

**The differences of worries domains between men and women
of students of psychology faculties in Indonesia**

Kwartarini Wahyu Yuniarti
Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Gadjah Mada
Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Email: kwartarini_yuniarti@yahoo.com

Abstract. The degree of differences of the domains between men and women is brought about the stereotype of gender that has been internalized into long term memory. Yet, the cultural diversity, the situations and the conditions of the society also affect the stereotype of gender development and the long term memory. The cultural diversity is estimated to cause differences of worries domains between men and women. Thus, a further study on worries domains between men and women is in need to be held. The instrument used in this study is *Worrie Domain Questionnaire*⁺ which was developed by Rijsoort, Emmelcamp, & Vervaeke (1999). The WDJ⁺ instrument (*Worrie Domain Questionnaire*⁺) is used to measure the degree of relationship worries, lack of confidence worries, aimless future worries, work incompetency worries, financial worries, and health worries. The subjects of this study are 155 students of Psychology program consisting of 81 students of Psychology Faculty of Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta; and 74 Psychology students program of Medical Faculty of Syah Kuala University, Aceh. The ages of the subjects of the study range from 17 years old to 24 years old. The samples of the study were gained by using purposive sampling method. The hypothesis was tested quantitatively by using the t-test.

The result of the t-test shows that there are no differences of worries domains between men and women; relationship worries domain ($F = -0.504, p = 0.615, p > 0.05$), lack of confidence worries-domain ($F = -0.506, p = 0.614, p > 0.05$), aimless future worries domain ($F = -0.210, p = 0.834, p > 0.05$), work incompetency worries domain ($F = -0.313, p = 0.754, p > 0.05$), financial worries domains ($F = -0.2549, p = 0.796, p > 0.05$) and health worries domain ($F = -1.530, p = 0.129, p > 0.05$). This is because the culture and the situation and condition, of university students in Indonesia, in seeing the stereotype of gender are not established yet. It is not like university students in western countries, they hold more responsibility in relationships, future, and lack of confidence, work, financial, and health than university students in Indonesia do, university students here, both men and women, tend to rely on their parents, especially financially. Despite that, university students at their ages, 17 to 24, in Indonesia do not hold many responsibilities in relationships, future, and lack of confidence, work, financial, and health that they cannot experience the stereotype of gender that has to do with this matter. Finally, the worries domains between men and women of university students in Indonesia do not show any differences.

Key Words : Worries domains, gender, stereotype gender

In most of the case, everybody have experienced worry, for it is a general case suffered by all (Barkovec, Ray & Strober, 1998). However, the duration, frequency, and area of interest that becomes the topic of worry vary between people.

Tallis' research on the frequency of worry on 128 people consisting of university students and working adults between ages 18-19 stated that 38% experiences worry at least once a day; 19.4% at least once every 2-3 days; and 15.3% at least once every month. 27.3% were unable to accurately recount the times they worried. The duration or time range of worry also varies. A total of 24% stated that their worries lasted approximately a minute; 38% stated duration of 1-10 minutes; 18% between 10-60 minutes; and 11% between 1-2 hours. A total of 9% stated to experience worries for 2 hours or more (Holaway, Rodebaugh & Heimberg, 2006). According to Boehnke, Schwartz, Stromberg, and Sagiv (1998), the areas of life under interest that becomes the topic of worry are known as the *worry domain*. Moreover, Boehnke et.al. (1998) also stated that there are no definite standards regarding the total number of one's worry domain, for it largely relies on the theory used to explain the worry domain. One theory regarding the worry domain belongs to Eysenk, which stated that the worry domain is a group of regions as a source of worry caused by different information in one's long-term memory. Based on that theory, Tallis, Eysenck and Matthews conducted a cluster analysis to investigate the domains of worry within an individual. Results of the cluster analysis illustrates five domains; *relationships, lack of confidence, aimless future, work incompetence, and financial*. The degree of these five domains differs in each individual. For that reason, Tallis, Eysenck and Matthews developed the *Worry Domains Questionnaire (WDQ)* that measures the dominance of each domain. The WDQ was further developed by Rijsoort, Emmelkamp and Vervaeke (1999) by adding the domain *health*. The revised questionnaire is known as *Worry Domains Questionnaire** (WDQ*).

