

Investigation of Psychometric Properties of the Turkish Version of the Transcultural Community Resilience Scale

Osman Hatun^a, Gülşen Topal Özgen^b

^a Sinop University

^b Ministry of National Education

ABSTRACT

In recent years, there has been a growing public, political, and academic interest in the concept of community resilience to better understand and enhance community development in the face of natural disasters, epidemics, economic crises, and other challenges. The importance of community resilience has become even more critical, especially after the earthquake disaster that occurred in Turkey on February 6, 2023, affecting 10 provinces and resulting in the death and injury of thousands of people. This study aims to investigate the psychometric properties of the Turkish Transcultural Community Resilience Scale (TCRS) in Turkish adult samples. The study participants consisted of 405 (76% female) adults aged between 18 and 58 ($X^2 = 27.44$, $ss = 10.12$). The data were collected through the Turkish versions of the TCRS, the Brief Psychological Resilience Scale, and the Patient Health Questionnaire-4. The psychometric properties of the Turkish TCRS were analyzed by using confirmatory factor, reliability, and correlation analysis. Based on confirmatory factor analysis, the 28-item, three-factor structure of the scale had acceptable goodness-of-fit values in the Turkish participant group. Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega reliability coefficients for the total score of the scale were high. The reliability coefficients were good in terms of community strengths and support, community trust and faith, and community values subscales. Correlation analysis revealed that TCRS had a positive relationship with psychological resilience scores, and a negative relationship with anxiety and depression scores. In conclusion, the TCRS has a similar factor structure to the original form, acceptable fit indices, and high reliability coefficients.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 6 July 2022

Revised 23 August 2022

Accepted 8 September 2022

KEYWORDS

Community resilience
• Individual resilience •
Depression • Anxiety • Validity
and reliability

The processes affecting the world and 21st century societies involve many shocking ecological, political, geopolitical, economic, and social crises and stresses. With the fast and frequent occurrence of, and intense disturbance of communities by these crises, it can be said that this century is the age of increasing uncertainties and chronic problems that we cannot avoid (Altay-Kaya, 2021). Earthquakes with intensity of 7.7 and 7.6 affecting 10 provinces of Turkey on February 6, 2023 caused thousands of deaths and injuries, unemployment, and psychological, social and economic crises. The psychological resilience of the society can support coping in these situations of crisis that deeply affect the society. Social resilience is a feature that enables communities to survive despite these problems. Over the last 25 years, the

social, political, and academic interest in the concept of social resilience has led to its study under an umbrella of disciplines from psychology to ecology (Plodinec, 2013).

A community is a shared entity with a common geographical boundaries and destiny (Norris et al., 2008). It is a group of people who live (or do not live) in the same district, village, or neighborhood; share a similar culture, habits, and resources; and are exposed to the same threats and risks, such as diseases, political and economic problems, and natural disasters (IFRC, 2018). It is assumed that resilient communities are stronger in coping with such situations that threaten their existence. However, in the literature, definitions of community resilience vary according to context and purpose (Lind-

CORRESPONDANCE TO: Gülşen Topal Özgen, Ministry of National Education, Türkiye. Email: gulsen.topal.41@gmail.com ORCID: 0000-0001-7010-3644

To cite this article: Hatun, O., & Topal Özgen, G. (2022). Investigation of psychometric properties of the Turkish version of the Transcultural Community Resilience Scale. *TRC Journal of Humanitarian Action*, 1, 97-107. <https://doi.org/10.55280/trcjha.2022.1.3.0009>

berg & Swearingen, 2020). It can be considered as a quality (e.g., ability or capacity), a process, and/or an outcome associated with successfully adapting to and recovering from difficulties (Pfefferbaum et al., 2013).

The concept of “*resilience*” (described in Turkish as robustness, durability, endurance, flexibility, or tirelessness) is the ability of any system to respond to unexpected crises or prolonged stresses without losing its integrity, and to adapt to changing conditions due to these factors by improving and renewing itself (Altay-Kaya, 2021). On the other hand, *community resilience* is the capacity of a community to cope with a crisis and grow while maintaining the quality of life, the core values, and the identity of its members (Berger, 2017). The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2018) defines resilience as “the ability of individuals, communities, organizations, or countries exposed to disasters and crises and underlying vulnerabilities to anticipate, reduce the impact of, cope with, and recover from the effects of adversity without compromising their long-term prospects.”

