The purpose of the current study was to examine the validity and reliability of (Journal of Marital and Family Therapy 2003, 29, 209) Differentiation of Self Inventory-Revised (DSI-R; Skowron & Schmit, 2003) in Turkish adults. The DSI-R was translated, independently back-translated, and revised. Two independent samples of adults over the age of 25 were used. The original 46-item DSI-R was not supported by the data derived from Sample 1 (n = 221). However, a revised 20-item, four-factor model fit the data well. This 20-item model was subsequently cross-validated with a second sample of Turkish adults (n = 187). Scale scores showed adequate internal consistency, 5-week test–retest reliability, and satisfactory convergent and criterion-related validity. It was concluded that Turkish DSI-R (DSI-T) is a valid and reliable measure to assess an individual’s differentiation level. In light of the findings, implications for the use of the DSI-T and ideas for future research are discussed.

Bowen Family Systems Theory can be regarded as the most comprehensive theory of human functioning from a systems perspective (Skowron, Van Epps, & Cipriano, in press). In his theory and therapy, Bowen focused on multigenerational transmission process, family of origin issues, and family projective process (Bowen, 1976, 1978). He is considered as the first family therapist to develop a complete theory about intergenerational emotional reactivity and how this may affect the present nuclear family (Kerr, 2008). According to Bowen (1978), patterns of family interaction pass from one generation to the next. Within these patterns, differentiation of self has emerged as the core concept of his theory.

Differentiation of self is conceived as the degree to which one is able to balance (a) emotional and intellectual (feeling-thinking) functioning and (b) intimacy and autonomy (togetherness–separateness) in relationships, especially within the family of origin (Bowen, 1978; Skowron & Friedlander, 1998). Balancing emotional and intellectual functioning refers to one’s ability to distinguish his or her feelings from his or her thoughts, and balancing intimacy and autonomy refers to one’s ability to distinguish overdependence from independence (Bowen, 1978; Kerr, 2008; Kerr & Bowen, 1988). Bowen (1978) explained many personality characteristics in terms of differentiation. For instance, highly differentiated people are capable of thoughtful consideration, connected with significant others while maintaining a separate self, able to set a more objective life course, are more flexible, more adaptable, and emotionally more independent when compared with their lower differentiated counterparts. Bowen (1978) postulated that differentiation developed in family relationships results in solid selves, and people with solid selves have reasonable expectations of what to get from self and others, clearly defined beliefs and life principles based on thoughtful process, and responsibility for self and consequences of their choices.
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As a multidimensional construct, differentiation of self has two main dimensions, namely intrapsychic and interpersonal relationships (Skowron & Friedlander, 1998). The intrapsychic dimension consists of emotional reactivity and difficulty in taking an “I” Position. When intrapsychic differentiation occurs, the individual does not impulsively act out strong feelings, but rather reflects on these feelings, and this helps the individual free himself or herself from replicating the problematic, emotionally driven interaction patterns from the family of origin (Carr, 2006). The interpersonal dimension consists of fusion and emotional cut off. When interpersonal differentiation occurs, the individual can better develop person-to-person relationships and regulate the emotional distancing with others.