An understanding of which worry domains are dominant is a very important factor, for each worry domain is essentially related to different aspects and may be used to predict possible appearing psychological disorders. Not to mention currently worry arises as a characteristic of disorders, specifically mood and worry disorders (Purdon & Harrington, 2006).

The difference in worry domains between males and females, according to Conway, Wood, Dugas and Pushkar (2003), are not only influenced by their different biological genders. As Lips (2005) stated as gender stereotypes, differences are more accentuated by the culture's formation of how a male and a female should behave in evaluating experiences and express his/her worries as a member of the male/female kind. A majority of studies conducted shows that females tend to worry more than men (Conway, Wood, Dugas & Pushkar, 2003; Hunt, Wisocki & Yunko, 2003; Hatton, 2006). There are also a number of differences in regard to the worry domain and which are higher between males and females. Research by Wood, Conway, Pushkar and Dugas (2005) stated that females worry more on *relationships* whilst males worry more regarding *achievement* and *finances*.

Rijsoort, Emmelkamp and Vervaeke (1999) stated that females have higher worries in the domains of *relationships* and *lack of confidence*, whereas Lindesay, Baillon, Brugha, Dennis, Stewart, Arara and Meltzer (2000) stated that females have higher rates of worry in *relationships* and *health*. On the other hand, males suffer more worry in *work incompetence*. Dugas and Conway's (2003) research shows that females have higher worries related to *lack of confidence* than males.

Based on the above illustrations, it can be seen that there are still many differing opinions regarding which worry domains has a higher degree between females and males. For that reason, more studies are required in order to diagnose, treat, and predict the probability of psychological disorders related to worry in males and females, bearing in mind, the correlation of each worry domain towards different aspects; for instance *health* relates significantly to *health worries*.

This study aimed to discover whether or not there is a difference in domains of worry between males and females.

Methods. The dependent variable for the current study is the worry domain. The worry domains are an area of life that becomes a topic of worry, which manifests due to more concern being given to that specific area. The worry domains of the current study are based on the worry domains of Tallis, Eysenck and Mathew which was further developed by Rijsoort et al. (1999). The worry domains include the following: 1. *relationships*, 2. *lack of confidence*, 3. *aimless future*, 4. *work incompetence*, 5. *financial*, and 6. *health*. All six of these worries are measured with the *Worry Domains Questionnaire*⁺ (WDQ⁺). The independent variable is sex. Sex refers to biological characteristics distinguishing both male and female.

Study participants. This study involved a total of 155 psychology students, with 81 students from Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, 74 students from the psychology program, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Syah Kuala, Aceh. The selection of both faculties are made based on financial, time, and energy considerations, because the current study serves as a collaboration study between faculty of psychology, Universitas Gadjah Mada and the Psychology Program, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Syah Kuala. Ages range from 17-24 years. Ranges in age are also considered because age difference influences differences in worry domains. Purposive sampling is conducted towards the subjects, of which serves as the techniques of selecting subjects based on the research objective, of which is based on specific characteristics that are viewed to be strongly related with the characteristics of the aforementioned population.

Table 1.
Worry Domains Questionnaire⁺ *Blueprint prior to Trial Tests*

No	Domain	Item	Total
1.	<i>Relationships</i>	19, 20, 21, 23	4
2.	<i>Lack of Confidence</i>	2, 4, 10, 15, 18	5
3.	<i>Aimless Future</i>	3, 5, 13, 14, 16, 17, 22	7
4.	<i>Work Incompetence</i>	6, 24, 25	3
5.	<i>Financial</i>	1, 7, 9, 11	4
6.	<i>Health</i>	8, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30	6
Total		30	30

Results. Table 2 demonstrates that subjects are largely 20 years and younger (94,3%). This is indicated by the higher percentages for 17 year olds as much 17 (11%), 18 year old subjects as much as 59 (38,1%), 19 year old subjects as much as 46 (29,7%) and 20 year old subjects as much 24 (15,5%). From a total of 155 subjects, only 9 (5,7%) had ages above 20.

