

AN INVESTIGATION ON NEED AFFILIATION  
AND ITS RELATION TO FAMILY COHESION  
IN TURKISH ADOLESCENTS

Belgin Tunalı  
B.A., Boğaziçi University.- 1981

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the  
Degree of Master of Arts  
in  
Clinical Psychology

Department of Social Sciences, Faculty of Administrative Sciences

Bogazici University Library



39001100375180

14

Boğaziçi University

1983

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is difficult to express adequately my appreciation of the help and support offered me, in one form or another, by my professors, friends and family.

I want especially to express my gratitude to Dr.Gökçe Cansever for her generous help and guidance. I have always considered myself lucky to have her constant support and warm, understanding attitude.

I owe special thanks to Doç.Dr.Güler Fişek for her constructive suggestions, encouraging attitude and support. I also would like to express my thanks to Doç.Dr.Hamit Fişek for his help and suggestions.

I am greatly indebted to Olli Ahopelto who helped me with the typing and supplied me with the obscure library references, to Zeynep Somer for her contributions in the scoring procedure, and to Gök Gürer for his help in computer programming.

Finally, I would like to thank the principal, teachers and especially the cooperative students of Rüstü Uzel Kız Meslek Lisesi who participated as subjects in this study.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. ABSTRACT	i
II. INTRODUCTION	1
A. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
1. THE CONCEPT OF MOTIVATION	3
SOCIAL MOTIVES	7
NEED FOR AFFILIATION	9
FACTORS RELATED TO THE NEED FOR AFFILIATION	13
2. FAMILY COHESION	19
3. FAMILY SIZE	25
4. EXTENDED FAMILY	28
5. THE TURKISH LITERATURE	30
B. IMPLICATIONS OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW	32
C. HYPOTHESES	33
III. METHOD	34
A. SUBJECTS	34
B. MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS	34
C. PROCEDURE	37
IV. RESULTS	38
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	42
VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY	51
VII. APPENDICES	56

## A B S T R A C T

The present study is an investigation on the need for affiliation and its relation to the level of cohesiveness in the family. By administering Faces II Scale of Family Cohesion and Adaptability, the families of the subjects were divided into four groups of different cohesion levels ranging from the lowest cohesion (ie. "disengaged") to the highest (ie. "enmeshed"). The need for affiliation was defined as establishing, maintaining or restoring a positive affective relationship with another person. Four T.A.T. cards were used for measuring the degree of affiliation and the need for affiliation was predicted to increase as the cohesion level in the family increased. It was also predicted that as the size of the family (ie. number of children) increased, there will be a decrease in the need affiliation scores of the subjects.

Besides the stated relations, certain characteristics of the subjects like death, divorce, or remarriage in the family, the presence of grandparents in the family atmosphere, the age of the parents, and whether the mother worked or not

were also examined in relation to the need for affiliation and the level of cohesion.

70 subjects of the study were all females coming from lower middle socio-economic status families, ages between 15-17.

The results have shown that the predicted relation exists between the need for affiliation and level of cohesion in the family. That is, as cohesiveness, in the family increases, so does the need for affiliation. With regard to the second hypothesis, the results yielded a nonsignificant relation between the two variables; in other words, no significant increase was observed in the need for affiliation as the size of the nuclear family increased. Families with "working mothers" seemed to be more cohesive and the members of such families received higher scores on need for affiliation. Other factors such as death, divorce, remarriage, etc. did not have any significant relation with need for affiliation and family cohesion level.

Certain suggestions were made on the basis of the results obtained from this investigation.

## I N T R O D U C T I O N

The aim of this study is to test the possible effects of the smallest but yet most influential social unit, family on the development of an important social motive, need for affiliation. The basic variables of the study through which the family is assumed to play an important role in need affiliation are the cohesiveness level of the family and its size.

The family is the most salient agency in any society and is sometimes called the basic social institution. While providing for the child's biological needs, it, at the same time, guides his development and shapes him into an integrated person who can direct his own life in the society in which he is brought up. Furthermore, the family provides roles for its members both within itself and in the larger social system and influences status, motivation and incentives.

Although the nature and developmental process of social motives are still not completely understood, they are known to be strongly influenced especially by child-rearing

methods of the parents, their values and the structure of the family (Berkowitz, 1964). Affiliation need is one of such social motives.

The family as an institution has been studied by sociologists a lot but it is rather a new area of research for psychologists. Instead of focusing only on parents, and related matters like parental attitudes, child rearing practices and the like, family is lately taken as a whole unit with its structure, communication and interactional patterns, and other variable dimensions with regard to its dynamics. The different aspects of these functional and structural dimensions on developing personalities are the most important topics in present literature.

According to many family researchers, cohesiveness level in the family is one of such important differentiating dimensions in the family (Olson et al, 1979). It refers to the intensity of the emotional ties among family members and according to these researchers, normal, warm and affectional ties help the person become capable of forming healthy relations with a reasonable degree of conformity, while the extremes, too high or too low cohesion discourage the healthy development. The former leads to a need for closeness and sharing that is almost a clinging dependence, i.e. seeking out for help and relying on other people as sources of approval and support. The opposite is true for too low cohesion in the family, i.e. incapacity for making social relations and even

the lack of any such desire. Thus, high family cohesion is expected to lead to a higher need for affiliation.

A large family is characterized by relatively low occurrence of overprotection, less amount of time and energy invested on each individual (Bossord, 1952), with often a greater possibility for the development of a differentiated self (Minuchin, 1974) and thus is expected to influence the need for affiliation unfavorably.

Thus, moving from these assumptions, in the first part of the survey of literature, the concept of motivation, social motives, and one of them, the need for affiliation will be traced very briefly. In the second part, some conceptualizations regarding family cohesion will be shortly presented and it will be followed by the third part dealing with factors related with family size. In the last part, the Turkish literature on family structure and cohesion will be very briefly reviewed.

## Review of Literature

### The Concept of Motivation

We are all familiar with the experience of being urged or driven to behave in certain ways and of desiring to act in a particular manner in order to reach our ends or objects. We usually attribute those impulses and desires to motivation and

believe that we are "motivated" to seek, for instance, food, sex, wealth, social relations and so on. Although different theories have different conceptions about motivation, there is a general agreement that a motive is an internal factor that arouses, directs and integrates a person's behavior (Murray, 1964).

The field of motivation is very broad, and there are many different approaches to it, but, generally speaking, while some of them point out the innate, inherited nature of it, such as instinct and drive theories with their emphasis on physiological and biological basis; others stress the "learned" or "acquired" side of it, emphasizing the external factors and the experience of the organism. There are some eclectic approaches as well, eg. "humanistic theories" (Arkes, Garske, 1977) of Maslow's concept of motivation toward self-actualization.

Theories explaining motivation in terms of instincts emerged with the influence of Darwin's concept of evolution and later McDougall, Sigmund Freud developed the instinct doctrine as an important explanatory concept in psychology; instincts were inherited and inborn in man. While McDougall constructed an important list of instincts as flight, repulsion, curiosity, pugnacity, self-abasement, self-assertion, parental, reproductive, hunger, gregariousness, acquisitiveness and constructiveness (Murray, 1964, p.5), Freud emphasized two main instincts, sexual and aggressive which he conceived

as the main motivating forces in man's behavior.

All organisms have physiological needs, need for food, liquid, elimination and so on. The organism is driven to activity for the satisfaction of them. This is the basis for speaking of physiological drives which maybe looked upon as energizers (Munn, 1961). For example, Cannon's concept of homeostasis proposes that a state of disequilibrium is set up in the body whenever the internal conditions deviate from a normal, steady state. The satisfaction of psychological drives, are also attempts for the body to return to a state of equilibrium (Murray, 1964). The greatest influence of the homeostasis drive concept has been in the field of learning. Clark L.Hull, a learning theorist, assumed that all rewards are based on the reduction of primary homeostatic drive; a reward of food reduced the homeostatic imbalance produced by hunger. Secondary rewards such as social approval are effective because they have been associated with food and other primary rewards in the past. Afterwards, a considerable amount of interest has centered around external sources of motivation as opposed to inner determinants.

Especially after the tendency for the list of instincts to grow, the behavioristic school, along with many cultural anthropologists attacked the instinct and drive theory and tried to explain behavior and motivation on the basis of learning. Such approaches emphasized the environmental stimuli as the forces that direct and channel behavior

Society, by manipulating the rewards and punishments can shape the individual's behavior and motivation in the desired direction. They did not take into consideration man's inner, inborn purposes, strivings and active nature.