Although Bowen’s Family Systems Theory has received much attention from both clinicians and researchers, there have been few attempts to test its constructs’ validity by developing sound measures to assess them, especially differentiation of self (Anderson & Sabatelli, 1992; Haber, 2003; Licht & Chabot, 2006). As discussed by Schnarch and Regas (2012), many of these scales measured only one component of differentiation rather than a broader evaluation. Skowron and Friedlander (1998) developed the differentiation of self inventory (DSI) to fill this gap. In line with Bowen’s theory, they used four dimensions of differentiation as the subscales of their scale: Emotional Reactivity (ER), Taking an “I” Position (IP), Emotional Cutoff (EC), and Fusion with Others (FO). This was a 43-item self-report measure focusing on adults, their significant relationships, and current relations with family of origin. Skowron and Friedlander (1998) reported moderate to high internal consistency with values of coefficient alpha range from .74 to .85 for the four subscales, and .88 for the total score. After examining the studies that used DSI and realizing that the FO subscale consistently demonstrated lower reliability estimates (ranging from .57 to .74), Skowron and Schmitt (2003) further revised the DSI Fusion subscale to strengthen its reliability and construct-related validity. The revised scale (DSI-R) contained 46 items with the same subscales. Internal consistency reliability coefficients were higher in this form ranging from .81 to .89 for the four subscales and .92 for the total score. The DSI-R can also be used as a clinical instrument for evaluating psychotherapeutic progress and outcomes from a systemic perspective (Knauth & Skowron, 2004; Skowron & Friedlander, 1998). Determining and working with the most differentiated member of the family would indirectly facilitate the change of the other members and the system as a whole (Skowron & Friedlander, 1998). Further, by examining subscales of DSI, practitioners would better identify which factors of differentiation seem more problematic and design therapy sessions to strengthen these components. For instance, if the client’s score were low on fusion dimension, the therapist would apply an individual, insight-oriented approach, whereas if client’s I-Position score were low, the therapist would apply interpersonal, experiential interventions (Murray, Daniels, & Murray, 2006; Peleg, 2002; Skowron & Friedlander, 1998).

There is also an extensive body of supporting validity data, including relationships between the DSI scales and other psychological constructs. Greater differentiation of self is associated with lower levels of psychological distress (Kim-Appel, Appel, Newman, & Parr, 2007; Murdock & Gore, 2004; Skowron, Stanley, & Shapiro, 2009) and depression (Hooper & DePuy, 2010; Hooper & Doehler, 2011), and higher levels of marital satisfaction (Peleg, 2008; Skowron, 2000), relationship satisfaction (Lal & Bartle-Haring, 2011), and psychological adjustment (Skowron, 2004; Skowron, Wester, & Azen, 2004).

Despite the vast amount of research on the concept of differentiation of self, researchers called for further investigations of it across other United States racial/ethnic groups and non-English-speaking countries (Skowron & Friedlander, 1998; Skowron et al., in press). They stated that even though Bowen’s concept of differentiation has universal aspects, more research is needed to better understand it within the context of different cultures (i.e., collectivistic vs. individualistic) and worldviews. They also suggested cross-validation of DSI since results of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis may have differed with different samples. Besides, Seponski, Bermudez, and Lewis (2013) argued that developing culturally appropriate measures and instruments that meet the needs of the unique population is a prerequisite of creating culturally responsive family therapy models and research. Therefore, the current study would have also an important contribution for the family therapy research and applications in Turkey and countries sharing similar cultural patterns with Turkey.
Cultural patterns lead individuals and their families to attaching different meanings to life events (Triandis, 1995). Therefore, it is not surprising that they value different things and shape different self-concepts (Oyserman & Lee, 2008). When talking about culture, individualism and collectivism come out as two main components differing cultures (Hofstede, 1980; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1997; Triandis, 1995, 2007). People in individualistic cultures value more on independence and autonomy, whereas people in collectivistic cultures value more on interdependence and intimacy (Skowron, 2004; Triandis, 1995). Chung and Gale’s (2006) cross-cultural study supports this notion that undergraduate students from collectivistic Korean culture scored significantly lower than students from European American culture on each subscale of DSI-R. In another study, however, an inconsistent result was found by Tuason and Friedlander (2000) that Philippine and the U.S. samples did not differ significantly on their overall differentiation of self scores. Thus, further evidence is needed for the assertion that differentiation levels differ with respect to various cultural characteristics.

The current study is conducted with adults from Turkey, which has traditionally been regarded as a “constructivist” culture (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996a). The family model in collectivistic cultures is represented by emotional and economic interdependence between generations, whereas the individualistic family model is based on the emotional and economic independence of the individual (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005). With the effect of urbanization and economic development, Turkey is in a transition period in which it demonstrates both characteristics of collectivist and individualistic cultures and their family models (Hortaçsu, 2003; Imamoğlu & Imamoğlu, 1992; Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005; Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Specifically, families value interdependence in emotional aspects and independence in economic aspects (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996b, 2005). The distinction is commonly determined by socioeconomic status that the more individuals’ socioeconomic status increases, the more they demonstrate the culture and family models of individualistic societies (Imamoğlu & Karakitapoglu-Aygün, 2004, 2006, 2007).