In addition to definitions that consider community resilience as a capability that protects the community in difficult situations, some consider it as part of the process of the existence of communities. In this context, community resilience is considered a process in which intermediary structures such as school, family, and peer groups soften the impact of oppressive situations and systems (Sonn & Fisher, 1998). This process adds a set of adaptive capacities to a positive trajectory of functioning after a disturbance (Norris et al., 2008).

Looking at the definitions, two features of community resilience stand out: first is the ability of communities to cope with external stresses and disturbances as a result of social, political, and environmental changes; and second is the existence and engagement of community resources for sustainable development in an unpredictable environment (Lindberg & Swearingen, 2020; Plodinec, 2013). These definitions suggest that community resilience is a collection of capabilities and processes. There is debate on whether the resilience of the individuals who make up the community reflects community resilience (Norris et al., 2008). Community resilience is different from individual resilience, which is derived from people who experience adverse events. Certainly, communities are aggregates of separately existing individuals. Therefore, the resilience of a community, however it is defined, must be in terms of individual resilience (Eachus, 2014). Additionally, community resilience requires “collective action” (Pfefferbaum et al., 2013), and much like individual resilience, involves attitudes, thoughts, beliefs, behaviors, and resources. Resilience is a dynamic process that needs to be maintained over time to facilitate healthy adaptation (Pfefferbaum et al., 2013). Resilience-enhancing resources can be acquired, and skills can be taught, developed, and practiced at individual and community levels. Notably, there has been an increase in programs by government, industrial, and civil society organizations to support community resilience against crises (Patel et al., 2017).

How we define community resilience affects how we try to measure and improve it (Patel et al., 2017). Thus, it is necessary to operationalize the concept to be used in measurement. Many authors agree that the difficulties of measuring community resilience are due to the limitations of the measurement scales (Kulig et al., 2013; Plodinec, 2013). One limitation is that a scale is developed from only one community, making its generalizability to other communities questionable. Another is that perceived community resilience relates to a particular moment in time, rather than an independent construct that is stagnant over time. This makes the objectivity of the scales controversial (Kulig et al., 2013). Despite problems in generalizability, measurement scales are important for clarifying this concept and providing more objective indicators. Moreover, most individual and community mental health studies agree on the positive role of the social environment and community resources (Arslan, 2018; Yalçın, 2015). Although scales measuring community resilience were developed in non-English languages, none were done in Turkish. Moreover, research in Turkish communities is lacking, with only one qualitative study on the perceived community resilience of victims of the Van earthquake (İkizer et al., 2016). Also, the psycho-social and economic damage of the earthquake that took place in Turkey on February 6 still continues to affect the whole society. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to examine the psychometric properties of the TCRS adapted to Turkish.

Method

Participants and Procedure

The study participants consisted of 405 Turkish adults aged between 18 and 58 ($\bar{x} = 27.44$, $sd = 10.12$). 311 (76.79%) of the participants were female and 94 (23.21%) were male. Of the participants, 43 (10.62%) were primary school graduates, 216 (53.33%) were high school graduates and 146 (36.05%) were university graduates. In terms of marital

status, 269 (66.42%) of the participants stated that they were single, 124 (30.62%) were married and 12 (2.96%) were divorced. In terms of socio-economic level, 43 (10.62%) of the participants declared that they had low income, 339 (83.70%) had average income and 23 (5.68%) had high income (Table 1).

Table 1.

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Variables	Group	f	%
Gender	Female	311	76.79
	Male	94	23.21
Educational Status	Primary School	43	10.62
	High-School	216	53.33
	University	146	36.05
Marital Status	Single	269	66.42
	Married	124	30.62
	Divorced	12	2.96
Socio-Economic Status	Low	43	10.62
	Average	339	83.70
	High	23	5.68

Before starting to collect data, necessary permissions from the author of TCRS were obtained to adapt the tool into Turkish. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Scientific Research and Ethical Review Board of Kırklareli University. The TCRS was translated into Turkish by five faculty members who have a good command of English. Then, two academics from the field of educational sciences determined the most accurate and comprehensible translation of each item. To test the comprehensibility of the translated items, a pilot study was conducted before deciding the final version.

