

The Obstacle In Front of Living Together with Differences In Turkey: The Paranoia Culture

Mustata Koç

Sakarya University Faculty of Education Department of Educational Science

Abstract: The main aim of this research is to determine the level that the people who live in Turkey have/don't have the paranoid thinking form. There's a close relationship between having this form of thinking and the culture of living with differences. The research has been carried out by social survey method and 987 women and 906 men, 1893 people in total who live in Turkey. The data of the research is collected by SCL 90-R scale and analyzed by SPSS for Windows package. As a result of the analysis, a-The people who live in Turkey that have paranoid thinking form is found to have been higher than the ones who don't have this kind of thinking form-Women who live in Turkey have been found out to have paranoid thinking form more than men, c-It's found out that age is not a factor on having the paranoid thinking form in Turkey, d-being married or single isn't a factor on having the paranoid thinking and e-it's found out that the people whose education level are low have paranoid thinking form more.

Key words: Paranoia • Paranoid Thinking • Living Together • Culture and Differences

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary culture is economically related to the principle of individual rivalry. Insulated person has to war the other individuals of the same group, overcome and often throw them away. The psychological outcome of this situation is the widespread hostile tension between the individuals [1]. One of the outcomes of this hostile tension between the individuals is the ruin of social interaction. Although the social interaction is generally informal and it's not much emphasized, is closely related to the language which constructs it. Though we mostly don't realize, this kind of communication is an upper striving. If we can do this well, we can become very successful as social beings; the price for not doing well is loneliness and being insulated [2]. As a result of the ruin of the social communication the formation of necessary dynamics required for social life is obstructed. Social life requires sharing, cooperation, taking responsibilities and accepting others as they are. The social identities of the individuals who don't have these dynamics can't develop. Individuals, who have negative social personality, tend to decrease the negative dimensions of their belongings or memberships in some ways in order to keep or carry out their social identities [3]. Self focused attention means self consciousness that is being aware of him/her. In this context the self divides into two as the private self and the general self [4]. According to this, Bacanlı [5] special self consciousness expresses that the

directing of self's behaviors by senses, thoughts and beliefs, that's by insertive rules and by this way his/her attitudes and behaviors would be in accordance. At the end of this process, inner observation becomes a method that's turned to in the evaluation of human behavior.

While we are trying to causalize our behaviors, we use the same data loading process that we use effort other's behaviors [6]. Individual's own way of self perception and the situation that occurs when the person does the same or alike loadings to the events that s/he comes up is a "prejudice". This condition-approaching everything with suspicion- is in a way experienced as a requirement of social life and ends in the alienation of the individual to both him/herself and the society in which s/he lives. In a society whose self respect is low and whose beliefs to the customs are weak, defensive behavior and prejudice get stronger. As the people are educated and their vision of world develop, they do not get afraid of the differences between, see the common features of all people and release from prejudice [7]. Many times pride and prejudice go hand in hand. For example a man is sacked. If he wants to get rid of the thought that he's useless, the most functional way of this is to think that there's someone who may have caused this [8]. For the original development of the self, the individual should risk a conflict with the society. Unless a person learns being responsible for his/her life's/he can't become a human [9]. Being responsible for your life requires accepting and loving others as they are.

Love, includes touching somebody in his/her own world [10]. For this, an individual should succeed in living together with differences. Cultural differences add to the personality just like cultural similarities [11]. The evaluation of this situation as an advantage rather than a disadvantage is related to having positive social behavior. Positive social behavior can generally be defined as intended behaviors that aim at being useful for others [12]. Individual psychology defends that when a person loses the interest for others, he/she loses his/her own logic and understanding [13]. As a result of this lack of interest, rivalry may take an important place at the basis of interpersonal relationships. Because, the level of the ability to struggle with life is closely connected to passing over the people who are seen as rivals.

The more the person tries to compete and beat others, the less s/he would succeed in realizing his/her potential [14]. And this causes the person to behave without thinking, in accordance with the results of his/her behaviors and not to be aware of life. The way to the awareness of our behaviors passes from "knowledge", "skill" and "responsibility". If we give importance and take living like a real human seriously, we behave with this understanding of knowledge, skill and responsibility [15]. People come to an agreement with him/her and tolerate his/her environment as long as s/he knows the truths. But the one who can not achieve this, reflects the unconscious self that he doesn't like and accept and criticizes and condemns other people. While doing this s/he isn't really aware of his/her real self that s/he is watching [16]. In other words the person has become alienated to him/herself. The neurotic increase of the individual is caused by the alienation, hostility, fear and the lacking self trust [17]. The alienation of the person to him/herself is an important signal for the neurotic increase.