A new approach to motivation was proposed by Maslow who stressed the developmental nature of motivation; physiological needs, such as food, sleep, etc. being the lowest, and self-actualization being the highest level (Munn, 1961). Maslow asserted that a lower need must be adequately satisfied before the next higher need can fully emerge in a person's development. One can not devote himself to his safety needs before his physiological requirements are met. This natural development can go wrong when there is insufficient gratification of needs at any given level. The man whose life-long environment provides the barest essentials for physical survival is not likely to develop pressing needs for achievement and prestige, or a chronically hungry man will not be seeking out to realize all his potential for self-actualization. The ideal physical and social environment is therefore one that makes possible the gratification of each level of needs as the individual reaches out for next (Kretch et al, 1979).

At this point, where the inevitable influence of the social environment is mentioned, the topic of the present study necessitates a closer look at the social motives which will further lead to the main concept of the present study,

the need for affiliation.

### Social Motives, Definition and Origin

Most behavior is affected by interpersonal relationships and such motives which involve people and interpersonal interactions are referred to as social motives. In general, the human being is motivated to behave in such a way that he seeks the society of others and wants to attain social approval and acceptance, and tries to control and inhibit behavior which is disapproved by others (Fernald and Fernald, 1978).

Whether motives are learned, innate or both, it is a known fact that all human beings are exposed to certain environmental influences. All are, initially helpless, all depend upon social contacts for survival, all are positively conditioned to those who are instrumental in satisfying their early needs, all learn to appeal to others for help and all learn the advantages of coping with certain aspects of the behavior of those around them (Munn, 1961). The mother child relationship is the key concept in this developmental process. Contact with his mother reassures the infant in the states of need and distress and she is the first and only source of satisfaction and affection (Vernon, 1969), but as the child gets older, other agents, other factors rather than just the mother, shape him into a social being. Thus, with the increase in age level, motivation is increasingly modified and although

the influence of family relationships on the child's motivated behavior is fundamental, he also acquires a great deal of social learning from his peer groups and others.

The most extensive list of social motives available was drawn up by Murray and his colleagues (Vernon, 1969). Murray differentiated "psychogenic" and "viscerogenic" needs, the former being directed towards social behavior, and the latter towards the satisfaction of biological and homeostatic needs. Murray does not claim that social motives are innate, and they do not all occur in everyone. Vernon (1969) classified the needs in Murray's list as follows: Viscerogenic needs included needs for air, water, food, sex, lactation, urination and defecation, for avoidance of danger, unpleasant stimuli, excessive heat and cold, for sensuous gratification; for rest and sleep. Psychogenic needs, on the other hand, included needs such as those pertaining to the prestige and enhancement of the self; to defense of status and avoidance of humiliation; to the exercise of power; to affectionate relations with others; to inanimate objects; and to cognition.

According to Murray, needs are often interrelated, each reinforcing or conflicting with each other. To satisfy the same need, different people may employ different types of behavior and needs exert a force or "press" on the individual which stimulates him to behave in a certain manner. For instance, some types of social relationship or situations will stimulate affiliation while others nurture or aggression.

The extent and the manner in which an individual reacts to these stimuli appears to depend on previous experience, especially in childhood. Such experience also influences the individual to actively seek to encounter such particular types of situations, for instance, people towards whom he can display nurturance (Murray, 1964).

After construction of such a list of needs, a variety of procedures like interviews, questionnaires, case histories, tests of ability, tests of personality like T.A.T. and Rorschach tests were all utilized in order to draw up a "psychograph" for each individual indicating the main types of needs, the principal needs, and types of behavior employed. Out of all those "psychogenic needs", it would not be wrong to say that the need for achievement has been studied much more in detail. The need for affiliation, which is the topic of the present study attracted considerable attention as well though never as much as the need for achievement.

#### Need for Affiliation

In the classification of Murray's "psychogenic needs", the need for affiliation (n aff) is in the category of "needs pertaining to affectionate relations with others". It is a fact that most of people experience occasional cravings to be with others, sometimes for a good reason, frequently for no apparent one. We seem simply to want to be in the physical presence of others. In some individuals, such cravings are

more obvious. Despite its importance in social life, not much is known of the variables and conditions effecting the need.

Murray defines need for affiliation as the need "to draw near and enjoyable co-operate or reciprocate with an allied other (an other who resembles the subject or who likes the subject), to please and win affection of a cathected object" (Murray, 1964). While Shipley and Veroff in their studies define n aff as "need for security" (Cofer and Appley, 1964), Atkinson et al define it as "establishing, maintaining or restoing a positive affective relationship with another person. The relationship is most adequately defined by the word "friendship" (Atkinson, 1958). This definition is the definition of the need in the present study as well.

As it is in all other social motives, parent-child attachment is crucial in the development of need for affiliation and particular factors increase and decrease the tendency to affiliate in a given situation. Instinct, innate determinants, learning and satisfaction of needs are all theoretical approaches explaining the need for affiliation:

#### Early Approaches:

For C. Darwin, any characteristic that increases the chance of survival, because of natural selection, should, over many generations become dominant and their offspring will tend to have that quality. It is obvious that people who are in a

group together with others, will have a better chance of surviving than those who are solitary. The group provides some protection and an increased opportunity to get food by hunting in groups and so on. Thus, it is highly reasonable that people who are in large groups manage to live longer and their children survive, since once born, they need protection.

Other early social psychologists such as McDougall believed that gregariousness is a human instinct. People live together in groups just like ants collect in any colonies by instinct, and baboons build elaborate social structure (Freedman et al, 1981). Human beings also affiliate without thinking ie. instinctually just as a baby sucks on a nipple. Humans are born with many genetically determined characteristics and one of them is to seek out, form groups with other human beings (Freedman et al, 1981). These, however, do not prove that affiliation is genetically controlled.

The helplessness and dependence of the human infant, his inability to survive when left alone necessitates gregariousness. Although, his helplessness is no longer a must, when he becomes capable of gratifying his needs by himself, such solitary living is quite rare and is usually considered as deviant. Hence, although it seems that gregariousness is to some extent innately or instinctually determined the question of why people affiliate when no longer in need is still left open (Freedman et al, 1981).

### Current Approaches:

Behavioristic theories, on the other hand, believe that the need for affiliation is learned like anything else. As the basic needs of the child like food, protection etc. are gratified by someone else, by the simple process of association, "others" get connected with rewards, and people become the source of gratification and satisfaction in the child's environment. Besides, since the child is rewarded when he is with other people, this associative link is strengthened and reinforced. Thus, the child seeks out other people which leads to satisfaction. First starting with the attachment to the mother, and parents, later to peers and other sources of gratification makes the child a social being. To affiliate with others becomes a customary part of his life. Thus, as children learn all sorts of habits that shape their lives, so they learn affiliation. Since all children in all cultures to some extent must learn to affiliate, it becomes a universal characteristic (Freedman et al, 1981).

It is a known fact that most needs can only be satisfied within the presence of other people. In other words, social needs like needs for achievement, love, appreciation, comfort, respect and power are difficult, actually impossible to satisfy in isolation. Thus, most people have acquired through early social learning many needs that can be satisfied only by others (Fernald, 1978).

## Factors Related to Need for Affiliation

Psychologists have tried to determine the factors that increase or decrease the tendency to affiliate. In order to understand the nature and causes of affiliation, specific conditions that produced more affiliation or those that lessen it are tried to be discovered; fear, anxiety (embarrassment), birth order, and parental practices came out to be relevant determinants. Another social motive, need for achievement, is also contrasted with the need for affiliation in order to see any possible similarity or contradictory effects, if any exists. Such research gave light to the need for affiliation especially on the area of parental attitude and family structure. Thus, in the following section, each determinant will be taken up one by one with related important investigations to see the nature of the existing relationship.