Data were collected through Google Forms. The link to the data collection form was shared on the social media accounts of the researchers. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. The informed consent contained information such as the purpose of the study, that personal information shall remain confidential, that the data shall be used only within the scope of the study, that the participants can terminate the study at any time, and that voluntariness is required for participation in the study. The research was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Measures

Turkish Transcultural Community Resilience Scale (TCRS)

The original TCRS developed by Cénat et al. (2021) consists of 28 items and three subscales, namely the *community strengths and support* subscale consists of 14 items, the *community trust and faith* subscale with five items, and the *community values* subscale with nine items. The scale is scored according to a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree), and the total score ranges from 28 and 140. The Cronbach's α internal consistency coefficient of the scale was 0.96 for the total score, 0.95 for the *community strengths and support* subscale, 0.95 for the community trust and faith subscale, and 0.88 for the community value subscale. This total scale and each subscale showed high internal consistency and good fit indices (RMSEA = 0.042, AGFI = 0.92; IFI = 0.91, CFI = 0.96), conducted in different cultures (Cénat et al., 2021). In the present study, we translated the original TCRS into Turkish, and the internal consistency coefficients of the scale were high ($\alpha = 0.95$, $\omega = 0.95$).

Turkish Brief Resilience Scale (BRS)

The psychological resilience of the participants were measured using the Turkish version of the BRS (Doğan, 2015) originally developed by Smith et al. (2008). The scale, which consists of a single dimension and six items, is scored according to a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree). The total score that can be obtained from the scale ranges from 6 to 30. This scale has a high reliability ($\alpha = 0.83$) and good fit indices (RMSEA = 0.05, SRMR = 0.03, NFI = 0.99, CFI = 0.99, I = 0.99, RFI = 0.97, GFI = 0.99, AGFI = 0.96). In this study also, the reliability coefficients of the scale are good ($\alpha = 0.85$, $\omega = 0.84$).

Turkish Patient Health Questionnaire-4 (PHQ-4)

The PHQ-4 adapted into Turkish by Demirci and Ekşi (2018), originally developed by Kroenka et al. (2009), was used for measuring the psychological distress of the participants. The scale developed for measuring depression and anxiety symptoms briefly consists of four items using a four-point Likert scale (0 = Not at all, 3 = Nearly every day). High scores indicate a high level of psychological distress. The scale has a good fit for the one-factor model (SRMR = 0.008, RMSEA = 0.000, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00) and high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.83$) (Demirci & Ekşi, 2018). In the present study also, the reliability coefficients for the total score of the scale are high ($\alpha = 0.84$ and $\omega = 0.85$).

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics and internal consistency coefficients of the variables were calculated first. For the normality assumption, skewness, and kurtosis values of the variables were calculated. It is suggested that acceptable skewness and kurtosis values for a normal distribution should range between -1.5 and 1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted for testing the validity of the three-factor structure of the Turkish TCRS. To determine the degree of the goodness-of-fit of the model tested, the Chi-Square/Degree of Freedom (X^2/df) ratio, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Incremental Fit Index (IFI), Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) indices were examined in accordance with Kline's (2015) suggestions. RMSEA and SRMR values below 0.08, the X^2/df ratio below 3, and the CFI, TLI, and IFI values above 0.90 indicate an acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2015; Schermelleh-Engel & Moosbrugger, 2003).

Corrected item-total correlations are calculated for the item analysis of the scale. For the reliability of the scale, Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω internal consistency coefficients were calculated. Internal consistency was deemed sufficient when the internal consistency coefficients are 0.70 and above (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). For the criterion validity, Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship between the TCRS and the BRS and PHQ-4. The data were analyzed by using IBM SPSS (IBM Corp., 2016) and Jamovi (The Jamovi Project, 2020) software.

Findings

The psychometric properties of the TCRS are presented below.

