the patient mentions a topic which he never talked about before. He underlines the hassles and fights he has with his mother, which are very frequent, and adds that he felt ashamed to discuss these matters. He justifies the decision on leaving psychotherapy by emphasizing his inability to talk about these matters in therapy, before suggesting that he remained hesitant to talk about his mother. He positions himself as someone who is being evaluated, constructs the discourse of shame by giving details of embarrassment he felt because he still lives with and under the care of his mother. When the therapist emphasizes that he is able to speak his mind clearly at that moment, he states the lack of concern since he will not come to next session. He accomplishes to justify his decision on leaving psychotherapy by positioning himself as evaluated subject and by constructing a discourse of shame and embarrassment. The following examples are distinct emotion discourses that are created during anger talk.

3.4.1.1. Anger as Undesirable

As the primary object of examination in this thesis, anger as an affect is found to be constructed as undesirable, unwelcome, and something to be cured of. The excerpts below hopefully demonstrate this:

> sinirlendiğim için de kendime sinirleniyorum o kadar küçük bişeye o an gözümde büyüttüm için hani mesela şu an anlatırken diyorum ki bu o kadar sinirlenilecek bişey değil keşke ağzımda bi sakız olsaydı diyorum hani sinirimi o şekilde atabilirdim gibi geliyo

This speaker states that she is angry because she often gets angry by emphasizing that she is inclined to overrate or overvalue the topics she talks about. She devaluates the objects of anger and constructs herself as angry subject first. In the latter part of the quotation, she expresses the wish to get rid of her anger by chewing gum. She positions herself as someone frustrated, and constructs a discourse of anger as undesirable. See the next quotation:

> kanım çekiliyomuş gibi gereksiz yere sinirleniyorum yani bazen gereksiz yere mesela kerime sinirlendim kerime neden sinirlendiğimi hatırlamıyorum yani neden sinirlendiğimin ortada yok sebebi

Starting her talk by metaphorization, this patient constructs anger as something redundant, unnecessary, and without any reason. Contrary to general inclination found in other anger talk, she increases her proximity to anger by using possessive suffixes. By underlining the lack of any reason to cause her to get angry, she constructs anger as unwelcome.

> P: içimdeki öfkeyi alcam atcam yani
> T: keşke öyle olsa di mi, gerçekten bi çaba gerektirecek bi süreç gerektiriyo eğer düzenli devam edecek olursanız istekli olursanız fayda görmeyeceğiniz bi alan değil
> …
> P: nolmuş ne yaşamışım benim psikolojimde ne var bi bulsam o noktayı bi alıp şöyle bi çıkartıp atıcam ben de rahatlıcam

64

In the dialogue above, the patient starts with expressing her desire to remove the anger out, by disowning it and suggesting her tendency to avoid confrontation with her anger. Therapist states the importance of regular sessions while empathizing with her. Patient continues mentioning her inability to find the reasons that cause anger and her wish to eradicate those in order to relax a bit. She actively tries to create a distance between herself and anger or possible reasons of anger by emphasizing the undesirable aspects.

> mesela atıyorum günlük olarak mesela sürekli bişeyler oluyo bi de şaşırıyorum yani var olan günlük hayattaki sorunlarıma mı bakayım yoksa geçmişten gelen sorunları mı çözeyim hangi birisini çözümleyeyim yoksa işte insanlara karşı verdiğim o duygusal tepkileri tutmayı mı öğreneyim

A patient who experiences difficulty controlling her anger expresses possible aspects of therapeutic talk she wants to focus. She mentions daily problems, problems that have roots in the past, and learning how to manage her anger. She distances herself from her anger problems by switching it with a general term of maintaining composure. While positioning herself as frustrated subject, she constructs anger as something which should be analyzed and worked out. Producing this type of talk manages to erect anger as undesirable, and something which is to get rid of. In these excerpts, speakers positions themselves as frustrated subjects in order to accomplish constructing anger as undesirable while using many discursive strategies, which dominantly appears as distancing.

3.4.1.2. Anger and Guilt

Guilty feelings are common in psychotherapeutic discourses, yet those who produced during anger talk is of importance. See the first excerpt where a patient who talks about a presentation he had to do at workplace:

> … dolayısıyla ölçme ve değerlendirmeye dönüyor o soracakları saçma soruları toplantıda soruyorlar öncesinde de sorabilirler ama sormuyolar bir süre sonra böyle şey oluyor sanki beni eleştiriyomuş gibi sanki yaptığım çalışmada kalitesiz bi taraf arıyomuş gibi davranmaya başlıyolar…o saçma sapan yorum yapan kişiler yoktu öğleden sonra toplantıda bir süre sonra onlara ısınmaya başladım ama o zaman öfkem de geçince yanlış bir şey yaptığımı hissetmeye başladım bu da ayrı rahatsızlık verici bi şey bunu nası telafi ederim düşünmeye başladım sürekli aslında orda kafam konuda değildi yani aklım işte sabahki öfkede ve bunu nasıl bir şekilde telafi ederimdeydi ondan sonra aklıma bize yardım etmek için gelen kişilere bi işte tatlı ya da pasta börek bişey ikram etmek geldi

After stating that the presentation turned into an evaluation of himself, patient devaluates the questions of the audience, who made him feel criticized about his work. After positioning himself as evaluated subject, he continues to narrate the events took place at work. Because people who commented on his presentation were no longer present in the audience, he expresses how his anger diminished and guilt took over. Stating that it was a disturbing feeling, he emphasizes his own wrong-doing and rumination of events. He expresses a need to compensate for his grumpy attitude he had in the earlier part of the day and finds solutions such as offering treats. At one level, guilt is constructed as an emotion that follows his own anger; in other words, he feels guilty because he felt angry earlier. On another level, guilt can be interpreted as a continuation of anger in the guise of a different form since he redirects anger from audience to himself. By positioning himself as evaluated and people in the audience as critical, he justifies his anger first, but states his guilt with a regretful tone. Another example is below:

> P: evet çünkü eğer bıraktım deseydim bırakıp aynı yerde tekrar devam etme ihtimalim yok ım o yüzden neden danışmadan neden bana sormadın diyebilirdi belki bu da bilmiyorum o zaman bişeye cevap veremezdim
> T: neye cevap veremezdiniz
> P: bişey söyleyemezdim açıklayabilirdim sadece o kadar
> T: peki ne anlama gelirdi sizin için
> P: yani bi sankiii kural dışı bi hareketmiş gibi izlenimi veriyo şu an
> T: ne demek kural dışı
> P: suçluluk hissi uyandıran rahatsız edici bi his çok sevmiyorum
> T: biraz anlatabilir misiniz o hissi

P: yani daha önce çok oldu ben küçükken bu ıhm mesela mesela meslea sınavların kötü geçmesi sınavdaki derecemin kötü olması eve gelene kadar bu suçluluk duygusunu yaşardım

T: nası bi suçluluk duygusu o

P: çünkü suçluyum çünkü ıhm doğru olanı yapmadım ya da iyi bi başarı elde edemedim gibi

T: suçluyum çünkü doğru olanı yapmadım

P: yani beklenen o değil çünkü beklenen iyi bi başarı ıhm hım ondan sonra mesela bişeyi kırdığım zaman

T: bişeyi kırdığınız zaman

P: evet evde bi vazo bişey kırdığım zaman bişeyi bozduğum zaman hissettiğim suçluluk duygusu

In this dialogue above, patient expresses the difficulty he had explaining his decision on leaving graduate school to his boss who might get upset. He expresses his feelings as guilt and discomfort since he failed to comply some rules (of his boss). He has associations coming from childhood and adolescence where he had felt guilt after the therapist raises some remarks he said. By putting emphasis on what is expected of him by other people, he constructs guilt as a feeling he experiences when he is faulty and in the wrong. Although he avoids confrontation with his boss by anticipating his possible anger, he keeps the anticipated anger by himself in the form of feelings of guilt and discomfort.

3.4.1.3. Anger and Anxiety

Through many expressions, anxiety as an affect reveals itself during anger talk. Despite indirect ways of expression, people speak their feelings as being stressed, nervous, and tense. Look at the first excerpt:

işte bu doluluğu ben nasıl boşaltacağımı bilemiyorum konuşmakla boşalmıyo daha çok böyle kasılıp gitmiş oluyorum çıktığımda mutlu olmuyorum sürekli bi enerjim çekilmiş oluyo zaten yeteri kadar enerjim çekilmiş durumda

Patient makes her anger into a metaphor of being full of it, and states her inability to rid herself of it. She continues with how she feels tension and nervousness after sessions, and emphasizes her lack of stamina at dealing with these emotions. By

distancing herself away from anger through metaphor, and by positioning herself as frustrated and incapable subject, she speaks her anxious and stressful feelings and her inability to deal with them. Another one is below:

> P: stresliyim sanırım biraz herkes de zaten gergin olduğumu söylüyo
> T: hmm dışardan gergin olduğunuzu söylüyolar siz ordan psikolojim bozuk heralde diyosunuz
> P: evet
> T: hmm sizce
> P: biraz gergin olduğumu hissediyorum gereksiz sinirleniyorum onun farkındayım hmm
> T: neye sinirleniyosunuz

Starting this dialogue by pointing out that she is stressed, speaker disowns these feelings by referring to others' opinion that they found her nervous. When therapist emphasizes the distance she put between herself and feelings of anxiety, she devaluates her anger by stating that it is unnecessary and redundant to feel angry, yet she is. Positioning herself as yielding subject who cannot reconcile also supports her distancing strategy. Not accepting her emotions first, she increases proximity to anger from feelings of anxiety thanks to therapist's emphasis. Next quotation has references to feelings of relief as the opposite of anxiety and nervousness:

> nolmuş ne yaşamışım benim psikolojimde ne var bi bulsam o noktayı bi alıp şöyle bi çıkartıp atıcam ben de rahatlıcam

By constructing herself as someone frustrated, she talks about her incapability to find out important aspects of her psychic life. She fantasizes about getting rid of these undesirable aspect and a final feeling of relief she will experience at the end. Anxiety as an affect is difficult to separate from other emotive content clearly; however, hopefully these quotations demonstrate different ways of expressing anxiety, as nervousness, stress, and opposite of relief which has connotations of anxiety. By talking about these in close proximity with anger and switches I discovered between anger and anxious feelings reveals the connection between anger and anxiety.

3.4.1.4. Anger and Helplessness

By assigning themselves as frustrated, incapable, and/or yielding subjects, patients often construct a discourse of helplessness which has connotations of hopelessness, desperation, and an emphasis on lack of means. To better demonstrate, examine the examples below:

> ee hani benim kontrolüm dışında gelişen ama benim düşünce ve duygu sistemimi etkileyen şeylerin çokluğu yani beni daha bir köşeye sıkışmış biraz çaresiz hissettirebiliyo bana yani çünkü ben zaten yapabileceğim şekilde yapıyorum orda ya da yapabileceğim başka şeyler varsa henüz farkında değilimdir bilmiyorum ama farkına varabildiğim ve yapabileceğim şeyleri yapmama rağmen eğer hani benim dışımda gelişen şeylerden doğrudan benim hayatımı etkileniyosa ve bu sıklıkla oluyosa işte sen duygudurumunu düzenlemeye çalışırken sürekli bu tip durumlar senin duygudurumunu senin istemediğin yönde etkiliyosa ıı napıcaz.

First stating the lack of control he has over circumstances which affect him, and second telling the amplitude of these influences, this patient speaks his feelings of helplessness and how he is backed into a corner. By focusing on the efforts he makes, he stresses the inevitability of these influences. In other words, he states that although he tries hard, he gets affected by outside circumstances very often. By positioning himself as someone frustrated, he applies abstracting talk and distancing (duygudurumu) in order to construct a discourse of helplessness. Subject positions of incapability and inability to reconcile are also present, but less emphasized. By blaming outside circumstances, he supports the construction of helplessness during anger talk. See the next quotation:

> P:…bir çatışma aile içi bi çatışmaya dönüşüyo o çatışmalarda da ben baya bi dezavantajlı durumdayım ve ben muhtacım onlara tek başıma hareket edemeyecek
> T: ne demek muhtaçlık
> P: e beyin ameliyatları geçiriyorum hastayım bakıyolar yatalağım epilepsi krizleri geçiriyorum yani bu muhtaçlık şey değil hani soyut bi muhtaçlıktan bahsetmiyorum hani bir orda bir durum var bir hastalık var ve bunla ilgili bir çocuksun zaten hani her şeyin sağlıklı olsa bile bir bakım gerekiyo birinin sana yemek yapması lazım çamaşırını yıkaması lazım ve vs vs bi çocuksun sonuçta ve bütün bunların yanında hastalık olunca orda bir muhtaçlık durumundan bahsedilebilir diye düşünüyorum böyle bu örnek üzerinden bu

This patient first positions himself as someone who fell into dispute in family conflicts in the past when he was in need because he was having brain surgeries as a young adolescent. He underlines the aspects of illness and health in order to strengthen the position of incapability. By strongly focusing on being in need of help, and by narrating his personal history to negotiate those emotions, he accomplishes to construct a discourse of despair and helplessness. By pulling conflicts within family in the past into the discourse he creates at the first place, he emphasizes his role as disadvantaged and in need of help. In both examples above, speaker tends to blame outside circumstances and to assign himself a position of non-responsibility. In other words, subject appears as someone who is yielding to circumstances in order to justify his feelings of inadequacy and lack of solutions.

