

Arastırma Makalesi

A Study for Scale Development: War Trauma Exposure Scale

Nurten ÖZÜORÇUN KÜÇÜKERTAN^{1,2*} , Ayşe Nuray KARANCI^{1,3} ¹ Middle East Technical University, Department of Psychology, Ankara, Turkey² Middle East Technical University-Northern Cyprus Campus, Psychology Program, Güzelyurt, Cyprus³TOBB University of Economics and Technology, Department of Psychology, Ankara, Turkey

Makale Bilgisi

Abstract

Keywords:

war assessment,
war scale,
war trauma
exposure

Despite being widely studied, research only deals with consequences of war. While assessing war effects, the existing instruments take war as a general trauma, simply ask about its existence and skip to the consequences. Thus, there is a gap in assessing what experiences the survivor went through. Aim of the study is to develop a scale that will enable understanding war experiences qualitatively, and also evaluate the impact of them quantitatively, named as War Trauma Exposure Scale (WTES). This study was carried out as part of a thesis (Author), with Turkish Cypriot women in North Cyprus ($N = 168$) considering Cyprus War. Three phases were followed: interview, pilot study, and psychometric examination. At psychometric investigation, factor analysis revealed three-factor solution: "Negative Emotions", "Exposure to Violence", and "Loss". The overall reliability of WTES was good ($r = .91$). Both, Impact of Events Scale (IES-R) and the scale were gathered under the same factor with 75.68% variance. Scale showed significant correlations with other related constructs. ANOVA supported that the scale was parallel to IES-R. Chi-square fit test (χ^2) revealed a good fit. Consequently, the scale is relatively valid and reliable for measuring war-related exposure despite limitations. WTES, is a distinct one since (1) it directly focuses on war-trauma, (2) lists 23 real war-trauma exposures to be identified, (3) asks the survivor's war experience and (4) assess its influence. Therefore, unlike existing scales to assess war-trauma, WTES helps to understand unique exposure of the war-survivor and assess the psychological impact these exposures.

Öz

Anahtar
kelimeler:savaş ölçeği,
savaş travması
maruziyeti,
savaş travması ölçeği

Geniş çapta çalışılmasına rağmen, araştırmalar yalnızca savaşın sonuçlarıyla ilgilendirir. Savaşın etkilerini değerlendirirken mevcut ölçekler savaşı genel bir travma olarak ele alır, sadece yaşamı yaşadığını sorar ve doğrudan sonuçlarına atlar. Yani, savaştan sağ kurtulanların hangi deneyimleri yaşadıklarını değerlendirmede bir boşluk vardır. Bu nedenle, çalışmanın amacı, savaş deneyimlerinin nitel olarak anlaşılmasını sağlayacak ve etkilerini nicel olarak değerlendirebilecek bir ölçek geliştirmektir. Bu çalışma bir tez çalışmasının parçası olarak (Yazar), Kuzey Kıbrıs'taki Kıbrıslı Türk kadınlarla ($N = 168$) Kıbrıs Savaşı dikkate alınarak yapılmıştır. Çalışmada üç aşama izlenmiştir: görüşme, pilot çalışma ve psikometrik inceleme. Psikometrik incelemede, faktör analizi "Olumsuz Duygular", "Şiddete Maruz Kalma" ve "Kayıp" olmak üzere üç faktörlü çözüm ortaya koymuştur. Ölçeğin genel güvenilirliği iyidir ($r = .91$). Hem Olayların Etkisi Ölçeği (IES-R) hem de Savaş Travmasına Maruz Kalma Ölçeği (WTES) %75.68 varyans ile aynı faktör altında toplanmıştır. Ölçek, diğer ilgili yapılarla önemli korelasyonlar göstermiştir. ANOVA, ölçeğin IES-R ile paralel olduğunu desteklemiştir. Ki-kare uyum testi (χ^2) iyi bir uyum göstermiştir. Sonuç olarak WTES'in, sınırlılıklarına rağmen, savaşa bağlı maruz kalmayı ölçmek için nispeten geçerli ve güvenilir bir ölçek olduğu bulunmuştur. Savaş Travmasına Maruz Kalma Ölçeği (WTES), (1) doğrudan savaş travmasına odaklandığı, (2) savaş travmasının tanımlanabilmesi için 23 gerçek savaş deneyimini listelediği, (3) hayatta kalanın maruz kaldığı savaş deneyimi sorduğu ve (4) bu maruz kalmanın etkisini ölçtüğü için diğer ölçeklerden ayrılır. Dolayısıyla, savaş travmasını değerlendirmeye yönelik mevcut ölçeklerden farklı olarak, WTES, savaştan sağ kurtulanların savaş deneyimlerini anlamayı ve bu savaş deneyimlerinin psikolojik etkisini değerlendirmeyi mümkün kılan bir ölçektir.

*Correspondent Author, Psychology Program, Middle East Technical University-Northern Cyprus Campus, Güzelyurt, Cyprus.

e-posta: nurtenk@metu.edu.tr

DOI : 10.31682/ayna.1202068

Submission Date: 17.11.2022; Acceptance Date: 16.04.2023

Introduction

War-related experiences are very hard ones when compared to other non-interpersonal traumatic incidents (Do et al., 2019). War-trauma can create great psychological impacts like depression, anxiety, PTSD and some other psychiatric disorders (Do et al., 2019; Johnson et al., 2022). In addition to its relatively acute effects, war also have long-term impact on the survivor's life (Freitag et al., 2013; Gade & Wenger, 2011). It is evident that even after 50 years following World War II, the survivor's exposure to shocking war incidents, is negatively linked to the survivor's psychological adjustment through the PTSD symptoms, anxiety and anger (Bramsen & van der Ploeg, 1999). Regarding such evidence, it is clear that survivor's either current or earlier war-experiences are in the scope of clinical interest.

However, it seems difficult to qualitatively assess these war-related unique experiences of survivors. Although there are many studies focusing on the psycho-symptomatological results of such war-related experiences (Do & Correa-Velez, 2019; Mundy et al., 2020; Johnson et al., 2022), very few manage to reveal what the war-related experience was like for the person who experienced them (Goldstein et al., 1997; Manzanero et al., 2021).

While assessing these war-related experiences, there are many scales that directly and only focus on the psychopathological effects aftermath trauma. Among them, Impact of Event Scale (IES-R) is one of the most respected scales while studying trauma (Weiss & Marmar, 1997). IES-R is a 15-item Likert type scale that the participant is expected to report the impact of the event within the last seven days, considering any possibly traumatic exposure (Horowitz et al., 1979). However, this scale just aimed to assess the symptomatological reactions to the event within the last week, rather than focusing on the incidence as a personal experience. Thus, using this scale, one can only answer to what extend the individual developed symptoms in relation to the traumatic incidence, within the last week. But what about the individual's intense cognitive, physical, and emotional reactions for an event that happened before the last week? Simply because these reactions are not reported for the last week, can we disregard what the person experienced during war-times? IES-R scale is therefore is limited since it does not (1) focus on the war-related trauma, (2) concern the individual's personal war-related traumatic experiences, and (3) help clinicians to understand the impact of war-trauma other than the symptoms experienced with the last week.