Factor Structure

The factor structure and factor loadings of the scale are presented in Table No 2. The fit indices of the 28-item and three-factor measurement model in the original form were at the borderline, but the TLI value was low ($\chi^2 = 1024.27$, $df = 347$, $\chi^2/df = 2.96$, CFI = 0.90, TLI = 0.89, IFI = 0.90, SRMR = 0.053, RMSEA = 0.069 [90% CI = 0.065 - 0.074]). The modification indices of the first model were examined and some corrections were made in the measurement model according to the proposed modification indices. Modifications were made between the error variances of item 1 and item 2 in the community strengths and support subscale, and between the error variances of item 21 and item 22 in the community values subscale. When the analyses were repeated, the corrected model provided better fit values ($\chi^2 = 896.42$, $df = 345$, $\chi^2/df = 2.59$, CFI = 0.92, TLI = 0.91, IFI = 0.92, SRMR = 0.052, RMSEA = 0.063 [90% CI = 0.058 - 0.068]). The item factor loadings of the TCRS varied between 0.61 and 0.75 for the community strengths and support subscale, between 0.62 and 0.76 for the community trust and faith subscale, and between 0.59 and 0.83 for the community values subscale. The item factor loadings of the scale varied between 0.59 and 0.83 for female participants and between 0.47 and 0.90 for male participants.

Table 2.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Factor	Items	λ	θ	z-value	λ_{female}	λ_{male}
CSS	m1	.665	.049	14.760*	.652	.735
	m2	.610	.050	13.209*	.586	.726
	m3	.724	.050	16.542*	.729	.699
	m4	.750	.046	17.382*	.763	.682
	m5	.713	.050	16.199*	.710	.726
	m6	.619	.050	13.480*	.634	.567
	m7	.662	.048	14.675*	.660	.680
	m8	.643	.046	14.141*	.616	.754
	m9	.635	.051	13.903*	.644	.576
	m10	.719	.042	16.377*	.725	.681
	m11	.705	.045	15.954*	.717	.663
	m12	.749	.046	17.335*	.741	.790
	m13	.663	.049	14.705*	.664	.681
	m14	.707	.048	16.018*	.670	.901
CTF	m15	.617	.057	12.851*	.617	.627
	m16	.728	.049	15.914*	.726	.762
	m17	.719	.048	15.662*	.717	.747
	m18	.755	.048	16.745*	.736	.870
	m19	.647	.051	13.632*	.675	.474
CV	m20	.585	.046	12.555*	.593	.539
	m21	.636	.047	13.925*	.629	.673
	m22	.656	.047	14.504*	.648	.694
	m23	.710	.044	16.094*	.695	.798
	m24	.769	.044	18.022*	.771	.771
	m25	.810	.045	19.468*	.810	.823
	m26	.829	.043	20.146*	.830	.820
	m27	.768	.045	17.970*	.761	.797
	m28	.820	.044	19.831*	.822	.827

Note. CSS = Community Strength and Support, CTF = Community Trust and Faith, CV = Community Values, λ = standardized factor loadings; θ = error variance, λ_{female} = standardized factor loadings for females, λ_{male} = standardized factor loadings for males, * $p < .001$

Item Analysis and Reliability

An item analysis was conducted to determine the predictive power and discrimination of the Turkish TCRS items, presented in Table No 3. The skewness and kurtosis values of all articles of the scale ranged between -1.5 and 1.5 . The corrected item-total score correlations of the articles of the subscales ranged between 0.59 and 0.73 for the community strengths and support subscale, between 0.55 and 0.68 for the community trust and faith subscale, and between 0.57 and 0.77 for the community values subscale. The internal consistency coefficient for the total score of the scale was at a high level ($\alpha = 0.954$, $\omega = 0.954$), while the coefficients of the subscales varied between 0.82 and 0.93 .

Table 3.