> P: bu da bana saçma geliyo böyle mesela bu da çözümü olan pek bişey değil sanırım
> T: öfkelisiniz
> P: öfkeliyim bunun için yapabileceğim bişey yok söylediğim zaman bunu da söylüyorum tuğçeyle konuşun bu durumu bana yansıtmayın dediğim zaman da gene değişen bişey olmuyo
> T: çözüm olmayan durum ne peki
> P: annem ve babamın tuğçeye gösteremedikleri tepkiyi bana göstermeleri yani tuğçeye söyleyemediklerini tuğçeye söylemeleri gerekirken gelip bana söylemeleri
> T: hmm
> P: bu da beni sinirlendiriyo haliyle

Before the therapist introduces that the patient appears angry, she mentions how the family conflict she is in seems insolvable. She accepts readily her anger but emphasizes her inability to change her emotion. She states that she makes the necessary effort to solve the family conflict deriving from her sister's irresponsible behavior, yet her parents are not prone to hear and understand her. She positions herself as someone who falls into dispute and yielding to insolvability of the situation. In order to justify her position and discourse of helplessness, she gives proves of her effort in trying to talk to her parents. By emphasizing that she is not the addressee of family drama since her sister is to blame, she underlines the lack of means to finalize this conflict. Her statements of whole situation being meaningless let her devaluate her anger. Although comparison with her sister is felt in the talk, it is not one of the primary

strategies used by this speaker. When she increases her proximity to anger after therapist's suggestion, she clearly defines her efforts and reasons of her anger, yet positioning herself as tolerating subject allows her justify the situation as hopeless.

As seen in these quotations above, people position themselves as yielding, frustrated, incapable and even tolerating when constructing the discourses of helplessness, despair with the strong focus on impossibility to solve the problem. A large variety of strategies is applied to accomplish their goals. Now I will continue with discursive analysis of sadness that emerged in anger talk.

3.4.1.5. Anger and Sadness

During analysis of the data, anger talk was often accompanied by feelings of sadness, unhappiness, and hurt. Some of the patients clearly state the sadness they felt while others speak of circumstances that include anger and sadness side by side. See the first quotation:

> ama ben istemiyorum onlar bu kadar yoğun yaşamak istemiyorum şu an öfkem çok yoğun üzüntüm çok yoğun hayal kırıklığım çok yoğun hani ağlamıcam diyorum yapmıcam bunu kendime ama gidiyo

In the former part of the talk, speaker states that she does not want to experience emotions in an intense way which she usually does. She lists anger, sadness, and frustration while emphasizing how intense they get that she cries. She increases her proximity to her feelings by using possessive suffixes while giving the detail of crying in order to raise the attention on sadness. See the next dialogue:

> …ben de tamam dedim o anda çok bağardı falan ben mesela bağırmadım etmedim bi ara bi dertlendim ben de tamam bi daha da bi fikir öneri getirirsem dedim küfürlü falan konuştum hani ama sonra durdum o bi süre daha devam etti ben hani tamam seni anlıyorum dedim hani bu kadar etkilendiğinin üzüldüğünün sinirlendiğinin farkına varamadım hani ben sadece işi daha iyi bi seviyeye çekmeye çalışıyodum senin şahsınla ilgili bişeyden bahsetmiyorum özür dilerim dedim biri de bıdı bıdı yaptı işte ondan sonra da sakinleşti falan hani o küsmeden kavga etmeden ayrılmayı balanse etmeyi başardık ama bu beni çok yoruyo

71

After mentioning an argument he had with his colleagues, this patient gives details of the events that took place after the argument. He says that other person shouted at him while he composed himself for some time. By comparing himself with the other person, he positions himself as tolerating subject since he was able to remain calm. Just after this positioning, he talks about the conversation between himself and the other person, where he positions other person as misunderstood subject. He cites parts of conversation, emphasizing the way he spoke to other person, saying that he could not understand how other person got angry and upset. Accomplishing peace among the group by apologizing, patient constructs a discourse that brings anger, misunderstanding, and sadness together.

> ama ben işte insanları anlamaya empati yapmaya çalıştığım için karşı taraftan onu görmediğim için oh iyi o zaman yani en azından bu durum beni çok üzdü ikinci kere sürekli yüz yüze bakıyoruz Meltem hayırdır nasılsın ne yaptın diyebilirsin yani tüm gün sabaha kadar uyumadım demek yani bunu dedim ama hiç en azından şunun anlaşılmasını istiyorum hani üzüldüm bu onun için önemliymiş hani sorabilirsin düşün ki ben inanç sistemimi sorgulayacak kadar bundan etkilendim

This patient starts her speech by positioning herself as misunderstood subject by suggesting how she tends to empathize with people because she often experiences the lack of empathy from others. Switching to problems she had regarding a close friend, she generates alternative scenarios where she states her expectations while complaining about how her friend did not show any care to her. Saying that she felt upset when her close friend did not show any interest in her when she was in a bad shape, she constructs a discourse of sadness during anger talk where she reflects the situation so important that her faith is not as strong as before. By repeatedly stating her need to be understood and positioning herself as misunderstood subject, patient generates alternative scenarios where she would not be so upset in order to create a discourse of hurt and sadness during anger talk.

I identified these emotions emerged during anger talk as the ones that are most frequently observed. Some others were given under the general title of Emotion Discourse. As observed in these quotations and in my analysis, anger talk contains

other affects. People position themselves in a certain way and utilize specific discursive strategies to construct discourses that help them accomplish their intentions and justify their position and feelings in seemingly consistent way although variation between accounts demonstrates that they shift positions even in the same line of speech and accomplish creating many discourses at the same time. Now I will continue presenting my results on other discourses that I identified.

3.4.2. Anger as Social Threat

It is very common knowledge that people are prone to feel anxiety in the face of threat, which leads them to fight or flight. In both scenarios a certain level of energy in required, which is mobilized by the anxiety. In the similar lines, my analysis reveals that anger is often interpreted as a social threat. People mention arguments, conflicts and generally a disruption in the social bond during anger talk, which leads me to claim that anger is seen as a threat that is posed on social relations. Examine the first example:

> P: Onlar bana katlanıyolar belki ben benim gibi birine katlanamayabilirdim benim gibi davranan birine
> T: Katlanıyolar
> P: Yani şuana kadar hiç ben böyle davrandığım zaman bi küstükleri darıldıkları kötü davrandıkları olmadı
> T: küsmek darılmakla arada nası bi ilişki var
> P: yapabilirlerdi yani kırıcı davrandığım oluyo kötü bişey söylemiyorum belki ama mesela doruğa direk orda sunumu paslamam doğru değildi ya öncesinde en azından bi sunumu görseydi…

After thoroughly telling a conflict in the workplace, this patient emphasizes that even though he acts in an offending way, his colleagues do not get offended or become distant to him. By introducing the notion of offense, he constructs a discourse of threat that is posed on his social relations. Positioning himself as tolerated subject, he emphasizes his offensive behaviors which are angry in nature, yet his feelings of guilt is also present at the end of the dialogue, stating his behaviors are faulty. Another quotation is below:

73

neyi değiştirirsem o duygudurumdan uzaklaşıcam bulamıyorum mesela yani şey gibi de dediğim gibi biraz önce kendimi dağa vurmak hayır bunu bi seçenek olarak hani total sosyal izolasyondan bahsediyorum bu örnekte

This patient mentions his need to alter his affective state, which appears unbearable at times. He states that he wants to get distant from his affective state, which is angry in nature and accomplishes to increase his distance to his anger by referring to anger with a general term. He adds that he sometimes wants to get isolated from other people and to leave civilized life behind. By positioning himself as incapable subject at analyzing and solving his affective state, he distances himself from anger by avoiding confrontation with it directly, while constructing a discourse of anger as a threat that would lead him to total isolation. In the next excerpt which also involves work place arguments, we can see an interplay of subject positions and discursive strategies in production of this discourse:

> P: benim o anda ürettiğim fikirler var ve bu fikirleri ürettiğim için azar işitiyorum yani hatta olay hakaret noktasına geliyor şimdi ben yine o anda kendimi kontrol altında tutup tamam mı içimden benim o anda gelen şey şu değil yani hani hı o zaman ben sakince durayım özür dileyeyim güzel güzel yaptığımız işe devam edelim içimden o anda duygusal olarak gelen şey bu değil ama ben davranışımı bu duyguyla belirlemiyorum çünkü daha orta vadede düşündüğünüzde o anda göstereceğiniz o duygula olan tepki hayatınızın gidiş yönünde hepimiz için ekipçe pozitif bir yönde olma ihtimali çok düşük yani o anda bunları düşünmek bu çok yoruyor insanı yani insan ilişkileri bu yüzden yorucu zaten
>
> T: içinizden geldiği gibi davranmamaktan bahsediyosunuz aslında özünde insan ilişkilerinde
>
> P: özünde bundan mı bahsediyorum öyle anlaşılıyorsa öyledir belki de ama daha ziyade şu yani bu benimle ilgili bişey değil bak o o o anda içinden geldiği gibi davranmış bana bağırmak çağırmak sinirlenmiş öfkelenmiş kendini tehdit altında hissetmiş ve bunu içinden geldiği gibi davranmış ben de içimden geldiği gibi davranırsam ortaya çıkacak sonuç o anda yaşanan duyguların ortaya çıkardığı travmatik bişey olucak

This patient states unfairness of a situation where he was insulted and got shouted at only because he generates novel ideas for a project. By emphasizing his role as productive, he creates a position of misunderstood subject with the connotation of his intentions not being seen. He underlines the effort he expenses in controlling his anger in order to avoid any confrontational talk and reaction, which he expresses as tiring

and frustrating. On the one hand, he emphasizes his levels of tolerance to pose as tolerating subject, on the other, his later statements also create a position of frustration. Utilizing abstracting talk at some parts, and clearly suggesting avoidance of confrontation in the talk, he accomplishes to construct anger as a threat to social relations at work. Therapist's interpretation that he could not act freely stimulates patient's talk in a direction where how the other people felt threatened by his continuous production of novel ideas, and their reactions including shouting, getting angry, etc. By contrasting himself with others, he emphasizes he could not act freely because when others act in this way, his efforts to compose himself would increase the possibility of a traumatic result in this project. By posing himself as frustrated but also tolerating, he justifies his anger and constructs a discourse of social threat.

Through an interplay of many subject positions and discursive strategies, people construct anger as a social threat they face in workplace and in their relationships. They also speak about these in psychotherapy during anger talk, which leads me to conclude that although the threat is distant at the time they mention those incident, they are still loaded with these angry feelings.

3.4.3. Anger and Control

Themes of control appeared very frequently during the analysis of the data. Some of the quotations I presented earlier also incorporate discourses that involve themes of control; however, a variety of discourses emerged from the data including anger as an affect that is controllable, that should be controlled, and uncontrollability of outside circumstances as reason of angry affect. Now I will try to demonstrate those in under the general title of control.

> P: ee hani benim kontrolüm dışında gelişen ama benim düşünce ve duygu sistemimi etkileyen şeylerin çokluğu yani beni daha bir köşeye sıkışmış biraz çaresiz hissettirebiliyo bana yani çünkü ben zaten yapabileceğim şekilde yapıyorum orda ya da yapabileceğim başka şeyler varsa henüz farkında değilimdir bilmiyorum ama farkına varabildiğim ve yapabileceğim şeyleri yapmama rağmen eğer hani benim dışımda gelişen şeylerden doğrudan benim

hayatımı etkileniyosa ve bu sıklıkla oluyosa işte sen duygudurumunu düzenlemeye çalışırken sürekli bu tip durumlar senin duygudurumunu senin istemediğin yönde etkiliyosa ıı napıcaz bütün değişkenleri ortadan mı kaldıralım yani

T: kontrolsüzlükten bahsediyorsunuz

P: dağa mı vuralım yani hani böyle bişiy mi olması gerekiyo hani tabi ben kontrol manyağı kontrol fırik bi adam mıyım öyle olduğumu düşünmüyorum öyle miyim?

Just in the beginning of this excerpt, patient expresses the helplessness stemming from the influences of uncontrollable circumstances. While he distances himself from affects by using general terms (düşünce ve duygu sistemi), he also positions himself as yielding subject to those influences he is unable to alter. Repeated emphasis on outside circumstances that affect him, he accomplishes to justify his feelings of desperation and anger. The way he speaks also represents a strategy of abstraction, which ensures distancing from experience. Unable to reconcile with uncontrollable influences, his position is strengthened by his ideas of removing all unmanageable variables in his life. He asks himself the question whether he is a control freak or not and concludes that he does not think so. Introduction of a notion of being in control excessively, he also constructs a clash of a wish to control everything and inability to control them, ending up positioning himself as incapable subject. The next subject constructs a discourse of anger as controllable:

> …yoksa işte insanlara karşı verdiğim o duygusal tepkileri tutmayı mı öğreneyim

In this small excerpt, speaker states that as an option of utilizing therapy she could learn how to control emotional reactions that she produces against other people. By suggesting that emotional reactions can be learned to control, she constructs a discourse of anger that is manageable and that she should learn how to control. Another example is below:

> belki de çok uzun süreç belki de başka bişey sıkıntı benim daha net sonuç alabilmem mesela öfke kontrolümü daha rahat yapıyor olabileceğim bi nokta yapamıyorum ama sonuçta sizin elinizde sihirli değnek yok hani puf deyip yapacak haliniz yok ama

While negotiating her anger within, this patient talks about possible outcomes of psychotherapy by emphasizing her need to easily control her anger against other people. Again, a construction of anger as something controllable and manageable can be clearly seen.