Moreover, table 2 also demonstrates that most subjects are female. Such findings are apparent from the higher percentage for female subjects as much as 110 (71%). From 155 subjects, only 45 (29%) subjects were males.

Table 2.
Subject Descriptive based on Age and Sex

Age (years)	Total	Percentage (%)
17	17	11
18	59	38,1
19	46	29,7
20	24	15,5
20 ⁺	9	5,7
Total	155	100

Sex	Total	Percentage (%)
Male	45	29
Female	110	71
Total	155	100

Note: 20⁺ indicate subjects above the age of 20 years namely 21, 23 and 24 years.

Based on the research results, a descriptive comparison is made between the hypothetic situation (possible situation) and the empiric situation (situation obtained by the research data). Comparison is made by calculating some statistical data including: minimum score, maximum score, mean, and standard deviation between the hypothetic score and empiric score for each of the worry domains as well as the overall worry which is displayed in table 3.

Table 3.
General Description of Data

No.	Variable	Hypothetic Score				Empiric Score			
		Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
1.	<i>Relationships Domain</i>	4	20	12	2,67	4	20	10,55	4,791
2.	<i>Lack of Confidence</i>	5	25	15	3,33	5	25	14,03	4,592

3.	<i>Aimless Future</i> Domain	7	35	21	4,67	7	35	20,30	7,267
4.	<i>Work Incompetence</i> Domain	3	15	9	2	3	15	8,38	2,888
5.	<i>Financial</i> Domain	4	20	12	2,67	4	20	10,75	3,866
6.	<i>Health</i> Domain	6	30	18	4	6	30	17,25	6,663
7.	Overall worry	30	150	90	20	30	146	83,43	26,842

Note: Min= minimum score, Max= maximum score, SD= Standard Deviation.

Before testing the hypothesis, the level of the worry domain and overall worry is determined. Scores for each worry domain and overall worry is categorized to understand the score levels of the subject. Scores for each worry domain can be categorized into five categories, namely very high, high, mild, low, and very low. Table 4 displays the categorization of the overall worry and for each worry domain by using the formulation to calculate five-score categorization norms (Azwar, 2008):

Table 4.
Worry Categorization

Worry Domain	Category	Score Range	Subject Total	Percentage (%)
<i>Relationship</i>	Very high	Above 16	23	14,84
	High	14-16	19	12,26
	Mild	12-13	20	12,90
	Low	9-11	33	21,29
	Very low	8 below	60	38,71
Total			155	100
<i>Lack of Confidence</i>	Very high	Above 20	11	7,10
	High	18-20	24	15,48
	Mild	14-17	50	32,26
	Low	11-13	30	19,35
	Very low	10 below	40	25,81
Total			155	100
<i>Aimless Future</i>	Very high	Above 28	22	14,19
	High	24-28	37	23,88
	Mild	20-23	24	15,48
	Low	15-19	31	20
	Very low	14 below	41	26,45

Total			155	100
<i>Work Incompetence</i>	Very high	Above 12	6	3,87
	High	11-12	35	22,58
	Mild	9-10	35	22,58
	Low	7-8	31	20
	Very low	6 below	48	30,97
Total			155	100
<i>Financial</i>	Very high	Above 16	12	7,74
	High	14-16	29	18,71
	Mild	12-13	21	13,55
	Low	9-11	48	30,97
	Very low	8 below	45	29,03
Total			155	100
<i>Health</i>	Very high	Above 24	30	19,35
	High	21-24	15	9,68
	Mild	17-20	30	19,35
	Low	13-16	38	24,52
	Very low	12 below	42	27,10
Total			155	100
Overall	Very high	Above 120	15	9,68
	High	101-120	29	18,70
	Mild	81-100	36	23,23
	Low	61-80	41	26,45
	Very low	60 below	34	21,94
Total			155	100%

Based on the categorization in Table 4, the figures suggest that most subjects have very low levels of worry for the worry domains *relationships* (38,71%) , *aimless future* (26,45%), *work incompetence* (30,97%) and *health* (27,10%). For the domains *lack of confidence* (32,26%) and *financial* (30,97%) most subjects fall in the mild category. For overall worry, most subjects are categorized in the low category. Furthermore, only a small portion of subjects displayed very high levels of worry for the domain *lack of confidence* (7,10%), *aimless future* (14,19%) *work incompetence* (3,87%), *financial* (7,74%) and overall worry (9,68%). Small numbers of subjects fell in the category of high for the worry domains of *relationships* (12,26%) and *health* (9,68%).