### Fear and the Need for Affiliation:

In a series of very important, now classic studies, Schachter attempted to discover the factors which effect the need to affiliate and came up with his hypothesis that people with high fear would affiliate more than those with low fear (Schachter, 1959). Briefly, in his first experiment, his subjects were threatened with either strong or weak electric shocks, and then were given the choises of waiting alone or with others. The strong-shock subjects had a greater preference for waiting with others (ie. high need for affiliation) when

compared with the low-shock group. To understand the phenomenon, Schachter proposed several alternatives and as a result of the following investigations, two of them, "direct anxiety reduction" and "self-evaluation" were found to be satisfactory explanations. In the first alternative of "direct anxiety reduction", subjects tended to comfort, support and reassure one another and attempted to increase courage when they were together and thus, fear was reduced. As for the second explanation "self-evaluation", the subject compared himself with others as a means of establishing a framework and social reality for his opinion, ie. one may use other people to evaluate his emotions and feelings as a result of affiliating to them (Schachter, 1959). Similar contributions of other investigators like Wrightman support this finding (Schachter, 1959).

#### Anxiety and the Need for Affiliation:

When anxiety rather than fear is taken as a determinant different aspects like embarrassment enter into picture. In a study by Fish, Karabenick and Heath, high and low fear, and high and low anxiety were compared in relation to the need for affiliation. Subjects affiliated more under high than low fear, as in Schachter's findings, but less under anxiety conditions. The results showed that when subjects were going to be watched in an anxiety situation, they had much stronger preferences for waiting alone than when they were not going

to be watched. The authors interpreted this result as showing that the anxiety manipulation really involved a threat of embarrassment (Freedman et al, 1981). Harrison (1976) also suggested that people may not desire to affiliate in anxiety-arousing conditions if these conditions would lower their self-esteem eg. if they have to do something embarrassing in front of others (Beck, 1978). Thus, we can talk about two distinct findings: Fear is a determinant which increases the tendency to affiliate whereas anxiety or threat of embarrassment tends to decrease it. Thus, as a social phenomenon, other people are a source of comfort or embarrassment. We tend to seek them out when they provide comfort (ie. reduce fear), while we try to avoid them when there is some expectation of embarrassment (ie. anxiety).

#### Birth Order and the Need for Affiliation:

Another important finding in Schachter's investigations on the need for affiliation is that birth order is an important determinant of a person's desire to affiliate. First-born and only children have a stronger tendency to affiliate than do later-borns. Such a finding is explained in terms of parental attitudes and the rather different psychological environment of the first-born when compared with later-borns. Schachter talks about the relative overprotection of the first-born child. Parents are more concerned about their first-child than about later children. Parents who are still inexperienced

and insecure will be more alert and responsive to the signals from the first child, and hence, respond more quickly than they might be expected with later children. This usually leads them to overprotect the first child. When the child falls, her mother runs to comfort her, therefore, the child soon learns that when she is uncomfortable, her mother is a source of comfort. Eventually, the child learns that people in general provide help (Freedman et al, 1981). With later children, the parents are more relaxed and pay less attention to the trials and tribulations of growing up. In addition, now they have two children to care for and not so much time for each. In the light of the above, Schachter talks about the development of a greater affiliative tendency in the first-borns than in later-born children. This he names as a greater "dependency" as well, and by the term, he refers to the extent to which the individual uses or relies on other persons as sources of approval, support, help and reference (Schachter, 1959). In the further variations of such research, he found that the affiliative tendency decreases progressively for the later-born children, that is second-borns show a greater tendency to affiliate than do third-borns who in turn show a greater tendency to affiliate than forth-borns and so on, and this progression is maintained regardless of family size (Schachter, 1959).

Another social motive, need achievement, has also been studied in relation to the need for affiliation and the two

motives have been usually treated as contrasting ones. Reisman (1950) proposed that American society under the influence of population growth and educational philosophies, is creating more and more "other-directed" personalities which he thought might produce a decline in need achievement and an increase in the level of need affiliation. McClelland (1961) reported that need achievement was negatively and significantly correlated with need for affiliation only in 1950's (Berkowitz, 1964). In one of the related studies, French (1956) put need achievement, in conflict with need affiliation. She asked her subjects to choose one of the two partners for a task: either a liked one, who, however, was known to have little capacity for the task, or someone who had proved successful at the task but whom they disliked. Subjects with high achievement need and low need for affiliation solved the conflict according to the expectation: They choose as a partner the disliked but capable person. For such people, the successful situation of the task is dominant; persons with high need for affiliation and low achievement need made the reverse decision (Heckhausen, 1967).

F. Samelson, on the other hand, believed that the need for affiliation and the need for achievement are by definition, not specific habitual response tendencies, but motives which should combine with situational factors to produce different and even contradictory behavior outcomes. Thus, he attempted to analyze the relation of the two to conforming behavior. He

had two experimental conditions, a condition of full conflict with a majority, and another in which prior experimental manipulation refuted this conflict to some extent. The findings showed that in the first condition, need achievement is negatively related to conformity. In the reduced conflict situation, however, the subjects low in need achievement became more independent while those high in need achievement showed no change in conformity. The need for affiliation, on the other hand, was found to be not directly related to conformity but interacting with need achievement in a consistent way. The investigators interpretation of the result assumes that in a very ambiguous situation, strong motivation to be successful may induce a person to conform to majority opinion in order to satisfy the desire to be correct (Atkinson, 1958).

#### Parental Attitudes and the Need for Affiliation:

In the development of such motives, as previously mentioned, parental child rearing practices are some of the main factors. Although the facts about the development of social motives are not on firm basis, at least for need achievement, the importance of independence training starting from an early age is widely accepted (McClelland et al, 1953). One would expect that the same thing should hold true for the need for affiliation. Since, in the light of the above mentioned investigations and even by definition, they are

contradictory motives, it may not be wrong to suspect that a parental discipline which leads to a heightened sense of belongingness in the child. In fact, as Murray (1964) pointed out, it is likely that parents of "affiliation-motivation" children put more emphasis on close family ties, and conformity to parental authority which encourages dependence rather than independence. At this point, the other variable of the study, cohesion level in the family enters into the picture and in requires a more detailed look.

### Family Cohesion

As indicated before, new important topics have entered recently into the area of research regarding family structure and functioning. Most of these topics are developed by family therapists who work within a general systems orientation. One significant dimension of family behavior is cohesion. This dimension is utilized in the works of psychiatrists, family therapists, family sociologists, small group theorists, group therapists, social psychologists and anthropologists. The definitions and sources of all different but related terms which are brought up by these different disciplines are beyond the limits of this study, but when the concept is viewed in terms of family structure and dynamics, it refers to the intensity of emotional ties among family members. Olson, Sprenkle and Russell who contributed a lot to the topic, define it in their model as having two components: the

emotional bonding members have with one another and the degree of individual autonomy a person experiences in the family system (1979). In their conceptualization, some specific variables are thought to be included in the concept of family cohesion like emotional bonding, independence, boundaries, coalitions, time, space, friends, decision-making, and interest and recreation. Olson et al thought that when levels of cohesion in a family are balanced, the functional balance of the family will be more effective as well and the family will deal more effectively with situational stress and problems (Olson et al, 1979). The extremes of high family cohesion, "enmeshment", and low cohesion, "disengagement" are more problematic for families and regarded as vulnerable to stress, hence, pathological (Olson et al, 1979). Thus, cohesion like other important dimensions is salient especially as a clinical indicator in family therapy, providing treatment goals as well.

↗ Children who experienced normal, warm and affectional relations with their parents usually show a good capacity to make social relations with a reasonable degree of social conformity. Rejection by parents may give rise to in capacity for making social relations and in addition an apparent lack of any desire for them or normal social acceptance, the psychopath being the extreme example of this. But over-protectiveness, over-affection and too close ties may produce a clinging dependence, an excessive desire for social approval

and an inability to take any responsibility or give support to others (Vernon, 1969). Thus, as far as cohesiveness is concerned, families need to balance their degree of connectedness as a unit while maintaining individuality or separateness, this point becomes more important as children get older and become adolescents (Russell, 1979, p.31). //

In a study by Wedgwood (1960), conflict and tension between the adolescent and his family were found to be correlated with the intensity of bonds between family members (Groode et al, 1971). In another study by Russell (1979), high family functioning was found to be associated with moderate family cohesion and adaptability, and low family functioning had extreme scores on those dimensions.