3.4.4. The Need to Express Anger

Although it seems confusing at first, people also construct anger as something which should be expressed in contrast to containing and controlling it without expression. This discrepancy is of great importance for me as a discourse analyst since variability in the accounts and discourses constructed during psychotherapy can be obviously revealed by comparing these two approaches to anger.

> o dönemde kendini ifade etme yeteneklerinde henüz gelişmemiş daha farklı bi seviyede hani bunu bu kadar aklı başında şekilde ifade edemiyosun bir çatışma aile içi bi çatışmaya dönüşüyo o çatışmalarda da ben baya bi dezavantajlı durumdayım

Referring to childhood memories he talked about earlier in the session, this patient underlines his lack of skill at expressing himself well during family disputes, by positioning himself as someone disadvantaged and someone who falls into conflicts. By removing his responsibility on these little arguments, his position as yielding appears stronger while he constructs an implicit wish to express himself well since he concludes this part of talk by claiming that he is disadvantaged compared to other family members. See the next quotation:

> T: siz annenizin tuğçeye sert olmasını istiyosunuz
> P: yani eğer gerçekten sinirliyse gerçekten tepkisi varsa bu tepkiyi ona da koymasını istiyorum hani bana anlatırken sinirli sinirli anlatıp dolu dolu konuşup babam da aynı şekilde tuğçe gelince hiçb bişey olmamış gibi davranmaları benim sinirimi bozuyo böyle olunca ben de tuğçeye sinirleniyorum neden tuğçeye hiçbirimizin bi söz etme hakkımız yok

The dialogue above starts with therapist's suggestion that the patient wants her mother to be tough on the patient's sister since she is generally the one who creates disputes

77

in the family. Patient states the inconsistency she observes in her parents' attitude towards her sister because on the one hand, they got angry and emotionally loaded easily due to the sister's irresponsible behavior. However, patient emphasizes this discrepancy and states that her parents should act consistent with their anger towards her sister. By positioning herself as someone who falls into dispute, she says that she also gets upset at her sister. Her anger talk is constructed around the idea that if someone is angry towards someone, they should express it to that person.

> P: yani bu örneklerin en yoğun örneği üniversite sınavı bi sene boyunca devam ediyo sabahtan akşama kadar çalışıyorum hayatımda hiç olmayan disip-disiplin hayatımda tahmin bile edebileceğimden daha fazla hayatımda en çok çalıştığım günün üç katı daha fazla çalışıyorum herhangi sıradan bi günde üniversite sınavının bu konuda bence gerçek
> T: evet ses tonunuz yükseldi nası acaba oldu
> P: tehdit hissettim
> T: hmm nası bi tehdit
> P: şöyle bişey hissettim üniversite sınavı dediniz ı üniversite sınavı dediğinizde ıı benim her şeyimi üniversite sınavına bağlıyosunuz dediğinizde sanki hayatımdaki en önemli şey basit bi üniversite sınavıymış gibi hissettim kendimi değersiz hissettim buna saldırma ihtiyacı hissettim buna karşı bu yüzden bi tepki verdim

After the therapist points out that an important topic emerged again in the session, patient raises his voice and therapist emphasizes it. Patient's response states that he felt threatened by the therapist's emphasis. In the session, patient narrates the immediate experience he had a couple seconds earlier in the following way. He first underlines the feelings of worthlessness since he tends to overvalue this topic which is about university entrance exams, then he continues narrating his need to attack it. He constructs himself as someone who cannot reconcile with his past while producing a discourse that demonstrates the need to express anger.

3.4.5. Injustice

Anger talks that are produced around the discourse of injustice is plenty in number. In one way or another, people generate discourse of injustice and unfairness in order to justify their anger. Examine the excerpts below:

> başvurma sebebimde zaten öfkelendiğimde direk ağlamam ya da ne bileyim işte bir şeye sinirlendiğimde haksızlığa uğradığımı düşünmem çok sert ani tepkiler vermem…kendimi çok haksızlığa uğramış hissediyorum yani iş yerimdeki işler onlar o kadar önemli değil şu anda da sonra ben diyorum niye bu insanlarla aynı iş yerinde çalışıyorum da bu hayat nasıl bir yani her şeyi sorguluyorum ya olmam gereken yer burası mı

In the quotation above, patient mentions her reason for applying to psychotherapy, which can be characterized as uncontrollable crying when she got anger. She continues talking about her anger in connection with feelings of being hard done by, which she cannot tolerate. In other words, she clearly states that when she feels angry, she usually considers the situation she is in as unjust and unfair. This demonstrates an apparent association between anger and injustice. Despite being not clear, a position of someone who cannot reconcile is also present when characterizing the situation unjust because she is unable to accept. Another one is below:

> Eski sevgilimin evlendiğini çocuk sahibi olacağını falan filan öğrendim çok önden şeydi yani saçma bir ayrılık geçirmiştik beni niye etkiliyo çünkü ben şu anda ıh mutlu değilim bence kötü bi insan ve o mutluluğu yakaladı ya da yakalıyo hani içimde kalan hani böyle ah gibi aman evlendi ben evlenseydim keşke öyle bir duygu değil asla hiçbir şekilde şu kadar yanımda görmek istediğim bi karakter değil ama beni sömürmesi vicdanımı sömürmesi hani o aşırı derecede duygusal anlamda beni sömürdükten sonra bana o kadar kötülüğü dokunduktan sonra hani onun şey yapması böyle nihayetinde bir şekilde hayatını kurabiliyor ama benim hala kuramamış olmam bildiğiniz bütün inanç sistemimi sorguluyorum ben şu anda

After learning about his ex-boyfriend and his life, this patient compares her life to his in the initial part of this excerpt. By claiming her ex-boyfriend as bad and as someone who found happiness, she constructs a discourse of injustice while positioning herself as someone yielding and unable to reconcile. Her claims against her ex-boyfriend can be found at latter parts of this quotation where she states how his ex-boyfriend has

exploited her and now built his life around happiness, which strengthens discourse of injustice. By referring to able aspects of him, she construct herself as someone incapable, which further supports the unfairness of situation.

> P: ben sinirlenmekte haklı olduğumu düşünüyorum bu konuda
> T: hmm yine haklı olmaktan bahsediyosunuz
> P: evet
> T: ne bu haklı olmak peki
> P: bilmem
> T: çok dilinizde olan bişey haklı olmak
> P: evet

In the dialogue above, patient starts with suggesting that she has a right to be angry. In its simplicity, this statement reveals the clear structure that being angry is a right, in reference to sense of justice. Therapist emphasizes this part of having a right to be angry, patient confirms and distances herself from this topic of conversation by giving short and affirmative responses. See the last example:

> T: haksızlık teması getiriyosunuz
> P: zaten benim sorunum bu sürekli haksızlığa uğruyorum buna takılıyorum sürekli bişey geliyo falan filan sorunum bu yani hak haksızlık yani neden bi sürü insan haksızlığa uğruyo ama yok bana koyuyo çok koyuyo
> T: sizi çok etkiliyo

In the dialogue above, after the therapist points out that patient talks in a discourse of unfairness, she identifies the main problem she has with experiencing injustice and unfair events all the time. By comparing herself with other people, she emphasizes how much feelings of unfairness affects her. She appears as someone who is frustrated by these circumstances.

As seen from these excerpts, discourse of injustice is constructed by speakers for intentions of justification of anger, identifying reasons of anger, etc. Subject positions of incapability, frustration, and inability to reconcile emerges whereas many strategies are used to accomplish these intentions.

3.4.6. Nonsensicality

Inability to find meaning, lack of reason and clarity, and the need to discover are coherently express themselves in this discourse. In other words, speakers construct a discourse of meaninglessness regarding a situation that gets them angry and that needs to be analyzed and solved. See few numbers of examples below:

> yani onun bi nedeni olduğunun farkına varıyorum tamam bi nedeni anlamaya çalışıyorum bu duygunun bana ne anlatmaya çalıştığın çözümlemeye çalışıyorum

Speaker talks about how he is aware that there are reasons why he feels a certain affect while posing himself as incapable at discovering them. By distancing himself from anger, he refers to anger as "emotion", in other words, by utilizing a general term. His emphasis on inability to find meaning of anger constructs a discourse of nonsensicality. Next quotation is below:

> sonra anlayamadığım bir şekilde bi grubun aslında birlikte takıldığımız insanların böyle değişik tavırlarına böyle saçma saçma çocuk çocuk böyle değişik tavırlarına maruz kalıyorum hatta bi arkadaşımla beraber maruz kalıyoruz

By starting her speech by stating her inability to understand clearly why some of her colleagues have certain attitudes against her, she constructs a discourse of confusion. By describing her colleagues' attitudes and behaviors as strange, childish, and nonsensical, she strengthens her current discourse which is created for justifying her position as subject who falls into dispute. By passivizing her role at these type of interactions, she manages to position herself as also generally yielding. Unable to understand clearly, and unwilling to understand why, she constructs a discourse of nonsensicality she faces at work. See the last example:

> evet ve sorması da bana saçma geliyo yani yemekhaneye mi gidiyosun diye sorması bana saçma geliyo yani alışveriş merkezine gidicem ya yemekhanenin ordan dolmuşa binerim ya otostopla metroya giderim ya ring gelir metroya giderim ama giderim bi şekilde yani tamam alışveriş merkezine gideceğimi biliyosun ama sorgulama yani

Talking about a topic regarding how she perceives people as interfering and intrusive, this patient repeatedly states that she found her friends' questions intrusive and nonsensical. Repeating a statement in the similar lines of absurd and nonsensical, she emphasizes the meaninglessness of the situation. Positioning herself as frustrated subject, she blames her friend for being intrusive. She also makes the reason of her anger distant by projecting it as meaningless.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

In this section, I will discuss my research findings from a discourse analytic perspective in order to assess the validity of these findings. Next, I will reflect on my role as a researcher so that influence that I have over this construction of text can be critically evaluated by readers. Finally, I will discuss clinical implications of these findings in detail.

4.1. Validity of Discursive Study of Anger in Psychotherapy

After taking into account both quality criteria provided by Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Georgaca and Avdi (2012), I will briefly discuss this discursive study. As I mentioned earlier, coherence of the analysis as a whole, fruitfulness and usefulness of these findings, rigorousness, and reflexivity of the researcher are the overlapping quality criteria for discourse analysis.

I tried to maintain the coherence of this piece of research by attending to my attitude towards the text of this thesis as a whole. From introduction where I reviewed the literature to the final chapter of this thesis, my attitude towards other texts including research papers and my raw data was discursively critical. As observed throughout my thesis, I tried to pose a critical stance against definitions, assumptions, and conclusions of anger and anger-related phenomena. Similarly, during analysis and writing of my results include same attitude, which can be summarized as discursive as best. Taking each quotation at a time to work through, I tried to focus on discourse and discursive aspects in order to transparently show my process of analysis. By giving a sufficient number of quotations, dialogues, and excerpts from psychotherapy sessions, I tried to increase transparency of this process and to give participants' orientations openly to readers. Additionally, my attempt to analyze data in a rigorous fashion can be

exemplified by how I repeatedly code and recode the data and iteratively decide on my final results. My effort can be also demonstrated by the structure of the results section where I decided to give each excerpt and its analysis in a sequential manner so that readers can critically evaluate each point of data I decided to include. Throughout this thesis, my reflexive stance can be observed, which I will also include a discussion of my role as a researcher next in this section, together with detailed discussion of clinical implications of these findings in order to show usefulness and applicability of this research.

4.2. Reflection on My Role as Researcher

Belonging to a psychoanalytically oriented approach in psychotherapy, and with a special interest in discourse analysis, the greatest difficulty I experienced was due to that of undergraduate education which was heavily dominated by experimental, cognitivist, and positivist tradition. For example, despite the fact that I was aware of my subjectivity involved in this thesis work from selection of topic to the way I analyzed the data, I catch myself worrying over number of quotations I should provide and over inclination of trying to squeeze data from some sessions which proved to be less fruitful compared to the rest. Giving exemplary analyses for regret and shame at the beginning of emotion discourses was also related to same insecurity that would prove differences between anger and other related discourses. Although I knew my current perspective over psychotherapy and my preference for linguistically studied phenomena in psychological science, I find myself still haunted by reliability and validity of my findings in the gaze of others.

Another point I wanted to make is that my personal interests in discursive approaches are relatively new. As a novice discursive researcher, the hardship in my research stemmed from a process of adapting to discourse studies in general. I even see this work as learning process since this is my very first attempt at conducting a discourse analysis. For example, I counseled some of my colleagues when I had difficulty in

merging categories in structuring of results section, which can be evaluated as a violation of subjective nature of this type of research. I also read similar studies (Elliott, 2002) and methodological papers (Avdi & Georgaca, 2007; Georgaca & Avdi, 2012; Edwards, 1999) to increase my understanding of discourse analytic research.

In spite of believing that some of the challenges I encountered in conducting discourse analysis for emotion discourse result from my naivety and background, I also believe that dealing with data which is full of anger was also challenging for me because of personal reasons regarding anger. As mentioned earlier, anger is personally relevant emotion for me, and my motivation for study of anger stem from personal experiences including supervision and psychotherapy sessions in my clinical training, and my personal life.