As another scale, Foa's Post-traumatic Diagnostic Scale (1997) is a measurement that focuses on assessing the pathological reactions related with the traumatic experience. Although Post-traumatic Diagnostic Scale asks about the "type of the [traumatic] event", no further information is concentrated about this extraordinary experience. So, the individual is simply and only asked whether the traumatic experience was a "war" or an "accident", an "earthquake" ...etc. However, clinicians are probably expected to intend to understand, what the person went

through, together with his/her reactions to the experience. Thus, it seems crucial to specify the war-related experience itself in the clinical area to be able to talk about its effects. Just asking people whether they experienced war or not, does not give much information about what kind of experiences they went through. What difficulties the individual was exposed to during these war times, remains a mystery. Thus, the quality of any clinical work that would rely only onto the occurrence of a war-trauma without understanding the individual's exposure, will be debatable. Thus, there is a need for a scale that can help clinicians understand the war-survivor's experiences as a war-trauma exposure.

Therefore, despite the fact that a qualitative understanding of such war-related experiences is important in clinical area, there seems to be an important gap regarding the limitations of the tools intended for this purpose. As mentioned above, the other pre-existing war trauma measurements become very limited especially in the clinical practice due to some reasons. First, such tools are not intended to focus specifically on the war-trauma; but rather they scan the occurrence of a variety of possibly traumatic incidences including war. Second, even if such scales can also be used to scan war-related trauma, too; they concern only the occurrence of war incidents regardless of the individual's unique experiences and exposures throughout this incidence. What is more, these scales only assess the individual's current symptoms related to the trauma, thus they can only inform us about the individual's level of symptomatology development following the traumatic experience. As a result, we can only detect whether certain psychiatric disorders, such as PTSD, occurred or not, aftermath trauma. However, the non-occurrence of a psychiatric disorder cannot neutralize what the individual lived throughout such a devastating experience. With the light of these limitations, the current study aims to develop a scale which can help clinicians both qualitatively understand the unique and extraordinary experiences of the war-survivors, and also enables them to quantitatively study such war-related trauma exposures. To do so, first, interviews will be conducted to understand the war-trauma experiences of the survivors. Then these experiences will be turned to war-exposure items. After that, these items will be listed and the participants will be first asked to depict which exposures s/he went through and they will be required to further clarify the level of this exposure's influence on a Likert-type scale. After the pilot study, the psychometric properties of the scale will be investigated with a larger sample. Detailed information about the participants is given at the Method section.

Method

Methodologically, the scale development study was held in three main steps as a part of a large study (Author). In the first step, war-survivors were interviewed about their war-related experiences and the effects of these war incidences. The interviews were then analyzed

and coded. Following this, a scale was formed based on these reported war experiences of survivors together with literature information. After that, as a second step, a pilot study (in the form of individual semi-structured interviews) with 10 war-survivors was conducted to test the scale and get specific feedback, especially regarding the survivors' war-related experiences. Then, feedbacks are considered and in addition to that, statistic-related revisions were made. After the needed changes, as the third step, the scale was further administered to a larger group of war-survivors ($N = 168$) in order to investigate the scale's psychometric properties. In order to fulfill this aim, Factor Analysis was conducted and the scale's correlations with related measures were investigated. Further, univariate ANOVA was computed to see whether the mean values are different from that of similar constructs. The fit of the scale was also inspected.

Participants

Mainly starting from 1963 until 1974, both Greek and Turkish Cypriots experienced highly devastating war times. However, these experiences were not systematically studied. Thus, as a part of a larger study (Author), the research was planned to be conducted among Cypriots regarding 1963-74 Cyprus Conflict/War and related war trauma. However, despite all the efforts of the authors, bureaucratically it was only possible to conduct the study in the Northern part of the island with Turkish Cypriot women ($N = 168$). Although at the interview and pilot study parts, man war-survivors were also included to be able to get various war-related information, as well; the psychometric properties of the scale were tested among female war-survivors, since the main study was interested in the mother's war-trauma transmission (Author).

Required sample size determination for the psychometric calculations was adapted from Tabachnick and Fidell's (2007) book (p. 123). For the pilot study's sample size, Nieswiadomy's suggestions (2002) were considered ($N = 10$). Considering the interview process like a "narrative study" that can inform about the war-related experiences of the survivors, it was mentioned that there is not a single rule to determine the sample size (Francis et al., 2010). Therefore, the quality of the 10 interviews was considered to be enough since it is not the size of the sample, but the quality of the story that will be important (Moen, 2006). At each stage of the study, data was collected from the convenient sample via snowball technique. The whole data collection process lasted for about 3 months.

Step one (interviews) was conducted with both males and females (2 men and 8 women) while the rest of the psychometric studies are continued with 168 Turkish Cypriot women. The women's age ranged from 45 to 72, with a mean of 52.66 ($SD = 6.40$). Please note that the main study was completed in 2013. Therefore, actually, the age of the participants during the war-times was ranging from 6 to 33. Although at age 6 remembering an event may

be doubtful, since at the interview step participants described detailed experiences at this age, these cases (with age 45 in 2013) were decided to be included in the study. For detailed information about demographic characteristics see Table 1.

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics for Women's Demographic Variables

Variables	N	%	Mean	SD	Min-Max
Age	168		52.66	6.40	45-72
Education	166				
Primary	49	29.5			
Secondary	20	12			
Lycee	80	48.2			
University	14	8.4			
Masters/Doctorate	2	1.2			
Other	1	0.6			
Income	168				
Very low	3	1.8			
Low	16	9.5			
Moderate	112	66.7			
Moderate to high	31	18.5			
High	6	3.6			
Any psychological treatment	164		.20	0.80	0-1
Yes	13	7.7			
No	151	89.9			
Still in psychological treatment	123		1.35	2.22	0-1
Yes	2	1.2			
No	121	72			

Interview Step

As the first step, an interview with a small sample ($N = 10$) was conducted with ten adults (8 women and 2 men) in North Cyprus (ages between 45-60) who experienced war/combat. Among the women, one woman (who partially lost her walking ability due to a severe injury caused by a school bombing) said that her life was like a “fairy tale” before the war times; however, she lost many things due to war: her beauty, walking ability, beautiful house, expensive car, “easy” life thus consequently she reported becoming an “incomplete” person. Survivors reported that they experienced “very hard times” since they had to “evacuate their houses and their villages”, “being obliged to walk for days on the mountains without any food or water”, “not being able to find a shelter”, “not being able to find any food or water at the places they settled temporarily”, “not being able to find any clothes appropriate to the weather conditions”, “losing many valuable things (like: a healthy body, car, jewelry, money, remembrance like important photographs ...etc)”, “falling apart from their family members, close neighbors and close friends”, “becoming enemies with their close Greek friends”, “feeling doubt about their safety every time and everywhere”, “experiencing an attack or bombing to a ‘protective’ civilian shelter (like hospitals, schools, mosque... etc)”, “despite being a child,

participating in the combat actively”, “witnessing violence towards a family a member, a friend or a person out of family”, “witnessing a family member, a friend or a person out of family being murdered”, and “directly experiencing violence from others towards the self”. Not only war-related combat was reported, but also severe torture scenes were frequently expressed by the survivors as exposure to violence. Participants said that even after more than 40 years (at 2013), sometimes they may feel horrified and may see some flashbacks. They reported experiencing such things resulting from seeing soldiers, hearing flying planes/helicopters, seeing army vehicles (like tanks and lorries) passing-by, watching a combat/war scene, hearing a gunfire, and hearing an unexpected loud voice.

This small sample interview enabled researchers to gather detailed information about the experiences of war survivors, and this information was parallel to the literature findings on war experiences of the survivors (Goldstein et al., 1997). Consequently, these interview-information were synthesized with the literature data including DSM-5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), Goldstein and colleagues’ article about “war experiences” (1997), Elal and Slade’s (2005) “traumatic exposure severity scale” and “post-traumatic diagnostic scale” by Foa and colleagues (1997), in order to form “War Trauma Exposure Scale” that is developed as a part of a larger study (Author). The scale was originally developed in Turkish and all the psychometric studies are based on this Turkish version. However, in order to contribute to the literature, the scale went through a rough translation to English in order to give an idea for non-Turkish readers. For the Turkish version of the scale, see Appendix A and for the English version see Appendix B.