Olson, Sprenkle and Russell in their study, provide a theoretical overview of the salience of the cohesion and adaptability dimensions in family therapy literature (1979). Recently, many family therapists, primarily describing families of schizophrenics, developed their own terminology while sharing a common focus:

A very important approach to the topic comes from Salvador Minuchin (1974). The sense of belongingness and separateness which are the two elements of one's identity, come from transactional patterns in the family structure. Minuchin (1974) stated that the sense of separateness and individuation occurs through participation in different family

"subsystems", in different contexts, as well as through participation in extrafamilial groups. According to the model, each individual belongs to different subsystems in the family, in which he has different levels of power, and he learns differentiated skills. Subsystems can be formed by generation, by sex, by interest, or by function. Dyads such as mother-child, or father-mother can be subsystems. The rules that define who participates how and in which subsystem are the boundaries of subsystems. These boundaries protect the differentiation of the family system. The main thing for Minuchin is that for proper functioning of the family, boundaries of subsystems must be clear. While allowing contact between the members of different subsystems, they must at the same time permit to members to fulfill their functions without interference. Minuchin states that in families with unclear or "blurred" boundaries (ie. rules) there is a loss of distance and a consequent increase in communication, and concern (ie. too much cohesion). Thus, the differentiation of the family system diffuses which he calls "enmeshed family system". Some others develop overly rigid boundaries where communication across subsystems becomes difficult and the nurturant and accommodation functions of the family are not fulfilled. This other extreme Minuchin called the "disengaged family system". The normal range lies in between, with clear boundaries. Minuchin further states that members of enmeshed families, with a heightened sense of belonging, may be handicapped discouraging autonomous

exploration and problem solving. Here, in the light of the model proposed, a child who is a member of such a system, may be expected to be too much dependent on others ie. parents when faced with problems or when in need. In this system, the members are too alert to others' reactions and the behavior of one member immediately effects others. On the other extreme, the disengaged family tolerates a wide range of individual variation and independence while lacking one of the main functions, protection and concern. The members of the subsystems can not cross over the extremely rigid boundaries to reach the others.

As an example to the different terminology on the topic, the extreme family togetherness was described by Wynne et al as "pseudo-mutuality" which is defined as "a predominant obserption in fitting together at the expense of the differentiation of persons in the relationship" (Olson et al, 1979).

Sterling, on the other hand, identified two opposing forces, "centripetal" and "centrifugal". High family cohesion can be viewed as "centripetal force" pulling family members toward one another into an intellectual and emotional "oneness". "Centrifugal force", on the other hand, pulls family members away from the family system. He proposes that for a family system to function properly and effectively, these two forces must operate in a more or less balanced manner (Olson et al, 1979).

In another more or less the same, but differently defined approach on the dimension of cohesiveness in the family, Bowen (1976) argues that the degree of fusion and differentiation between emotional and intellectual functioning is highly important (Guerin, 1976). The concept "differentiation of the self" is the cornerstone of his theory. At the one extreme of this continuum are those whose emotions and intellect are so fused that their lives are dominated by the automatic emotional system, leading to a less flexible, less adaptable, and more dependent personalities. Those who are more differentiated are on the other extreme with a relative separation between emotional and intellectual functioning which makes them more flexible and more adaptable. Using the same key concept, Bowen talks about "undifferentiated family ego mass", or "emotional fusion" for the extreme cohesion of the family which he defined as "a quality of "stuck togetherness" that is a conglomerate emotional oneness which exists at all levels of intensity" (Olson et al, 1979). The other extreme of very low cohesion which Minuchin named as "disengaged family system" is "emotional divorce" in Bowen's terminology. The optimal level is where there is a balanced cohesion, which is "differentiated self" for Bowen. Spouses who are more differentiated can let their children grow and develop their own autonomous selves without anxiety and each of the family members are more responsible for themselves and do not blame others for failures or use or rely exclusively on others as sources of approval, support and help.

Thus, in the light of above theories and investigations it is clear that patterns of family transactions, like cohesiveness and closeness are significant in establishing personality traits or motivation of the offspring, eg., the need for affiliation.

### Family Size

The size of the family in relation to the need for affiliation is a sociological variable and is scarcely touched by psychologist because of problems of designing properly controlled studies on the effects of family size on personality development.

Due to the presense of a limited number of investigations on the topic, the relation between the need for affiliation and family size could be conceptualized in three ways: First, through parental concern, time and emotional impacts on the individual, secondly, through cohesion, the closeness and togetherness of family members, and thirdly, in terms of family structure ie. transactional patterns and the number and participation to the subsystems proposed by Minuchin.

Taking emotional aspects into consideration, Bossard (1952) contrasted the large and small family with respect to their impact on children. In the small family, parenthood is intensive rather than extensive. Considerable emphasis is placed on individual development. For the child, the implica-

tions are many. Because of parents' tremendous investment, emotional and otherwise, the child is under pressure to measure up to family expectations. Large families are rather different. A greater degree of administration, organization and as indicated above, authoritarian control is needed. Furthermore, there is less intimate contact between the parent and any individual child (though higher participation in child rearing by older siblings is observed). Overprotectiveness, overindulgence and intrusiveness seldom occur (Johnson et al, 1965). In R. Bernard's study (1961), it was also found that parents in small families spend more time and effort on each child than in large families (Goode et al, 1971). Such findings are in the same line with Schachter's explanation for the high need for affiliation of the first-born children as discussed above.

With regard to cohesiveness, in a study, Parsons and colleagues have hypothesized more intimate and intense emotional relationship in the nuclear family as the bonds have become attenuated in the extended family and have found that affect is likely to be more positive in small than in large families and their own findings were consistent with past findings that positive affect tends to decline with increasing number of children, except for a slight increase in the two child family. However, the decline in the affect of children towards parents is much less than the decline in their perception of their parents' affect towards them. They, thus,

concluded that family size is more likely to be reflected in feelings of children of being neglected and rejected than in rejective feelings on their part toward their parents (Nye et al, 1970).

Talking on the dimension of cohesion in the family, family size has impacts on spouse relationship as well. Strodtbeck et al (1968) talk about a definite reduction of opportunities for interaction with and between parents as family size increases. In Christensen's paper (1968), it is indicated that the birth of the first child constitutes a crisis for parents: now the twosome turns to threesome, and additional tasks especially demanding of the mother reduce the time and energy that husband and wife have for each other. Before the child, there is only one relationship, husband and wife, but after the birth, there is husband and wife, father and child, mother and child, and the interacting triad composed of all three.

With each additional child there is a fundamental change in the interactional pattern of the original married pair. Though it needs to be further researched, Christensen concludes that some generalizations can be at least tentatively identified: As the number of children increases, husband and wife experience more interference with their own relationship, find less time for shared activities and move toward greater role specialization.

Together with the above factors, a large family is suspected to effect the need for affiliation unfavorably when Minuchin's approach to the family is taken as the model. As briefly mentioned above, Minuchin talks about subsystems in the structure of the family through which the system differentiates and carries out its functions. Within the family, individuals are subsystems and one individual may belong to more than one subsystem. That is, a child can be a son, an older brother, a nephew or a younger brother at the same time. In each subsystem, he has different levels of power, roles, responsibilities etc. and he learns differentiated skills (Minuchin, 1974). For Minuchin, such an organization provides valuable and effective training on the way to achieve autonomy, the differentiated "I am". That is, the more the number of subsystems one belongs to, the more likely it is for a child to differentiate his sense of separate self, and a large family obviously have more subsystems than a small one when compared on this aspect.

Therefore, if summarized, the large family can be expected to have a negative effect on the need for affiliation because of its complicated transactional patterns, role differentiation, low protectiveness, relatively less time invested in children and probably a lower level of cohesion.

#### Extended Family

Besides the predicted influence of cohesion and family

size on need for affiliation, the presence of other people such as relatives or grandparents in the family are thought to bring influences with them. Minuchin while talking about the subsystems, particularly stressed the importance of freedom from interference by other subsystems. For example, the proper functioning of the spouse subsystem requires freedom from interference by in-laws, children and sometimes by the extrafamilial. For instance, Leslie (1976) stated that grandmotherhood often is a major part of the middle-aged woman's solution to the loss of children through marriage. As grandmother, she acquires a new importance and usefulness. She experiences again most of joys of parenthood and mostly reassumes the role of authority as she counsels her daughter or daughter-in-law. Especially if retired many grandfathers also identify much more completely with the young grandchildren (Leslie, 1976, p.785). All those factors might lead to overprotection and overindulgence on the side of grandparents especially if living together which might further lead to dependence and increased need for affiliation. But, of course, a parental subsystem that includes a grandparent can function quite well, as long as lines of responsibility and authority are clearly drawn.