The DSI-R appears to be a reliable and valid measure when applied with American populations. However, few published studies have been conducted with diverse samples outside the United States (US). In one exception, Chung and Gale (2006) studied cultural differences in differentiation of self between European American and Korean students. The results of this study demonstrated that internal consistency levels were adequate to strong with values of ER = 0.68, IP = 0.68, EC = 0.63, FO = 0.69, and .85 for the full scale. In Hebrew versions of DSI (Peleg, 2002) and DSI-R (Peleg, 2008), these values were ER = 0.77, IP = 0.66, EC = 0.72, FO = 0.55, and DSI full scale = 0.76; and ER = 0.89, IP = 0.67, EC = 0.78, FO = 0.75, and DSI-R full scale = 0.80, respectively. As no evidence exists regarding the use of the DSI-R scale and its subscales within a Turkish sample, a study on its validity and reliability on a Turkish population is clearly called for. Responding to the call for further investigations of the Bowenian construct of differentiation of self across other United States racial/ethnic groups and non-English-speaking countries (Skowron & Friedlander, 1998; Skowron et al., in press), the purpose of the present study was twofold: (a) to explore the factor structure of the DSI-R in a Turkish adult sample, (b) to cross-validate the structure of this model and further examine the other psychometric properties of the DSI-R with an independent sample of Turkish adults.

METHOD

Participants
Two independent samples of adults over the age of 25 were used. Sample 1 served as the calibration sample for the first objective of the study, which was to explore the most appropriate structure of the DSI-R. This sample consisted of 221 adults who were the parents of psychological counseling and guidance students. Of them, 119 (54%) were women and 95 (43%) were men (seven sex unspecified). Their ages ranged from 42 to 65, with a mean age of 48.56 (SD = 8.68). Sample 2 served as the validation sample and contained 187 adults including psychological counselors, psychologists, social workers, and nurses who participated in a family counseling training program. Of them, 109 (58%) were women and 78 (42%) were men. Their ages ranged from 25 to 56, with a mean age of 37.48 (SD = 9.23).
Procedure

Participants in Sample 1 were contacted via their children. During the class time, the first author of the study gave brief information about the study and distributed packets of research instruments to the students. Packets included written/verbal consent instructions and written information about the privacy policy which was for their parents not to share their answers with their partners. Participants completed them separately at home, and students returned materials in two separate sealed envelopes to the researchers. For the Sample 2, data were collected during class time by two researchers. After listening to a description of the study, trainees were provided written/verbal consent instructions. Volunteers who agreed to participate were given and completed the research instruments. All participants were informed that their responses would be kept anonymous and only group data would be reported. No incentives were offered to the participants in both samples for their participation in the study.

Data Analysis

All preliminary analyses, Pearson’s correlations, and exploratory factor analyses were conducted with SPSS version (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) 15 for Windows. Confirmatory factor analyses with maximum likelihood (ML) estimation and fit statistics were carried out with AMOS 16.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Measures

**Differentiation of Self Inventory-revised (DSI-R; Skowron & Friedlander, 1998; Skowron & Schmitt, 2003).** The DSI-R is a 46-item self-report measure of Bowen’s concept of differentiation of self (DSI-R; Skowron & Friedlander, 1998; Skowron & Schmitt, 2003). Ratings are made on a six-point scale from *Not at all true of me* (1) to *Very true of me* (6). It contains four subscales: Emotional Reactivity (ER), “I” Position (IP), Emotional Cutoff (EC), and Fusion with Others (FO). The 11-item ER assess the degree to which a person responds to environmental stimuli on the basis of emotional flooding, emotional lability, or hypersensitivity. A sample item includes “People have remarked that I’m overly emotional.” The 11-item IP assess a clearly defined sense of self and the ability to thoughtfully adhere to one’s convictions even when pressured to do otherwise. A sample item includes “I usually do what I believe is right regardless of what others say.” The 12-item EC assess the feeling threatened by intimacy in relationships with others and fears of engulfment and behavioral defenses like overfunctioning, distancing, or denial. A sample item includes “I have difficulty expressing my feelings to people I care for.” The 12-item FO assess emotional overinvolvement with others, heavy reliance on others in decision making, and overidentification with parents which is taking in parental values, beliefs, and expectations without question. A sample item includes “I want to live up to my parents’ expectations of me.” Scores are calculated by reversing scores on the reversed items, then summing individual items comprising each scale and dividing by the number of items on each scale, so that higher scores reflect greater differentiation of self for the total DSI-R; less ER, EC, and FO, and greater ability to take an “I” Position. Internal consistency reliability was high with values of coefficient alpha range from .81 to .89 for the four subscales and .92 for the total score. The concurrent validity was supported by a positive correlation with marital satisfaction (Skowron, 2000) and a negative correlation with trait anxiety (Skowron & Friedlander, 1998) for the full DSI-R and its four subscales.