Pilot Study and Revisions

As mentioned above, the interview data is synthesized with literature information and the War Trauma Exposure Scale was constructed with 23 items. To repeat, DSM-5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), a specific article about “war experiences” of Goldstein and colleagues (1997), “traumatic exposure severity scale” (Elal & Slade, 2005) and “post-traumatic diagnostic scale” by Foa and colleagues (1997), formed the literature basis for War Trauma Exposure Scale. Once the scale was formed, the scale was completed by 10 Turkish Cypriot women who did not re-participate in the study, and participants gave detailed feedback regarding the content, the language, the wording, the format, and any other. Considering these feedbacks, item 4’s wording was revised about its Turkish expression.

Psychometric Properties of the Scale. As a part of the large study (Author), “Satisfaction with Life Scale” (SWLS), “Turkish Ways of Coping Inventory” (TWCI), and “Impact of Event Scale-Revised” (IES-R) were also included to the questionnaire set to be able

to screen for the current scale's validity. Regarding this, further detailed information can be found in the Results section below.

Materials

Summarized information about used instruments is presented at Table A.

Table A.

Summaries of the Measurement Tools

Measurement Tool	Aim	Structure	Type	Specific Characteristics
Impact of Event Scale- Revised (IES-R)	assess impact of (any) traumatic event	15 items	4-point Likert-type scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assess impact of the event within last 7 days
Turkish Ways of Coping Inventory-Revised (TWCI-R)	assess coping strategies against difficult life events	74 items	5-point Likert-type scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> asses specific coping strategies to cope with difficult events
Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)	assess reported life satisfaction	5 items	7-point Likert-type scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> short and reliable scale in understanding life satisfaction
War Trauma Exposure Scale (WTES)	detects survivor's exposure to war-related incidences and assess the impact of the exposure	23 items	5-point Likert-type scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> specific to war lists war-related experiences and detects what exposures the survivor experiences. assess the impact of each individual war-exposure item

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS). SWLS intends to get an individual's subjective general life satisfaction simply with the help of five statements. It was originally constructed by Diener and colleagues (1985). The test-taker reports each statement by using a 7-point Likert-type scale. The scale's internal consistency was .87 and the test-retest correlation was .82 (Diener et al., 1985). In the Turkish translation study of the scale (Durak et al., 2010), its back-translation showed semantically similar items with the original one. This Turkish version was used for the current study. SWLS is a relatively superior scale with its increased ability to assess the subjective well-being of the participant via only five statements (Pavot et al., 1991). Besides, being suitable for various age groups gives another advantage to the scale and as a result of this, it is widely used in Turkey (Agbuga et al., 2011; Doğan, 2006; Güler & Gazioğlu, 2008; Gün & Bayraktar, 2008). For the current study, the Cronbach alpha value for reliability was .88.

Turkish Ways of Coping Inventory (TWCI). Folkman and Lazarus (1980) developed Ways of Coping Checklist. In order to assess the cognitive and behavioral strategies to handle stressful situations, it was revised including 68 items. For this Ways of Coping Checklist, the strategies were grouped in two main coping styles: problem-focused coping and emotion-focused coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In general emotion-focused coping strategies are basically avoidance, attention-distraction, and denial. On the other hand, problem-focused coping strategies require finding a solution to the existing problem. The scale was translated in Turkish and added 6 more items by Siva (1991). Cronbach alpha coefficient of the scale was reported as .90 (Siva, 1991).

In another study, the factors were subjected to a second-order factor analysis. As a result, a third factor was found: Seeking Social Support- Indirect Coping Style (Gençöz et al., 2006). The current study used this 3-factor version. Cronbach alpha coefficients for the subscales were .85, .83 and .80 for problem-focused coping, emotion-focused coping, and seeking social support: indirect coping subscales, respectively. Within the current study, the terms “seeking social support”, and “indirect coping” were interchangeably used.

Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-R). Impact of Event Scale is a 15-item scale that is developed in 1979 (Horowitz et al., 1979). The scale assesses the current psychological impact (within the last 7 days) of an important event on a 4-point scale. It consists of two subscales that are “intrusion” (with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .78) and “avoidance” (with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .82) (Horowitz et al., 1979). The Turkish translation was conducted in 2006 (Çorapçioğlu et al., 2006). Işıklı (2006) concluded that the scale showed a significant correlation with SCL-40 ($r = .51$). In 1997, Weiss and Marmar added some more items to meet the DSM-III criteria for PTSD and the number of factors increased to 3 including “arousal”. This revised three-factor version was correlated with Brief Symptom Inventory ($r = .72$), Beck Depression Inventory ($r = .60$), and Beck Anxiety Scale ($r = .60$); and the scale’s Cronbach alpha coefficient was .93 (Işıklı, 2006). Cronbach alpha coefficients for subscales were .90, .83, and .82 for “arousal”, “intrusion”, and “avoidance” subscales, respectively (Işıklı, 2006). For the present study, Cronbach alpha coefficients were .90, .92 and .85 for “arousal”, “intrusion”, and “avoidance” subscales, respectively.

Procedure

By using snowball technique, the data was collected from various parts of Northern Cyprus, as a part of a larger study (Author) from the convenient sample. The data was gathered approximately within 3 months. The participants were both informed and their signed consents were taken. It was explained for participants that the current study does not intend to be able to make any diagnosis, however, they were individually asked whether they would

like to get feedback in relation to the result of the possible psychological impact of their previous war experiences. None of the participants required personal feedback; only one case wanted to have access to the general study results. Once the study was completed, this participant (case number 64) was informed about the general findings of the study. Since the study was a limited one in terms of its diagnostic abilities, no further action was taken in terms of directing people to receive psychological help.

Statistical Analysis

For statistical analysis, Predictive Analytics SoftWare (PASW) version 18 was used. While determining the steps to follow and decide on the statistically critical issues, Tabachnick and Fidell's (2007) book was used. Prior to the main analysis, Tabachnick and Fidell's (2007) data cleaning procedures were administered where the data accuracy, missingness, univariate and multivariate outliers, normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity and singularity were inspected. As a result of this data cleaning, 11 cases were deleted due to the missing values and 1 case was deleted since she reported zero-level trauma exposure. Finally, 168 cases remained.

Results

Factor Structure, Reliability, and Validity of War-Trauma Exposure Scale

The factor analysis and all other validity and reliability analysis were conducted based on the source of Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). To figure out the factor structure of the 23-item War Trauma Exposure Scale, principle component analysis was conducted with varimax rotation. The factors above eigenvalue of 1.00 were considered with respect to scree plot and factor loading of .30 was taken as a criterion to determine the structure of the items. As a result, the most adequate solution was three-factor structure (explained 52.13 % of the variance). These three factors were 'Negative Feelings', 'Exposure to Violence', and 'Loss'. 'Negative Feelings' factor was named since it included items related to danger and threat perception, insecurity feelings, helplessness, and feelings of fear and horror. 'Exposure to Violence' factor takes its name from the survivor's exposure to a variety of violent acts (such as being wounded, bomb bursting, witnessing another individual being killed or abused). The third factor, 'Loss', refers to the survivor's any form of physical or psychological loss (such as losing the healthy body, jewels, car, money, good-quality life, home, home-town, loved ones...etc). The 'Negative Feelings' factor included 5 items (item factor loadings ranging from .57 to .82), while 'Exposure to Violence' was composed of 10 items (item factor loadings ranging from .39 to .74) and 'Loss' was formed with 8 items (item factor loadings ranging from .34 to .64). For detailed factor loadings of the items and reliability coefficients see Table 2.