Finally, I also want to remind readers that this thesis is also a construction of a text, which can be critically read, analyzed, and evaluated. Despite the attitudes of many researchers and psychologists, I am not attempting to define anger, finalize my conclusions of anger, and suggesting new ways of approaching it in daily life or psychotherapy. On the one hand, clinical implications of these results will be discussed next, which assumes that I drew conclusions from my results; on the other hand, these are my constructions of anger as a psychotherapist in training and a novice researcher.

4.3. Clinical Implications

Implications of my research can be summarized into two broad categories as accounts on anger in clinical settings and discursive approaches that can be utilized in psychotherapy. First, my analyses reveal some insights that are compatible with some findings in the literature and with psychoanalytic thinking, which can contribute to our understanding of anger. Second, I believe that discourse analysis consisting of discursive strategies, subject positions and production of discourses can be utilized in psychotherapeutic practice, as a part of clinical intervention to angry subject.

4.3.1. Implications of Discourse Analysis of Anger

4.3.1.1. Discursive Strategies

Distancing as the most commonly applied strategy against anger can be discussed in connection to general subjectivity of patients. For instance, avoiding confrontation by the patient can be a point of intervention in psychotherapy so that function of anger as a signal can be utilized in psychotherapy. Similarly, disowning anger or causes of anger seem a more radical stance against anger because by removing possessive suffixes, people isolate anger from their subjectivity on the level of language. Connection between blaming, as one of most common strategies, and the subject position of inability to reconcile is worth mentioning since blaming may function to strengthen this position and could prevent progress in therapy.

Narrating anger experiences or talking on matters that are related to anger in some manner is another strategy which may be associated to the discourse of the need to express. Constituting anger as something which should be expressed, patients facilitate discursive strategies such as general narration of everyday events and their subjective experience in the form of negotiation of their subjectivity. However, accounts present themselves as inconsistent since narrating and distancing are almost opposites of each other in approaching anger. Also, generating alternative scenarios for anger experiences can be considered as a discursive defense against reconciliation with the situation and failure of subjective reality and expectations.

4.3.1.2. Emotion Discourse

Anger is observed to be an undesirable emotional state, which is harmonious with the majority of findings in the literature. The most frequent discursive strategy applied during anger talk seems to be distancing. Although many subtypes of distancing is observed in another study (Elliott, 2002), my analysis reveals distinct strategies that

come together under general category of distancing. Undesirable and unwanted view of anger is also compatible with distancing strategies which have the most variability among other discursive strategies. Renouncing anger by modes of avoiding confrontation and disowning one's own anger experience is similar to denial of one's true experience. Emotion discourse also reveals that showing anger is followed closely by feelings of guilt. Psychoanalytically speaking, guilt is closely associated to the superego function, which posits that socially constructed, unspoken, and normative rules and laws are prohibitions enacted upon the individual. Implications of misdeeds and wrongdoings suggested by Averill (2012) in the formation of angry affect can be interpreted as something that creates guilt in the individual when expression of anger is misplaced, maladaptive, and harmful for the social bond. When patients talk about anger as undesirable emotion, they position themselves as frustrated. Considering one of the earliest theory of aggression takes into account anger as the link between frustration and aggressive outcome, when people's construction of themselves is frustrated, anger appears to be undesirable because outlet for anger in an aggressive manner is prohibited by the symbolic law, which leads further frustration and anger.

The relationship between anxiety and anger was demonstrated from a psychoanalytic point of view in the first section. Analysis implies that anger and anxiety are mentioned in close proximity in the same discourses which shows transformation of anxiety into angry affect when faced to a disappointment or failure of reality is partially supported by my findings.

Observation of anger in connection to helplessness is also revealing since subject positions constructed for these emotional states include incapable subject position. In contrast to (a fantasy of) prominent agency, prohibitions and failure to accomplish one's expectations are constructed in close proximity with anger, or during anger talk. Whether the expectations belong to others or to the speaker seems irrelevant for production of anger.

4.3.1.3. Discourses of Social Threat, Control and Need to Express

Construction of anger as social threat can be taken in support of Averill (1982) and Rothenberg's (1971) conclusion of anger, which can be summarized as a signal which conveys the message that an obstruction is present for the individual or others on a social level. Lacanian view that anger emerges in social and relational levels when the subject is disappointed for disruption of his or her reality is also supported by this discourse (Soler, 2016). As s signal, anger communicates to the subject that symbolic laws registered by linguistic and socio-cultural practices are not in place. In connection to anger signaling a social threat, themes of control and the need to express anger were also constructed by patients, which seems inconsistent with each other. In other words, constructions of anger in psychotherapy include both a need to express and control it, which appears as inconsistent and contradictory; however, expression of anger is also exemplified by aggressive acts that are not enacted by the subjects ("içimden gelen şey alıp bardağı kafasına gömmek istiyorum"), which implies some kind of impulse control, not anger control. As Averill's (1982) findings suggests, most of the anger experiences are not followed by destructive or aggressive acts. Instead, anger creates a channel to express the disappointment and frustration, and a channel for communication in general, which supports Kassinove and Sukhodolsky's (1995) view of anger. Similarly, frustrated and yielding subject positions appears more frequently in discourse of control and need to express anger, which implies that agency of the subject is restricted in one way or another. Attribution of the cause of anger to uncontrollable, outside circumstances accomplishes the construction of subject positions with decreased agency (yielding, tolerating) and discourses of control over circumstances. Overall, discourse of control is more about restricting aggressive impulses, not anger, since anger is a signal that opens a pathway to satisfy the need to express the subjective experience of the angry subject, although anger itself is also perceived as a social threat in terms of interpersonal relationships. This places importance in psychotherapy setting for recognition of anger on the therapist's side with its functions. Knowing that despite undesirability of anger constructed within social norms, psychotherapeutic techniques can be adjusted accordingly by therapists

so that awareness that anger is a functioning affect for the individual might be achieved. Also, regardless of the issues of control that can be worked through in psychotherapy, control in relation to anger seems not control of anger but aggressive drives, which is necessary for the neurotic individual (for short introduction to neurosis see Fink, 1999).

4.3.1.4. Discourse of Injustice

Although it is difficult to define what is just or unjust, patients repeatedly construct a discourse of injustice. Relationship between anger and perceived injustice is studied generally in association with medical conditions and psychological well-being. For example, people with chronic pain and experiences of trauma are subjects of these kind of research (Waiess, 1998; McCracken, 2013; Junie et al., 2018). Although participants did not mention any disability, trauma or medical conditions, construction of a discourse of injustice were accomplished for justification of anger, which brings me to the point that although there is no real difficulty such as bodily or emotional pain compared to chronic pain patients, speakers constitute anger in close relation to concept of justice. Evidence regarding likelihood of increased perceived injustice in relation to angry affect is also present in the literature (Lovaš, 1996). Considering discursive findings of my research, it is implied either that experience of anger may increase the distortion of sense of justice in speakers or that perception of injustice may create anger in the subjects. Most of the data I analyzed for anger talk involves interpersonal relationships as a subject and the other, which pushes me to discuss these findings also in this context. According to Lacan (2014), from a linguistic point of view, degree of symbolization is lacking, where in the place of this lack fundamental affect of anxiety emerges unless the desire of the subject is in motion. The relationship between subject and the other always implies a fantasy (See Evans, 2006 for exact definition of fantasy in Lacanian discourse), which can be regarded as a mismatch concerning realities created by subject and the other. Anger in relation to injustice can be considered in terms of this antinomy that compact between two people in terms of

their individual constructions of reality is impossible (For detailed analysis see Ragland-Sullivan, 2004). I claim that injustice and feelings of unfairness constructed during anger talk are closely associated to a failure of fantasy on the subject's side. In other words, impossibility of a complete, smooth, and ever-functioning interpersonal relationship lays the foundation for failure of reality and disappointment of the subject, which leads to emergence of angry affect. In support of this argument, I also remind readers that speakers position themselves as someone yielding and passive, who are unable to reconcile, compromise, and come to terms by. The sense of unfairness seems closely associated to inability to accept this impossibility and failure in symbolic functioning of socially constructed reality. Incapability and frustration, and especially inability to compromise can be topics for psychotherapy sessions, since analysis and evaluation of these subject positions may be beneficial in transformation of these positions. Since symbolization of experience into different modes can be regarded as the primary concern of psychotherapy, anger can be taken as a signal that posits a mischief in interpersonal and social plains, which opens a channel to speak for the subject.

4.3.1.5. Discourse of Nonsensicality

Inability to find meaning and lack of reason and rationale are also constructed discourses in anger talk. It seems that a very parallel connection can be observed between Lacanian concept of lack and these discursive practices. On the one hand, meaninglessness of the situation, acts of others, and positions people find themselves in may be interpreted as a devaluation strategy of anger experience; on the other hand, inability to symbolize and a resistance to reconcile may represent lack of meaning as a function of lack in linguistic structure. Similar to discourse of injustice, nonsensicality signifies non-conceivability of structural fault in linguistic and social phenomena. Therefore, identification of whether patients devaluate or distance themselves from anger or anger-related experience is of importance for the therapy process. Signification of this lack of meaning is claimed to be the only possible cure

for patients, also (Lacan, 2008). It can be drawn from these arguments that speaking and putting this meaninglessness into words are the suggested ways in psychotherapeutic practice.

4.3.2. Culture-specific Implications

Studies conducted in Turkey or in Turkish have similarities with general literature concerning anger. Most of the research conducted on anger focuses on adolescents and sees anger in compatible with the general literature (Özmen, Çetinkaya, Özmen, & Akil, 2016). For example, Canpolat (2017) takes anger as something controllable and studies the effectiveness of an anger control program. Some other studies imply anger management techniques (Uzunoğlu & Arabacı, 2017), with CBT-based interventions (Şekerci, Terzi, Kitiş, & Okuyan, 2017). However, most of the studies conducted with adolescents examine the anger in interpersonal relationship and communication contexts. Kutlu and Bedel (2019) study conflict resolution, Kıran and Çelikkaleli (2008) examine social self-efficacy, and Öztaban and Adana (2015) investigate the relationship between interpersonal styles and problem solving skills in association with anger. Another study examines the relationship between communication skills and anger problems in order to investigate a solution focused intervention (Siyez & Tuna, 2014). In similarity with general literature, these studies take anger as something controllable, or which should be controlled and managed; in contrast to mainstream view of anger, they evaluate and try to change the style of expression. In other words, compatible with my findings, anger is constructed in connection to discourses of control, and the need to express anger is granted, yet unlike general psychotherapy literature, interpersonal elements and means of expression is of more concern of researchers. These trends also demonstrates the inclination to treat anger as something socially constructed and dealt with, compared to theories which view anger as total of many biological, hormonal and environmental factors. These trends can also be interpreted in connection to General Strain Theory (Agnew, 2017). It claims that daily experiences posit many negative life events which can be called stressors or strains to

the individual who in return choose internalizing or externalizing behaviors. When people react daily strains with externalizing tendency, they become frustrated and angry, and choose to show aggressive behaviors. Teaching social, communication and problem solving skills to individuals with problematic anger can be beneficial in dealing with maladaptive anger.

4.3.3. Concluding Remarks

Many perspectives identify causes of anger in interpersonal relationships and daily experiences. Although people with traumatic experiences, chronic patients, and people with other mental health problems tend to experience anger and show aggression, anger should be still problematic for the individual because it causes problems in their everyday functioning and their relationships with others. DiGiuseppe and Tafrate (2003) found in their meta-analysis that anger can be treated effectively through psychotherapy. Cognitive and behavioral interventions are dominantly studied in the literature and they are found to be effective in treatment of anger and aggression. As mentioned earlier, quick interventions such as social skills training and problems solving skills training based on cognitive-behavioral techniques can be utilized in treating anger. Considering the effect sizes for anger treatment, it seems promising to treat anger through psychotherapy in the short term. However, long-term effectiveness of these studies are unspecific. Process-oriented therapies such as dynamic and psychoanalytic psychotherapy can also be effective in treating anger (Mayne & Ambrose, 1999; Greenberg & Bischkopf, 2007). The duration needed to effectively change angry affect and related components may be longer than expected (Pizer, 2014), which implies a trusting therapy relations and alliance and a long-term therapy process to overcome many aspects of maladaptive anger. Psychoanalysis in particular points to the direction that transference is the only condition to fundamental change in patient's psychic life (Lacan, 2015). In other words, transference allows the patient to repeat the previous experiences in other relationships with the therapist in the immediate session, which can lead to a positive change if the therapist can handle the

transference well. When anger is treated in the immediacy of the session between the therapist and the patient in the long term, a more enduring change in problematic anger can be achieved.

4.3.4. Discursive Approach to Psychotherapy

Psychotherapy as a practice and discourse analytic research share language at their roots and as a source. This commonality can be utilized in both practice and research, which may be beneficial for both. Avdi and Georgaca (2007) claims that fundamental techniques of discourse analysis can be used as psychotherapeutic interventions. Similarly, I suggest that defining subject positions and discursive strategies used by speakers can be of great use in formulating cases and working with patients. Action-orientation and rhetorical effects of discourses can be assessed during psychotherapy before designing interventions for each subject. Guidance provided by discourse analytic approach may also be used as short-term interventions to raise emotional awareness of patients, which in my case, is about awareness of constructions and reproductions of anger. Subject positions may reveal interpersonal dynamics for the patient-therapist dyad or discursive strategies can guide practitioners in identifying idiosyncratic features of patients' speech patterns and also their own. For example, transference can be interpreted in terms of whether the patient positions therapist in a certain way or whether therapist accepts this positioning. Since interpersonal aspects of anger are understudied in the literature, discourse analytic approach can also be useful in studying psychotherapy relationship, transference and other interpersonal factors in general. Additionally, case studies can be conducted using discourse analysis so that rich information provided can be captured in its diversity and variability. Since discourses are created for a purpose and shapes the reality we perceive, rhetorical practices constructed in therapy can be challenged in both patient's and therapist's side for betterment of psychotherapy process. Consequently, the value given to critical method in discursive approaches may help psychotherapy practice in preventing dead ends in the process.