Item-Total Correlations and Descriptive Statistics

Factor	α	ω	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	rit
CSS	.925	.925	m1	3.440	1.078	-0.408	-0.298	.666
			m2	3.412	1.083	-0.325	-0.532	.601
			m3	3.857	1.152	-0.734	-0.411	.696
			m4	3.756	1.066	-0.647	-0.129	.733
			m5	3.556	1.148	-0.473	-0.508	.691
			m6	3.830	1.085	-0.675	-0.256	.596
			m7	3.756	1.056	-0.461	-0.597	.641
			m8	3.741	1.022	-0.457	-0.446	.608
			m9	3.844	1.123	-0.756	-0.218	.591
			m10	3.763	0.956	-0.535	-0.159	.684
			m11	3.647	1.020	-0.515	-0.222	.665
			m12	3.751	1.074	-0.575	-0.426	.715
			m13	3.778	1.097	-0.614	-0.356	.628
			m14	4.020	1.081	-1.021	0.374	.668
CTF	.819	.818	m15	3.358	1.185	-0.264	-0.746	.547
			m16	3.973	1.075	-0.811	-0.242	.618
			m17	3.467	1.052	-0.265	-0.593	.648
			m18	3.299	1.070	-0.241	-0.462	.676
			m19	3.620	1.085	-0.439	-0.479	.571
CV	.914	.914	m20	3.454	0.983	-0.304	-0.299	.565
			m21	3.365	1.041	-0.313	-0.368	.646
			m22	3.415	1.049	-0.336	-0.376	.663
			m23	3.760	1.007	-0.631	0.041	.695
			m24	3.973	1.040	-0.849	0.042	.736
			m25	3.884	1.071	-0.751	-0.077	.746
			m26	3.933	1.050	-0.718	-0.171	.768
			m27	3.763	1.055	-0.584	-0.222	.709
			m28	3.877	1.055	-0.692	-0.174	.763

Note. CSS = Community Strength and Support, CTF = Community Trust and Faith, CV = Community Values, rit = item-total correlations, α = Cronbach's alpha, ω = McDonalds omega

Criterion Validity

The relationships between the Turkish version of TCRS, BRS, and PHQ-4 were examined (presented in Table No 4). The skewness and kurtosis values of all variables varied between -1.5 and 1.5 and the data exhibit a normal distribution. Furthermore, the reliability coefficients of TCRS, BRS and PHQ-4 were at good levels. The TCRS correlated positively with BRS ($r = 0.463$, $p < 0.001$), and negatively with the anxiety dimension ($r = -0.486$, $p < 0.001$) and depression dimension ($r = -0.490$, $p < 0.001$) of PHQ-4. Moreover, the subscales of TCRS were significantly related to the subscales of BRS and PHQ-4.

Table 4.

Descriptives and Correlations

Variables	Mean (SD)	Skew.	Kurt.	α	1	2	3	4	5	6
(1) TCRS	103.29 (19.99)	-1.01	0.71	.954	1					
(2) CSS	52.15 (10.69)	-0.93	0.53	.925	.946*	1				
(3) CTF	17.72 (4.16)	-0.47	-0.43	.819	.776*	.608*	1			
(4) CV	33.43 (7.19)	-0.81	0.31	.914	.923*	.790*	.672*	1		
(5) BRS	18.45 (5.19)	-0.05	-0.29	.843	.463*	.453*	.369*	.401*	1	
(6) Anxiety	2.81 (1.64)	0.43	-0.72	.790	-.486*	-.487*	-.398*	-.396*	-.459*	1
(7) Depression	2.85 (1.66)	0.42	-0.59	.770	-.490*	-.504*	-.418*	-.370*	-.503*	.655*

Note. TCRS = Transcultural Community Resilience Scale, CSS = Community Strength and Support, CTF = Community Trust and Faith, CV = Community Values, BRS = Brief Psychological Resilience Scale, α = Cronbach's alpha, * $p < .001$

Discussion and Recommendations

The aim of this study was to examine the psychometric properties of TCRS on Turkish adult samples. The articles of the scale were first translated from English to Turkish by five academicians and the most accurate translations were selected by two experts in educational sciences. The concept of “community” used in the original scale is more often used as “community” even though it had multiple translations such as “community, congregation, association” in Turkish. However, when the overall items of the scale were examined, it was preferred to use “community” as a concept of a “social environment” to fully meet the phenomenon to be measured. The scale was finalized after pilot applications of the translated scale. The research data were collected online through Google Forms.