Table 2.

Composition of Factors of War-Trauma Exposure Scale with Factor Loadings, Percentages of Variance Explained and Cronbach Alpha Values

Factors and Items	Factors		
	1	2	3
Factor 1			
Negative Feelings			
(Variance explained 35.34 %)			
(Cronbach Alpha .86)			
7. Experiencing a great feeling of fear or horror	.82	.13	.16
6. Thinking that your life is at danger	.79	.09	.17
8. Thinking that another person's life is at danger	.79	.04	.18
19. Wherever you go, thinking that you are not safe	.66	.23	.18
14. Feeling yourself helpless	.57	.27	.32
Factor 2			
Exposure to Violence			
(Variance explained 9.64 %)			
(Cronbach Alpha .83)			
4. Involving combat (actively)	.06	.74	.18
5. Being witness to killing many people collectively	.14	.71	.05
16. Witnessing to village/house/car...etc being set on fire	.23	.64	.09
17. Witnessing somebody from your family being exposed to violence and/or abuse	.25	.63	.24
22. Being wounded	-.08	.63	.20
15. An unexpected attack to the environment (like: school, mosque, church, hospital...etc) that you have	.30	.62	.18
18. Witnessing a gunfight	.49	.57	.03
10. Witnessing an out-of-family-person being exposed to violence and/or abuse	.31	.56	.30
2. Being exposed to violence and/or abuse	.10	.46	.43
3. Bomb bursting and/or weapon firing nearby you	.67	.39	-.09
Factor 3			
Loss			
(Variance explained 7.16 %)			
(Cronbach Alpha .76)			
13. Losing some valuable things due to the experienced conditions (a healthy body, jewels, car, house, money,...etc)	.28	.13	.64
20. Death of somebody you knew	.16	.28	.64
11. Death of somebody from family	-.14	.34	.64
1. Moving to another place to live	.12	-.01	.62
12. Loosing trace of somebody you knew and not having any news from him/her	.30	.25	.59
21. Being separated from close neighbors and/or friends	.40	.12	.57
23. Parting from some family members	.45	.18	.45
9. Experiencing deprivations due to war/combat situation (shelter, food, clothes...etc)	.58	.11	.34

When the items were analyzed under the emerging factors, statistically item 9 “Experiencing deprivations due to war/combat situation (shelter, food, clothes...etc)” was loaded for Negative Feelings; however, it was theoretically decided to be taken to Loss. Also, although statistically item 3 “Bomb bursting and/or weapon firing nearby you” appeared under Negative Feelings, it was included to Exposure to Violence. For the factor structure and sub-factor nomenclature of the scale see Table B; for the item-total statistics, see Table 3.

Table B.

Summary of the Factor Structure of War Trauma Exposure Scale and Sub-Factor Nomenclatures

Factor Name	Number of items	Included items	Description of the factor
Negative Feelings	5	6. Thinking that your life is at danger	Describes the negative war/combat related feelings like arousal due to a threat, feelings of fear and/or horror, insecurity, and hopelessness
		7. Experiencing a great feeling of fear or horror	
		8. Thinking that another person’s life is at danger	
		14. Feeling yourself helpless	
		19. Wherever you go, thinking that you are not safe	
Exposure to Violence	10	2. Being exposed to violence and/or abuse	Describes specific war/combat incidences that the survivor personally exposed to a violent act and/or survivor witnessed a violent act towards someone close
		3. Bomb bursting and/or weapon firing nearby you	
		4. Involving combat (actively)	
		5. Being witness to killing many people collectively	
		10. Witnessing an out-of-family-person being exposed to violence and/or abuse	
		15. An unexpected attack to the environment (like: school, mosque, church, hospital...etc) that you have	
		16. Witnessing to village/house/car...etc being set on fire	
		17. Witnessing somebody from your family being exposed to violence and/or abuse	
		18. Witnessing a gunfight	
		22. Being wounded	
Loss	8	1. Moving to another place to live	Describes death of close individuals, loss of bodily organs, possessions, loss of social relations and networks, and experiencing deprivations
		9. Experiencing deprivations due to war/combat situation (shelter, food, clothes...etc)	
		11. Death of somebody from family	
		12. Loosing trace of somebody you knew and not having any news from him/her	
		13. Losing some valuable things due to the experienced conditions (a healthy body, jewels, car, house, money,...etc)	
		20. Death of somebody you knew	
21. Being separated from close neighbors and/or friends			
		23. Parting from some family members	

Table 3.

Item-Total Correlations and Cronbach's Alpha Values If Item is Deleted

	Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
WTES1	.33	.912
WTES2	.50	.909
WTES3	.53	.908
WTES4	.51	.908
WTES5	.48	.909
WTES6	.57	.907
WTES7	.60	.907
WTES8	.54	.908
WTES9	.54	.908
WTES10	.63	.906
WTES11	.39	.911
WTES12	.59	.907
WTES13	.53	.908
WTES14	.61	.906
WTES15	.59	.907
WTES16	.52	.908
WTES17	.60	.907
WTES18	.60	.906
WTES19	.57	.907
WTES20	.54	.908
WTES21	.56	.907
WTES22	.38	.911
WTES23	.55	.908

In order to get the scores for the subscales, the item-responses were simply summed. The scale is a 5-point scale where “0” represents not being exposed to any war/combat situation; other than “0” all other numbers signify an exposure. “1” corresponds to an exposure without the survivor being affected by this exposure, and “5” means that the survivor was exposed and that s/he was very highly affected.

The overall reliability of the scale was .91, and that of the subscales were .86 (for Negative Feelings), .83 (for Exposure to Violence), and .76 (for Loss).

Descriptive statistics revealed that Loss was the most prevalent combat-experience of Turkish Cypriot women survivors ($M = 21.36$). Loss was followed by Negative Feelings ($M = 17.35$) and Exposure to Violence ($M = 14.22$). For the current study, the statistical analyses were generally conducted for the total War Trauma Exposure Scale score of the participants.

For the validity investigations, correlations between women’s scores of “War-Trauma Exposure Scale” and “Satisfaction with Life Scale”, “Turkish Ways of Coping Inventory”, and “Impact of Event Scale-Revised” were examined. As mentioned earlier, the study was conducted as a part of a larger study (Author) therefore the variables were also kept within the scope of this larger study as well. Nonetheless, as literature showed, well-being (Berthold, 2000; Veronese & Pepe, 2017; Veronese et al., 2017) and coping (Erdener, 2017; Khamis, 2015; Wildth et al., 2017) were highly related to war-trauma experiences.

Pearson correlations revealed that WTES was significantly linked to emotion-focused coping ($r = .20, p < .05$) and IES-R's total score ($r = .51, p < .01$). Further, the WTES total score showed significant correlations with all three factors of IES-R; avoidance ($r = .36, p < .01$), intrusion ($r = .56, p < .01$), and arousal ($r = .48, p < .01$). However, the scale did not depict significant correlations with problem-focused coping ($r = .05, p > .05$), indirect coping ($r = -.08, p > .05$), and Satisfaction with Life Scale ($r = -.05, p > .05$). For correlations, see Table 4.

Table 4.