Specifically, Avdi and Georgaca (2007) identify one of the fundamental features of psychotherapy as a meaning transformation, caused by the discursive shifts in patients' speech. Most obvious approach to psychotherapy for a profound change in the subject can be achieved by interventions pointed at subject positions and constituted discourses. Alterations in positioning and generation of certain discourses can be utilized by therapist. By increasing diversity and flexibility in discourses, subject positions, and discursive strategies utilized by patients, fundamental change in subjective experience can be achieved (Frosh, Burck, Strickland-Clark, & Morgan, 1996), of which anger seems to operate as a signal. Greenberg and Bischkopf (2007) claims that process-oriented psychotherapies (such as long-term or psychodynamic) can treat anger problems more effectively since they also take the context and meaning of anger experiences into account. Similarly, it is also claimed that anger can be beneficial in addressing issues in psychotherapy (Meloy-Miller, Butler, Seedall, & Spencer, 2018).

4.4. Limitations and Future Directions

As in every kind of research, discourse analytic approach and my research on that matter have limitations. First of all, role of my subjectivity in this research can be viewed as both a limitation and strength. I mentioned my part and possible influence over analysis and presenting my data throughout this thesis in reflexive statements in different sections and when I felt necessary. The claims that subjectivity of researcher cannot be ruled out in any type of research including laboratory studies of positive sciences demonstrate that acknowledging and reflecting on this position of researcher can be a natural part of any research. Secondly, all of the data were from transcripts of psychoanalytical/psychodynamic-oriented therapy sessions. Increasing diversity of approaches to psychotherapy in conducting discourse analytic research on emotions (and anger) can be beneficial to better understand and criticize every approach. Since the role of the therapist shifts in different approaches in psychotherapy, constructed discourses can be very divergent compared to my study. Another limitation of this

research may be due to the collection of data from therapists in training. Looking at anger from sessions of professionals in the field may fruit different results. Finally, because of the labor-intensive aspect of discourse analysis, I limited my data to seven psychotherapy sessions considering the scope of this thesis. This may produce some limitations since anger is found to be related to shame frequently in the literature (Soler, 2016; Cassiello-Robbins, Wilner, Sauer-Zavala, Peters, & Bentley, 2018; Zhu et al., 2018); nevertheless, my data has only one instance of a mention of shame. Similarly, anger is studied in connection to grief and other phenomena concerning loss (Ross, 1991; Seshadri, 2014), yet my data does not have any directly observable connection to a significant experience of loss. These topics can be studied in connection to angry affect from discourse analytic perspective.

Discourse of injustice seems more wide-spread in therapy discourse compared to studies conducted with chronic pain and trauma patients. Further research into the connection of perceived injustice and anger can be studied. Additionally, although frustration hypothesis seems to be abandoned by the majority of the researchers and the idea is considered outdated in cognitivist circles, my data indicates the relation exists since one of the subject positions is frustrated subject. Further clarification on this matter can be achieved by discourse analysis in connection to plains of existence of the subject (symbolic, imaginary, and real) suggested by Lacan (see Olivier, 2004 for detailed introduction) since frustration is generally associated with imaginary register. In other words, psychoanalysis treats frustration as an imaginary phenomena, as in a failure of fantasy in opposition to structural effects of symbolic plain. After commenting on limited number of research on psychotherapy relationship, transference and alliance, interpersonal aspects of anger between therapist and client can also be examined from discourse analytic perspective in studies of transference and countertransference.

Discursive approaches to psychotherapy and subjectivity has also been criticized for losing touch with the everyday reality of subjectivity and experience since discourse are seen as fragmented and chaotic. My results also demonstrates this fragmented nature of discourses and subjectivity. Although people experience their self in a

continuity in everyday life, discursive approaches treat subjectivity as something partial and ever-changing (Crossley, 2000). Avdi and Georgaca (2009) claims that psychoanalysis can be an answer at these problematic nature of discursive approaches since adapting to different discourses and subjective positions and accomplishing a more flexible approach can be seen as an ultimate end to psychotherapeutic practices.

REFERENCES

Agnew, R. (2017). General strain theory. In B. Teasdale & M. S. Bradley (Eds.), *Preventing crime and violence.* (pp. 21–30). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-44124-5_3

Andrew, G., & McMullen, L. M. (2000). Interpersonal Scripts in the Anger Narratives Told by Clients in Psychotherapy. *Motivation & Emotion*, *24*(4), 271–284. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010792900030

Anestis, M. D., Anestis, J. C., Selby, E. A., & Joiner, T. E. (2009). Anger rumination across forms of aggression. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *46*(2), 192–196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.09.026

Avdi, E. (2005). Negotiating a pathological identity in the clinical dialogue: Discourse analysis of a family therapy. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, *4*, 493-511. https://doi.org/10.1348/147608305X52586

Avdi, E., & Georgaca, E. (2007). Discourse analysis and psychotherapy: A critical review. *European Journal of Psychotherapy and Counselling*, *9*(2), 157–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642530701363445

Avdi E., & Georgaca, E. (2009). Narrative and discursive approaches to the analysis of subjectivity in psychotherapy. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass 3(*5), 654-670.

Averill, J. R. (1982). *Anger and aggression: An essay on emotion*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Averill, J. R. (2012). Anger. *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*, 137–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-375000-6.00023-9

Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: a social learning analysis*. Prentice-Hall.

Barrett, L. F. (2011). Constructing Emotion. *Psihologijske Teme / Psychological Topics*, *20*(3), 359–380.

Berkowitz, L. (1962). *Aggression: A social psychological analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Berkowitz, L., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2004). More thoughts about anger determinants. *Emotion*, *4*(2), 151–155. https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.4.2.151

Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and quality in social research*. Routledge.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge.

Cannon, W. B. (1927). James-Lange theory of emotions: a critical examination and an alternative theory. *American Journal of Psychology*, *39*, 106–124. https://doi.org/10.2307/1415404

Canpolat, M. (2017). Öfke Kontrolü Programının Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Öfke Kontrolü Becerilerine Etkisi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi 7*(47), 87 – 98.

Cassiello-Robbins, C., & Barlow, D. H. (2016). Anger: The Unrecognized Emotion in Emotional Disorders. *Clinical Psychology: Science & Practice*, *23*(1), 66–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/cpsp.12139

Cassiello-Robbins, C., Wilner, J. G., Sauer-Zavala, S., Peters, J. R., & Bentley, K. H. (2018). Elucidating the relationships between shame, anger, and self-destructive behaviors: The role of aversive responses to emotions. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2018.12.004

Crossley, M. L. (2000). *Introducing Narrative Psychology: Self, Trauma and the Construction of Meaning*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Deffenbacher, J. L., Oetting, E. R., Lynch, R. S., & Morris, C. D. (1996). The expression of anger and its consequences. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *34*(7), 575–590. https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(96)00018-6

Deffenbacher, J. L., Oetting, E. R., Thwaites, G. A., Lynch, R. S., Baker, D. A., Stark, R. S., … Eiswerth-Cox, L. (1996). State–Trait Anger Theory and the utility of the Trait Anger Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *43*(2), 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.43.2.131

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2000) The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. In Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., Eds., *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Sage: Thousand Oaks

DiGiuseppe, R., & Tafrate, R. (2003). Anger treatment for adults: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology-Science And Practice*, *10*(1), 70–84.

DiGiuseppe, R., Tafrate, R., & Eckhardt, C. (1994). Critical issues in the treatment of anger. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, *1*(1), 111–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1077-7229(05)80089-6

Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O. and Sears, R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression.* New Haven, Yale University Press.

Eatough, V., & Smith, J. (2006). "I was like a wild wild person": Understanding feelings of anger using interpretative phenomenological analysis. *British Journal of Psychology*, *97*(4), 483–498. https://doi.org/10.1348/000712606X97831

Edmondson, C. B., & Conger, J. C. (1996). A review of treatment efficacy for individiuals with anger problems: conceptual, assessment, and methodological issues. *Clinical Psychology Review 16*(3), 251-275.

Edwards, D. (1999). Emotion discourse. *Culture & Psychology*, *5*(3), 271–291

Ekman, P. (1992). An Argument for Basic Emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 6(3/4),* 169-200.

Elliott, J. J. C. (2004). *The organization of anger in client-therapist discourse*. (Thesis) ProQuest Information & Learning.

Evans, D. (1996). *An introductory dictionary of Lacanian psychoanalysis*. Florence, KY: Taylor & Frances/Routledge.

Fink, B. (1999). *A clinical introduction to Lacanian psychoanalysis : theory and technique*. Harvard University Press.

Freud, S. (1936). *Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety.* Toronto: Longmans, Green.

Freud, S. (1963). *General Psychological Theory: Papers on metapsychology.* New York: Macmillian Publishing.

Frosh, S., Burck, C., Strickland-Clark, L., & Morgan, K. (1996). Engaging with change: A process study of family therapy. *Journal of Family Therapy*, *18*(2), 141–161. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6427.1996.tb00041.x

Gardner, F. L., & Moore, Z. E. (2008). Understanding Clinical Anger and Violence The Anger Avoidance Model. *Behavior Modification*, *32*(6), 897–912. https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445508319282

Georgaca, E. and Avdi, E. (2012). Discourse Analysis. In Qualitative Research Methods in Mental Health and Psychotherapy (eds. D. Harper and A. R. Thompson). John Wiley & Sons doi:10.1002/9781119973249.ch11

Gendron, M., Lindquist, K., Barsalou, L., & Barrett, l. F. (2012). Emotion words shape emotion percepts. *Emotion*, *12*(2), 314-325.

Greenberg, L. S., & Bischkopf, J. (2007). Anger in psychotherapy: To express or not to express? That is the question. In T. A. Cavell & K. T. Malcolm (Eds.), *Anger, aggression and interventions for interpersonal violence.* (pp. 165–183). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Hawkins, K. A., & Cougle, J. R. (2013). Effects of Interpretation Training on Hostile Attribution Bias and Reactivity to Interpersonal Insult. *Behavior Therapy*, *44*(3), 479–488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2013.04.005

Harre, R. (1987). *Social Construction of Emotions*. New York: Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Hewitson, O. (2010) What Does Lacan Say About… Affects? Retrieved from https://www.lacanonline.com/2010/05/what-does-lacan-say-about-affects/

Howells, K., Day, A., Bubner, S., Jauncey, S., Williamson, P., Parker, A., & Heseltine, K. (2002). Anger Management and Violence Prevention: Improving Effectiveness. *Trends & Issues in Crime & Criminal Justice*, (227), 1.

Junie S., C., John A., S., Esther, Y., Ming-Chih, K., Sean C., M., & Beth D., D. (2018). The Impact of Perceived Injustice on Pain-related Outcomes: A Combined Model Examining the Mediating Roles of Pain Acceptance and Anger in a Chronic Pain Sample. *The Clinical Journal of Pain*, (8), 739. https://doi.org/10.1097/AJP.0000000000000602

Kassinove, H., & Sukhodolsky, D. G. (1995). Anger disorders: Basic science and practice issues. *Issues In Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing*, *18*(3), 173-205. doi:10.3109/01460869509087270

Kıran, B. E. & Çelikkaleli, Ö. (2008). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Sosyal Yetkinlik Düzeyleri ile Sürekli Öfke ve İfade Biçimlerinin İncelenmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi 29*(3), 37-49.

Kutlu, A. & Bedel, A. (2019). Çatışma Çözme Programının Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Çatışma Çözüm Becerilerine, Sürekli Öfke ve Öfke İfade Tarzlarına Etkisi. (Turkish). *Ilkogretim Online*, *18*(1), 97–111. https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2019.527165

Lacan, J. (1997). *The seminar of Jacques Lacan: Psychoses* (J. Miller, Ed.; R. Grigg, Trans.). New York: W. W. Norton.

Lacan, J. (2002). *Ecrits: the first complete edition in English* (B. Fink, Trans.). New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
101

Lacan, J. (2008). *The ethics of psychoanalysis: 1959-1960*. London: Routledge.

Lacan, J. (2014). *Anxiety* (J. Miller, Ed.). Cambridge UK: Polity

Lacan, J. (2015). Transference: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VIII. Cambridge UK: Polity.

Laughlin, M. J., & Warner, K. (2005). A Relational Approach to Anger: A Case Study. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, *24*(2), 75–89. https://doi.org/10.1521/jsyt.2005.24.2.75

Lee, A. H., & DiGiuseppe, R. (2018). Anger and aggression treatments: a review of meta-analyses. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *19*, 65–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.04.004

Lovaš, L. (1996). Anxiety, anger and sensivity to injustice. *Ceskoslovenska sychologie*, *40*(3), 248–255.