Moreover, identification related to differences of the degree of the worry domains with the overall worry may simply be discovered by the mean. The mean for each domain category and overall worry can be observed from Tabel 5.

Table 5.

Mean and *t*-test towards the Worry Domain and Overall Worry Based on Sex

Worry domain type	Mean total	Mean based on sex		t	df	p
		Male	Female			
<i>Relationships</i>	2,6371	2,5611	2,6682	-0,504	153	p>0,05
<i>Lack of confidence</i>	2,8052	2,7467	2,8291	-0,506	153	p>0,05

<i>Aimless future</i>	2,9005	2,8730	2,9117	-0,210	153	p>0,05
<i>Work incompetence</i>	2,7935	2,7556	2,8091	-0,313	153	p>0,05
<i>Finance</i>	2,6871	2,6556	2,7000	-0,259	153	p>0,05
<i>Health</i>	2,8742	2,6741	2,9561	-1,530	93,886*	p>0,05
Overall worry	2,7811	2,7059	2,8118	-0,668	153	p>0,05

Note: * demonstrates variance on scores for the health domain between males and females.

Based on table 5, it may be observed that the topic of largest worry in order of the highest to the lowest scores, is the domain *aimless future* (2,9005), *health*, (2,8742) *lack of confidence* (2,8052), *work incompetence* (2,7935), *finance* (2,6871), and *relationships* (2,6371).

Furthermore, based on sex differences, males are most worried with an *aimless future* (2,8000) while female subjects are more worried for *health* (2,9909). Second among the most worrying topics for males is *work incompetence* (2,7667) and for females an *aimless future* (2,8948). The domain *lack of confidence* is ranked third for males (2,7611) and females (2,8291). Ranked four for the males (2,7378) is health and *work incompetence* for females (2,8030). The worry domain for finance is ranked fifth for both males and females. Sixth ranked for both males (2,4722) and females (2,6523) is the worry domain relationships. Mean differences need to be analyzed using the t-test to discover whether statistically significant mean differences are evident.

Understanding the conditions of the sample requires tests of normality and homogeneity. Normality tests are performed to identify whether the sample represents the distribution of the population. Normal distributions are said to indicate that the sample represents the distribution of the population. Normality tests are conducted using the *One-Sample Kolmogorof-Smirnov Test*. Normality is established when $p > 0,05$ and deviating from normality when $p < 0,05$.

The *relationships* worry domain has a K-S Z score = 1,160 and $p = 0,136$ ($p > 0,05$). The *lack of confidence* worry domain has a K-S Z score = 1,086 and $p = 0,189$ ($p > 0,05$). The *aimless future* worry domain has a K-S Z score = 1,018 and $p = 0,252$ ($p > 0,05$). The *work incompetence* worry domain has a K-S Z score = 1,305 and $p = 0,066$ ($p > 0,05$). The *financial* worry domain has a K-S Z score = 1,237 and $p = 0,094$ ($p > 0,05$). The *health* worry domain has a K-S Z score = 1,124 and $p = 0,160$ ($p > 0,05$). The results of the analysis demonstrate that the overall worry has a K-S Z score = 0,756 and $p = 0,618$ ($p > 0,05$).

Based on the normality tests, it may be concluded that the data for each worry domain and for overall worry indicates a normal distribution. Therefore, the sample taken for the research for each worry domain and for overall worry can be said to represent the population. Homogeneity tests is made with the goal to observe the difference of variances for the scores of the worry domain for *relationships*, *lack of confidence*, *aimless future*, *work incompetence* and *financial* and overall scores for male and female subjects. In cases of homogeneity, it assumes that no differences of variances are evident for the scores for the worry domain *relationships*, *lack of confidence*, *aimless future*, *work incompetence* and *financial* as well as the overall worry scores for male and female subjects. Homogeneity tests in the study uses the *Levene's Test*. Homogeneity is established when $p > 0,05$ and violated when $p < 0,05$.