In cultural conditions, the first effective group of influences on neuroses is sensitive insulation, the potential hostile tension among people, distrustfulness, fear and the conditions that create a feeling of individual weakness [17]. These conditions cause the occurrence of inner conflicts that construct the psycho-dynamics of human behavior. Neurosis is ego's becoming weaker as a result of inner conflicts and extreme outer pressure and finally turning to excessive defense mechanisms [18]. Getting away from truth comes first in the problems that occur as a result of the excessive use of the defense mechanisms. By this way the person guesses how the others will react to some stimulatory according to His/her inner dynamics. However we need to know the personalities, motives, excitements and attitudes of people in order to make inferences [6]. The person becomes to

have a kind of paranoid way of thinking as a result of the prejudice to others and his/her connecting every stimulation with him/herself. The main feature of the paranoid personality disorder is to interpret other's behaviors badly and showing a continuous distrustfulness and skepticism. Such people although there's no evidence that realizes their expectation think that others will exploit, deceive and give harm to them (DSM-IV). Such kind of thinking way eliminates the functions of a person's social support systems. Social support has an important role on person's developing the skills of coming over problems and using present skills [19].

People in Turkey see the other as a rival to pass over. They see the other as a basic obstacle rather than a source to come over the obstacles. They spend their energy and time to eliminate the problems coming from the other. They have become to relate every simulative to themselves and to conclude the quality of their relations to others with "If.." questions. Think that someone has told you had done something that you hadn't. Do you need to defend yourself? The answer is definitely "yes". Because there has come up a paranoia culture in this country. The way of thinking of a person living in such a culture is first to judge than to find evidences for his decision which is the simplest way. We have become to believe everything said for others and now we become to believe the things said for us. Today, people are so willing to hear others sayings that they don't hear their own conscience and after a while they won't know their own conscience too. Living together, living by knowing and accepting the differences is first the result of how someone deals him/herself with the other. In order to come to this conclusion, the conscious related to the differences should be reconstructed. This process should first begin with the determination of the distortions in our thinking form. The first of the distortions in our thinking form is the paranoid thinking way. This thinking form is the first of the obstacles in living with differences and this culture. In this process that the differences come up evidently, this study looks for answers to what extend the people living in Turkey have this kind of point of view that can affect people's frame vision to the other.

- Does the level of having paranoid thinking form differ from women to men?
- Is the marital status (single-married) of the people living in Turkey a factor on having the paranoid thinking form?
- What kind of a relation is between the education level and having the paranoid thinking form?
- Is age a factor on having the paranoid thinking form?

MATERIALS AND METHOD

Participants: Participants are reached by the students of Niğde University Faculty of Education and who attend the study as voluntary “pollsters”. 987 women (52,1%) and 906 men (47,9) participated in the study. 312 of the participants (16,5%) are between the age of 20-25, 427 (22,6%) are between 26-30, 319 (16,9) are between 31-35, 300 (15,8) are between 36-40, 222 (11,7%) are between 41-45, 227 (12,0%) are between 46-50, and 86 (4,5%) are between the age of 51-60. The marital status of the participants are studied in two categories and divisions are done by taking this into consideration. To this, the 1016 (53,7%) of the participants are married and 877 (46,3%) are single. The education level of the participants are taken in five categories as; “illiterate”, “elementary school graduates”, “secondary school graduates”, “high school graduates”, “and university graduates”. According to this, among the participants who took part in the study 109 (5,8%) are illiterate, 400 (21,1%) are elementary school graduate, 380 (20,1%) are secondary school graduates, 452 (23,9%) are high school graduates and 552 (29,2%) are university graduates.

The collected findings should be supported by observations. If there's an inconsistency, personal discussions should be made. The scale has been found reliable but valid only in part of General Symptom Index with the study done by Dağ [20]. After the inventory is applied, with the evaluation done by the pollsters, unconstructive discussions with the people who have been found to have Paranoid Thinking Symptom about whether they have this kind of thinking form are done and the results are tested according to the answers they have given to the inventory.