Mancuso, J. C., & Sarbin, T. R. (1998). The narrative construction of emotional life: Developmental aspects. In M. F. Mascolo & S. Griffin (Eds.), *What develops in emotional development?* (pp. 297–316). New York, NY: Plenum Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-1939-7_12

Martin, M. W. (2012). Psychotherapy as Cultivating Character. *Philosophy, Psychiatry, and Psychology*, *19*(1), 37–39.

Mayne, T. J., & Ambrose, T. K. (1999). Research review of anger in psychotherapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *55*(3), 353–363.

McCracken, L. M. (2013). Anger, injustice, and the continuing search for psychological mechanisms of pain, suffering, and disability. *Pain*, *154*(9), 1495–1496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2013.05.042

Meloy-Miller, K. C., Butler, M. H., Seedall, R. B., & Spencer, T. J. (2018). Anger can help: Clinical representation of three pathways of anger. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, *46*(1), 44–66.

Mohr, D. C., Shoham-Salomon, V., Engle, D., & Beutler, L. E. (1991). The expression of anger in psychotherapy for depression: Its role and measurement. *Psychotherapy Research*, *1*(2), 124–134.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2015). Transitional Anger. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, *1*(1), 41–56.

Olivier, B. (2004). Lacan's Subject: The Imaginary, Language, the Real and Philosophy. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, *23*(1), 1–19.

Özmen, D., Çetinkaya, A., Özmen, E., & Akil, İ. Ö. (2016). Trait anger and anger expression styles in adolescents. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi*, *17*(1), 65–73. https://doi.org/10.5455/apd.176085

Öztapan, Ş. & Adana, F. (2015). Lise öğrencisi erkek ergenlerde problem çözme eğitiminin probem çözme becerisi kişilerarasi ilişki tarzi ve öfke kontrolü üzerine etkisi. *Hemşirelikte Araştırma Geliştirme Dergisi 1*(17), 21-36.

Paivio, S. C. (1999). Experiential conceptualization and treatment of anger. *Journal Of Clinical Psychology*, *55*(3), 311–324.

Pizer, B. (2014). A Clinical Exploration of Moving Anger Forward: Intimacy, Anger, and Creative Freedom. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, *24*(1), 14.

Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality : discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. Sage.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology : beyond attitudes and behaviour*. Sage Publications.

Ragland-Sullivan, E. (2004). *The logic of sexuation: from Aristotle to Lacan*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ross, A. A. (1991). *Cognitive accompaniments of the emotions of sadness, anger, and grief. Dissertation Abstracts International*. ProQuest Information & Learning.

Rothenberg, A. (1971). On anger. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *128*(4), 454-460. doi:10.1176/ajp.128.4.454

Rubin, J. (1986). The Emotion of Anger: Some Conceptual and Theoretical Issues. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, (2), 115.

Saini, M. (2009). A meta-analysis of the psychological treatment of anger: developing guidelines for evidence-based practice. *The Journal Of The American Academy Of Psychiatry And The Law*, *37*(4), 473–488

Saussure, F. de (1966). *Course in general linguistics*. McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Seshadri, G. (2014). How Does Your Anger Bubble Up? An Intervention for Anger, Grief and Loss, and Relapse Prevention. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, *25*(3), 271.

Siyez, D. M. & Tuna, D. T. (2014). Lise öğrencilerinin öfke kontrolü iletişim becerilerinde çözüm odaklı psiko-eğitim programının etkisi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberli Dergisi 41*(5), 11-22.

Soler, C. (2016). *Lacanian affects: the function of affect in Lacan's work*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Spielberger, C. D., & Reheiser, E. C. (2009). Assessment of Emotions: Anxiety, Anger, Depression, and Curiosity. *Applied Psychology: Health & Well-Being*, *1*(3), 271–302. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2009.01017.x

Spielberger, C. D., Reheiser, E. C., & Sydeman, S. J. (1995). Measuring the experience, expression, and control of anger. *Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing*, *18*(3), 207–232. https://doi.org/10.3109/01460869509087271

Şekerci, Y. G., Terzi, H., Kitiş, Y. & Okuyan, C. B. (2017). Sekizinci Sınıf Öğrencilerine Bilişsel Davranışçı Yaklaşıma Göre Uygulanan Öfke Kontrol Programının Etkinliği. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi. 4*(10), 201-207.

Takebe, M., Takahashi, F., & Sato, H. (2016). Anger rumination as a risk factor for trait anger and anger-in: A longitudinal study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *101*, 451–455. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.038

Uzunoğlu, G., & Arabacı, L. B. (2017). Davranım Bozukluğu Tanılı Ergenlere Verilen Psikoeğitimin Öfke Yönetimine Etkisi. *Dusunen Adam: Journal of Psychiatry & Neurological Sciences*, *30*(4), 344–353. https://doi.org/10.5350/DAJPN2017300409

Quiggle, N. L., Garber, J., Panak, W. F., & Dodge, K. A. (1992). Social information processing in aggressive and depressed children. *Annual Progress in Child Psychiatry & Child Development*, 217–241.

Quinodoz, J. M. (2005). *Reading Freud : a chronological exploration of Freud's writings*. Routledge.

Verbi Software. (2016). MAXQDA Analytics Pro (Computer Programme). Berlin:Germany: VERBI

Yip, J. A., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2019). Losing your temper and your perspective: Anger reduces perspective-taking. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, *150*, 28–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.07.003

van Wagoner, S. L. (2000). Anger in Group Therapy, Countertransference and the Novice Group Therapist. *Journal of Psychotherapy in Independent Practice*, *1*(2), 63.

Waiess, E. A. (1998). A clinical note on traumatic experiences and the patient's anger. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, *15*(2), 294–296. https://doi.org/10.1037/0736-9735.15.2.294

Whorf, B. L., Carroll, J. B., Levinson, S. C., & Lee, P., (2012). *Language, Thought, and Reality : Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: The MIT Press.

Wiggins, S. and Potter, J. (2008). Discursive psychology. In: Willig, C. & Stainton-Rogers, W. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology. London: SAGE*

Willig, C. (2008). Introducing qualitative research in psychology (2nd ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Wyckoff, J. P. (2016). Aggression and emotion: Anger, not general negative affect, predicts desire to aggress. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *101*, 220–226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.001

Zhu, R., Xu, Z., Liu, C., Tang, H., Liu, J., Wang, H., … Mai, X. (2018). The effect of shame on anger at others: awareness of the emotion-causing events matters. *Cognition and Emotion*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2018.1489782

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

PSİKOTERAPİDE ÖFKE: BİR SÖYLEM ANALİZİ

BÖLÜM 1

GİRİŞ

1.1.Öfke ve Öfke Benzeri Kavramlar

Öfke yapılan bir yanlışı düzeltme ve tekrarını önleme amacıyla suçlama içeren bir duygudurum olarak nitelendirilmektedir (Averill, 1982). Öfke, benzeri anlamlarda kullanılabilen saldırganlık, düşmanlık ve şiddet ile karıştırılmaktadır. Saldırganlık davranış içerdiği için gözlemlenebilirken, öfkede bu söz konusu olmayabilir. Düşmanlık bir tutum ya da kişilik özelliği olarak zarar verme niyetini belli etmek için kullanılırken (Rothenberg, 1971) şiddet bu tutumun davranışlarca gösterilmesiyle oluşan bir sınır aşma ve zarar verme niyetiyle ortaya çıkan bir taşmadır.

1.2.Felsefi Temeller

Felsefe tarihinde öfke Aristoteles tarafından kişinin kendisi ve yakınlarının statüce aşağılanması karşısında oluşan bir acıyla ortaya çıkan intikam alma dürtüsü olarak tanımlanmıştır (Averill, 1982). Meşrulaştırılmamış bu eylem karşısında ortaya çıkan öfke, diğer duygular gibi kişinin etkilendiği ve mantıklı düşünme kabiliyetini kaybettiği bir ıstırap olarak nitelendirilmektedir.

108

1.3.Tarihsel Bakış Açıları

Darwin'den bu yana duygu ile ilgili tartışmalar beden ve zihin ikiliğinde tartışılmıştır. Hayal kırıklığı ve saldırganlık arasındaki ilişkiyi düzenleyici olarak öfkeyi Berkowitz (1962) eklemiştir. Bir diğer geçerliliğini koruyan düşünce James-Lange kuramı (Cannon, 1927) olarak bilinen fizyolojik ve zihinsel uyaranların yorumunu öne koyan bakış açısıdır.

1.4.Güncel Bakış Açıları

1.4.1. Genel Bakış Açıları

Alanyazına bakıldığında öfkenin genellikle istenmeyen ve olumsuz bir duygu olarak görüldüğü sonucuna ulaşılmaktadır. Biyolojik ve fizyolojik süreçler oldukça vurgulanmış (Ekman, 1992), deneyimsel, fizyolojik, bilişsel ve davranışsal birçok tarafı olan bir kavram olarak öfke çalışılmıştır (Edmondson & Conger, 1986). Diğer taraftan öfke her zaman saldırganlıkla iç içe bağlantılı bir duygu olarak tanımlanmaya devam edilmiştir. Genellikle birçok güncel kuram öfkeyi doğuştan gelen, gözlemlenebilir ve ölçülebilir olarak görmekte ve zihinsel ve bedensel duyumların bir yorumu olarak nitelendirmektedir. Birçok çalışma, öfkenin bilişsel ve davranışçı kısımlarının ayrı ayrı çalışılmasıyla ilgilenmekte, sosyokültürel ve kişilerarası alanlardaki çalışmalar ise yetersiz görünmektedir.

1.4.2. Sosyal İnşacı Bakış Açıları

"Dile dönüş" hareketi olarak nitelendirilen bir akımın neticesinde duygular, insanlar arasında ve kültürel düzlemde tarihsellik içerisinde ve dilsel pratiklerle üretilen ve yeniden üretilen olgular olarak tasarlanmaktadır. Bakış açılarını iki grupta toplamak mümkündür ve ilki fizyolojik değişkenleri ve duyguların inşa edilen ve inşa edici özelliklerini birbirlerini tamamlayan parçalar olarak görürken (Averill, 1982), ikinci görüş duyguları tamamen inşa edilen olgular olarak nitelendirmektedir (Harre, 1987). İki bakış açısı da duyguları ve öfkeyi inşa edilen olgular olarak görürken bir taraftan yapıcı işlevlerine vurgu yapmakta, özellikle öfkenin yok edici unsurlarından ziyade yapıcı kısımlarını ön plana almaktadır.

1.4.3. Psikanalitik Bakış Açıları

Psikanaliz duygulara yeteri önemi vermediği gerekçesiyle uzun süre eleştirilmiştir (Quinodoz, 2015). Ancak Freud (1963) dürtü ve bilinçdışının işlevlerinden biri olarak duyguları ve düşünce içeriklerini birbirlerinden ayırmıştır. Benzer bir ayrımı yapısalcılık akımını başlatan Saussure (1966) gösteren ve gösterilen ikiliğini kullanarak dil teorisi içerinden incelemiştir. Freud ve Saussure'ün düşünceleri arasındaki benzerlik Lacan tarafından fark edilip bir araya getirilmiş ve psikanalitik teori tekrar yorumlanmıştır. Bu bakış açılarına göre sadece gösterenler yani sesler, kelimeler, cümleler, düşünceler bastırılabilirken bunlara bağlı duygular serbest kalır ve kendilerini başka gösterenlere bağlarlar.

Öfke psikanalitik teoriye göre söylemsel anlaşmaların, sosyal kural, norm ve yaşayış biçimlerinin çökmesi sonucunda öznenin hissettiği bir hayal kırıklığı ve beklentilerinin karşılanmaması durumuyla ortaya çıkar.

1.5. Öfkenin Psikoterapisi

Psikoterapi kişilikte temelden değişimlerin ve kendiliğin deneyiminin değiştirebildiği bir alan olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Martin, 2012). Sosyal inşacı bakış açısına göre psikoterapi anlam değişiminin ve üretiminin gerçekleştirildiği bir kurum olarak görülmektedir (Avdi, 2015). Sorunlu öfke psikoterapi aracılığıyla iyileştirilebilir durumdadır (Howells ve ark., 2002). Bilişsel ve davranışçı terapilerin etkililiği alanyazında birçok kez çalışılmış ancak oryantasyon fark etmeksizin öfkenin terapi süreciyle iyileştirebileceği sonucuna varılmıştır (Saini, 2009). Psikodinamik yönelimli ve sürece odaklanan uzun süreli tedavilerin daha etkili olduğu tartışılmıştır (Mayne & Ambrose, 1999). Bazı çalışmalarsa öfkenin terapi ilişkisini olumsuz etkileyebileceğini belirtmektedir (DiGiuseppe, Tafrate, & Eckhardt, 1994).