Correlations of War-Trauma Exposure Scale with Other Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Problem FC		.26**	.22**	.25**	.09	.04	-.03	.04	.05
2. Emotion FC			.12	-.06	.37**	.40**	.44**	.44**	.20*
3. Indirect C				.14	.06	.13	.12	.11	-.08
4. SWLS					-.06	-.18*	-.20**	-.16*	-.05
5. Avoidance						.69**	.66**	.85**	.36**
6. Intrusion							.91**	.96**	.56**
7. Arousal								.94**	.48**
8. IES-R total									.51**
9. WTES									

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

With respect to the scale's construct validity, a Principle Component Analysis was conducted for WTES and IES-R with varimax rotation. The scree plot was inspected and factors above eigenvalue of 1.00 were considered. As a result, both WTES and IES-R were significantly loaded under the same construct (with a variance of 75.68%). For both WTES and IES-R, the factor loadings were .87. In addition to that, a univariate ANOVA was conducted for participants' WTES scores and total IES-R scores. Results captured significant group differences. It was evident that highly-exposed women war-survivors also scored highest on IES-R ($M = 45.73, SD = 21.42$), while moderately-exposed obtained moderate IES-R scores (M

= 29.77, $SD = 17.61$) and low-level exposed got lower IES-R scores as well ($M = 21.42$, $SD = 13.33$) and all these three groups (low, moderate and high) were significantly different from each other. In addition to that, the fit of WTES was investigated and Chi-square test revealed a good fit for WTES ($\chi^2 (148) = 217.93$, $p < .000$). The Chi-square test result for WTES was very similar to the fit of IES-R ($\chi^2 (149) = 249.96$, $p < .000$).

Conclusion, Discussion, and Limitations

War Trauma Exposure Scale (WTES) is a novel scale that is developed as a part of a larger study (Author) which, unlike other widely used trauma scales, assesses both the qualitative and quantitative war-experiences of survivors. The scale was investigated in terms of psychometrics and despite being a very limited study, the results revealed that WTES which is a 23-item 5-point Likert-type scale, generally depicted to have acceptable-to-good reliability and validity.

The statistical computations depicted that the scale has a generally good fit. Factor analysis helps to figure out that the scale has three sub-scales: ‘Negative Feelings’, ‘Exposure to Violence’, and ‘Loss’. Each subscale and the scale in general, showed high reliability coefficients. Further, univariate ANOVA ensured that the grouping of participants according to their level of war-exposure was parallel with that of their IES-R scores. This was important since it clarifies the ability of the scale to detect the level of war-related trauma exposure and its impact. Besides, Principle Component Analysis for WTES and IES-R ensured the scale’s construct validity.

However, partially supporting the expectations, the scale was moderately correlated with IES-R. Although both of the scales consider participants’ war-related trauma experience at the current study, WTES is aimed to capture survivors’ exposure to war-trauma; while, IES-R targets any trauma incidence. In addition to that, IES-R concerns the psychological impact of the traumatic incidence, instead of considering what kind of experiences the survivor was exposed to. Furthermore, there is a time issue: while IES-R asked about the current (considering last week) influence of the previous event; in the present study WTES assessed women’s exposure to the war-trauma that happened before more than 40 years (in 2013). Related to this, Patrick Clarkin (2019) clearly explains the long-term effects of war. As it is categorized at this review, war experiences creates long-term negative effects through leading physical trauma, losing resources, spreading infections, limiting humanitarian help, breaking social networks, causing destruction of infrastructures (like roads, homes, health care...etc), bringing malnutrition and disrupting water supply, concluding in forced displacements, being responsible for ecological destructions and breaking crop cycles, and creating psychological distress and sexual trauma (2019). This review depicts that war-experiences cannot be taken

as a one-shot trauma source, but rather experiencing war is very powerful one since it has the ability to impact the individual and his/her surrounding with a ripple effect within the following years. Therefore, regarding the elapsed time starting from the exposure of the war until the current socio-political situation in Cyprus, the long-term psychological effects of war should be considered within this framework. This signals another limitation to the current study. The changed life conditions and problems in remembering should be taken into account while evaluating the assessment ability of WTES. Therefore, a deeper investigation on the long-term effects of war experiences at Cyprus, is suggested for future research.

Although the literature suggests that higher trauma-exposure predicts lower life-satisfaction levels (Besser & Neria, 2009); since in the current study WTES is interested in past exposure to a war-related traumatic event, it is plausible to expect that the Turkish Cypriot women war survivors have found a way to be satisfied with their life (like settling their own republic and forming a country for themselves). The time elapsed and the socio-political attempts of the community, may explain for the lack of significant correlations with the SWLS as this “new life” may have increased their life satisfaction. Such relationships can be better understood within a further study.

Regarding the correlation between the war-exposure and coping strategies, at a study it was found that 72.7% of the Holocaust survivors hold emotion-focused coping and the percentage of having problem-focused coping among them was 54.5% (Cosman et al., 2013). Thus, we can say that the current study’s results were partially parallel since WTES was significantly correlated with emotion-focused coping, and it was not significantly correlated (Taylor, 1990) with problem-focused coping.

Regarding all these relationships between WTES, and IES-R, SWLS, and TWCI, it can be said that WTES has an acceptable concurrent validity. Moreover, considering factor analysis of WTES and IES-R, it is possible to conclude that WTES is applicable to war trauma and its assessment.

However, it should be clearly noted that the psychometric studies should be expanded with larger and more representative populations and with some other trauma assessment measurements as well, in order to increase the generalizability of the results. Besides, in the current study, the scale was tested on a war trauma that happened more than 40 years earlier (in 2013). Keeping in mind that the participants were children at those times, their reports based on their memories can be misleading. Therefore, the scale is suggested to be tested also with males, some other age groups, greater populations, and with more recent exposures as well. In addition to that, being a part of a larger study also restricted authors’ ability to focus on the psychometric properties of the scale. Thus, it is for sure further studies are needed to focus and test the psychometric properties of WTES.

As mentioned earlier, another limitation is, certainly, studying war-related experiences only with Turkish Cypriots. This can never change the fact that Greek Cypriots were exposed to war-related trauma as well. However, as mentioned earlier, due to some bureaucratic reasons it was not possible for authors to conduct the study in the Southern part of the island with Greek Cypriots. Future researchers are strongly encouraged to find ways to study war-related trauma in the Southern part of the island as well.

Nonetheless, despite all these restrictions, the psychometric investigations of War-Trauma Exposure Scale revealed a satisfactory-level reliability and validity for the scale (Cook & Beckman, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Therefore, although there are limitations to the study, it is possible to conclude that WTES can be an important source with its acceptable psychometric properties, to be used especially for understanding the trauma exposure of war survivors. Consequently, unlike other trauma measurements, WTES can be a distinct tool to (1) assess the war-trauma, (2) enable understanding the survivor's war-related exposures, and (3) at the same time, make it possible to assess the influence of these exposures.

Authors' contribution:

In this research, the authors contributed equally to forming the research idea, formulating the research hypotheses, determining the method and design of the research, organizing the research and evaluating and discussing the findings appropriately. In addition, the first author contributed to the collection, organization and reporting of data and writing of the conducted study, while the second author contributed by supervising and evaluating the study and providing feedback on scientific issues.

Declaration of conflict of interests:

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest for this study.

Funding:

The authors declare that they have received no financial support for this study.

Ethical approval:

This study was conducted with the Ethics Committee Approval of the Middle East Technical University Institute of Social Sciences, dated April 12, 2012.