Factor analysis was conducted for testing the validity of the three-dimensional structure of the TCRS. It was observed that the fit indices of the 28-item and three-factor measurement model in the original form were at the borderline, except the TLI value which was low. The modification indices of the first model were examined and some corrections were made according to the proposed modification indices. These corrections were in the error variances of item 1 and item 2 in the *community strengths and support* dimension of the scale, and between item 21 and item 22 in the *community values* dimension of the scale. When the analyses were repeated, the fit indices of the corrected model reached an adequate level (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2015; Schermelleh-Engel & Moosbrugger, 2003), and the model provided better fit values. The predictive and discriminative power of the items of the TCRS were found to be adequate. In the reliability analysis, it was found that the internal consistency coefficient for the total score of the scale was above the criteria specified by Tabachnick & Fidell (2013), meaning that it was at a high level. In this way, a reliability level parallel to the high level of internal consistency in the original form of the scale was achieved. Upon further analysis, the scale showed that the community resilience it intended to measure fits the definition of the ability to provide the necessary resources for its members. Thus, the greater the capacity of communities to help their members build their resilience, the more resilient they become.

For criterion validity analyses, the relationships of the TCRS with the BRS and the PHQ-4 were examined. The TCRS was positively correlated with the BRS and negatively correlated with anxiety and depression dimensions of the PHQ-4. In the validity studies of the original form of the scale, TCRS was positively correlated with personal resilience scores and negatively correlated with depression scores (Cénat et al., 2021). Studies in the literature revealed that psychological resilience is associated with positive emotions (Arslan, 2015) and is a predictor of well-being (Korkut-Owen et al., 2017). Similarly, in a study by Kimhi and Shamai (2004) examining the relationship between stress and community resilience, it was found that individuals with high stress exhibited lower social resilience.

In conclusion, Turkish TCRS is a valid and reliable scale measuring community resilience. This scale aims to measure community resilience, the capacity of communities to provide the necessary resources, support, and interactions to help individual members cope, rebuild, and recover from individual and collective forms of trauma.

However, some limitations of this study must be acknowledged, such as the sampling method used, the online collection of data, and the use of a cross-sectional design. In future studies, a longitudinal design would allow assessment of the test-retest reliability of Turkish TCRS. The relationship between the Turkish TCRS and variables other than psychological resilience, anxiety, and depression, such as trauma and stress can be investigated. Finally, the mediating and moderating effects of Turkish TCRS can be tested in different samples.

Ethical approval

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Kırklareli University (Date: 18.11.2022 No: E-35523585-302.99-68502).

Authors' contribution

All authors contributed equally to this manuscript.

Peer-review

Externally peer-reviewed

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Disclosure statement

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Author's ORCID numbers

Osman Hatun	0000-0001-8408-7286
Gülşen Topal Özgen	0000-0001-7010-3644

References

- Altay Kaya, D. (2021). Zorunlu göç ve dayanıklılık planlaması: Türkiye'nin Suriye zorunlu göçü deneyimi. *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, 38(2), 115–144. <https://doi.org/10.4305/METU.JFA.2021.2.2>
- Arslan, G. (2015). Çocuk ve Genç Psikolojik Sağlık Ölçeği'nin (ÇGPSÖ) psikometrik özellikleri: Geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 16(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.12984/eed.23397>
- Arslan, G. (2018). Social exclusion, social support and psychological wellbeing at school: A study of mediation and moderation effect. *Child indicators research*, 11(3), 897–918. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-017-9451-1>
- Berger, R. (2017). An ecological-systemic approach to resilience: A view from the trenches. *Traumatology*, 23(1), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.1037/trm0000074>
- Burton, C. G. (2015). A validation of metrics for community resilience to natural hazards and disasters using the recovery from Hurricane Katrina as a case study. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 105, 67–86.
- Cénat, J. M., Dalexis, R. D., Derivois, D., Hébert, M., Hajizadeh, S., Kokou-Kpolou, C. K. ... Rousseau, C. (2021). The transcultural community resilience scale: Psychometric properties and multinational validity in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.713477>
- Community & Regional Resilience Institute. (2013). *Definitions of community resilience: An analysis* (A CARRI report) <http://www.resilien-tus.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/definitions-of-community-resilience.pdf>