1.6.Duygulara Söylemsel Yaklaşım

Psikoloji alanyazınında duygulara yaklaşımda birçok ontolojik ve epistemolojik yaklaşım gözlemlenmektedir. 1980lerden bu yana psikolojide nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden söylem analizi kullanılmaya başlanmıştır (Potter & Wetherrel, 1987). Psikoloji çalışmalarında genellikle nicel yöntemler kullanılagelmiş olsa ve istatistiksel sonuçlar daha güvenilir bulunmakta olsa da, nitel araştırmalar son dönemlerde sayıcı ve kalitece artmıştır. Nitel ve nicel araştırmalar arasında birçok varsayımsal ve teorik fark bulunmaktadır. Denzin ve Lincoln (2000) bu farkları ortaya koymuştur: İlk olarak nitel araştırmalar kullanılan verilerin zenginliğini korumaya ve aktarmaya odaklanmakta ve detayların, kendiliğin oluşturulma biçimlerinin ve günlük deneyimlerin daha önemli olduğunu vurgulamaktadır. İkinci olarak nitel araştırmalar hipotez testi ve genellenebilir sonuçlardan ziyade kişilerin deneyimlerini odaklarına almaktadırlar. Üçüncü olarak nitel araştırmalar post-modern bakış açısıyla olaylara yaklaşmakta, pozitivist bakış açılarını reddetmektedir. Daha çok dilin kurucu ve

değiştirici etkilerine odaklanan bu tip çalışmalar, dil kullanılarak aktarılan aynı çalışmalarda araştırmacının da verilerin ve analizin bir parçası olduğunun altını çizer. Dördüncü olarak laboratuvar çalışmaları ve kontrol koşulları yerine, günlük yaşamdan kesitlerin çalışılmasını bir hassasiyet olarak görür. Son olarak, nitel araştırmacılar günlük deneyimlerin önemliliğini vurgular ve soyutlamalar, kanunlar, teoriler üretmek yerine daha çok soru, öznel açıklamalar üretirler.

1.6.1. Söylem Analizi

Söylemler sosyokültürel ve etkileşimsel bir bağlam çerçevesinde ortaya çıkan anlam sistemleri olarak tanımlanır ve konuşan kişilerin dışında da var olmaya devam ederler (Georgaca & Avdi, 2012). Söylemler, yazılı veya sözlü her türlü metinden oluşurlar ve konuşanların öznelliğini, gerçekliğini ve bakış açılarını şekillendirirler. Aynı zamanda konuşan kişilerce şekillendirilmeye, üretilmeye ve yeniden üretilmeye de devam ederler. Belirli bir bağlama kesinlikle bağlı olarak alınması gereken söylemler, bir amaçla ortaya çıkarlar ve gerçekliği kurucu işleve bu yolla sahip olurlar.

Söylem analizi ise bu dil pratiklerinin yani kullanımdaki dilin detaylı incelenmesidir (Potter & Wetherrel, 1987). Söylem analizi gerçekçi bakış açısından çok göreceli bir bakış açısıyla verileri inceler. Başka bir deyişle söylem analizinde konuşulan nesnenin gerçek varlığı şüphesizce kabul edilmez, aksine kullanılan dilin nasıl olduğuna göre bunun değişebileceği varsayılır. Böylece dil kullanımının kendisinin çalışılmasını salık verir.

1.6.2. Çalışma Fikri

Psikoterapi çalışmalarında söylem analizi açısından ve genel olarak nitel araştırma açısından bir eksiklik olduğu vurgulanmıştır (Avdi & Georgaca, 2007). Edwards

(1999) duyguların psikoloji bilimi içerisinde önceden belirlenmiş kategoriler olarak alınmasını sorunlu bulmuş ve duyguların söylem analizi ile çalışılması sonucunda bu varsayımların ve tanımların sorgulanabileceğini ortaya koymuştur. Öfkenin söylem analiziyle psikoterapi bağlamında çalışıldığı ancak bir örneğe rastlanmıştır (Elliott, 2002).

Klinik tecrübeler ve süpervizyon süreçleri etkisiyle kişisel olarak dikkat çeken öfkenin söylem analiziyle incelenebileceğini düşünmekteyim. Özellikle öfkenin psikoterapide nasıl organize olduğuna dikkat etmekte, öfkenin psikoterapide nasıl deneyimlendiği, ifade edildiği ve inşa edildiğini söylem analizi kullanarak çalışmayı amaçlamaktayım.

BÖLÜM 2

YÖNTEM

2.1. Söylem Analizi

Söylem analizi kullanımdaki doğal dilin incelenmesidir. Bu çalışma için söylem analizini psikoterapi görüşmelerine uygulamayı öfkenin incelenmesi amacıyla hedeflemekteyim. Söylem analizini seçmemin sebebi öfkenin tanımları ve öfkeye bakış açılarını sorgulamak, ve sorunlu öfkeye bakış açılarını genişletmektir.

2.2. Söylem Analizini Kalite Kriterleri

Söylem analizinin kalite kriterleri Potter ve Wetherell (1987) tarafından analizin bütünlülüğü, katılımcıların yönelimleri, yeni sorular üretebilme kapasitesi ve sonuçların bereketliliği olarak verilmiştir. Analizin bütünlülüğü kendi içindeki

113

tutarlılığı ve mikro-makro seviyelerdeki uyumuyla ilgiliyken katılımcıların yönelimleri verilen beyanlara ve katılımcıların gerçekliğine ne kadar önem verildiğiyle alakalıdır. Yeni sorular üretmek, keşif amaçlı yapılan nitel araştırmaların genel kriterlerinden sayılmaktadır. Ayrıca sonuçların bereketliliği yeni söylemlere ulaşmak, yeni açıklamalar bulmak gibi kısımlarla ilgilidir ve en çok önem verilen kalite kriteridir. Georgaca ve Avdi (2012) ise özellikle psikoterapi çalışmalarında içsel tutarlılık ve bütünlük, titizlik, transparanlık, faydalılık ve refleksivite gibi kriterler saymışlardır. Özünde iki bakış açısı da birbirine benzemekle beraber titizlik ve sonuçların uygulanabilirliği gibi kaygılar ikinci kriterleri ayıran noktalardır. Verilerin analizini yaparken iki kalite kriterini de yönerge olarak alıp uygulamaya özen gösterdim.

2.3. Söylem Analizinin Evreleri

Potter ve Wetherell (1987) ve Georgaca ve Avdi (2012) taraflarından verilen yönergeleri takip ettiğim bu çalışmada, ilki daha çok teknik, ikincisi ise daha çok tutarlılık ve bütünlük bağlamında değerlendirilebilir. Kalite kriterleriyle beraber, söylem analizinin nasıl yapıldığını bu iki kaynakta aktarıldığı şekilde uyguladım.

2.3.1. Araştırma Konusu

Öfke hem kişisel hem entelektüel anlamda ilgilendiğim bir konu olmakla birlikte, psikoterapi pratiğim sırasında zorlandığım bu duyguyu dilin kullanımları açısından incelemeye karar verdim. Alanyazına baktığımda öfke ile ilgili çalışmaların psikoterapi bağlamında yetersizliği ve içgörüden yoksun bir çok çalışma beni bu konuyu çalışmaya itti. Yeni açıklamalar, söylemler ve sorular üreten bir yöntem olarak söylem analizi kullanarak bu çalışmayı yapmayı planladım.

2.3.2. Veri Toplama ve Prosedür

Veri seti, öfke veya öfke konuşması içeren toplamda yedi psikoterapi görüşmesinden oluşmaktadır. Ayna Klinik Psikoloji Destek Ünitesinde stajlarını yapmakta olan lisansüstü öğrencilerinden "terapist veya danışanın tarafından kaynaklanmış olabilecek öfkeli duygudurum veya öfke konuşması içeren terapi konuşmalarının iletilmesi" istenmiştir. Başka bir deyişle psikoterapistlerin bakış açısından öfke içerdiği söylenen seanslar alınmış ve araştırmacı tarafından bu bilgi seansları dinlemek suretiyle doğrulanmıştır. Seansları istenen hastalar, duygudurum bozukluğu, dikkat dağınıklığı, kişilerarası ilişkilerde yaşanan zorluklar, dürtü kontrol sorunları gibi sorunlarla başvuruda bulunmuşlardır. Psikoterapi görüşmeleri birçok kere dinlendikten sonra alınacak kısımlar belirlenmiş ve deşifreleme işlemi yapılmıştır. Defalarca okunan bu alıntılar MAXQDA programı kullanılarak kodlanmış ve kategorize edilmiştir. Georgaca ve Avdi (2012) tarafından tavsiye edilen toplamda beş seviyeden söylemsel stratejiler, özne pozisyonları ve söylemler olmak üzere üç seviye seçilmiş ve buna göre kodlanmış veriler incelenmiştir. Psikoterapi seansları Türkçedir ve dilin doğal kullanımını bozmamak açısından İngilizce'ye çevrilmemişlerdir.

2.3.3. Refleksivite

Bu kavram hem bir kalite kriteri olarak önemlidir hem de araştırmacının da araştırmanın bir parçası olarak etkilerinin neler olabileceğini göstermek açısından çalışmanın transparanlığını arttırmaktadır. Seansları istenen terapistler gibi ben de klinik psikoloji yüksek lisansında ve aynı programda eğitim görmekte olan, öfkeyle ilgili hem seanslarda, hem süpervizyon sürecinde hem de bazen kişisel hayatımda sorunlar yaşamış olan biriyim. Psikoterapist kimliğimi analizi tamamlama sürecimde

115

paranteze almaya çalışmış, verilere yeni bir bakışla incelemiş ve kodlamış durumdayım.

BÖLÜM 3

ANALİZ VE SONUÇLAR

3.1. Analiz

Bu bölümde, daha önce bahsettiğim gibi, üç seviyeli bir analizi alıntılardan örnekleri de vererek sunacağım. Bu sonuçlar okuyucular tarafından eleştirel bir şekilde okunmalı ve genellebilirliğinden ziyade analizin ortaya çıkardığı çeşitlilik dikkate alınmalıdır.

3.2. Söylemsel Stratejiler

Analizin sonucunda ortaya çıkan söylemsel stratejilerden ilki mesafelenmedir. Öfkeye, öfkenin sebeplerine farklı türlerde söylemsel stratejiler kullanarak mesafelenen konuşmacılar, dil kullanımı seviyesinde yaratıcı yöntemlerle bunu becermektedirler. Öfkeyi sahiplenmemek, deneyim ve kendini ayrı olarak konumlandırmak, yüzleşmekten kaçınmak gibi temel stratejilerin yanında mesafelenme soyutlayıcı ve dezorganize konuşma biçimleri, metafor kullanımıyla mesafelenme, öfke deneyimini ve duyguları değersizleştirme gibi birçok farklı tip içermektedir. Bir diğer kullanılan strateji suçlamadır. Suçlama kişinin kendisine, başkalarına veya duruma atfedillebilirken analizler sırasından oldukça sık biçimde karşılaşılmıştır. Alternatif senaryolar geliştirmek, danışanların anlattıkları olaylarda beklentileri karşılanmadığında ve öfkelendiklerinde kullandıkları bir başka söylemsel

stratejidir. Alternatifler üreterek nasıl olabilirdi kısmını vurgulamak amacıyla kullanmaktadırlar. Bir diğer strateji öykülemedir. Kendi içinde bir hesaplaşma biçimini de alabilen bu strateji aynı zamanda öfke konuşması sırasında olayı detaylı biçimde anlatma şeklinde de ortaya çıkmıştır. Öfkeli olaylarda ve öfke konuşmalarında bulunan son strateji ise karşılaştırmadır. Kişiler kendileri ve başkalarını, bazı durumları başka durumlarla karşılaştırarak öfkeyi meşrulaştırma veya öfkenin sebeplerini araştırmaya girişmektedirler.

3.3. Özne Pozisyonları

Tahammül edilen ve tahammül eden ikiliği şeklinde kurulan ilk özne pozisyonunda öfke karşısında kişiler kendilerini tahammül eden konumuna koyarken, öteki kişiyi tahammül edilen olarak yerleştirmektedirler. Benzer biçimde kendilerini öfkeli hissettikleri zamanlarda tahammül edilen, karşı tarafı tahammül eden olarak kurmaktadırlar. Değerlendirilen ve değerlendiren özne konumlarına göre ise, konuşmacıların değerlendirilme, eleştirilme karşısında öfkelenmeleri ve değerlendiricilere dönük öfkeleri ortaya çıkmıştır. Becerikli ve becerikli olmayan özne konumları ise kişilerin değiştiremeyecekleri özelliklerine atıfta bulunarak oluşturdukları yapamama-edememe konumuyla ilgilidir. Öfke konuşması sırasında konuşmacılar sıklıkla kendilerini yetersiz, beceriksiz olarak konumlandırmaktadırlar. Teslimiyetçi özne pozisyonuna göre ise kişilerin kendilerini pasif bir özne, failliği bastırılmış bir özne olarak konumlandırdıkları görülmektedir. Durumlar, olaylar ve kişiler karşısında edilgen kalıplarla, kendilerinin bir öznelliği yokmuşçasına inşa ettikleri bu konum, kendini sorunların ortasında buluveren ve gerçekleri kabullenmekte zorluk yaşayan gibi alt tiplerle ortaya çıkmıştır. Hayal kırıklığına uğrayan özne konumu ise adından da anlaşılacağı üzere, hayal kırıklığı, yılgınlık gibi temalar çağrıştırmakta, becerikli olmayan konumuna benzer nitelikte bir durumun imkânsızlığına atıf yaparak oluşturulmuş bir konumdur. Adaletsizliğe atıf yapıp öfkeyi meşrulaştıran bir konum olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Yanlış anlaşılan/Anlaşılamayan özne

pozisyonu ise kişilerin öfke konuşmalarında anlaşılmadıkları, empatiye ihtiyaç duydukları bir noktada üretilmektedir.