References

- Agbuga, B., Aslan, Ş., Erol, A. E., Dündar, U., & Kepenek, Y. (2011). Relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction of sports entrepreneurs. *Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport/ Science, Movement and Health*, 11(2), 266-272.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5* (5th ed).
- Berthold, S. M. (2000). War traumas and community violence: psychological, behavioral, and academic outcomes among Khmer refugee adolescents. *Journal of Multicultural Social Work*, 8(1-2), 15–46. https://doi.org/10.1300/J285v08n01_02
- Besser, A., & Neria, Y. (2009). PTSD symptoms, satisfaction with life, and prejudicial attitudes toward the adversary among Israeli civilians exposed to ongoing missile attacks. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 22(4), 268-275.
- Bramsen, I. & van der Ploeg, H.M. (1999), Fifty years later: the long-term psychological adjustment of ageing World War II survivors. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 100(5) 350-358. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.1999.tb10878.x>
- Clarkin, P. F. (2019). The embodiment of war: Growth, development, and armed conflict. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 48, 423-442. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102218-011208>
- Cook, D. A., & Beckman, T. J. (2006). Current concepts in validity and reliability for psychometric instruments: Theory and application. *American Journal of Medicine*, 119, 166e7–166e16. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2005.10.036>
- Cosman, I., Macavei, B., Sucala, M., & David, D. (2013). Rational and irrational beliefs and coping strategies among Transylvanian holocaust survivors: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, 18(2), 179–194. doi: [10.1080/15325024.2012.687322](https://doi.org/10.1080/15325024.2012.687322)
- Çorapçıoğlu, A., Yargıç, İ., Geyran, P., & Kocabaşoğlu, N. (2006). Validity and reliability of Turkish version of “Impact of Event scale-Revised” (IES-R). *New Symposium*, 44(1), 14-22.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75.
- Do, T. T. H., Correa-Velez, I., Dunne, M. P. (2019). Trauma exposure and mental health problems among adults in Central Vietnam: A randomized cross-sectional survey. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 10(31). doi: [10.3389/fpsy.2019.00031](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00031)
- Doğan, T. (2006). Üniversite öğrencilerinin iyilik halinin incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30, 120-129.
- Durak, M., Durak E., Ş., & Gençöz, T. (2010). Psychomotor properties of Satisfaction with Life Scale among Turkish university students, correctional officers, and elderly adults. *Soc Indic Res*, 99(3), 413-429.
- Elal, G., & Slade, P. (2005). Traumatic exposure severity scale (TESS): A measure of exposure to major disasters. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 18(3), 213-220.
- Erdener, E. (2017). The ways of coping with post-war trauma of Yezidi refugee women in Turkey. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 65, 60-70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2017.10.003>.
- Freitag, S., Braehler, E., Schmidt, S., & Glaesmer, H. (2013). The impact of forced displacement in World War II on mental health disorders and health-related quality of life in late life – a German

- population-based study. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 25(2), 310-319. doi:10.1017/S1041610212001585
- Foa, E. B., Cashman, L. A., Jaycox, L., & Perry, K. (1997). The validation of a self-report measure of posttraumatic stress disorder: The Posttraumatic Diagnostic Scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 9(4), 445-451.
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1980). An analysis of coping in a middle-aged community sample. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 21(3), 219-239.
- Francis, J. J., Johnston, M., Robertson, C., Glidewell, L., Entwistle, V., Eccles, M. P., & Grimshaw, J. M. (2010). What is an adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies. *Psychology and Health*, 25(10), 1229-1245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870440903194015>
- Gade, D. M., & Wenger, J. B. (2011). Combat exposure and mental health: the long-term effects among US Vietnam and Gulf war veterans. *Health Econ.*, 20, 401-416. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.1594>
- Gençöz, F., Gençöz, T., & Bozo, Ö. (2006). Hierarchical dimensions of coping styles: A study conducted with Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34(5), 525-534.
- Goldstein, R. D., Wampler, N. S., & Wise, P. H. (1997). War experiences and distress symptoms of Bosnian children. *Pediatrics*, 100(5), 873-877.
- Güler, Y. Ç., & Gazioğlu, A. E. İ. (2008). Rehberlik ve psikolojik danışmanlık öğrencilerinde öznel iyi olma hali, psikiyatrik belirtiler ve bazı kişilik özellikleri: Karşılaştırmalı bir çalışma. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23, 107-114.
- Gün, Z., & Bayraktar, F. (2008). Türkiye’de iç göçün ergenlerin uyumundaki rolü. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 19(2), 167-176.
- Horowitz, M., Wilner, N., & Alvarez, W. (1979). Impact of Event Scale: A measure of subjective stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 41(3), 209–218.
- Işıklı, S. (2006). *Trauma sonrası stres belirtileri olan bireylerde olaya ilişkin dikkat yanlılığı, ayrışma düzeyi ve çalışma belleği uzamı arasındaki ilişkiler* [Unpublished doctorate thesis]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü, Ankara, Turkey.
- Johnson, R. J., Antonaccio, O., Botchkovar, E., Hobfoll, S. E. (2022). War trauma and PTSD in Ukraine’s civilian population: comparing urban-dwelling to internally displaced persons. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*, 57, 1807–1816. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-021-02176-9>
- Khamis, V. (2015). Coping with war trauma and psychological distress among school-age Palestinian Children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 85(1), 72-79. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000039>
- Lazarus, R.S. & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. USA: Springer Publishing.
- Manzanero, A. L., Crespo, M., Barón, S., Scott, T., El-Astal, S., & Hemaid, F. (2021). Traumatic Events Exposure and Psychological Trauma in Children Victims of War in the Gaza Strip. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(3-4), 1568–1587. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517742911>
- Moen, T. (2006). Reflections on the narrative research approach. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(4): 56-69. doi: [10.1177/160940690600500405](https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690600500405)
- Mundy, S. S., Foss, S. L. W., Poulsen, S., Hjorthøj, C., & Carlsson, J. (2020). Sex differences in trauma exposure and symptomatology in trauma-affected refugees. *Psychiatry Research*, 293, 113445. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113445>

- Nieswiadomy, R. M. (2002). *Foundations of nursing research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Pavot, W., Diener, E., Colvin, C. R., & Sandvik, E. (1991). Further validation of the satisfaction with life scale: Evidence for the cross-method convergence of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57(1), 149–161.
- Siva, A. N. (1991). *Coping with stress, learned powerfulness, and depression among infertile people*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S., (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th Ed.). United States of America: Pearson Education.
- Taylor, R. (1990). Interpretation of the correlation coefficient: A basic review. *JDMS*, 6(1), 35-39.
- Veronese, G., & Pepe, A. (2017). Sense of coherence as a determinant of psychological well-being across professional groups of aid workers exposed to war trauma. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(13), 1899–1920. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515590125>
- Veronese, G., Pepe, A., Jaradah, A., Murannak, F., & Hamdouna, H. (2017). We must cooperate with one another against the enemy: agency and activism in school-aged children as protective factors against ongoing war trauma and political violence in the Gaza Strip. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 70, 364-76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.06.027>
- Weiss, D. S., & Marmar, C. R. (1997). The Impact of Event Scale - Revised. In J. Wilson & T. M. Keane (Eds.), *Assessing psychological trauma and PTSD* (pp. 399-411). New York: Guilford.
- Wildth, H., Umanos, J., Khanzada, N. K., Saleh, M., Rahman, H. U., & Zakowski, S. G. (2017). War trauma, psychological distress, and coping among Afghan civilians seeking primary health care. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation*, 6(2), 81-100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ipp0000065>

Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması: Savaş Travmasına Maruz Kalma Ölçeği (WTES)

