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ABSTRACT
Today it is not possible to talk about the concept of a crisis as comfortably as we speak of the word crisis because the word carries with it a serious semiologic problem. Alongside this, almost all situations described as a crisis carry a number of common features and the results arising from these features, though trivial, are still possible to discuss. In this chapter, after a brief review of the term crisis’ academic language status, common psychological characteristics carried by the social systems in crisis situations arising from situations of weakness are addressed. In crisis situations, the available individuals’, communities’ or societies’ self-defense and protection mechanisms indicate inability of the available methods to solve problems. Furthermore, Crisophilia can be found in all cases related to social systems and in all stages of crisis in your living area. In order to create living space, crisophilia applies actions aimed at creating the crisis itself. Crisophilic individuals or groups wait patiently for the system to fall into a state of crisis and the intervention made during the crisis in the system is viewed as saving the system, due to this a crisophilic individual or group can also sometimes be seen as a hero. Because of the desperation in the system a crisophilic individual or group is adopted in the system. Here in this case, the system itself opens its doors to crisophyilia.
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INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, after a brief review of the term crisis’ academic language status, common psychological characteristics carried by the social systems in crisis situations arising from situations of weakness will be addressed.

As a means of gaining from the status of weakness viewed and for the sake of being pleased with others’ crisis situations therefore, the term ‘Crisophyilia’ is recommended and for the case of naming the subjects, the recommended “Crisophyilic” terms will be initially defined and on top of the definitions, the forms of behavior thereof will be interpreted.

BACKGROUND

The Term Crisis in Academic Language

In the International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences published in 1968, the article describing ‘crisis’ begins with a sentence like this: “The word crisis in scientific research meaning is a common term.” A continuation of the description mentions that the term crisis is used in many situations which differ from one another and due to this; the term becomes unsuitable in systematic production of knowledge (Robinson, 1968).

In the current edition of the same encyclopedia of 2008, a separate item on ‘crisis’ cannot be found. In the new edition an item is included in the form of ‘economic crises’ but a separate item of crisis can hardly be found. This is considered an indication that the term can take place with a collapsed meaning in academic language.

The word crisis, especially in the twentieth century, probably due to its stunning connotations is used so often and in a sloppy manner that the variety of usage renders the academic definition of the term impossible. Despite excessive use of the word in the social sciences community, the word crisis is not included in many of the major reference sources related to social sciences. Just as “economic crisis,”” the use of the word in collapsed circumstances or situations is maintained in academic language.

More of the word crisis is only a reference in the many dictionaries and encyclopedias published in the twenty-first century. One of these, the new dictionary of the history of ideas, published in 2005 in the article describing ‘crisis’ it is stated that “the history of the concept of crisis consists of failure in defining the concept coupled with inflation in the use of the word and as a result the concept as an analysis material has become worthless.” At the end of the explanation in the same source still, the most noteworthy use of the word in the twenty-first century is in activist and political rhetoric, and consequently in everyday language too, for each purpose for which the word is used, the emphasis is on its return to a cliché (‘Crisis’ clause, 2005).

Although the general validity of the term crisis as a concept is not highly esteemed in the jargon of social sciences and humanities, disciplines of psychology and psychiatry have also started having a strong grip on the concept of crisis by using emerging theoretical productions to improve practical strategies. Through the use of psychology and psychiatry the theoretical knowledge accumulated around the word crisis can contribute to the use of this word as a means of functional academic analysis. For this reason, it would be useful to look at the use of the word crisis in the disciplines of psychology and psychiatry briefly.

The Concept of “Crisis” in Psychology and Psychiatry

The simplest definition of the word crisis in psychology “is a psychological imbalance, the turning point in the life of a person” (Bahatia, 2009). In many unusual cases, in order to describe a hazardous situation, the word used in psychology brings mixed and limited usage, “which is caused by an