3.4. Söylemler

3.4.1. Duygu Söylemi

Psikoterapi seanslarında öfke konuşması sırasında oluşturulan söylemler incelendiğinde öfkenin istenmeyen ve hoş karşılanmayan bir duygu olarak inşa edildiği gözlemlenmiştir. Öfke sonucunda suçluluk hislerinin geldiği ve öfkeli hissettiği için bunu telafi etmeye çalışma gibi detaylar dikkat çekmektedir. Kaygıyı betimleyen gerginlik, rahat olmama ve stresli olma gibi kavramlarla birlikte beliren öfke, çaresizlik hisleriyle de birlikte ortaya çıkmaktadır. Hayal kırıklığı, üzüntü ve öfkenin sıralandığı ve birlikte yer aldığı konuşmalar ise öfkenin üzüntüyle de beraber ortaya çıkabildiğini göstermektedir.

3.4.2. Sosyal Tehdit Olarak Öfke

Öfke genel olarak insanlar arası ilişkilerde çoğunlukla da iş yeri gibi sosyalleşilen ortamlarda bir tehdit olarak inşa edilmektedir. Kişinin öfkelenmesinin sonucunda dargınlık, küsme gibi ilişkiyi zora sokan sonuçların beklenmesi, öfkeli tepkiler sonrasında masadan kalkıp gitme, konuşmayı devam ettirmeme gibi ilişkilere zarar veren sonuçların anlatılması öfkenin bir tehdit olarak görüldüğünü göstermektedir.

118

3.4.3. Öfke ve Kontrol

Kontrol söylemleri öfkenin kontrol edilebilir bir duygu olması, öfkenin kontrolün olmadığı durumlarda ortaya çıkması ve öfkenin kontrol edilmesi gerekliliği gibi çeşitlerde gözlemlenmiştir. Öfke kontrolü söylemleri, dürtünün kontrol altında tutulması gerekliliği ile ilgili alıntılar bunları göstermektedir. Daha olumlu tarafından bakılacak olunursa da öfkenin kontrol edilebilirliği aynı zamanda öfkenin terapide çalışılabilir ve baş edilebilir bir duygu olduğu tarafına da çekilebileceğini göstermektedir.

3.4.4. Öfkeyi İfade Etme İhtiyacı

Kontrol söylemlerinin aksine öfkenin ifade edilmesi ve dışa vurulması gereken bir duygu olduğu söylemlerine de rastlanmıştır. Muhatap alınan kişiye karşı öfkenin ifade edilmesi, tehdit karşısında sesini yükseltme ve öfkesini ifade etme gibi örneklerin yer aldığı bu söylem, istekten ziyade bir ihtiyaç seviyesinde öfkenin ifadesini yerleştirmektedir.

3.4.5. Adaletsizlik

Haksızlığa uğramak, durumun adil olmaması, adaletsizlik gibi çağrışımların olduğu bu söylem tipinde, konuşmacılar kendilerini hayal kırıklığına uğramış, becerikli olmayan, yetersiz gibi konumlara yerleştirip içinde bulundukları durumları haksızlık olarak nitelemektedirler. Öfkeyi meşrulaştırmak veya öfkeyi sebeplere bağlamak amacıyla içinde bulundukları durumu adaletsiz olarak nitelendirmektedirler.

119

3.4.6. Anlamsızlık

Rasyonellikten uzaklaşma, bir anlam bulamama ve zihinsel olarak netliğin sağlanamaması ile öfkenin sık sık bir araya geldiği de gözlemlenmiştir. Özellikle "saçma, gereksiz, anlamsız" gibi tabirlerle bu özelliklerin atfedildiği kişiler ve durumlar aynı zamanda öfke yaratan durumlar olarak da nitelendirilmektedir. Anlam bulamama ve akla uygun olmama gibi bağlantıları olan anlamsızlık söylemi, öfke konuşmalarında sık karşılaşılan bir söylem olarak ortaya çıkmıştır.

BÖLÜM 4

TARTIŞMA

4.1. Psikoterapide Öfkenin Söylem Analizinin Geçerliliği

Bu çalışma Bölüm 2'de verilen kalite kriterlerine uymaya özen göstererek yürüttüğüm ve sunduğum analizin geçerliliğini değerlendirmeyi de gerektirmektedir. Giriş kısmında analizin kendisine ve sonrasında tartışma kısmına kadar söylemsel olarak eleştirel bir duruş sürdürmeye çalışmaktayım. Refleksif ifadelerle transparanlığı arttırmaya çalışmam, çalışma sürecinde çalışmanın bir parçası olduğumu unutmamam, bu çalışmanın geçerliliğini gösteren diğer bazı kriterlerdir. Alıntıları tek tek verip analiz sürecini de göstermem buna örnek olarak gösterilebilir.

4.2. Bu Çalışmadaki Rolüm Üzerine Refleksif Duruş

Lisans eğitimim ve söylem analizini öğrenme süreci olarak nitelendirebileceğim bu süreçte genel olarak nitel çalışmalar, özel olaraksa söylem analizi yapma konusunda zorluklar yaşadım. Verilen alıntıların sayılarına, farklı örnekleri bir araya getirme girişimlerime, çalışma sorumu netleştirmede yaşadığım zorluklara bakıldığında hala kendimi nicel çalışmalardaki gibi çalışmanın geçerlilik ve güvenilirliği ile ilgili kaygılanırken buldum. Kişisel olarak ilgilendiğim bir duyguyu çalışma sırasında zorlanmama rağmen, söylemsel olarak eleştirel duruşumu bozmamaya özen gösterdim.

Okuyuculara da hatırlatmak isterim ki, sosyal inşacı bakış açıdan ve söylem analizinin de gerektirdiği üzere, bu metin de bir söylemdir ve eleştirel olarak ele alınıp incelenebilir. Beklenilenin aksine öfkeyi tanımlamak, öfke konusunda net sonuçlara varmak ve psikoterapide öfkeyle çalışmak konusunda yepyeni yöntemler belirlemek gibi bir amacım bulunmamakla beraber, söylemlerdeki çeşitliliği yakaladığımı düşünmekteyim.

4.3. Klinik Çıkarımlar

4.3.1. Öfkenin Söylem Analizinin Çıkarımları

Mesafelenme diğer stratejilere göre en çok kullanılan ve en çok sayıda tipi belirlenen strateji olarak psikoterapi pratiğinde öfkeyi işaret eden bir sinyal olarak kullanılabilir. Dil kullanımı seviyesinde mesafelenme stratejisi ve suçlama gibi stratejiler öfkenin istenmeyen ve yüzleşilmeyen bir duygu olduğunu göstermektedir. İstenmemesinin ve olumlu görülmemesinin ötesinde suçluluk ve kaygıyla beraber de gelebilen öfke, insanların ilişkilerinde ve sosyal boyutta yaptıkları yanlışlar, hatalar, sınır aşımları gibi durumlarda eşlik eden bir duygu, sonrasındaki suçluluk ise bunların düzeltilmesi açısından önemli görülebilir.

Öfkenin bir sosyal tehdit olarak inşası ise Averill (1982) ve Rothenberg'in (1971) görüşleriyle uyumlu görülmüştür. Ortamda kişinin kendisi veya başkaları bir sinyal olması amacıyla ortaya çıkan öfke, kişinin kendisi veya başkaları için ortamda bir sorunun olduğunu gösteren ve bu biçimde iletişimin yolunu açan bir duygu olarak nitelendirilmektedir.

Öfke bir taraftan ifade edilmesi bir ihtiyaç olarak değerlendirilen bir duygu olarak inşa edilirken bir diğer söylem kontrolü üzerinedir. Ancak örneklere dikkatli bakıldığında öfkenin kontrolünden bahsedilmediği, aksine dürtüsel davranışların ve saldırganca tepkileri kontrol edildiğini, öfkenin ise deneyimlendiği sonucuna varılabilir. Averill'in (1982) de dediği gibi, birçok öfke deneyimi yok edici ve yıkıcı değil kurucu ve değiştirici deneyimler tarafından takip edilmektedir. Psikoterapide bu farkın akılda tutulması, öfkenin sağlıklı işleyişini devam ettirirken dürtüsel ve kontrol edilmesi gereken saldırgan davranışların sebeplerinin araştırılmasında kullanılabilir.

Alanyazında öfke ve algılanan adaletsizlik arasındaki bağlantılara değinilmiştir (Lovas, 1996). Adaletsizlik söylemleriyle öfkenin psikanalitik yorumunda olduğu gibi ilişkilerde iki tarafın gerçekliklerinin uyumsuzluğu ve söylemsel uyumluluğun bozulduğu bir noktanın öfke yaratması şeklinde açıklamalar birbirleriyle tutarlı görülmektedir. Başka bir deyişle, öfke kişilerarası ilişkilerde insanın beklentilerinin karşılanmaması ve bir fantezi olarak değerlendirilebilecek kişisel gerçeklik inşasının başkalarınınkiyle uyumsuzluğu ile alakalı görülmektedir. Bu ise adaletsizlik ve haksızlık gibi söylemlerle desteklenmekte ve öfke bu şekilde meşrulaştırılmaktadır.

4.3.2. Kültüre Özgü Çıkarımlar

Türkçe alanyazına bakıldığında öfke çalışmalarının daha çok ergenler ve okul döneminde davranış bozukluğu yaşayan kişilerle çalışıldığı gözlemlenmiştir. Öfke kontrol programları, sorun çözme becerileri eğitimi, sosyal beceri eğitimi gibi BDT bazlı kısa uygulamaların yer aldığı Türkçe alanyazın öfkenin inşası açısından genel

çalışmalara benzese de çalışılan alanlar konusunda kişilerarası ilişkilere, iletişim becerilerine ve stresi azaltmaya dönük tekniklere başvurmasıyla uluslararası alanyazından farklılaşmaktadır.

4.3.3. Sonuçlar

DiGiuseppe and Tafrate (2003) çalışmalarında psikoterapi yöntemleriyle öfke problemlerinin iyileştirilebildiğini bir meta-analiz çalışmasında göstermişlerdir. Kısa süreli ve sorun çözme odaklı ve sosyal beceri geliştiren bilişsel davranışçı yaklaşımlarla hazırlanmış uygulamalar öfkenin tedavisinde faydalı görünmektedir. Sürece odaklı, psikodinamik ve psikanalitik gibi uzun süreli tedavilerle de öfkenin daha kalıcı biçimde iyileştirilebileceği de çalışılmıştır (Mayne & Ambrose, 1999; Greenberg & Bischkopf, 2007). Bazı çalışmalar, beyin fizyolojisi seviyesinde gerekli değişimlerin ancak uzun süreli tedaviler sonucunda oluşacağı ve kalıcı olacağını savunmaktadır (Pizer, 2014). Psikanalitik açıdan bakılırsa da aktarımda ortaya çıkan öfkenin çalışılması en açık yöntem olarak görülmektedir.

4.3.4. Psikoterapiye Söylemsel Yaklaşım

Kaynak ve köken olarak söylem analitik yaklaşım ve psikoterapi ortak bir zeminde yani dil çalışması zemininde birleştirilebilir. Bu, söylem analitik bakış açısının psikoterapide uygulanabilirliği ihtimalini doğurmaktadır. Hasta formülasyonlarından özne pozisyonu ve üretilen söylemlerin amaçlarına kadar birçok alanda söylem analizinden yararlanılabilir. Özellikle danışanlar için değil, terapistin kendini çalışması ve hangi söylemlerin üretimine katkıda bulunduğunu belirlemede, kendisini nasıl konumlandırdığında aktarım ve karşı aktarım konularında söylem analitik yaklaşımdan faydalanılabilir. Psikoterapinin temel işlevlerinden birini danışanların konuşmalarında bir değişim, öznelliklerini ifade etmede bir farklılık olarak gören Avdi

ve Georgaca (2007), üretilen söylemler ve özne konumlarında terapist tarafından desteklenen bir değişimin, gerçekliği ve kişinin kendiliğini deneyimleme konusunda değişime yardımcı olabileceğini belirtmektedir.

4.4. Çalışmanın Kısıtlılıkları

Her çalışmada olduğunu gibi bu çalışma da kısıtlılıklar içermektedir. Araştırmacı olarak öznel rolüm bir taraftan kısıtlılık bir taraftan da araştırmanın olumlu bir tarafı olarak görülebilir. Kullanılan psikoterapi seansları psikodinamik/psikanalitik yönelimli terapistler alınmıştır, farklı tarzlarda ve farklı deneyim seviyelerinde terapistlerin seanslarıyla yapılan çalışmalarda bu çalışmadaki bulgular değişebilir. Örneğin, öfke sıklıkla utanç gibi kompleks duygularla birlikte çalışılmıştır (Soler, 2016) ancak bu çalışmada sadece bir örneğe rastlanmıştır. Bu söylem çalışmasında aynı zamanda bir duygu ve bu duygunun konuşmalarına dikkat edilmiş, terapistin veya danışanın rolleri veya konuşmanın kimler tarafından üretildiği önemsiz kabul edilmiştir. Aktarım ve karşı aktarım, benzer biçimlerde terapi ittifakı ve ilişkisi çalışmalarında öfkenin çalışılabileceği, nasıl ele alınabileceğinin gösterilmesi gibi çalışmalar yapılabilir.

APPENDIX C: THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname   : Evran
Adı / Name   : Ahmet
Bölümü / Department   : Psikoloji

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) : Anger in Psychotherapy Practices: a Discourse Analysis

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans** / Master   ■   **Doktora** / PhD   ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ■

2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years**. * ☐

3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. * ☐

* *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*
 A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature   ....   **Tarih** / Date …………………………