Özet

Savaş travması yaygın olarak çalışılmaktadır. Kullanılan ölçekler ise savaş deneyimini genel bir travma olarak ele alır ve sadece savaş yaşantısının yaşanıp yaşanmadığını sorarak, bu yaşantının psikopatolojik etkilerini ölçmeye geçer. Dolayısıyla, hayatta kalanların savaş deneyimleri hakkında çok az şey sorulur ve bilinir. Örneğin, alanda en sık kullanılan travma ölçeklerinden biri olan Foa'nın Travma Sonrası Stres Tanı Ölçeği (Post-Traumatic Diagnostic Scale) (1997), travmatik bir olayla ilgili psikopatolojik sonuçları ölçmektedir. Ayrıca Foa'nın ölçeği, savaşa özgü değildir; herhangi bir travmanın ardından ortaya çıkan psikiyatrik semptomatolojiye odaklanır. Horowitz tarafından 1979 yılında geliştirilen Yaşam Olayları Ölçeği (Impact of Event Scale-Revised, IES-R) (Horowitz ve diğerleri, 1979) ise, sıklıkla kullanılmasına karşın, savaşa özgü değildir ve travmatik olayın son 7 gün içerisindeki etkisini ölçmektedir. Bu nedenle, hem savaş-travmasını nitel olarak anlamayı sağlayacak, hem de niceliksel olarak savaş deneyimlerinin etkilerini değerlendirebilecek bir ölçek geliştirmek amaçlanmıştır. Dolayısıyla ölçek, savaş-travması çalışmalarında sadece psikopatolojilerin oluşumuna odaklanmak yerine, savaştan sağ kurtulmuşların ne yaşadığını ve bu yaşantıların onları ne kadar etkilediğini değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Kıbrıs'ta hem Kıbrıslı Rumlar hem de Kıbrıslı Türkler, özellikle 1963-1974 yılları arasında savaş ve çatışmayla ilgili travmatik deneyimler yaşamışlardır. Ancak Kıbrıslıların bu savaş ve çatışma deneyimleri, tüm psikolojik önemine karşın, sistemli bir şekilde incelenmemiştir. Doktora tezinin (Yazar) bir parçası olarak bu çalışma, savaşla ilgili travmatik olayları hem niteliksel hem de niceliksel olarak değerlendirebilen yeni bir savaş-travması ölçeğinin sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Savaş-travmasını bu ölçek ile değerlendirmek için hem Kıbrıslı Rum hem de Kıbrıslı Türklerin çalışmaya dahil edilmesi planlanmış olsa da bürokratik nedenlerden dolayı, yalnızca 1963-1974 Kıbrıs Savaşını yaşamış Kıbrıslı Türk kadınlarla ($N = 168$) çalışmak mümkün olmuştur. Üç aşama izlenmiştir: görüşme, pilot çalışma ve psikometrik araştırmalar. Psikometrik çalışma genel hatları ile Faktör Analizi, ilgili ölçümlerle ölçeğin korelasyonları ve ANOVA hesaplamalarından oluşmaktadır.

Görüşmeler ve pilot çalışma sonucunda 23 maddelik 5'li Likert-tipi Savaş Travmasına Maruz Kalma Ölçeği (WTES) oluşturulmuştur. Katılımcılar, bu savaş deneyimleri maddelerini yaşayıp yaşamadığını belirtir. Eğer katılımcı o savaş deneyimine maruz kalmışsa, bu olayın kendisini ne kadar etkilediğini 1 ile 5 arasında (1 Hiç, 2 Biraz, 3 Orta, 4 Epey, 5 Çok Fazla) puanlar. Gerçekleştirilen Faktör Analizi, üç faktör ortaya koymuştur. Bu faktörler "Olumsuz Duygular", "Şiddete Maruz Kalma" ve "Kayıp" olarak isimlendirilmiştir. Ölçeğin güvenilirliği iyidir ($r = .91$). WTES ve travmatik deneyimin etkisini ölçen Yaşam Olayları Etkisi Ölçeği (IES-

R) için yapılan ilke bileşen analizi, her iki ölçeğin de aynı yapı altında %75,68'lik bir varyans açıklayarak yüklendiğini göstermiştir ve ölçeğin yapı geçerliliğini desteklemiştir. Ölçek, bir parçası olduğu tez çalışmasının (Yazar) ilgili değişkenleriyle, literatüre paralel olarak, anlamlı korelasyonlar göstermiştir (duygu odaklı başa çıkma ile, $r = .20$, $p < .05$; ve IES-R toplam puanı ile, $r = .51$, $p < .01$). ANOVA hesaplamaları, WTES' in IES-R ölçeği ile paralel olduğunu göstermiştir. Yani, WTES'e göre yüksek oranda savaş travmasına maruz kalan kadınlar, IES-R' de en yüksek puanları alırken ($M = 45,73$, $SD = 21,42$), orta düzeyde maruz kalan kadınlar IES-R' de orta düzeyde puanlar bildirmiş ($M = 29,77$, $SD = 17,61$), ve savaş deneyimlerine düşük düzeyde maruz kalan kadınlar ise IES-R'de daha düşük puanlar ortaya koymuştur ($M = 21,42$, $SS = 13,33$). Ölçeğin Ki-kare uyum testi (χ^2), ölçeğin IES-R' ye benzer şekilde iyi uyum gösterdiğini ortaya çıkarmıştır ($\chi^2 (149) = 249,96$, $p < .000$, ve $\chi^2 (148) = 217,93$, $p < .000$, sırasıyla). Ancak, bu çalışma başka bir çalışmanın parçası olduğundan (Yazar), bazı sınırlılıklar vardır. Ölçeğe yönelik psikometrik incelemelerin, daha ileri çalışmalarla genişletilmesi gerektiği açıktır. Ayrıca bu çalışmada, kişilerin savaş deneyimleri ve ölçüm yapılan tarih arasında 40 yıldan fazla bir süre vardır. Çalışmanın kapsamının, bu süre içerisindeki birçok değişkenin olumlu veya olumsuz etkilerini içermiyor olması bir diğer sınırlılıktır. Bununla birlikte, aradan geçen 40 yılı aşkın sürede, o dönemde yaşları 6 ile 33 olan katılımcıların, bu savaş deneyimlerini ne ölçüde hatırlayabildikleri başka bir kısıtlılığı ortaya koyar. Tüm sınırlılıklarına karşın, psikometrik incelemeler, ölçeğin savaşa bağlı maruz kalmayı, nispeten güvenilir ve geçerli bir şekilde ölçebildiğini göstermektedir.

Ölçek, birkaç yönüyle diğer travma ölçeklerinden ayrılmaktadır. İlk olarak WTES, doğrudan ve sadece savaş yaşantılarına dairdir. Ayrıca, ölçek savaştan kurtulanların yaşayıp rapor ettiği 23 deneyimlerini, maruz kalılabilecek birer durum olarak listeler; bu yönüyle savaştan kurtulanların savaşa dair ne yaşadığını tek tek tanımayı da mümkün kılar. Bununla birlikte, hayatta kalanın maruz kaldığı her bir deneyimden ne kadar etkilendiğini sorar ve böylece bu savaş deneyiminin kişiyi nasıl etkilediğini niceliksel olarak ölçmeyi de olanaklı hale getirir.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Savaş Travmasına Maruz Kalma Ölçeği- War Trauma Exposure Scale (WTES)

“1960 Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti’nin kurulmasının yaklaşık olarak 3 yıl ardından, Kıbrıslı Türk ve Rum toplumları arasında çatışmalar/savaş alevlenmeye başlamıştır. İki toplum arasındaki çatışma/savaş, 1974 yılında Türkiye’nin adaya askeri olarak müdahale etmesi ve bu müdahale sonucunda adada ateşkes anlaşmasının imzalanması ile durmuştur.”

