PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF TWO SCALES IN TURKISH: DESIRE THINKING QUESTIONNAIRE (DTQ) AND METACOGNITIONS ABOUT DESIRE THINKING QUESTIONNAIRE (MCDTQ)

Leyla Alma-Uzuntuna, PhD. Candidate (Deparment of Psychology, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, TURKEY)
A. Esin Yilmaz, Dr. (Deparment of Psychology, Dokuz Eylul Univesity, İzmir, TURKEY)
Prof. Marcantonio M. Spada (Division of Psychology, School of Applied Sciences, London South Bank University, London, UK)

Craving has been defined as a subjective experience that prompts individuals to seek out and achieve a target, or practice an activity, in order to reach its desired effects (Marlatt, 1987). The escalation and persistence of craving are dependent on the activation of a process of cognitive elaboration termed ‘desire thinking’ (Kavanagh et al., 2009). **Desire thinking** is a voluntary cognitive process involving the elaboration of a desired target at a verbal (repetitive self-talk regarding the need to achieve the desired target and self-motivated statements; Caselli & Spada, 2010) and imaginal (construction of mental images of the desired target or of its context of consumption; Kavanagh et al., 2009) level. The target of desire thinking may be an activity, an object, or a state (Kavanagh et al., 2009). Desire thinking also appears to be a transdiagnostic process, with subjective reports indicating that this experience is qualitatively similar across a range of targets, including alcohol, food, soft drinks and tobacco (Caselli & Spada, 2010). Recent studies revealed that metacognitions have a role in addictive behavior. Furthermore, specific **metacognitions about desire thinking** contribute to the initiation and maintenance of alcohol use, smoking, gambling (Caselli, & Spada, 2013, Fernie et al., 2014).

The current study aimed to determine the psychometric properties of these two scales in a Turkish sample of alcohol users. As data collection was not completed yet, preliminary results were presented.

INSRUMENTS

Desire Thinking Questionnaire/DTQ (Caselli, & Spada, 2011): 10 items and two factor-structure, 5 items for each factor; 1) Verbal Perseveration - The perseveration of verbal thoughts about desire-related content and experience (e.g. “I mentally repeat to myself that I need to practice the desired activity); 2) Imaginal Prefiguration - The tendency to prefigure images about desire-related content and experience (e.g. “I imagine myself doing the desired activity”).

Metacognitions about Desire Thinking Questionnaire/MCDTQ (Caselli, & Spada, 2013): 3-factor structure, 18 items: positive metacognitions about desire thinking (PMDT), negative metacognitions about desire thinking (NMDT), and need to control desire related thoughts (NCDT). Internal consistency, divergent validity, temporal stability were also examined in a community sample and predictive validity was confirmed in a sample of alcohol abusers.

Table 1. Factor Loadings

	VP	IP
DTQ1	,134	,864
DTQ2	,121	,911
DTQ3	,198	,837
DTQ4	,607	,348
DTQ5	,781	,194
DTQ6	,858	,169
DTQ7	,875	,121
DTQ8	,590	,643
DTQ9	,352	,663
DTQ10	,824	,196

Participants

Data collected from 100 alcohol users (63% female, 83% of single, 16% of married, 1% of cohabiting) age ranged from 19 to 48 ($M = 26.7$, $SD = 5.59$). First alcohol age ranged from 3 to 30 ($M = 16.4$, $SD = 3.6$). Education level of all participants at least undergraduate level. AUDTI scores’ mean 18.5 ($SD = 6.53$).

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Explanatory Factor Analysis Results

DTQ: To assess the construct validity and to determine the factor structure of DTQ, a Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation was performed. The KMO and Bartlett’s test indicated a sampling adequacy of .841. (KMO = .841; Bartlett’s $\chi^2 = 636,049$; $p < .001$). Results suggested a two-factor structure (eigenvalues of 5.33, and 1.75) for the selected 10 items, which accounted for 70.7% of the variance. Factor loadings ranged between .60 - .91 similar to the original factor structure (see Table 1).

MCTDQ: To assess the construct validity and to determine the factor structure of MCTDQ, a Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation was performed. The KMO and Bartlett’s test indicated a sampling adequacy of .837. (KMO = .837; Bartlett’s $\chi^2 = 894,527$; $p < .001$). Results suggested a three-factor structure (eigenvalues of 6.68, 2.23 and 1.64) for the selected 18 items, which accounted for 58.7% of the variance. Factor loadings ranged between .49 - .90 similar to the original factor structure (except item 8; see Table 2).

Reliability

DTQ: Cronbach alfa of total score is .90, subscales ; IP’s.89, VP’s.88. Split half reliability of total score is .93, IP’s .88, VP’s.88.

MCDTQ: Cronbach alfa: .89, PMDT’ .87, NMDT’s.85, NCDT’s.76. Split half reliability of total MCDTQ is .86, PMDT.88 NMDT’s.84, NCDT’s.81.

Discussion

Although the study has not been completed yet the construct validity and reliability values seems promising to validate psychometric properties of the two scales in Turkish population (except MCDTQ item 8). Turkey and the world are facing a epidemic in addictive behavior. These self-report measures may facilitate future research in desire thinking and craving, addictive behaviors as well as facilitate assessment and case formulation within the context of addictive, eating and impulse control disorders (Caselli, & Spada, 2011).

However, Confirmatory Factor Analysis, and relevant validity and reliability analysis are required to complete the validation of these two scales in Turkish.

Table 2. Factor Loadings

	NMDT	PMDT	NCDT
MCDTQ1	,198	,742	,216
MCDTQ2	,710	,231	,084
MCDTQ3	,010	,836	,241
MCDTQ4	,239	,629	-,052
MCDTQ5	,740	,264	,140
MCDTQ6	,141	,818	,008
MCDTQ7	,320	,017	,492
MCDTQ8	,497	,478	,227
MCDTQ9	,279	,081	,718
MCDTQ10	,818	,158	,137
MCDTQ11	,535	,297	,183
MCDTQ12	,390	,560	,181
MCDTQ13	,429	,473	-,047
MCDTQ14	,720	,087	,065
MCDTQ15	,014	,090	,823
MCDTQ16	,728	,247	,237
MCDTQ17	,323	,722	-,151
MCDTQ18	,057	,039	,896

References

- Caselli, G., & Spada, M. M. (2010). Metacognition in desire thinking: A preliminary investigation. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 38, 629–637.
Caselli, G., & Spada, M. M. (2011). The desire thinking questionnaire: development and psychometric properties. *Addictive Behaviors*, 36(11), 1061-1067.
Caselli, G., & Spada, M. M. (2013). The metacognitions about desire thinking questionnaire: Development and psychometric properties. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 69(12), 1284-1298.
Fernie, B. A., Caselli, G., Giustina, L., Donato, G., Marcotriggiani, A., & Spada, M. M. (2014). Desire thinking as a predictor of gambling. *Addictive Behaviors*, 39(4), 793-796.
Kavanagh, D. J., May, J., & Andrade, J. (2009). Tests of the elaborated intrusion theory of craving and desire: Feature of alcohol craving during treatment for an alcohol disorder. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 48, 241–254
Marlatt, G. A. (1987). Craving notes. *British Journal of Addiction*, 82, 42–43.