The DSI-R was translated by the two authors who are native Turkish speakers and also fluent in English. The translated versions were then back-translated independently by two professional translators from Mevlana University. The back-translated versions were compared with the original version for meaning accuracy by an English native speaker on the faculty of Mevlana University and finally by the first author of the original version of DSI (Dr. Elizabeth Skowron), and the meanings of several words were clarified and reworded.

**Trait Anxiety Inventory (TAI; Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983).** The TAI is a 20-item self-report measure of stable trait anxiety. Ratings are made on a four-point scale from *Almost never* (1) to *Almost always* (4) (TAI; Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983). Sample items include “I have trouble making up my mind” and “I worry too much.” The range of possible score varies from a minimum score of 20 to a maximum score of 80, higher scores reflecting greater trait anxiety. The median alpha reliability coefficient was .90, and test–retest reli-
ability coefficients over intervals of 20 to 104 days were high ranging from .73 to .86. The concurrent validity of the scale was supported by the positive correlation with Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. This study administered a Turkish version of the TAI (Öner & LeCompte, 1985). The adapted TAI had an alpha coefficient between .83 and .92 with different samples, and test–retest coefficient was .86. The concurrent validity was supported by the positive correlations with other anxiety scales ranging from $r = .58$ to $r = .84$.

RESULTS

Prior to analysis, all study variables were examined for accuracy of data entry, assumptions of normal distribution and multivariate analysis for both samples. Skewness and kurtosis values ranged from $-0.74$ to $1.18$ and $-0.92$ to $1.22$, respectively, suggesting that the items conform to the assumptions of multivariate analyses. Scale means and standard deviations for each of the four subscales of DSI-T and DSI-T total scale are presented for both samples in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, Sample 1 had a mean score of 3.66 and Sample 2 had a mean score of 3.89 on the overall DSI. For both samples, Emotional Reactivity had the lowest ($M = 2.89$, $M = 3.23$, respectively) and Taking “I” Position had the highest ($M = 4.08$, $M = 4.26$, respectively) mean score.

Structural Validity

To test the stability of the original factor structure of the four-factor DSI-R (Skowron & Schmitt, 2003), a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using AMOS 16.00 software. As a combined rule for the acceptance of the model, five measures of fit indices were used with the following values: the chi-square/degrees of freedom (df) ratio $>3$, the goodness-of-fit-index (GFI), adjusted goodness-of-fit-index (AGFI), and the comparative-fit index (CFI) $>.90$, and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) $<.08$ (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The model indices were as follows: $\chi^2/df = 1.73$, GFI = .85, AGFI = .81, CFI = .79, RMSEA = .07, suggesting an unacceptable fit of the model to the data.