Results of the analysis shows that the value of the worry domain *relationships* has an $F = 1,766$ and $p = 0,186$ ($p > 0,05$). The worry domain *lack of confidence* has an $F = 0,317$ and $p = 0,574$ ($p > 0,05$). The domain *aimless future* has an $F = 0,158$ and $p = 0,692$ ($p > 0,05$). The worry domain *work incompetence* has an $F = 0,314$ and $p = 0,576$ ($p > 0,05$). The worry domain *financial* has an $F = 3,113$ and $p = 0,080$ ($p > 0,05$). The worry domain *health* has an $F = 3,984$ and $p = 0,048$ ($p < 0,05$). Overall worry indicates an $F = 2,374$ and $p = 0,125$ ($p > 0,05$).

Based on the homogeneity tests, it may be concluded that no differences of variances are evident on the scores for the worry domains *relationships*, *lack of confidence*, *aimless future*, *work incompetency* and *financial* as well as the scores for overall worry among male and female participants. Meanwhile the homogeneity tests indicate that the worry domain for health indicates a variance for the scores for the domain health among male and female subjects.

Hypothesis Test. Hypothesis tests in the study uses the t-test. The results of the t-test may be observed from the Table 6. The results of the t-test indicate that the worry domain *relationships* has a *t-test* value of $-0,504$ with $p = 0,615$ ($p > 0,05$), the worry domain *lack of confidence* has a *t-test* value of $-0,504$ with a $p = 0,614$ ($p > 0,05$), the worry domain *aimless future* with a *t-test* value of $-0,210$ with $p = 0,834$ ($p > 0,05$), the worry domain *work incompetence* has a *t-test* value of $-0,313$ with $p = 0,754$ ($p > 0,05$), and the worry domain *financial* with a *t test* value of $-0,2549$ with $p = 0,796$ ($p > 0,05$) as well as the worry domain *health* with a *t test* value as of $-1,530$ with $p = 0,129$ ($p > 0,05$). Negative t-test values for each worry domain indicates that the mean scores for each worry domain for male subjects is lower compared to the female subjects. Identical results can be observed through the descriptive statistics which display mean scores of the worry domain of male subjects that are generally lower compared to the female subjects. Based on that, it may be concluded that there are no differences for the worry domains *relationships*, *lack of confidence*, *aimless future*, *work incompetence*, *financial* and *health* between male and female subjects. Therefore the hypothesis that states that there is a difference of the worry domain between male and female subjects is rejected.

Additional Tests. To observe whether there are differences for overall worry, referring to the total score of each worry domain between male and female subjects, the t-test is performed. The results of the t-test assume variances for both populations are unequal with a value of $-0,668$, with a $p = 0,505$. Considering the value of $p > 0,05$, it may be concluded that no differences are evident of the level of overall worry between male and female subjects. The negative *t-test* demonstrates that the mean overall worry score for male subjects are lower compared to female subjects. This is also evident in the descriptive statistics that the mean overall worry for males ($2,7059$) is lower compared to the female subjects ($2,8118$).

Discussion. The results of the study demonstrate that the hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is no difference for worry domains between male and female subjects. The results of the study do not support studies that state that women are more worried for the relationship domain (Rijsoort, 1999; Wood, Conway, Pushkar & Dugas, 2005; Lindesay et al, 2000), *lack of confidence* domain (Rijsoort, 1999; Robichaud, Dugas & Conway, 2003) and the *health* domain (Lindesay et al, 2006). Meanwhile, male subjects are more worried for the finance domain (Wood, Conway, Pushkar & Dugas, 2005) and *work* (Lindesay et al, 2006). Furthermore, the results of the study also contradict findings that state that females are more worried than males (Conway, Wood, Dugas & Pushkar, 2003; Hunt, Wisocki & Yunko, 2003; Hatton, 2006). In addition, the findings in the study also contradict studies from Conway, Wood, Dugas and Pushkar (2003) stating that women are more vulnerable to maladaptive worries compared to men.