Lütfen aşağıdaki soruları cevaplandırırken, Kıbrıs’ta **1963-1974 yılları** arasında yaşanan çatışmaları/savaşı göz önünde bulundurunuz.

Aşağıda insanların savaş/çatışma dönemlerinde yaşamış olabileceği rahatsızlıkları içeren bazı maddeler bulunmaktadır. Lütfen aşağıda yer alan her bir maddeyi ayrı ayrı okuyup değerlendiriniz. Eğer belirtilen maddeyi siz de yaşadıysanız “**yaşadım**” ifadesinin yanındaki kutucuğu işaretleyiniz.

Takiben, bu yaşadığımız deneyimin sizi hiç etkilemediğini/rahatsız etmediğini düşünüyorsanız **1**; biraz etkilediğini düşünüyorsanız **2**; orta derecede etkilediğini düşünüyorsanız **3**; epey etkilediğini düşünüyorsanız **4**; ve çok fazla etkilediğini düşünüyorsanız **5** numarayı daire içine alınız. Eğer belirtilen maddeyi siz yaşamadıysanız, “**yaşamadım**” ifadesinin yanındaki kutucuğu işaretlemeniz yeterli olacaktır.

Örnek:

Silah kullanmak.
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3 (Orta) 4 (Epey) 5 (Çok Fazla)

Acıklama: Bu örnekteki kişi, bahsedilen dönemde silah kullandığı için “Yaşadım” ifadesinin yanındaki kutucuğu işaretlemiştir ve bunun onu ne kadar rahatsız ettiğini de uygun derecelendirmedeki numarayla seçerek belirtmiştir. Eğer bu kişi silah kullanmamış olsaydı, sadece “Yaşamadım” ifadesinin yanındaki kutucuğu işaretlemesi yeterli olacaktı.

1. Yaşadığımız yeri değiştirmek durumunda kalmak
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

2. Şiddete ve/veya tacize maruz kalmak
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

3. Yakinınızda bomba ve/veya silah patlaması
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

4. Çatışmaya birebir (aktif olarak) katılmak
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

5. Çok sayıda kişinin toplu olarak öldürülmesine tanıklık etmek
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

6. Hayatınızın tehlikede olduğunu düşünmek
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

7. Büyük bir korku veya dehşet duygusu yaşamak
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

8. Başka bir kişinin hayatının tehlikede olduğunu düşünmek
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

9. Savaş/çatışma ortamından dolayı mahrumiyetler yaşamak (barınak, yiyecek, giyecek...vs)
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

10. Aile dışından birinin şiddete ve/veya tacize maruz kaldığına tanıklık etmek
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

11. Aileden birinin ölmesi
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

12. Tanıdığımız birinin kayıp olması ve ondan haber alınamaması
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

13. Yaşananlardan dolayı eskiden sahip olduğunuz bazı kıymetli şeyleri kaybetme (sağlıklı bir beden, mücevher, araba, ev, para, ...vs)
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

14. Kendinizi çaresiz hissetmek
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

15. Korunaklı olduğunuzu düşünerek sığındığınız bir ortamın (örneğin: okul, cami, kilise, hastane...vs) beklenmedik bir şekilde saldırıya uğraması
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

16. Köyün/evin/arabanın...vs ateşe verildiğine tanıklık etmek
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

17. Aileden birinin şiddete ve/veya tacize maruz kaldığına tanıklık etmek
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

18. Silahlı bir çatışmaya tanıklık etmek
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

19. Nereye giderseniz gidin, güvende olmadığınızı düşünmek
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

20. Tanıdığınız birinin ölmesi
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

21. Yakın komşu ve/veya dostlardan ayrı düşmek
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

22. Yaralanmak
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

23. Ailenin bazı üyelerinden uzak kalmak
Yaşamadım <input type="checkbox"/>
Yaşadım <input type="checkbox"/> Ne kadar etkiledi? 1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3(Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla)

24. Bunların dışında yaşadığınız ve eklemek istediğiniz başka olay(lar) varsa lütfen ekleyiniz. Yaşadığınız her bir olayın sizi ne kadar rahatsız ettiğini/etkilediğini aşağıdaki derecelendirmeden uygun sayıyı yazarak belirtiniz

1 (Hiç) 2 (Biraz) 3 (Orta) 4 (Epey) 5(Çok Fazla) :

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Appendix B

War Trauma Exposure Scale (WTES)- English Version

“About 3 years following the settlement of Cyprus Republic, there happened to start combat/war incidences between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots. The war/combat between the two nations eased with the ceasefire agreement after the military intervention of Turkey in 1974.”

While answering the following questions below, please consider the war/combat experiences that happened between **1963 and 1974** at Cyprus.

The following items consist of some possible experiences and some possible disturbances that people may experience at times of any war/combat. Please read and evaluate each below item separately. If you have also experienced the mentioning situation, please put a mark nearby the box “**Experienced**”.

Following that, please also evaluate how much this experience influenced you by circling the related number. Therefore, if you believe that the incidence did not influenced you at all, choose 1(None), if you believe that it influenced you a little bit then choose 2 (A little), if you believe that the experience did moderately influenced you circle 3 (Moderate), if you believe that the incidence you have experienced was quite influential for you, then circle 4 (Quite) and if you believe that the incidence influenced you a lot, then choose 5 (Very much) by circling it.

If you haven’t experienced the mentioned incidence, then **only** put a mark nearby the box “**Not Experienced**”.

Example:

Using a gun.
Not Experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

Explanation: At this example, the person has chosen “**Experienced**” since s/he used a gun through these combat years. Then, s/he further informed us about the degree that this incidence influenced him/her by choosing 4. If this person did not use the gun through these years, then it would be enough to only put a mark nearby the box of “**Not Experienced**”.

1. Moving to another place to live
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

2. Being exposed to violence and/or abuse
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

3. Bomb bursting and/or weapon firing nearby you
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

4. Involving combat (actively)
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

5. Being witness to killing many people collectively
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

6. Thinking that your life is at danger
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

7. Experiencing a great feeling of fear or horror
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

8. Thinking that another person's life is at danger
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

9. Experiencing deprivations due to war/combat situation (shelter, food, clothes...etc)
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

10. Witnessing an out-of-family-person being exposed to violence and/or abuse
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

11. Death of somebody from family
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

12. Loosing trace of somebody you knew and not having any news from him/her
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

13. Losing some valuable things due to the experienced conditions (a healthy body, jewels, car, house, money,...etc)
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

14. Feeling yourself helpless
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

15. An unexpected attack to the environment (like: school, mosque, church, hospital...etc) that you have taken refuge in since you thought it was safe
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

16. Witnessing to village/house/car...etc being set on fire
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

17. Witnessing somebody from your family being exposed to violence and/or abuse
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

18. Witnessing a gunfight
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

19. Wherever you go, thinking that you are not safe
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

20. Death of somebody you knew
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

21. Being separated from close neighbors and/or friends
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

22. Being wounded
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

23. Parting from some family members
Not experienced <input type="checkbox"/>
Experienced <input type="checkbox"/> How much influenced? 1 (None) 2 (A little) 3(Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much)

24. Other than these mentioned incidences, if there are any experiences that you have lived through and would like to mention, then please add them below. If so, please also mention the degree to which they influenced you by using the scale below.

1 (None) 2 (A little) 3 (Moderate) 4 (Quite) 5(Very much) :

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....