Concluding that 46-item DSI-R did not fit the data obtained from Turkish sample, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to further explore the factor structure of the 46-item DSI-R that better represented the sample data. The adequacy of the data for factor analysis was supported by a Kaiser’s measure of sampling adequacy value of .77. Following Skowron and Schmitt’s (2003) suggestion, a principal component factor analysis with oblique rotation was first conducted. Seven factors had eigenvalues greater than one, which accounted for 40.9% of the variance. Sixteen items had dual or triple loadings $>.30$, and four items were found to have poor loadings $<.30$. Remaining items loaded on their respective factors consistent with the theory. Examination of the scree plot demonstrated a substantial break after four factors, which accounted for 32.6% of the variance. These items were deleted, and an EFA was repeated with remaining items with four-factor solution as suggested in the theory. The most appropriate solution suggested a 26-item four-factor model. The total variance explained by the four factors was 50.4%. Factor 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of the DSI-T for Samples 1 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DSI-R</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sample 1 (n = 221)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional reactivity</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I” position</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional cutoff</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion with others</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Potential range for the total DSI-R and subscales: 1–6.*
(ER) consisted of items 6, 21, 26, 30, 34, 38, and 40, which explained 19.4% of the variance. Factor 2 (IP) contained items 7, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31, and 41, which explained 13.9% of the variance. Factor 3 (EC) included items 2, 3, 8, 16, 20, 32, and 36, which explained 9.5% of the variance. Factor 4 (FO) included items 9, 17, 22, 33, and 45, which explained 7.6% of the variance (see Table 2).

Based on the results of the EFA, the four-factor model with 26 items was tested subsequently using CFA with maximum likelihood method for the generalizability and validation of the model. The results of CFA demonstrated that the model did not adequately describe the data ($\chi^2/df = 1.52$, GFI = .89, AGFI = .86, CFI = .84, RMSEA = .05). Thus, items having large modification indexes, poor parameter estimates <.40, and large standardized residuals were identified and deleted to examine the changes. Based on the combined information offered by modification indexes, parameter estimates, and standardized residuals, six items were dropped, and a respecified 20-item with the same four-factor model was tested. The results indicated a good fit of the four-factor structure of the 20-item DSI-T to the data with values of $\chi^2/df = 1.65$, GFI = .93, AGFI = .91, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .04. Parameter estimates ranged from .41 to .89. Intercorrela-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1: Emotional reactivity</th>
<th>Factor 2: “I” position</th>
<th>Factor 3: Emotional cutoff</th>
<th>Factor 4: Fusion with Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>Q22 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>Q5 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Q45 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>Q9 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Q33 -0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

*Exploratory Factor Analyses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Numbers in bold are the highest item-factor-loading values.
tions among the four subscales of the DSI-T were small to moderate ranging from .14 to .43 (see Figure 1).

Convergent Validity
To provide additional evidence for the validity of the DSI-T, correlational analyses were conducted to test for the associations between each of the subscales, the total DSI-T and trait anxiety as measured by trait anxiety inventory. As expected, DSI-T total score associated negatively with trait anxiety ($r = -0.64$, $p < .001$). Each subscales of DSI-T were also negatively associated with trait anxiety (ER: $r = -0.57$; IP: $r = -0.32$; EC: $r = -0.33$, and FO: $r = -0.56$, $p < .001$ for all).

Demographic Comparisons
To provide evidence for criterion-related validity of the DSI-T, we reported differences in terms of sex, age, and income. Following previous research suggesting that sex and age differences may exist among subscales of differentiation of self (Skowron, 2000; Skowron & Friedlander, 1998; Skowron & Schmitt, 2003), further analyses were conducted to compare the DSI-T and the original DSI as related to the demographic characteristics of sex, age, and income. The results of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) revealed statistically significant sex differences on the ER, $F(1, 185) = 29.15$, $p < .001$; IP, $F(1, 185) = 6.34$, $p < .001$; and FO, $F(1, 185) = 15.79$, $p < .001$; subscales, whereas no differences were seen on the EC subscale $F(1, 185) = .13$, $p > .05$. Specifically, women were emotionally more reactive ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 0.79$), experienced more difficulty in taking “I” Position in their relationships ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 0.77$), were emotionally more overinvolved with significant others ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.73$) when compared with men (ER:

Figure 1. Factor structure and parameter estimates of the DSI-T.
Internal Consistency and Test–Retest Reliability

Internal consistency reliabilities calculated using Cronbach’s alpha were adequate to strong for the subscales and total scale: DSI-T total scale = 0.81, ER = 0.78, IP = 0.75, EC = 0.77, FO = 0.74.