- Demirci, İ., & Ekşi, H. (2018). Don't bother your pretty little head otherwise you can't enjoy life. *ERPA International Congresses on Education* (28 June -1 July 2018), Istanbul / Turkey.
- Doğan, T. (2015). Adaptation of the Brief Resilience Scale into Turkish: A validity and reliability study. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 3(1), 93–102.
- Eachus, P. (2014). Community resilience: Is it greater than the sum of the parts of individual resilience? *Procedia economics and Finance*, 18, 345–351. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(14\)00949-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(14)00949-6)
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1-55.
- IBM Corp. Released. (2016). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows* (Version 24.0). Author.
- İkizer, G., Karancı, A. N., & Dogulu, C. (2016). Afetzedeler toplumsal dayanıklılığı nasıl algılıyor? 2011 Van depremleri örneği. *19. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi* (05- 07 Eylül 2016), p. 49. <https://hdl.handle.net/11511/71760>
- Kimhi, S., & Shamai, M. (2004). Community resilience and the impact of stress: Adult response to Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(4), 439- 451. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20012>
- Kline, P. (2015). *A handbook of test construction (psychology revivals): Introduction to psychometric design*, New York: Routledge.
- Korkut-Owen, F., Demirbaş-Çelik, N., & Doğan, T. (2017). Üniversite öğrencilerinde iyilik halinin yordayıcısı olarak psikolojik sağlamlık. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 16(64-Ek Sayı), 1461-1479. <https://doi.org/10.17755/esosder.300405>
- Kroenka, K., Spitzer, R. L., Williams, J. B., & Löwe, B. (2009). An ultra-brief screening scale for anxiety and depression: the PHQ-4. *Psychosomatics*, 50(6), 613-621. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psy.50.6.613>
- Kulig, J. C., Edge, D. S., Townshend, I., Lightfoot, N., & Reimer, W. (2013). Community resiliency: Emerging theoretical insights. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(6), 758-775. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1002/jcop.21569>
- Lindberg, K., & Swearingen, T. (2020). A reflective thrive-oriented community resilience scale. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 65(3-4), 467-478. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12416>
- Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(1), 127-150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9156-6>
- Patel, S. S., Rogers, M. B., Amlôt, R., & Rubin, G. J. (2017). What do we mean by 'community resilience'? A systematic literature review of how it is defined in the literature. *PLoS currents*, 9. [10.1371/currents.dis.db775aff25efc5ac4f0660ad9c9f7db2](https://doi.org/10.1371/currents.dis.db775aff25efc5ac4f0660ad9c9f7db2)
- Pfefferbaum, R. L., Neas, B. R., Pfefferbaum, B., Norris, F. H., & Van Horn, R. L. (2013). The Communities Advancing Resilience Toolkit (CART): development of a survey instrument to assess community resilience. *International journal of emergency mental health*, 15(1), 15-29. [10.1097/PHH.0b013e318268aed8](https://doi.org/10.1097/PHH.0b013e318268aed8)
- Plodinec, M. J. (2013). Definitions of community resilience: an analysis. *Community & Regional Resilience Institute* <https://s31207.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Definitions-of-community-resilience.pdf>
- Schermelleh-Engel, K. & Moosbrugger, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23- 74.
- Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The Brief Resilience Scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioural Medicine*, 15(3), 194–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070550080 2222972>

Sonn, C., & Fisher, A. (1998). Sense of community: Community resilient responses to oppression and change. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 26, 457–472. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6629\(199809\)26:5%3C457::AID-J-COP5%3E3.0.CO;2-O](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6629(199809)26:5%3C457::AID-J-COP5%3E3.0.CO;2-O)

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) (2018). IFRC Framework for Community Resilience. <https://www.ifrc.org/document/ifrc-framework-community-resilience>

The jamovi project (2020). *jamovi* (Version 1.2) [Computer Software]. <https://www.jamovi.org>