Some other factors which might effect the level of cohesion in the family are death of a parent or both parents, divorce or remarriage in the family, but each of those are of themselves quite complex and involve many factors to be

considered which are beyond the limits of this study. All such factors will be considered in this research for their degrees of possible influence on the need for affiliation, but as open questions rather than any predicted outcome.

### The Turkish Literature

In terms of related investigations in Turkey on this topic, there does not exist any study which directly focuses on the relationship between family cohesion and the need for affiliation as aimed in this study. There are, on the other hand, many investigations on Turkish family dynamics, functioning, role and status differentiation. It is not possible for this study to mention all those regarding the family, hence, only the approaches which are parallel with the topic of the present study emphasizing the transactional patterns and structure will be very briefly mentioned.

Turkey as a society moves from being a traditional, agricultural, rural, patriarchal society into an urbanized, industrial, modern, egalitarian one (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1981). However, the changes in values, and attitudes are not as fast as the changes in social structure and functioning; and especially in rural areas, close blood and kinship ties form the base for most social relationship (Stirling, 1965). The extended family is the source of security and support when the nuclear family has problems in fullfilling its tasks (Abadan Unat, 1976). Mutual responsibilities and royalties among members of hier-

archically ordered groups are the basis for social relationships, especially in rural communities where face-to-face interaction is predominant. Thus, the individual is in a network of close ties, beginning with the nuclear family and extending out to the relatives and close neighbors (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1981).

Moving from the indicated facts, Fişek (1983) presents an analysis of the Turkish family from a family systems theory perspective. When Minuchin's approach to the family is taken as the model, the boundaries of the subsystems in the family must be clear and differentiated for proper functioning. The social context of the Turkish family with above indicated characteristics, would appear to be somewhat fused, undifferentiated system of relationships within this perspective. Fişek points out that it is not the case however, since the hierarchical authoritarian structure of the society provides for differentiation on the normative level. That is, the system is differentiated and boundaries are clear as far as the roles and functions normatively expected from any individual of a given status are concerned (Fişek, 1983). She further adds that from the individual psychological functioning aspect, however, a relatively low differentiation and lack of autonomy may be expected and individuals in such systems, where emotional differentiation is not fully achieved, are likely to have a high need for a sense of belonging and be too quick in tending to fuse with others when

expectations are not clear and thus do not guide their emotional behavior (Fişek, 1983). This reasoning is more or less parallel with the findings of authors who agree that the traditional Turkish family dynamics would foster the development of a passive, dependent, constricted and frustrated person without a sense of autonomy and with a reliance on external sources of control and reinforcement (Cansever 1965, Gençtan 1973, Helling 1966, Kağıtçıbaşı 1981, Köknel 1970, Öztürk 1969).

Thus, when the existing literature on this particular topic for Turkish family is considered, it is seen that the system is highly differentiated with regard to normative roles and expectations but the experiential sense of belongingness and interdependence takes precedence over individuality which makes the system undifferentiated with regard to psychological and emotional relationships and experience of the individuals.

#### Implications of the Literature Review

Thus, in the light of the above theories and investigations, the need for affiliation is thought to have a relationship with the level of cohesion in the family. As the togetherness and closeness of the family members get more and more intense, hence, diversing from the normal limits, a need for closeness that is almost a clinging dependence increases which further leads to the development and increase of the

need for affiliation. The reverse is predicted for too low cohesion since it leads to an apparent lack of a good capacity for establishing and maintaining positive relations with others. Small families with possible occurrence of overprotection and with relatively more opportunity for giving enough time and energy to other members of the family, are expected to induce dependence rather than independence when contrasted with larger families, and this is thought to lead to increased need for affiliation.

### Hypotheses

Thus, the hypotheses underlying the study have been structured as follows:

A) Need for affiliation will increase as family ties get stronger, that is, the more cohesive the family, the stronger will be the need for affiliation.

B) The smaller the family, the stronger will be the need for affiliation.

## METHOD

### Subjects

The sampling population of the research was composed of 70 students of Rüstü Uzel Kız Meslek Lisesi ages between 15-17. As it was in Schachter's investigations as well, all subjects were females for the purposes of controlling the possible effects of sex variable. All subjects were from lower-middle socio-economic status families and parents were mostly elementary school graduates.

### Measurement Instruments

I- In this study, the definition and scoring of need for affiliation was based on the system developed by Shipley and Veroff (1958) revised by Atkinson et al. Shipley and Veroff define need for affiliation as "establishing, maintaining or restoring a positive affective relationship with another person; this relationship is most adequately described by the word "friendship" (Atkinson et al., 1958).

4 T.A.T. cards (4, 6BM, 8GF, 10) were used for the

measurement of need for affiliation and each story given to each T.A.T. card was scored according to the following seven main categories (see Appendix A for the detailed definitions of each category).

- 1- Imagery
- 2- Need
- 3- Instrumental Activity
- 4- Anticipatory Goal States
- 5- Obstacles or Blocks
- 6- Affective States
- 7- Thema

The maximum score one can get out of each story was 7, and the higher the score, the higher the need for affiliation (See Appendix B for detailed scoring of need for affiliation). Before the application of T.A.T. cards to the subjects, scoring reliability was checked by the method proposed by Shipley and Veroff. Two coders scored 50 stories independently and then the scores were compared for the category of "Imagery" and for other subcategory agreements. There was 91 % agreement over imagery and an average of 87 % agreement over the subcategories. The index of agreement was computed by dividing twice the number of agreements of a given category by the sum of the number of times the category was scored by the two scores.

II- The variable "family cohesion" was defined as "the emotional bonding that family members have toward one another". This is the same definition used in Faces II scale which is constructed by Olson et al (1981) for the purposes of measuring adaptability and cohesion dimensions in the family. Taking only the cohesion dimension into consideration, the same scale was used as the measuring tool of the present study.

The 30 item scale contains 16 cohesion items and 14 adaptability items. There are two items for each of the following eight concepts related to cohesion dimension: emotional bonding, family boundaries, coalitions, time, space, friends, decision-making, and interest and recreation.

According to Faces II, the individual's total score on cohesion could be between 16-80 and within the model, there are four levels of family cohesion ranging from extreme low cohesion (disengaged) [a total score of 47.9 or below], to extreme high cohesion (enmeshed) [a total score of 74.1 or above]. The two moderate or balanced levels of cohesion have been labeled as "separated" and "connected", and these two are thought to be most viable for healthy family functioning while the extreme areas are considered unhealthy and problematic (Olson et al, 1981).

III- Family size was the other variable in the study with the consideration that family is nuclear rather

than extended. The size was determined by the number of children.

### Procedure

Subjects were seen in groups and were first given a questionnaire which included information about age, income, occupation and educational level of the parents, subjects' preschool education if attended any, the number of children and grandparents or relatives living together with the family (see Appendix C). Then, they were given the four T.A.T. card - copies one after the other with time intervals of ten minutes. The instructions were given as written and verbally before they write their first story (see Appendix D). After this procedure was completed, the subjects were asked to answer the cohesiveness scale.

## R E S U L T S

The results of this study will be discussed by reviewing each hypothesis and the related findings.

Hypothesis one stated that the need for affiliation will increase as family ties get stronger, that is, the more cohesive the family, the stronger will be the need for affiliation. The strength of the predicted relation between these two variables was tested by means of a Pearson Correlation analysis. The need for affiliation and the cohesion level in the family came out to be significantly correlated ( $r = .44, p < .001$ ).

Hypothesis two stated that the smaller the family, the stronger will be the need for affiliation. In order to test this hypothesis, a Pearson Correlation analysis was carried out which yielded nonsignificant correlation between the two variables ( $r = .07, n.s.$ ).

In addition to the above hypotheses, certain factors, namely the demographic characteristics of the subjects seemed to be related to the degree of cohesiveness in the family and

to the need for affiliation. Those factors were conditions like death, divorce or remarriage in the family, the presence of grandparents in the family atmosphere, the ages of the parents and whether the mother worked or not. When tested for significance by means of a Pearson Correlation analysis, the factor of "working mothers" came out to be significantly correlated with the need for affiliation and cohesion in the family ( $r = .28, p < .010$  and  $r = .21, p < .039$  respectively). All other factors had no significant relation with any of the two variables. The values are shown in Table I.

TABLE I- Correlation Coefficients Between The Need For Affiliation and Cohesion in the Family and Demographic Characteristics of the Subjects.