To estimate the temporal stability of the DSI-T, test–retest reliability was evaluated using Pearson’s product–moment correlation. A test–retest correlation was calculated between the mean scores of DSI-T taken from the data of the 63 participants drawn randomly from Sample 2 who completed the scale twice in an interval of 5 weeks during class time. The coefficient value was $r = 0.74$, suggesting that the temporal stability was satisfactory.

DISCUSSION

The current study sought to expand the literature on differentiation of self by examining validity and reliability of DSI-R, which is a sound measure to use for both clinical and research purposes, in two independent Turkish samples. On one hand, the results of the study supported the four-factor structure and other psychometric properties of the Turkish version of DSI-R, and they were mostly comparable with the properties of the original English version. On the other hand, CFA with the original DSI-R yielded an unacceptable fit to the data even though some indices were high. Thus, a series of EFA on the calibration sample and subsequently CFA on a cross-validation sample were conducted. Consistent with the four-factor model of the original DSI-R (Skowron & Friedlander, 1998; Skowron & Schmitt, 2003), results yielded a revised 20-item four-factor model fit the data well. This model was partially supported by Drake’s (2011) work on the psychometric properties of a shortened 20-item version of DSI-R. His results indicated that shortened version of DSI-R had high alpha and test–retest reliability, structural and convergent validity suggesting that short form of DSI-R is a more efficient scale that still retained good psychometric properties. Many items of the DSI-T were the same with the DSI-R shorter version. Specifically, among the items of the original DSI-R, three items from ER (Items 21, 26, 34), two items from IP (Items 19 and 23), two items from EC (Items 8 and 16), and three items from FO (Items 5, 17, 33), subscales remained the same as those in Drake’s 20-item DSI-R. One possible explanation for the items that did not match with the original and shorter versions of DSI-R which had to be deleted might relate to cultural differences. For instance, item 18 (“At times I feel as if I’m riding an emotional roller–coaster”) contains the word “roller–coaster.” This word seems very familiar to American culture; however, it is confusing in Turkish culture because there are very few roller–coasters, and only in large cities of Turkey. Although these meaning discrepancies were taken into consideration during the translation process, some items did not work well with the current sample.

All the subsequent analyses were conducted on the respecified model. Means for the subscales and the total of the DSI-T (ER = 3.23, IP = 4.27, EC = 4.19, FO = 3.84, DSI = 3.89) were very similar to those obtained from the English versions (e.g., Skowron & Friedlander, 1998; ER = 3.37, IP = 4.08, EC = 4.53, FO = 2.92, DSI = 3.74; Skowron & Schmitt, 2003; ER = 3.15, IP = 4.07, EC = 4.34, FO = 3.84, DSI = 3.86). In a Philippine sample, participants had approximately the same overall level of differentiation of self (Tuason & Friedlander, 2000). One possible explanation for the similar results with U.S. samples might be that Turkey demonstrates both collectivistic and individualistic cultural characteristics as stressed earlier. These consistent results can be regarded as evidence of external validity of the DSI-T, suggesting that DSI-T and its subscales are indeed reflective of differentiation of self.

In line with Skowron and Friedlander’s findings (1998), the convergent validity of the DSI-T was supported by a high correlation between the DSI-T and the TAI. To provide further evidence for the criterion-related validity of the DSI-T, potential differences of sex, age, and income level were determined, which was suggested by previous research. These results were also consistent (Skowron & Dendy, 2004; Skowron & Schmitt, 2003) that women were emotionally more reactive, experienced more difficulty in taking “I” Position in their relationships, and emotionally more overinvolved with significant others when compared with men. In terms of age and income level, in line with Skowron and Schmitt’s (2003) findings, no significant differences were detected.
Both results related to the reliability were satisfactory. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was high for the total scale and moderate for the subscales. These results were consistent with previous studies conducted on non-English-speaking countries (e.g., Chung & Gale, 2006; Peleg, 2002, 2008) but lower than those conducted on US samples (e.g., Skowron & Friedlander, 1998; Skowron & Schmitt, 2003). Test–retest reliability in a 5-week interval was also satisfactory suggesting that the temporal stability of the DSI-T was good.