Basically, the results of the previous studies concerning worry domains among men and women differ from the current findings. Based on the theory suggested by Eysenck, the degree of differences for the worry domains are caused by different information in the *long term memory* (Tallis & Eysenck, 1997). The absence of differences of the worry domain between men and women indicate no differences of information in *long term memory* that is largely differently received by men and women, particularly information related to existing gender stereotypes. However, this does not imply that gender stereotypes do not exist with regards to *communality* and *agency*.

Based on verifying interviews towards two psychology students of Universitas Gadjah Mada, they stated that basically, their beliefs related with gender stereotype remain to exist in the society. For an example, males are viewed to be more independent, responsible towards financial problems in the family, while females are more polite, maintaining good manners, and express larger appreciation towards other people. Furthermore, when asked about their concerns related to personal relationships with others, self confidence, future, work abilities, financial problems and health, either for interviews with male and female subjects, both express concerns to all the topics above. According to them, although gender stereotypes are different however currently females remain to have responsibility towards financial matters and their future. Meanwhile, males also have the same needs as women to maintain fine relationships with others. This in accordance with the statements from Feingold (cited in Lips, 2005) suggesting that differences of activities based on what is appropriate for males and females is gradually fading and becoming less apparent because of the different conditions and social situations.

Based on the verifying interviews, when related with Eysenck's theory suggesting that gender stereotypes relate with *communality* and *agency*, worry among male and females do not form different schemes so that the information on *long term memory* is also not different. Therefore, for males and females, there are no differences on the level of their worry domain. This may be caused by information related to gender stereotype which is limited to the belief but not confirmed by the presence of information supporting differences of gender stereotypes related with worry. In accordance with the *long term memory* model from Atkinson and Shiffrin, lack of experience and use of information may hamper the entry of information to *long-term memory* (Passer & Smith, 2007).

Furthermore, based on the categories of worry, it demonstrates that most subjects express worries in the very low category (worry domain for *relationships*, *aimless future*, *work incompetence* and *health*), low (overall worries) and mild (*lack of confidence* and *financial* worry domain). This is because most subjects aged 17-20 years remain to be classified as adolescents (Santrock, 2005). Based on the observations, ages 17-20, mostly comprise of Indonesian students who are yet to gain financial autonomy and remain dependant towards their parents. In addition, expectations and social demands related with matters of *relationships*, *lack of confidence*, *aimless future*, *work incompetence*, *financial* and *health* is not evident in the current study. In line with Hurlock (1980) who suggests that anxiety and worry occurring in the developmental stage is influenced by demands and expectation society towards developmental tasks for the related developmental stage. This is confirmed by Davey and Levy (1998) that suggests that worry is a response from discomfort towards social evaluation. As a result, the low social demands and expectations towards matters of *relationships*, *lack of confidence*, *aimless future*, *work incompetence*, *financial* and *health* are related with the low level of worry towards those topics.

Based on the instruments of data collection for the worry domains, namely, WDQ⁺, it is possible that the worry domain measured by the WDQ⁺ does not reflect the worry domains that become a source of worries in Indonesia. This is because the worries contained in the WDQ were initially the results of cluster analysis from 155 subject responses towards the events that caused their worries (Tallis in Larzelere et al., 2001). The subjects that were used in the study consist of Europeans. Therefore, the responses towards the events that cause worries surely are those matters that are present in the *long term memory* of Europeans. Formation of the *long term memory* cannot

be separated from cultures and existing situations (Passer & Smith, 2007). Differences in culture and situations between European countries and Indonesia surely influence differences in forming the long term memory. Differences of culture and situations will cause differences in information and formation of the long term memory. One of the examples that demonstrate that the environment influences a person's health status is the research related with stress. The results of the study from 555 students in America, India, South Africa, and Germany demonstrate that differences in culture relate with matters that trigger their stress (Shiraev & Levy, 2004). Therefore, it is likely to have differences of cultures to matters that trigger worry. This may be due to worries towards matters that are universal, however the topic of worry is relative to culture as well as the differing situations and conditions. Based on that, differences of the degree of worries cannot be separated from culture, situations, and conditions from the surrounding environment. This is because the emergence of worry is influenced by information in the long term memory; where the information that enters in the long term memory have strong relations with culture, situations, and conditions from the environment.