	Age of the Mother	Age of the Father	Death, Divorce, Remarriage	Grandparents at Home	Number of Children	Mother Working	Cohesion
Need for Affiliation	$r=.10$	$r=.02$	$r=.10$	$r=.06$	$r=.07$	$r=.28^{**}$	$r=.44^{***}$
Cohesion	$r=.04$	$r=.09$	$r=.06$	$r=.04$	$r=.09$	$r=.21^*$	

\* =  $p < .05$

\*\* =  $p < .01$

\*\*\* =  $p < .001$

When the four T.A.T. stories for each subject were scored for the need for affiliation, there seemed to be differences among the different categories, so, a separate analysis was conducted to test the degree of significance among them. The result of the single sample t-test analysis, where the categories were taken as pairs, is given in Table II.

TABLE II- Need for Affiliation : Comparison of the Scoring Categories (N=70)

	(Difference) Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	T-value
Unrelated Imagery Affiliation Imagery	2.3143	1.303	.156	14.86**
Need Instrumental Activity	.5429	1.270	.152	3.57**
Need Personal Blocks	.8286	1.049	.125	6.61**
Need Environmental Blocks	.2143	1.226	.147	1.46
Instrumental Activity Environmental Blocks	.7571	1.256	.150	5.04**
Instrumental Activity Personal Blocks	.2857	.903	.108	2.65*
Instrumental Activity Goal Anticipation	.6286	1.010	.121	5.21**

\* =  $p < .01$

\*\* =  $p < .001$

Thus, it appears that the difference came out to be significant for the categories of unrelated imagery and affiliative imagery ( $t=14.86$ ,  $p < .001$ ), need and instrumental activity ( $t=3.57$ ,  $p < .001$ ), need and personal blocks ( $t=6.61$ ,  $p < .001$ ), instrumental activity and environmental blocks ( $t=5.04$ ,  $p < .001$ ), instrumental activity and personal blocks ( $t=2.65$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and instrumental activity and goal anticipation ( $t=5.21$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

With regard to the cohesion level of the families in terms of four categories (see page 36), 37 of the 70 families came out to be in the category of "enmeshed family cohesion" while 22 were "connected", 8 were "separated" and 3 were "disengaged" with a mean cohesion score of 63 for the whole sample. The highest cohesion score could have been 80 and the lowest 16.

## ~~DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION~~

The family, smallest but most salient social unit of society, shapes the individual into an integrated whole, and while providing for the roles, values, it imprints its members with selfhood. According to Minuchin whose approach is taken as the family model in the present study, the identity which is mostly acquired, through the agency of the family has two elements of "a sense of belongingness" and "a sense of being separate". These two elements come mostly from the transactional patterns and structure of the family (Minuchin, 1974). The members of the family belong to different subsystems and it is the boundaries of these subsystems which protect the differentiation of the system. That is, they must be clear for proper functioning and allow contact between family members while permitting them to fulfill their duties without interference. "The sense of belongingness" gets heightened when the boundaries get blurred as a result of an increase in communication and concern; or the opposite may be observed in the system where an extreme sense of separateness is accompanied with lack of concern and protection. In this transactional pattern, the boundaries of the subsystems get

so rigid that the members can not cross over them to reach each other. According to Minuchin, both of these patterns are unhealthy and the normal range lies in between. An important social motive, the need for affiliation, is thought to be in close relation to Minuchin's description of these transactional patterns. As the cohesion in the family (i.e. sense of belongingness) increases, the members' need to affiliate would increase as well, which means sacrifice from autonomy or differentiation as the system moves toward "enmeshed family functioning".

As predicted, the results of this study indicate a significant correlation between the cohesion level of the family, and an individual's need for affiliation. Such a result, first of all indicates that a high need for affiliation requires a certain type of family functioning and transactional pattern, i.e. a highly cohesive one. Taking from the theoretical perspective, individuals in a system of relatively low differentiation and lack of autonomy (i.e. high sense of belongingness) would be quick in tending to fuse with other, especially when normative expectations do not guide their emotional behavior (Fisek, 1983). This point is particularly important for Turkish society and thus requires a closer look: As indicated before, the traditional Turkish family system is highly differentiated with regard to normative role expectations but relatively undifferentiated with regard to psychological and emotional experiences, and

relationship of the individuals due to the emphasis on belonging (i.e. high cohesion) and interdependency (Fişek, 1983). This translates into a rather undifferentiated individual who has a high need for belonging but relatively lower need for separateness which induces him to move towards others with hopes of establishing, maintaining or restoring positive relationships with them.

It will be recalled that Faces II, the measurement scale of the cohesion dimension in this study, has four categories of cohesion levels. The mean of the cohesion score obtained in this study for the whole subject sample was 63, and 37 out of 70 families were under the category of "enmeshed family functioning". This finding is a good indicator of the network of close family ties in Turkish society as also stressed by other investigators. The two extreme categories of "disengaged family functioning" and "enmeshed family functioning" were regarded as potentially pathological when the evaluation of the family interaction is concerned. However, here, the social context with its characteristics of its own enters in to the picture.

For Turkey, when such undifferentiation and fusion is observed in terms of emotional and psychological experience in the family, the necessary differentiation and clarification comes from the social system with its rules, norms and expectations governing the formation and maintenance of boundaries. As long as the cultural norms regulate the functioning of the subsystem boundaries with its hierarchical authoritarian structure, there is a balance in the system.

This property of the Turkish family with its mixture of high role differentiation and low personel differentiation can accomodate both the social norms of interdependency and loyalty, and the social norms governing role expectations, and thus is not pathological under ordinary circumstances. However, for today's Turkey, there is the inavitable fact of a rapid socio-economic change which shakes this equilibrium and disturbs the role expectations, intra-group relationships with its main characteristics of changing values, and increased push towards differentiation. Studies reflecting this evolutionary process seems to indicate a challenge for the existing family structure with its close emotional ties possessing members with a high need for affiliation.

The second hypothesis of this study was related to the possible effects of family size and it was claimed that the smaller the family, the stronger would be the need for affiliation, a large family is characterized by a relatively low occurance of overprotection, less amount of time and energy invested on individuals, more subsystems in the family structure which leads to a greater possibility for the development of a differentiated self, and thus is expected to influence the need for affiliation unfavorably.

The results yielded a nonsignificant correlation between the two variables, that is, no significant increase was observed in the need for affiliation as the size of the nuclear family increased. This finding is parallel with the

results of Schachter who concluded that "the variable determining the affiliative nature of the response to anxiety appears to be ordinal position and not family size" (Schachter, 1959, p.57).

Thus, one can not talk of a significant decline in positive affect or any such change in the intensity of the emotional bonds with regard to changes in the size of the family as far as the results of this study is concerned. The same thing holds true when family structure is emphasized, that is, a large family naturally has more subsystems than a small one and thus, is expected to have more opportunity for its members to learn differentiated skills since they participate in many subsystems. This makes them able to achieve autonomy and differentiate a sense of separateness. The finding of a nonsignificant correlation between the two variables may be due to the above explained features of the Turkish family system. The normative roles, and expectations are so clearly drawn by the social context that the fact of participating in large number of subsystems does not bring any further differentiating effect with it. There could be other explanations on this point. It was stated that as the family size increases, there is a reduction of opportunities for interaction among the family members and there is less intimate contact between the parents and any individual child. This fact was conceived as decreasing the development of a high need for affiliation. For traditional Turkish

family, the individual child in such a family has alternative resources other than his/her parents to form close, intimate relationships, namely grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. i.e. extended family. Thus, in such a network of close relations between extended and nuclear family, there is a decline or shift in responsibility for the parents and the children of large families still have high needs for affiliation.

Within the narrow limits of the present study, some other factors like the presence of grandparents in the atmosphere of the nuclear family, death of a parent or both parents, divorce or remarriage in the family, the ages of the parents and whether the mother worked or not were all considered as they were thought to effect the level of cohesion and need for affiliation. Each of these is an important and complex topic by itself. Thus, they were taken as open questions without going into further depth. A major weakness of this study was the sampling population which was extremely homogeneous on these dimensions, each family had more or less the same characteristics. Probably due to thus homogeneity, all of these factors were not correlated with the two variables of the study, except the factor of "working-mothers". If dimension of level of cohesion in the family has to be studied in depth, each one of these variables require further researching.

The families with "working mothers" seemed to be more cohesive with members relatively high in need for affiliation

This result may be explained in terms of the working mother's possible extra efforts to compensate the time she is away from the family members by an increase in positive affect, concern, interest and the like which all effect and increase the cohesiveness level in the family and thus the need for affiliation.