Yalçın, İ. (2015). İyi oluş ve sosyal destek arasındaki ilişkiler: türkiye’de yapılmış çalışmaların meta analizi [Relationships between well-being and social support: A meta analysis of studies conducted in Turkey]. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 26(1), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.5080/u7769>

Topluluk Psikolojik Sağlamlığı Ölçeği

Hepimiz çeşitli topluluklara farklı düzeylerde kendimizi ait hissediyoruz. Bu topluluklar kültürel veya dini gruplar, mahallemiz veya ikamet alanımız, mesleğimiz, spor takımımız veya diğerleri olabilir. Lütfen aşağıdaki soruları, kendinizi ait hissettiğiniz veya kendinizi özdeşleştirdiğiniz topluluklarla ilgili deneyimlerinizi ve algılarınızı düşünerek 1 ile 5 arasında yanıtlayınız.

1-Hiç katılmıyorum, 2- Katılmıyorum, 3-Kararsızım, 4- Katılıyorum, 5- Tamamen katılıyorum

Maddeler	1	2	3	4	5
1-Eğer bana bir şey olursa, topluluğuma (çevreme) güvenebileceğimi biliyorum.					
2- Olağanüstü bir durumda (doğal afet, savaş vb) olayla yüzleşip yaşama devam etme konusunda topluluğuma (çevreme) güvenebileceğimi bilirim.					
3- Zor zamanlar geçirdiğimde, topluluğumda (çevremde) konuşabileceğim insanlar var.					
4- Topluluğumda sürdürdüğüm ilişkiler, başıma gelen veya gelebilecek sorunlarla başa çıkma yardımcı olur.					
5- Zorluklar karşısında güçlü yanarımdan biri, topluluğumdan bir veya daha fazla kişiye güvenebileceğimi bilmektir.					
6- Topluluğumun üyeleri, sorunlar ortaya çıktığında bana güvenebileceklerini bilirler.					
7- Topluluğumda zorluk yaşayan üyelere yardım etmeye istekliyimdir.					
8- Topluluğumun faaliyetlerine katılırım.					
9- Kültürel geleneklerim, manevi, dini veya kişisel değerlerim zorluklarla baş etmeye yardımcı olur.					
10- Topluluğumun etkinlikleri, insanlarla bağ kurmaya yardımcı olur.					
11- Topluluğum bir değişiklik veya zorluk durumunda uyum sağlamama yardımcı olur.					
12- Zor durumlarda topluluğuma güvenebilmek benim için çok rahatlatıcıdır.					
13- Topluluğumda, zor zamanlarda bile her zaman gülmenin ve kafamızı dağıtmanın bir yolunu buluruz.					
14- Topluluğumda, zorluklarla karşılaştığımda somut çözümler bulmaya yardımcı edebilecek en az bir kişi vardır.					
15- Zor zamanlar geçirdiğimde, topluluğumda veya çevremde bana yardımcı olabilecek kurumlar var.					
16- Hastalanacak olursam, gerekli bakımı almak için çevremdeki sağlık kuruluşlarına başvurabileceğimi bilirim.					
17- Bölgemdeki sağlık personelinin bana yeterli bakımı sağlayacağına güvenirim.					
18- Topluluğumun sosyal hizmetlerine güvenirim.					
19- Zor durumlarda hangi kurumlara başvuracağım konusunda yeterli bilgiye sahibim.					
20- Topluluğumda karşılıklı destek konusunda önemli gelenekler var.					
21- Topluluğum, tüm üyelerini kaynaştırmak ve onları daha güçlü hale getirmek için çaba sarf eder.					
22- Topluluğum, farklı üyelerinin birbirleriyle güçlü bağlar kurmasını sağlar.					
23- Karşılıklı destek, topluluğumdaki değerlerden biridir					
24- Topluluğumda paylaşmak, çok önemli bir değerdir.					
25- Topluluğumun bir üyesi olduğum için gurur duyuyorum.					
26- Topluluğumun değerlerini benimserim.					
27- Topluluğumun faaliyetlerine katılmak benim için önemlidir.					
28- Topluluğuma ve değerlerine bağlıyım.					