Instruments:

- Personal Information Form (PIF). The definition of the demographic properties of the participants is aimed with this study. While deciding on which demographic properties of the participants will be defined, the characteristics which will be related to the “paranoid thinking” that's the dependent variable are defined. In this context, at PIF, the information including the participants' sexes, ages, marital status and education levels are given.
- Symptom Scanning List (SCL 90-R). It's developed for determining the symptom level in seemingly “normal” people. While developing the scale, observing the level of psychopathology of normal

people and the change in short time periods is aimed at. The SCL_90-R scale consists of 90 sentences, 9 subtests and an additional scale. Participants give points as Never (0), Scarcely (1), Sometimes (2), Usually (3) and Always (4) to the sentences according to whether the symptoms have been seen in in the last one month. Whereas the General Symptom Index points between 0-0,99 are accepted as normal, the points above 1,0 are accepted as pathology symptoms [21]. In this study, the data about the paranoid thinking way which is one of the subscales that SCL 90 R measures are analyzed and the thesis taken in the study is statistically tested. This subtest about the paranoid thinking consists of six items (8, 18, 43, 68, 76, 83) reflects thoughts such as reflective thoughts, hostility, skeptic, megalomaniac and centralist thoughts, freedom, fear of lose and hallucinations. The data related to the scale's subscales aren't used in this study.

If it's used in the group, the complex sentences should be explained in advance. The uneasiness should be degreed by taking the discomfort, anxiety and uneasiness levels into consideration. Test consists of 10 subtests. The points of sub areas are found by summing up the given answers and then dividing them into the number of questions.

General Symptom Mean is found by dividing the points taken from the clinical subtests into total questions. GSM gives a general idea. If there's a problem in general, sub areas should be studied. Although there's not a problem in general, there may be problems in sub areas.

If the points are:

- >1.0: there's a psychological problem
- Between 0.5 and 1: the problem is at average
- < 0.5: there's no problem

RESULTS

First of all, to what extend do the people who entered the research have the “Paranoid Thought” is tested. For this it's accepted that the people who take 0-0,99 points from the SCL 90-R scale are accepted as they do not have paranoid thought and the ones who take points between 1,00-4,00 are accepted as they have paranoid thought. These situations are grouped in statistical analysis as “With Paranoid Thought” and “Without Paranoid

Table 1: The level of Paranoid Thought in people who live in Turkey

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative	
				Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Nonexistent	770	40.7	40.7	40.7
	Existent	1123	59.3	59.3	100.0
Total		1893	100.0	100.0	

Chi-square: 65.82 df= 1 Asymp. Sig..000

Table 2: Level of Paranoid Thought in Men and Women

		N	Paranoid Thought	
			Nonexitent	Existent
Sex	Female	N	344	643
		%	34.9	65.1
	Male	N	426	480
		%	47.0	53.0
Total		N	770	1123
		%	40.7	49.3

Chi-square: 28.97 df= 1 Asymp. Sig..000

Thought". As for this grouping, the answer for the first question of the research, that is; "What is the level of paranoid thought?" is looked for. The descriptive statistical analysis results done with this aim are given in table 1.

It's found out that out of the people who entered the research, 770 (40,7%) don't have paranoid thought and 1123 (59,3%) have paranoid thought. After the statistical analysis about whether the condition of having or not having the paranoid thought is statistically meaningful or not, it's found out that the difference is meaningful on behalf of having the paranoid thought. Whether having the paranoid thought differs in men and women according to the sex variable is given with the analysis results at table 2

It's found out that 344 (34,9%) of the women who entered the research don't have paranoid thought, 643 (65,1%) have paranoid thought. It's also found the 426 (47,0%) of men don't have paranoid thought and 480 (53,0%) have paranoid thought. After the statistical analysis about the difference between men and women on having or not having the paranoid thought, the difference on not having the paranoid thought is found to be on part of men. The level of paranoid thought in the people who entered the research is given on table 3.