When the scoring categories of the stories written by subjects to measure the need for affiliation (see Appendix A) were tested for significance, interesting differences were observed among them (see Table II). First of all when all the stories written for the four T.A.T. cards were considered, the stories related with affiliation were significantly more than the unrelated ones. This indicates an apparent affiliative concern among the majority of the subjects. The heroes of the stories felt the need of "establishing, maintaining or restoring a positive affective relationship with another person", but this need was significantly more than the instrumental activity (any act or plan to preserve or gain the desired relationship). In other words, there is a relative lack of initiation and activity despite the existing need for that. Subjects in their stories talk more about the environmental blocks indicating the obstacles (something or someone other than the desired person) standing in the way of the individual concerned, than they do about any instrumental activity initiated on the way to establish, maintain or restore a positive relationship. These

environmental blocks are also more than the personal blocks (personal shortcomings, such as jealousy, bad character etc. which stand in the way). These can be interpreted as being parallel with the above discussed fact of "externally controlled" individuals, lacking initiation. Another interesting finding was the relative lack of goal anticipation. This category was scored when someone in the story anticipated goal attainment or frustration and deprivation. This category was significantly less than the category of instrumental activity; in other words, the heroes in the stories of majority of the subjects acted without any positive or negative goal anticipation.

Obviously, these anticipations are made only by the comparison of different scoring categories from a total of 280 stories written by 70 subjects, but the frequency of certain responses to the same stimuli indicates certain features with regard to this particular group. Such similarities may be due to the homogeneous nature of the subject group as emphasized before but then, they may be regarded as descriptive for this population.

Due to practical reasons, this study has certain limitations. First of all, the homogeneous subject group was composed of only females, ages between 15-17, all coming from the same socio-economic status (i.e. lower-middle). The same procedure could be applied to subjects from different socio-economic status groups of different ages, including males as

well. Since the area of interest was the dimension of cohesion (and hence, family structure and transactional patterns), and a social motive coming with it, the need for affiliation, socio-economic status, sex differences (especially due to different role expectations) are all expected to bring effects with them. Regarding the cohesion dimension, the above mentioned factors which were treated as open questions like death, divorce or remarriage in the family could be taken separately in depth to see the possible differences. The same thing is true for the factor of extended family.

Another area of interest could be the investigation of other social motives in relation to cohesion dimension, because as it is found in this research as well, cohesion constitutes one of the main dimensions especially for the Turkish family system which calls for further research.

## B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Abadan-Unat, N. "Implications of Migrations on Emancipation and Pseudo-Emancipation of Turkish Women". Paper given at the Wellesley College Conference on Women and Development, 1976.

Arkes, H.R. and Garske, J.P. Psychological Theories of Motivation. Belmont, California, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1977.

Beck, R.C. Motivation: Theories and Principles. New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Inc., 1978, pp.355-356.

Berkowitz, L. The Development of Motivation and Values in the Child. New York, Basic Books Inc., 1964.

Bowen, M. "Theory in the Practice of Psychotherapy". In P.J. Guerin (ed.), Family Therapy: Theory and Practice. New York, Gardner Press, 1976, pp.42-90.

Cansever, G. "Psychological Effects of Circumcision," British Journal of Medical Psychology, 1965, 38, 321-331.

Christensen, H. "Children in the Family: Relationship of Number and Spacing to Marital Success," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30, 2, 283-289.

Cofer, K.N. and Appley, M.H. Motivation: Theory and Research. New York, J.Wiley and Sons Inc., 1964.

Fernald, D.L. and Fernald, P.S. Introduction to Psychology. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.

Fişek, G. "Psychopathology and the Turkish Family: A Family Systems Theory Analysis". In Ç.Kağıtçıbaşı (ed.), Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey. Indiana University Turkish Studies 3, 1983.

Freedman, J.L., Sears, D.O. and Carlysmith, M.J. Social Psychology. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.

Gençtan, E. "Toplumumuz bireylerinde kimlik kavramları ile ilgili sorunlar üzerinde bir tartışma" (A debate on problems concerning identity concepts in the individuals of our society), 50. Yıla Armağan, Ankara, Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları, 1973, 63-77.

Goode, W.J., Hopkins, E. and McClure, H.M. Social Systems and Family Patterns. New York, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1971.

Heckhausen, H. The Anatomy of Achievement Motivation. New York, Academic Press, 1967.

Helling, G.A. The Turkish Village as a Social System.

Unpublished monograph. Los Angeles, Occidental College, 1966.

Heyns, R.W., Veroff, J. and Atkinson, J.W. "A Scoring Manual for the Affiliation Motive". In J.W. Atkinson (ed.), Motives in Fantasy, Action, and Society, New Jersey, D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1958, pp.205-218.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. Çocuğun Değeri: Türkiye'de Değerler ve Doğurganlık (The Value of Children: values and fertility in Turkey). Istanbul, Boğaziçi Univ. Publications, 1981.

Köknel, Ö. Türk Toplumunda Bugünün Gençliği (Today's youth in Turkish society). Istanbul, Bozak Matbaası, 1970.

Kretch, D., Crutchfield, S. and Livson, N. Elements of Psychology. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1974, pp.461-464.

Leslie, G.R. The Family in Social Context New York, Oxford University Press, Inc., 1976.

McClelland, D., Atkinson, J.W., Clark A.R. and Lowell E. The Achievement Motivation. New York, Appleton-Century Crafts, Inc., 1953.

Munn, N.L. Psychology: The Fundamentals of Human Adjustment. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

Murray, E. Motivation and Emotion. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Nye, I.F., Carlson, J. and Garrett, G. "Family Size, Interaction, Affect and Stress", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 216-225.

Olson, D.H., Sprenkle, D.H. and Russell, C.S. "Circumplex model of Marital and Family Systems: I. Cohesion and Adaptability Dimensions, Family Types, and Clinical Applications," Family Process, 1979, 18, 3-25.

Öztürk, M.O. "Anadolu kişiliğinde özerklik ve girişme duygularının kısıtlanması" (Inhibition of autonomy and initiative in the Anatolian personality). Beşinci Milli Nöro-Psikiyatri Kongresi, 1969.

Russell, C.S. "Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems: III Empirical Evaluation With Families", Family Process, 1979, 18, 29-45.

Samelson, F. "The Relation of Achievement and Affiliation Motives to Conforming Behavior in Two Conditions of Conflict with a Majority", in J.W. Atkinson (ed.), Motives in Fantasy, Action and Society. New Jersey, D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1958, pp. 421-433.

Schacter, S. The Psychology of Affiliation. Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1959.

Stirling, P. Turkish Village. London, Weidengeld and Nicholson, 1965.

Strodtbeck, F. and Creelan, P.G. "The Interaction Linkage  
Between Family Size, Intelligence and Sex Role Identity,"  
Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30, 2, 301-  
307.

Vernon, M.D. Human Motivation. Cambridge, Cambridge University  
Press, 1969.

APPENDIX - A: THE SCORING MANUAL FOR THE NEED FOR AFFILIATION  
(Atkinson, et al., 1958)

1- Affiliation Imagery

It is scored when the relationship between two or more individuals is friendly. When there is an objective statement in the story that a person is separated from another and is concerned about it, or concerned about possible separation, affiliation imagery is considered to be present. This means that for a story to be scored for Affiliation Imagery, it should contain at least one of the following types of imagery:

a) Concern with rejection, being jilted, "stood up", left out, outcast or ignored;

b) Concern with loneliness, being without former friends or relatives, including mere mention of the word "lonely";

c) Concern with physical departure (eg. negative affective concern over the death of a loved one);

d) Concern with psychic separation (i.e. a quarrel, fight or disagreement);

e) Concern with no reciprocal love (i.e. one loves another, and is concerned because the other does not love him).

f) Reparation (i.e. seeking forgiveness, repenting, or changing one's ways to preserve an interpersonal relationship);

g) Loving, nurturing, and friendly actions on the part of one character towards another implying a desire that similar actions be reciprocated.

Stories that clearly do not meet the stated criteria are scored Unrelated Imagery, and the story is not scored for any of the categories below. Doubtful Imagery stories are not scored any further either.