One potential limitation of the current study was that both samples used in the study were of middle and higher socioeconomic status. As the cultural characteristics of the groups might vary in terms of economic status, further research should include participants of lower socioeconomic status and compare these groups on differentiation of self scores. Another limitation was that participants studied were drawn from a convenient sample of adults, but further studies should be conducted for the applicability of the DSI-T to adolescent or undergraduate populations.

Overall, the DSI-T appears to be a valid and reliable instrument that could be used for understanding Turkish adults’ level of differentiation self. A shorter version that still retains good psychometric properties can be an advantage. However, continuing evaluation of the applicability of the DSI-R to Turkish and other non-Western cultures is necessary to extend its generalizability and provide more empirical evidence for its structural validity.
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APPENDIX
DSI-T: BENLİĞİN AYRIMLAŞMASı ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda kendinize ve başkalarıyla olan ilişkilerinize yönelik düşünce ve duygularınızı içeren ifadeler yer almaktadır. Sizden istenen her bir ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyarak 1'den 6'ya kadar olan seçeneklerden sizi en iyi ifade eden seçeneği işaretlemenizidir. Eğer herhangi bir madde sizinle direk ilgili gözümüyorsa (örn., şu anda bir eşinizi/partnerinizi yoksa), olması halinde nasal düşünüp nasal davranıbileceğiniz ilgili en iyi tahmininizi belirtiniz. İçten yanıtlarınız için teşekkürler.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HİÇ UYGUN</th>
<th>ÇOK UYGUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEĞİL</td>
<td>DEĞİL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ailemin yanındanken genellikle kendimi kısıtlanmış hissediyorum. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Önemli bir işe ya da görevde başkalarının cesaretlendirmesine ihtiyacı duyarım. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. İnsanlar benimle yakınlk kurdurmakta, kendimi onlardan uzak tutarım. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. İnsanlar benimle yakınlk kurdurmakta, bundan genellikle rahatsızlık duyarım. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Hemen hemen hayatımın herkesi, onay alma ihtiyacı duyarım. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Değişiremeyeceğim şeyler için üzülmenin bir anlamı yok. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Yakın ilişkilerimde kısıtlama kaygısı yasayım. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Eleştirilmek beni oldukça rahatsız eder. 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Anne/babamın beklentisi, düşüncelere göre yaşamaya ترامبım. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Kendimi olduğu gibi kabul ederim. 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Eşi/aile, partnerimle bir tartışma yaşarsam, tüm gün bu tartışma üzerine düşünürüm. 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. Başkaları tarafindan bazı altıda olduğuumu hissettim zamanlarda bile onlara “hayır” diyebilirim. 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. Yaptığım şeyin doğru olduğunu düşünüyorsam, başkalarının ne dediğini pek de umursamam. 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. Bir karar alırken damıçağıştım biriyle yoksa kolay kolay karar veremem. 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. Başkaları tarafından incitilmen beni aşırı derecede rahatsız eder. 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. Eşi/aile, partnerimle yoğun ilgi beni bunaltır. 1 2 3 4 5 6
17. İnsanlar üzerindeki izlenimini merak ederim. 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. Duygularımı genellikle çevremekleden daha yoğun yaşamış yasayım. 1 2 3 4 5 6
19. Hayatında ne olursa olsun, kendimle ilgili düşüncelerimden asla taviz vermem. 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. Anne/babamın fikrini almadan karar veremem. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Puanlama: (Altı çizili maddeler tersten hesaplanacaktır)
Duygusal tepkisilik: 8, 11, 15, 17, 18
“Ben” pozisyonu: 6, 10, 12, 13, 19
Duygusal kopma: 1, 3, 4, 7, 16
Başkalarına bağmlılık: 2, 5, 9, 14, 20

Değerlendirme: Ters çevrime işleminden sonra 20 maddenin toplamı “Toplam Benliğin Ayrımlaşması” puanını, alt ölçelerin toplami ise her bir alt ölçeğin benliğinin ayrımlaşması puanını vermektedir. Puanın yüksekliği, benliğin ayrımlaşma düzeyinin yüksekliğini ifade etmektedir.