Whereas there couldn't have been found symptoms related to paranoid thinking form in the 36,9% of people between ages 20-25,there has been paranoid thought

Table 3: Level of paranoid thought according to the age variable

Age		N	Paranoid Thought	
			Nonexitent	Existent
20-25	N	115	197	
	%	36.9	63.1	
26-30	N	165	262	
	%	38.6	61.4	
31-35	N	131	188	
	%	41.1	58.9	
36-40	N	132	168	
	%	44.0	56.0	
41-45	N	95	127	
	%	42.8	57.2	
46-50	N	96	131	
	%	42.3	57.7	
51-60	N	36	50	
	%	41.9	58.1	
Total		N	770	1123
		%	40.7	59.3

Chi-Square: 4.71 df= 6 Asymp. Sig..581

symptoms found in 63,1% of these people. Though these symptoms couldn't have been found in 38,6% of people between ages 26-30,the paranoid thinking symptoms are found in 61,4% of these people. No symptom is found in the 41,1% of the people between ages 31-35,but is found in the 58,9% of these people. Whereas there couldn't have been found symptoms related to paranoid thinking form in the 44,0% of people between ages 36-40,there has been paranoid thought symptoms found in 56,0% of these people. Although paranoid symptoms couldn't have been found in 42,8% of people between ages 41-45,the paranoid thinking symptoms are found in 57,2% of these people. Though these symptoms couldn't have been found in 42,3% of people between ages 46-50,the paranoid thinking symptoms are found in 57,7% of these people and whereas there couldn't have been found symptoms related to paranoid thinking form in the 41,9% of people between ages 51-60,there has been paranoid thought symptoms found in 58,1% of these people.

As a result of the statistical analysis done in order to find whether age is a factor on having the paranoid thought, it's found out that the difference is not meaningful at the level of age. The analysis results related to having the paranoid thought in married and single people are given on table 4.

According to the results of the analysis done to test whether the marital status is a factor on having the paranoid thinking form; no symptom could have been in

Table 4: Level of having the paranoid thought in married and single people

		Paranoid Thought		

		Nonexistent	Existent	
Marital Status	Married	N	423	593
		%	41.6	58.4

	Single	N	347	530
		%	39.6	60.4

Total		N	770	1123
		%	40.7	59.3

Chi-Square: .83 df= 1 Asymp. Sig..361

Table 5: Level of having the paranoid thought according to the education level

		Paranoid Thought		

		Nonexistent	Existent	
Education Level	Illiteracy	N	32	77
		%	44.3	64.7
	Primary school	N	133	267
		%	162.7	237.3
	Secondary school	N	147	233
		%	154.6	225.4
	High School	N	212	240
		%	183.9	268.1
	University	N	246	306
		%	224.5	327.5

Total		N	770	1123
		%	770	1123.0

Chi-Square: 26.27 df= 4 Asymp. Sig..000

the 41,6% of married people but paranoid symptoms have been found in the 58,4% of married people. When the single people are observed, it has been found out that in 39,6 no symptom of paranoid thinking is found, but in 60,4% the paranoid thinking symptoms are found.

As a result of the analysis whether the difference between being married or single and having the paranoid thinking form, it's found out that the difference is not meaningful at the level of married. The findings related to whether education level is a factor on having the paranoid thought are given on table 5.

29,4% of illiterate people don't have the symptoms of paranoid thinking form,70,6% of these people have been found to have paranoid thought.33,3% of elementary school graduates don't have the paranoid thinking form whereas the 66,8% of them have.38,7% of the secondary school graduates don't have the paranoid thought

symptoms,61,3% of these people are found to have the symptoms of paranoid thought.46,9% of high school graduates don't have the symptoms of paranoid thought whereas the 53,1% have,and 44,6% of university graduates don't have the symptoms of paranoid thought whereas 55,4% of them have these symptoms.

What kind of a relation between education level and having the paranoid thought? As a result of the analysis done in order to find an answer to this question, it's found that the more the level of education increases, the lesser the condition of having the symptoms of paranoid thought gets. The level of having the paranoid thinking form is found to have been higher in illiterate, graduates of elementary and secondary schools than high school and university graduates

DISCUSSION

In the global world people now need the understanding of not only the unity of the people of same culture but especially the unity and life of people from different cultures. The understandings of government rules should also revise themselves in accordance with this orientation. During this period when it's too difficult for one to isolate him/herself from the world, people should be educated on deciding their own roadmaps by being conscious of their identity and accepting that there are people from different cultures. Turkey comes first among the countries that should have the culture of living with differences when the geography and the dynamics that construct its culture are taken into account. This research is focused on especially the prior psychological obstacle "Paranoid Thinking Form" rather than the sociological obstacles in front of living together with differences in Turkey.