Conclusions. This study concluded that there is no differences are evident for the worry domains of *relationships, lack of confidence, aimless future, work incompetence, financial and health* between males and females. The second conclusion is that there is no difference of overall worry between males and females.

Recommendation. Based on the conclusions above, future studies aimed to investigate worries and its domains are recommended to:

1. Select other variables that influence worries apart from sex, for instance age, culture, occupation, financial status, educational level, and marriage status. This is because differences in age, culture, occupation, financial status, educational level and marriage status possess different demands and expectations, whether they are internal or from the society so that it causes differences in the worry domains.
2. Total numbers between male and female subjects should be equal.
3. The creation of an Indonesian culture-based construct for measuring worry and the worry domains is required. This is because information processing as the initial process of worry cannot be separated from culture, situation and the conditions of a particular country.

References.

Archer, J. & Llyoyd, B.B. (2002). *Sex and Gender : Second edition*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Azwar, S. (2008a). *Dasar-dasar Psikometri*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

———. (2008b). *Penyusunan Skala Psikologi*. Edisi 1. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Basevitz, P., Pushkar, D., Chaikelson, J., Conway, M. & Dalton, C. (2008). Age-Related differences in worry and related process. *Journal Aging And Human Development*, 66, 283-305.

- Beck, A.T. & Clark, D.A. (1997). An information processing model of anxiety: Automatic and strategic processes. *Behavior Research & Therapy*, 35, 49-58.
- Baron, R.A., & Byrne, D. (1997). *Social Psychology*. New York : Allyn and Bacon.
- Bouman, T.K and Meijer, K.J. (1999). A Preliminary study of worry and metacognition in hypochondriasis. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 6, 96-101.
- Boehnke, K., Schwartz, S., Stromberg, C., & Sagiv, L. (1998). The structure and dynamics of worry: theory, measurement, and cross-national replications. *Journal of Personality*. 66, 745-782.
- Borkovec, T., Ray, W. & Strober, J. (1998). Worry : A cognitive phenomenon intimately linked to affective, physiological, and interpersonal behavioral processes. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 22, 561–576.
- Conway, M., Pizzamiglio, M. T., & Mount, L. (1996). Status, communality, and agency: Implications for stereotypes of gender and other groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 25–38.
- Conway, M., Wood, W. J., Dugas, M., & Pushkar, D. (2003) Are women perceived as worrying more than men? A status interpretation. *Sex Roles*, 49, 1–10.
- Davey, G.C.L. & Levy, S. (1998). Catastrophic worrying: Personal inadequacy and a perseverative iterative styles as features of the catastrophizing process. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 107, 576-586.
- Dugas, M., Freeston, M., Ladouceur, R., Rhéaume, J., Provencher, M. & Boisvert, J.-M. (1998). Worry themes in primary GAD, secondary GAD, and other anxiety disorders. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 12, 253–261.
- Freeston, M. H., Dugas, M.J., and Ladouceur, R. (1996). Thoughts, images, worry, and anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 3, 265-273.
- Gove, W. R. (1980). Mental illness and psychiatric treatment among women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 4, 345–362.
- Hatton, S.C. (2006). Worry in Childhood and Adolescence. In G. Davey & F. Tallis (Eds), *Worry and Its Psychological Disorders Theory, Assessment and Treatment* (pp. 81–97). Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Holaway, R.M., Rodebaugh, T.L., & Heimberg, G. (2006). The epidemiology of worry and generalized anxiety disorder. In . In G. Davey & F. Tallis (Eds), *Worry and its psychological disorders theory, assessment and treatment* (pp. 3–20). Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Hunt, S., Wisocki, P., & Yanko, J. (2003). Worry and use of coping strategies among older and younger adults. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 17, 547-560.