#### 2- Need for Affiliation

When there is a statement of a desire for the recovery, maintenance, or attainment of a friendly or loving relationship, Need is scored. Not scored Need are statements of a need for help, money, respect, etc. from a person. Some indications of a statement of Need are: "dreaming of", "prays for", and "desires his return".

#### 3- Instrumental Activity

When there is a statement that someone in the story plans or acts to preserve or gain a friendly or loving relationship, the story is scored for Instrumental activity. If such acts as giving advice or helping another are accompanied by evidence of concern for the feelings of the person, it is also scored for Instrumental activity.

#### 4- Anticipatory Goal States

This category is scored when someone in the story anticipates goal attainment or frustration and deprivation. The anticipatory goal state is scored positive when someone

in the story is thinking of the happiness accompanying an affiliative relationship or some affiliative activity or is thinking of the activity itself. It is scored negative when someone is thinking of the pain of separation or rejection or the fact of possible future separation or rejection itself.

#### 5- Obstacles or Blocks

This category is scored when goal directed activity is hindered or blocked in some way. The obstacle may be personal or environmental. When it is personal, the individual is concerned about a relationship having personal shortcomings such as jealousy or bad character, which stands in his way of preserving, obtaining or recovering the personal relationship in question. When the obstacle is in the environment, something or someone (other than the desired person) stands in the way of the individual concerned.

#### 6- Affective States-Positive or Negative

Affective (emotional) states associated with attainment of affiliative relationships, affiliative activities, or their frustration are scored for this category. When someone in the story experiences the joys and satisfactions of affiliation eg. he is happy over being accepted into the club, or companionate activity, eg. they enjoyed the game etc., the affective state is scored Positive. When the pain of separation or rejection is experienced, the affective state is scored negative; eg. he feels lonely, he is depressed over his inability to make friends and so on.

7- Affiliation Thema

When the main plot of a story or one of the equally predominant plots in the story is concerned with establishing, maintaining or restoring an interpersonal relationship characterized by friendship, mutual interest and sympathetic understanding, thema is scored.

## APPENDIX - B: EVALUATION OF THE SCORING CATEGORIES FOR NEED FOR AFFILIATION

In the scoring of need for affiliation, many researchers focused only on those categories which indicate positive (approach) interest and obtained need affiliation score for each story by counting (+1) for each of the following categories: Affiliation Imagery, Need, successful Instrumental Activity, Positive Anticipatory Goal States, Positive Affective State, Environmental Obstacle and Thema. From the content of the categories, this leaves out Negative Instrumental Activity, Negative Anticipatory Goal States, Personal Blocks or Obstacles, and Negative Affective States although they are taken into consideration while evaluation the stories. Therefore, the maximum score one can get out of each story is 7. In the present study, same procedure and scoring was followed since need for affiliation was defined accordingly and approach side (to others for support, reliance and approval) is stressed rather than avoidance aspect of the motive (fear of rejection, etc.).

## APPENDIX - C: THE COHESIVENESS SCALE

Yaşınız:

Cinsiyetiniz: a) Erkek b) Kadın

Anneniz: a) Sağ b) Değil

Babanız: a) Sağ b) Değil

Annenizin Yaşı: Mesleği:

Halen çalışıyor mu? a) Evet b) Hayır

(Evetse) Kaç yıldır:

Son bitirdiği okul: a) İlk b) Orta c) Lise d) Yüksek Okul

Babanızın yaşı: Mesleği:

Halen çalışıyor mu? a) Evet b) Hayır

Son bitirdiği okul: a) İlk b) Orta c) Lise d) Yüksek Okul

Anne babanız: a) Boşanmış

b) Ayrı yaşıyorlar

c) Baba tekrar evlenmiş

d) Anne tekrar evlenmiş

e) Hiçbiri

Ailenizin gelir düzeyi: a) Düşük b) Orta c) Yüksek

Kreş ya da yuvaya gittiniz mi: a) Evet b) Hayır

(Evetse) Kaç yıl süreyle:

Ailenizde (sizinle birlikte oturan) kaç kişi var:

Kimler? (Lütfen olanların yaşını ve adedini de belirtiniz)

Kaç tane

Yaş

a) Anne -----

b) Baba -----

c) Erkek kardeş -----

d) Kız kardeş -----

e) Anneanne (Babaanne) -----

f) Dayı -----

g) Hala -----

h) Teyze -----

ı) Amca -----

j) Diğer (örneğin dadı,  
hizmetçi, vs.)

Aşağıda ailelerin genel işleyiş tarzlarını yansıtan bazı ifadeler verilmiştir. Her ifadeyi okuduğunuzda (bu ifadenin sizin ailenizin durumunu ne kadar yansıttığını düşünüp hemen altında verilen seçeneklerden bir tanesini işaretlemeniz istenmektedir.

1- Ailemizde herkes zor durumlarda birbirine destek olur.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

2- Ailemizde herkes düşüncelerini rahatlıkla söyleyebilir.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık Sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

3- Dertlerimizi başkalarıyla konuşmak, aile içinde konuşmaktan daha kolaydır.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

4- Ailede önemli kararlar alınırken herkesin söz hakkı vardır.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

5- Ailece aynı odada biraraya geliriz.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

6- Çocuklar da kendi disiplinleri hakkında söz söyleme hakkına sahiptir.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

7- Ailemizde birçok şey birlikte yapılır.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

8- Aile sorunları birarada tartışılır ve varılan sonuçlardan herkes memnun kalır.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

9- Bizim ailede herkes kendi bildiğini yapar.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

10- Evdeki sorumlulukları birbirimize sırayla devrederiz.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

11- Ailede herkes birbirinin yakın arkadaşlarını tanır.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

12- Ailemizdeki kuralların neler olduğunu anlamak zordur.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

13- Ailemizde herkes kendi vereceği kararlar hakkında ailenin diğer üyelerine danışır.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

14- Ailemizde herkes düşündüğünü söyler.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

15- Ailemizde birlikte yapacak birşeyler bulmakta güçlük çekeriz.

- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

- 16- Ailemizde sorunlar çözüldürken çocukların önerilerine de uyulur.  
a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 17- Ailemizde herkes kendini diğerlerine yakın hisseder.  
a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 18- Ailemizde disiplin kuralları uygulanırken haksızlık yapılmaz.  
a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 19- Ailemizde herkes kendisini başkalarına aileden daha yakın hisseder.  
a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 20- Ailemizin sorunları olduğunda yeni çözüm yolları da denenir.  
a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 21- Ailemizde herkes ortak aile kurallarına uyar.  
a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 22- Ailemizde sorumlulukları herkes paylaşır.  
a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 23- Ailemizde herkes boş zamanlarını birlikte geçirmekten hoşlanır.  
a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 24- Ailemizde kurallar kolay kolay değiştirilemez.  
a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

- 25- Ailemizde herkes birlikte olmaktan kaçınır.
- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 26- Ortaya bir sorun çıktığında orta yolu buluruz.
- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 27- Birbirimizin arkadaşlarını uygun buluruz.
- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 28- Ailemizde herkes düşündüğünü açıkça söylemekten çekinir.
- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 29- Ailemizdekiler hep birarada birşeyler yaptıktan sonra, ikişer kişilik gruplar halinde birşeyler yapmayı tercih ederler.
- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman
- 30- Ailemizde kişiler ilgilerini ve eğlencelerini birbirleriyle paylaşırlar.
- a) Hemen hemen, hiçbir zaman      b) Nadiren      c) Arada sırada  
d) Sık sık      e) Hemen hemen, her zaman

APPENDIX - D: THE INSTRUCTION FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF T.A.T.  
CARDS

"Şimdi size teker teker olmak üzere 4 adet resim dağıtılacak ve herbiri için bir hikaye yazmanız istenecek. Her hikaye için on dakikalık bir süreniz var. Yazacağınız hikayelerin bir başı, bir ortası, bir de sonu olacak, yani daha önce ne olmuş; şu anda ne oluyor ve daha sonra ne olacak. Ayrıca hikayelerinizdeki kişilerin neler düşündüğünü, neler istediğini, neler hissettiğini de yazmanız isteniyor. Bir başka deyişle, size yazılı olarak da verilen şu soruları cevaplamanız gerekiyor:

- 1) Şu anda ne oluyor, bu kişiler kimler?
- 2) Bu duruma neden olan nedir, yani geçmişte ne olmuş?
- 3) Hikayede neler düşünülüyor, kim ne istiyor?
- 4) Ne olacak, ne yapılacaktır?"