Societies that consist of people who have this kind of thinking form can neither achieve living together with differences nor with the people of their own culture. In the diary of the European Union "Living together with differences" comes first among the conditions that the union lays down for the candidate countries. Perhaps the union should first put forth whether the people in candidate countries have the understanding of living together or the sociological and psychological factors before giving this responsibility to these countries.

When the levels of having the "paranoid thinking form" that's one of the factors that obstructs people who live in Turkey to live together with differences are observed, it's found out that people have paranoid thinking form. People who have this thinking form first

come to an opinion about others, then they try to find proofs for that idea. The normal thinking hierarchy is first to find proofs then to come to an opinion. When the sociological dynamics that construct Turkish culture are observed, the thinking system suggested to the individual is as not judging anything without certain evidences. This thinking way effects individual's relating him/herself with the other. As a result of this whether this "other" have different values than the individual or s/he has the same, the attributed meaning does not change. In this concept it's not the sociological factors that obstructs individual to live together with differences. It's especially the psychological factors that obstruct the people living in Turkey to live together with differences. This-paranoid thinking form- that obstructs living together with differences causes the individual to attribute meanings to the data s/he has, in accordance with his/her thinking system. That is, the person may tell s/he has data for his/her ideas about others but this data is formatted according to this person's thinking system. Within this process it's important for the individual to reconstruct his/her thinking system with respect to the data s/he has. Only then s/he can achieve to become objective. An individual's attributions made by recommendations of reliable data form the basis of the culture of living together.

It's found that women have paranoid thought more than men. The reason for this may be the meanings that our culture attributes to the role of women. Basically in our culture women are percept in a condition weaker than men and in need of help. Although there are recently made legal arrangements especially about this matter, more time is needed in order for this understanding to come into being as a culture. There have been important changes made in laws in order to prevent every kind of violence to women and to guarantee the personal rights of women. However as the social understanding is not at the same level, women have become the target of every kind of violence and have seen "the other" as a potential threat and adjusted themselves according to the meaning that the other attributes to them. The thought of "I may always get in trouble", now or then becomes the thinking way of women and this way of thinking is the major obstacle in front of one's achieving to live together with "the other".

Education level is found to have been an important factor on having the paranoid thinking form. People whose education level is higher have lesser paranoid thinking form than the ones whose education level is

lower. The basic way to get out of the paranoid thinking form is the education of people. As people get educated and as their vision of world change, they become more courageous, see the common features of people and get rid of prejudice [7]. We should see the differences not as negativity but as an important factor that assists in one's personality. Cultural differences make personality as richer as cultural similarities do [11]. Being educated provides people with more objective attributions to both him/herself and the others. By being educated the individual defines him/herself and the other better. In our culture "science" is defined as individual knows him/herself. A person gets afraid of the things that s/he doesn't know. The level of our knowing ourselves and the other forms the basis of the art of living together.

Age and marital status haven't been found as a factor on having the paranoid thought. The level of paranoid thought in young people (ages 20-25) and adults (ages 26-30) is found to have been higher than other age groups. But this difference is not meaningful at age level. When the mean points are taken into account, having the paranoid thought becomes higher or lower in proportion with the quantity of the sources and the quality that the person relates him/herself to these sources. Young and adults need others' support and understanding while finding jobs, getting married, deciding on the city to work, building a career, higher the life standards, getting a place in the society and gaining the skills to come over life. As there are no universal criteria to reach the sources which will provide this help and support, that's why the individual has to give subjective opinions. As a result of this the individual either attributes very high values to him/her or becomes to see him/herself superior to others or in contrast s/he feels too inferior which causes the person to make prejudices. Many times pride and prejudice goes hand id hand. For example a man is locked out; if he wants to get rid of the thought that he's useless, the most functional way of this is to think there's someone who caused it [21]. When this situation is generalized with all the unwanted situations that the individual has experienced, the thought is shaped as "never trust anybody". This way of thinking is innocently has become a Turkish proverb "Do not even trust your father" and no one has become anxious about how can this way of thought reflect negative results. This kind of thought perceives "the other" as a potential threat and balances itself in the light of this thought. Because man first thinks, then feels related to it and behaves. The basic factor that obstructs living together with differences is the

way of thinking that forms the content of interpersonal relationships in Turkey more than the sociological factors that this way of thought can be named as "Paranoid Thinking Way".