- Hurlock, E.B. (1980). *Psikologi Perkembangan : Suatu Pendekatan Sepanjang Rentang Kehidupan*. Jakarta : Erlangga.
- Kelly, W. E. (2002). An investigation of worry and sense of humor. *The Journal of Psychology*, 136 (6), 657-666.
- Khodarahimi, S., Rahimi, A., Rahimian, R. & Khodabande, Z. (2005). The study of adolescents worries and wishes in the north of fars province. *US-China Education Review*, 2 (3), 7-12.
- Linardatos, E. (2008). Qualitative and quantitative differences of worry among individual with and without generalized anxiety disorder. *Thesis*. Unpublished. Ohio : Kent State University. Downloaded from www.sagepub.com. Date: 13 October 2009.
- Larzelere, M.M., Diefenbach, G.J., Williamson, D.A., Netemeyer, R.G., Bentz, B.G., & Manguno-Mire, G.M. (2001). Psychometric properties and factor structure of the Worry Domains Questionnaire. *Assessment*, 8 (2), 177–191.
- Lindesay, J., Baillon, S., Brugha, T., Dennis, M., Stewart, R., Arara, R. & Meltzer, H. (2006). Worry content across the lifespan: An analysis of 16-74 year old participants in the British National Survey of Psychiatric Morbidity 2000. *Psychological Medicine*. 36 (11), 1625-1633.
- Lips, H.M. (2005). *Sex and Gender : An Introduction*. California : Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Matthews, G & Funke, J.,G. (2006). The Epidemiology of Worry and Generalized Anxiety Disorder. In . In G. Davey & F. Tallis (Eds), *Worry and Its Psychological Disorders Theory, Assessment and Treatment* (pp. 3–20). Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Mustafa, A. (2007). Gender differences in mental health. *Singapore Med J*, 48 (5), 385-391.
- Passer, M.W. & Smith, R.E. (2007). *Psychology The Science of Mind and Behavior* (3rd ed.). New York : McGraw-Hill.
- Pratt, P., Tallis, F., & Eysenck, M., (1997). Information processing, storage, characteristic and worry. *Behavior Research Theraphy*, 35, 1015-1023.
- Purdon, C. & Harrington, J. (2006). Worry in Psychopathology. In G. Davey & F. Tallis (Eds), *Worry and Its Psychological Disorders Theory, Assessment and Treatment* (pp. 41–50). Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Rijsoort, S., Emmelkamp, P., & Vervaeke., G. (1999). The penn state worry questionnaire and the worry domains questionnaire: structure, reliability, and validity. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 6, 297-307.
- Robichaud, M., Dugas, M. & Conway, M. (2003). Gender differences in worry and associated cognitive-behavioral variables. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 17, 501–516.

- Santrock, J. W. (2005). *Life Span Development : Perkembangan Sepanjang Hidup edisi 5*. Jakarta : Erlangga.
- Scott, E., Eng,W.&Heimberg, R. (2002). Ethnic differences in worry in a nonclinical population. *Depression and Anxiety, 15*, 79–82.
- Shiraev, E., Levy, D. (2004). *Cross Cultural Psychology. Second Edition*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Stavosky, J. M., & Borkovec, T. G. (1987). The phenomenon of worry: Theory, research and treatment, and its implications for women. *Women and Therapy, 6*, 77–95.
- Strauss, J., Muday, T., McNall, K., & Wong, M. (1997). Response style theory revisited: Gender differences and stereotypes in rumination and distraction. *Sex Roles, 36*, 771–792.
- Strober, J., Wolfradt, U. (2001). Worry and social desirability : Opposite relationship for socio-political and social-evaluation worries. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31*, 133-141.
- Strober, J. (1998). Worry, problem solving, and suppression of imagery : The role of concreteness. *Behavior Research and therapy, 36*, 751-756.
- Wetherell, J.L. (2006). Worry in older adults. In G. Davey & F. Tallis (Eds), *Worry and its psychological disorders theory, assessment and treatment* (pp. 69–80). Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Widhiarso, W. (2008). Komparasi ketepatan estimasi koefisien reliabilitas teori skor murni klasik. *Tesis* (Tidak Diterbitkan). Yogyakarta: Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Wood, W.J., Conway, M., Pushkar, D., & Dugas, M. (2003). People’s perception of women’s and men’s worry about life issues: worrying about love, accomplishment, or money?. *Sex Roles, 53*, 545-551.