REFERENCES

1. Budak, S., 1998. Çağımızda Nevrotik Kişiliği. (Karen Horney, The Neurotic Personality Of Our Time), Ankara: Öteki Psikoloji Yayınları, Üçüncü Basım.
2. Sillars, S., 1988. İletişim. (Türkçesi: Nüzhet Akın, Ed. Oya Tokgöz), Ankara: Özgün Matbaacılık.
3. Coşkun, H., 2005. The Affects of Social Identity and Role Taking on Productivity in Individual Brainstorming. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 56: 119-132.
4. (Fenigstein, Schier and Buss 1975).
5. Bacanlı, H., 2004. Identity In Social Relationship (kendini Ayarlama Psikolojisi), İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları: Bilim ve Kültür Eserleri: 905.
6. Dönmez, A., 1989. Sosyal Psikoloji. İstanbul: Imge Kitabevi, 3. Baskı.
7. Cüceloğlu, D., 1991. Human and Behaviors. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2. Basım.
8. Turhan, M., 1983. The Person In Society. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Bilim ve Kültür Eserleri Dizisi.
9. Aydın, A., 2002. The Meaning of Life and Lowe. İstanbul: Gentaş Kültür.
10. Geçtan, E., 1990. Psikanaliz ve Sonrası. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 4. Basım.
11. Newcomb, T.M., 1950. Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc.
12. Kumru, A., G. Carlo and C.P. Edwards, 2004. Relational, Cultural, Cognitive and Affective Predictors of Prosocial Behaviors. Turkish Psychology Journal, 19(54): 109-125.
13. (Kılıçoğlu 2004).
14. Budak, S., 1999. Çağımızda Nevrotik Kişiliği. (Farklı, V. F, The Unheard Cry For Meaning Psychotherapy and Humanism), Ankara: Öteki Psikoloji Yayınları, Dördüncü Basım.
15. Cüceloğlu, D., 2005. Özüne Yabancılaşmış İnsanların Oluşturduğu "Miş Gibi Yaşamlar". İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, Birinci Basım.
16. Geçtan, E., 1983. To Be a Human (The Meaning of Existential Individual and Social). İstanbul: Adam yayıncılık.
17. Budak, S., 1998. Psikanalizda Yeni Yollar. (Karen Horney, Nev Ways in Psychoanalysis. Ankara: Öteki Psikoloji Yayınları.
18. Yörükoğlu, A., 1975. Notes Of Psychology Lesson. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi TIP Fakültesi Yayınları, cilt.2.
19. Gençöz, T., 2003. Importance of Problem Solving Skills, Perceived Social Support and Anxiety symptoms On Suicide Attempts. Turkish Psychology Journal, 18(52): 1-11.
20. Dağ (1990).
21. Demir, G. and A. Demir, 1998. Assessment of Psychological Symptoms of Prisoners. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 13(41): 35-44.
22. (Turhan, 1983).
23. Adler, A., 1964. Problems of Neurosis. (İngilizceden Çeviren: Ali Kılıçoğlu, Edt: Özgü Çelik) İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
24. Amerikan Psikiyatri Birliği: Mental Bozuklukların Tanısal ve Sayısal El Kitabı (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders), Dördüncü Baskı (DSM-IV), Amerikan Psikiyatri Birliği, Washington DC, 1994' ten çeviren Koroğlu E, Hekimler Yayın Birliği, Ankara, 1995.
25. Bolton, N., 1972. The Psychology of Thinking. Edinburgh: Pinter in Great Britain by T&A Constable Ltd.
26. Budak, S., 1998. Uygarlık Din ve Toplum (S. Freud, Civilization, Religion and Society), Ankara: Öteki Freud Dizisi, Cilt 13.
27. Burger, J.M., 1993. Personality. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Third Edition.
28. Dönmez, A., 1989. Sosyal Psikoloji. İstanbul: Ara Yayıncılık.
29. Geçtan, E., 1990. Existential and Psychotherapy. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
30. Schultz, D.P. and S.E. Schultz, 2001. A History of Modern Psychology. (Türkçesi: Yasemin Aslay), İstanbul: Kanus Yayınları: 90, Psikoloji serisi:3.
31. Yalom, I., 1980. Existential Psychotherapy. (Türkçesi: Zeliha İyidoğan Babayigit), İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınları.