EXAMINING THE PREDICTIVE ROLES OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS'

ATTACHMENT STYLES, SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AND LOCUS OF

CONTROL LEVELS ON THEIR SOCIAL APPEARANCE ANXIETY LEVELS

BY

ZEYNEP PEKIN

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER

IN

DEPARTMENT OF GUIDANCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELING

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY

JUNE, 2017

T.C
YEDİTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

TEZ TESLİM ve ONAY TUTANAĞI

KONU:
Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Bağlanma Stilleri, Öznel İyi Oluş ve Kontrol Odağı Düzeylerinin Sosyal Görünüş Kaygı Düzeyleri Üzerindeki Yordayıcı Rollerinin İncelenmesi

ONAY:

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Berke KIRIKKANAT

(Danışman)   (İmza)

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Münire ERDEN

(Üye)   (İmza)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Makbule SOYER

(Üye)   (İmza)

TESLİM EDEN   : Zeynep Pekin

TEZ SAVUNMA TARİHİ   : 25/.05/2017
TEZ ONAY TARİHİ   : 25/.05/2017

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and rules that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Zeynep PEKIN

Signature:

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted with the aim of investigating the predictive values of university students' attachment styles (secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing), subjective well-being and locus of control levels on their social appearance anxiety levels. The sample of the study composed of 420 undergraduate students (330 female, 90 male) in Yeditepe University. The data was obtained from the participants via Relationship Scales Questionnaire (Griffin and Bartholomew, 1994; Sümer & Güngör, 1999), Subjective Well-Being Scale (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004), Rotter's Internal External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966; Dağ, 1991) and Social Appearance Anxiety Scale (Hart, Palyo, Fresco, Holle & Heimberg, 2008; Doğan, 2010). Independent samples t-test and one way analysis of variance were used to assess the differences among university students' attachment styles, subjective well-being, locus of control and social appearance anxiety levels in terms of three demographic variables: gender, department and age. In the main analyses of the study, firstly Pearson correlation analysis was used to examine the correlations among the study variables. Then, the multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive roles of attachment styles, subjective well-being and locus of control on social appearance anxiety. The results of the study revealed that female students were more externally oriented than male students. Older students reported higher levels of internal locus of control than younger students. Students' secure attachment styles differed in terms of gender and age. Male students had higher secure attachment scores than female students. Students older than 23 years old were more securely attached than students who are 21-22 years old and students who are 18-20 years old. Students' fearful attachment styles differed with regard to department and age. Students in life sciences reported higher fearful attachment scores than students in social sciences. Students who are18-20 years had higher fearful attachment scores than students who are 21-22

years old and students older than 23 years old. Students' preoccupied attachment styles differed based on the department they were involved in. Students in life sciences had lower preoccupied attachment styles than students in social sciences. The results of the regression analysis ascertained that subjective well-being, secure and preoccupied attachment styles were significant predictors of social appearance anxiety. All study variables (secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles, subjective well-being and locus of control) explained 40% of total variance related to social appearance anxiety.

Key words: Attachment styles, subjective well-being, locus of control, social appearance anxiety, undergraduate students

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, üniversite öğrencilerinin bağlanma stilleri, öznel iyi oluş ve denetim odağı seviyelerinin sosyal görünüş kaygıları üzerindeki yordayıcı gücünün belirlenmesi amacı ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, Yeditepe Üniversitesinde okumakta olan 420 lisans öğrencisi (330 kadın, 90 erkek) oluşturmuştur. Araştırma verileri İlişki Ölçekleri Anketi (Griffin and Bartholomew, 1994; Sümer & Güngör, 1999), Öznel İyi Oluş Ölçeği (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004), Rotter İç Dış Kontol Odağı Ölçeği (Rotter, 1966; Dağ, 1991) ve Sosyal Görünüş Kaygısı Ölçeği (Hart, Palyo, Fresco, Holle & Heimberg, 2008; Doğan, 2010) aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Üniversite öğrencilerinin bağlanma stilleri, öznel iyi oluş, denetim odağı ve sosyal görünüş kaygısı seviyelerinin cinsiyet, bölüm ve yaş değişkenlerine göre anlamlı farkılılık gösterip göstermediğinin belirlenmesinde ilişkisiz örneklemler t-testi ve tek faktörlü varyans analizi (ANOVA) kullanılmıştır. Ayrıca, araştırma değişkenleri arasındaki korelasyonların belirlenmesi için Pearson korelasyon analizi ve bağlanma stilleri, öznel iyi oluş ve denetim odağının sosyal görünüş kaygısı üzerndeki yordayıcı gücünün belirlenmesi için de regresyon analizi gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma bulgularına göre, kadın öğrencilerin erkek öğrencilere göre daha dıştan denetimli oldukları bulunmuştur. Öğrencilerin yaşları ilerledikçe, iç denetim odağı puanlarında yükselme olduğu görülmüştür. Ayrıca, erkek öğrencilerin kadın öğrencilere göre daha güvenli bağlandıkları saptanmıştır. 23 yaşından büyük öğrencilerin, 21-22 ile 18-20 yaş aralığındaki öğrencilere göre daha güvenli bağlandıkları belirlenmiştir. Öğrencilerin korkulu bağlanma stilleri, yaş ve bölüm değişkenlerine göre anlamlı farkılılık göstermiştir. Fen bilimlerinde okuyan öğrencilerin, sosyal bilimlerde okuyan öğrencilere göre korkulu bağlanma düzeyleri daha yüksek bulunmuştur. 18-20 yaş aralığındaki öğrenciler, 21-22 ile 23 yaşından büyük öğrencilere göre daha korkulu bağlandıkları saptanmıştır. Öğrencilerin

saplantılı bağlanma stilleri ise okudukları bölüme göre anlamlı farklılık göstermiştir. Sosyal bilimlerde okuyan öğrenciler, fen bilimlerinde okuyan öğrencilere göre daha yüksek saplantılı bağlanma düzeyi bildirmiştir. Regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre, öznel iyi oluş, güvenli ve saplantılı bağlanma stillerinin, sosyal görünüş kaygısını anlamlı yordadığı bulgulanmıştır. Üniversite öğrencilerinin bağlanma stilleri, öznel iyi oluş ve denetim odağı düzeyleri birlikte, sosyal görünüş kaygısı düzeylerine ait toplam varyansın % 40'ını açıklamıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Bağlanma stilleri, öznel iyi oluş, denetim odağı, sosyal görünüş kaygısı, lisans öğrencileri.

To my beloved family…

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

step of my life. I have always felt your endless support, patience, affection, understanding and unconditional love. I am who I am thanks to you… To my little hero, my brother, Kadir PEKİN, you are the greatest and the most valuable gift that my parents gave to me. I cannot imagine a life or a world without you. No matter how old you are, you will always be my little brother…

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

1.INTRODUCTION

1.1.Problem

As a social entity, an individual has to communicate with other people in order both to survive and to adapt the changes around him. As the infant grows, the relations which he makes with others vary and these relations serve to fulfill different needs (e.g. belongingness and love, prestige and feeling of accomplishments needs). However, it is a fact that a human infant is in need of protection and care at the beginning of his life. Specifically, the relation between the infant and the caregiver is the first close relation that the infant forms in his life. And this relation constitutes the foundation of other relations that will be made in the later years (Hamarta, 2004).

According to Bowlby (1969), the emotional relation between the infant and the caregiver who is typically the mother is described as attachment. Attachment system refers to the need and the tendency of sentimental attachment. Attachment system has three functions for an infant: 1) maintaining proximity to the caregiver to protect himself from environmental dangers (Sümer & Güngör, 1999), 2) using caregiver as a secure base to initiate new things or explore the environment, 3) perceiving the caregiver as a safety heaven to ensure his safety, comfort and support (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Definitions of these functions contributed the development of the strange situation which is a laboratory study developed by Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall (1978).

In the strange situation, Ainsworth et al. (1978) observed how exploratory behavior of the infant is affected in a strange environment when a) his mother exists in that environment b) his mother is absent c) a stranger exists in that environment. According to the results of strange situation, Ainsworth et al. (1978) classified behavioral patterns of infants into three categories: secure, avoidant and

anxious/ambivalent patterns. Children with secure attachment were upset in the absence of their mothers. However, they were happy and sought for proximity when their mothers came back. Although children with avoidant attachment looked for their mothers during the separation time, they ignored their mothers when they came back. Lastly, children with anxious/ambivalent attachment was not comforted by their mothers' return, displayed anger and cried very much.

Several researches state that attachment styles formed between the child and the caregiver serve as a foundation for relations in adulthood (e.g. Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Collins & Read, 1990). With this respect, Bartholomew (1990) proposed a model that comprises of four categories: secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachments which emerge from the intersection of two attachment dimensions: model of self and model of others. Models of the self can be constituted as either positive or negative with regard to children's self-esteem (the self as worthy or the self as unworthy). In a similar way, the model of others can be evaluated as either positive or negative based on the assumption that the other is caring or uncaring.

Individuals with secure attachment style (positive on both self and others models) view others as supportive and consider themselves as worthy of love and attention. Individuals with preoccupied attachment style (negative on self model & positive on others model) have low levels of self-esteem due to their beliefs of unworthiness, and thus, they need excessive dependency on others' approvals. Individuals with dismissing attachment style (positive on self model & negative on others model) avoid proximity with others due to their negative expectations about others. They overvalue the significance of independence in order to maintain their positive self-concept as a high sense of self-worth. Individuals with fearful attachment style (negative on both

self and others models) need excessive dependency on others' approvals, yet they avoid proximity in order not to be rejected (Bartholomew, 1990).

Another important concept in human relations is subjective well-being. SWB simply refers to individuals' subjective judgements and emotions related to their lives and relationships (Myers, 2001). Since adult attachment styles represent individuals' basic understandings associated with their interpersonal relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994), they have influences on individuals' subjective well-being levels (Karreman & Vingerhoets, 2012; Li & Fung, 2014). In other words, the constructions of self-model and others-model (e.g. the self-model related to self as worthy or unworthy of love, the others-model related to others who are accessible when they are needed) contribute the individuals' subjective well-being levels (Li & Fung, 2014). For instance, securely attached people who have positive self-model and others-model are more likely to have positive views about the human nature and social world around them (Collins & Read, 1990). Correspondingly, they experience more positive emotions than individuals in other attachment styles and report high levels of subjective well-being. On the other hand, unsecurely attached individuals (negative on either self or others models or negative on both at the same time) report low levels of subjective well-being (Karreman & Vingerhoets, 2012).

The other concept pertinent to interpersonal relations is locus of control. LOC simply refers to individuals' attributions related to the responsibility of what happened to them. They attribute these responsibilities either to themselves (internal locus of control) or to the external forces such as faith, luck etc. (external locus of control) (Rotter, 1966). In other words, internal locus of control is associated with the person's interpretation of events as a result of his own behaviors whereas external locus of control is related to the thought that external forces have control over events (Marsh &

Weary, 1995). With respect to this, internally oriented people are more resistant to negative environmental forces, react more when their personal freedom is restricted and contemplate themselves as more confident, active and effective than externally oriented people. Compared to internals, externals need others' approval more with regard to their low self-confidence (Solmuş, 2004). Individuals with fearful attachment style, who have negative self-model and others-model demonstrate low levels of self-confidence and excessive dependency on others' approvals. On the other hand, individuals with secure attachment style who have positive self-model and others-model are self-confident people with low dependency on others' approvals (Collins & Read, 1990). Thus, internal locus of control is associated with secure attachment style (Jankowska et al. 2015; Hejazi & Kia, 2015) while external locus of control is related to fearful attachment style (Demirkan, 2006).

Besides attachment styles, SWB and LOC, another pivotal concept in one's relationships is social anxiety. Social anxiety refers to fear of social situations accompanied by physical (e.g. blushing, increased heart rate etc.), cognitive (e.g. the thought of being not good enough etc.) and behavioral symptoms (e.g. turning eyes away etc.). With reference to attachment theory, origins of anxiety are rooted in the attachment between the child and the caregiver. If the child constructs negative self model (e.g. uncertainty of the self's lovability) and negative other model (e.g. uncertainty of the caregivers' availability when needed), he cannot rely on himself and others. Correspondingly, he experiences anxiety (Vertue, 2003). Several studies state that anxiety and avoidance are two fundamental attachment dimensions (e.g. Brennan, Clark & Shaver, 1998, Sümer, 2006). Extreme proximity desire, social support seeking, fear of rejection and abandonment constitute anxiety dimension whereas proximity avoidance, discomfort with intimacy and extreme self-esteem not to search

for social support compose avoidance dimension. People with secure attachment exhibit low levels of anxiety whilst people with unsecure attachment experience high levels of anxiety (Brennan et al., 1998; Sümer, 2006, Kırımer, Akça & Sümer, 2014). According to Vertue (2003), the term anxiety in attachment theory is more likely to be social anxiety since the self-model is associated with dependency on others' approvals.

High levels of social anxiety can severely influence individuals' daily lives such as their social relations and their subjective well-being levels (Maricic & Stambuk, 2015). According to Diener, Suh, Lucas and Smith (1999), subjective well-being comprises of affective and cognitive components. Cognitive component stands for life satisfaction while affective component divides into two as pleasant affect and unpleasant affect. Life satisfaction includes desire to change life, satisfaction with current life, past and future lives, significant others' views of one's life. Pleasant affect encompasses positive feelings such as happiness, affection, elation etc. whereas unpleasant affect contains negative feeling like anger, guilt, anxiety, worry etc. With this respect, high levels of subjective well-being indicate experiencing more pleasant affects, less unpleasant affects and positive evaluations related to life satisfaction. Since anxiety is included in unpleasant affect, high levels of social anxiety point low levels of subjective well-being.

Other than subjective well-being and attachment styles, locus of control is also related to social anxiety (Geist & Borecki, 1982; Spokas & Heimberg, 2009). Internally oriented people believe that events are the results of their own behaviors. On the other hand, externally oriented people accredit that they do not have any control over events but external forces such as faith, luck etc. do (Marsh & Weary, 1995). Studies revealed that internals have higher levels of self-esteem than externals (Saadat,

Ghasemzadeh, Karami, & Soleimani, 2011). According to Geist and Borecki (1982), people with low self-esteem feel less confident in social contexts in which they need to be in an interaction with others than people with high self-esteem. This situation may bring about social anxiety. Externals who assume that external forces have control over events do not like being in a social situation because social situations may enhance feelings of impotence. In this regard, externally oriented people experience social anxiety more than internally oriented people.

The subdimension of social anxiety -social appearance anxiety- refers to the fear and anxiety that derive from negative evaluations of others regarding one's appearance. Social appearance anxiety is a significant predictor of social anxiety (Hart, Flora, Palyo, Fresco, Holle & Heimberg, 2008). Both social appearance anxiety and social anxiety are related to the fear of negative evaluations of others. However, social appearance anxiety includes fear of negative evaluations with regard to appearance whereas social anxiety encompasses general fears about negative evaluation. Therefore, social appearance anxiety can be seen as a specific type of social anxiety. Based on attachment theories (Bowlby, 1969; Bartholomew, 1990), it is stated that one's attachment style is pertinent to his subjective well-being, locus of control and social anxiety levels. However, in literature, there is no study investigating the relations between attachment styles, subjective well-being, locus of control and social appearance anxiety. Since social appearance anxiety is a specific type of social anxiety, similar relations with attachment styles, locus of control and subjective well-being are expected. Thus, the research problem of this study is "*To what extent is social appearance anxiety predicted by attachment styles, subjective well-being and locus of control?*".

1.2. Purpose of the Study

In the present study prior to main analyses, the differences among attachment styles, subjective well-being, locus of control and social appearance anxiety with regard to gender, age and department and the correlations among study variables were explored. The main purpose of the study was to assess how well university students' secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles, subjective well-being levels and locus of control levels predicted their social appearance anxiety levels. The research questions of the study as followed:

Q1) Is there a significant difference among university students' attachment styles with regard to gender?

Q2) Is there a significant difference among university students' attachment styles with regard to age?

Q3) Is there a significant difference among university students' attachment styles with regard to department?

Q4) Is there a significant difference among university students' subjective well-being levels with regard to gender?

Q5) Is there a significant difference among university students' subjective well-being levels with regard to age?

Q6) Is there a significant difference among university students' subjective well-being levels with regard to department?

Q7) Is there a significant difference among university students' locus of control levels with regard to gender?

Q8) Is there a significant difference among university students' locus of control levels with regard to age?

Q9) Is there a significant difference among university students' locus of control levels with regard to department?

Q10) Is there a significant difference among university students' social appearance anxiety levels with regard to gender?

Q11) Is there a significant difference among university students' social appearance anxiety levels with regard to age?

Q12) Is there a significant difference among university students' social appearance anxiety levels with regard to department?

Q13) what are the relations between attachment styles, subjective well-being, locus of control and social appearance anxiety?

Q14) To what extent is social appearance anxiety predicted by attachment styles, subjective well-being and locus of control?

1.3.Limitations

Limitations of the present study were considered regarding to internal and external validity threats. As an internal threat, all instruments were self-report measures which are limited to individuals' perception levels of related constructs. Moreover, response styles and social desirability bias which are linked to self-report measures threat the internal validity. Social desirability bias is defined as the tendency of participants to answer the items in a way that others will view favorable. Response styles refer to tendencies of participants to choose particular response categories over others. Response styles comprise extreme response style (the tendency to choose extreme categories), midpoint response style (the tendency to select the

mid-point categories), acquiescence response style (the tendency to say yes or agree) and disacquiescence response style (the tendency to say no or disagree) (Wetzel, Böhnke & Brown, 2016). Other than these, since the data were collected in different courses and classes, the environment was considered as another internal threat. As an

external threat, data of the present study were obtained from Yeditepe University students. Thus, the results couldn't be generalized to the students in other universities.

1.4. Definitions

Attachment: Attachment is an intense emotional relation which occurs between the individual and his close ones (Bowlby, 1969).

Strange Situation: Strange situation developed by Ainsworth et al. (1978) was a laboratory study in which they observed how exploratory behavior is influenced by presence of mother, absence of mother and other conditions.

Models of Self: Models of self are the beliefs and expectations related to individual's own lovability (Bowlby, 1973).

Models of Others: Models of others are the beliefs and expectations related to attachment figure's sensitiveness and emotional accessibility (Bowlby, 1973).

Secure Attachment Style: Secure attachment style is the combination of both positive self and others models (Bartholomew, 1990).

Preoccupied Attachment Style: Preoccupied attachment style is the combination of positive self model and negative others model (Bartholomew, 1990).

Dismissing Attachment Style: Dismissing attachment style is the combination of positive self model and negative others model (Bartholomew, 1990).

Fearful Attachment Style: Fearful attachment style is the combination of both negative self-model and others-model (Bartholomew, 1990).

Subjective Well-Being: Subjective well-being refers to individuals' subjective judgements and emotions related to their lives and relationships (Myers, 2001).

Life Satisfaction: Life satisfaction refers to "*a conscious cognitive judgment of one's life in which the criteria for judgment are up to the person*" (Pavot & Diener, 2009, p.102).

Locus of control: Locus of control refers to individuals' attributions related to the responsibility of what happened to them (Rotter, 1966).

Internal Locus of Control: Internal locus of control is a belief that events are the results of one's own behaviors (Rotter, 1966).

External Locus of Control: External locus of control is a belief that events are the results of external forces such as faith, luck etc. (Rotter, 1966).

Social Anxiety: Social anxiety is the fear of social situations accompanied by physical (e.g. blushing, increased heart rate etc.), cognitive (e.g. the thought of being not good enough etc.) and behavioral symptoms (e.g. turning eyes away etc.) (Vertue, 2003).

Social Appearance Anxiety: Social appearance anxiety is the fear and anxiety that derive from negative evaluations of others regarding one's appearance (Hart et al. 2008).

1.5.Abbreviations

SWB: Subjective Well-Being

LOC: Locus of Control

SAA: Social Appearance Anxiety

RSQ: Relationship Scales Questionnaire

SWBS: Subjective Well-Being Scale

RIELOCS: Rotter's Internal External Locus of Control Scale

SAAS: Social Appearance Anxiety Scale

2.LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1.Attachment Styles

Theoretical Background of Attachment Styles

The concept of attachment refers to an intense emotional relation which occurs between the individual and his close ones (Bowlby, 1969). In other words, attachment is a long-lasting tie with a person who ensures security (Fleming, 2008). The term attachment figure means an individual with whom a baby forms their enduring emotional bond and whom they most wish to be relieved by when they are afraid or hurt. Attachment figure is usually mother or caregiver who tries to provide such a relationship to her baby. For instance, if a child is raised by someone other than biological mother such as one of the grandparents or adoptive parent, the child can make a primary attachment bond with them. Subsidiary attachment figure is a person who has a close secondary attachment bond with the child. This could be a sibling, nanny or father (Bowlby, 2007).

Human infants need an adult's protection and care to survive regarding to their extreme immaturity at the beginning of life. They have to demonstrate impulsive responses to ensure that protection and care (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). When an infant is born, he is far away from tabula rasa. The opposite way round, he is equipped with lots of behavior systems which are ready to be activated. Among these systems, some of them, such as crying, sucking and clinging, function as building bricks for later development of attachment. From the beginning, babies tend to respond to stimulants arising from the people around them. To illustrate, for babies, a human voice is an auditory stimulus or a human face is a visual stimulus. All these stimuli intercede attachment to specific figures. Even though there are no sharp borders between them, there are four phases of development of attachment behavior (Bowlby, 1969).

In the first phase, orientation and signals occur but the discrimination of figure is limited to olfactory and auditory stimuli. This period ranges from the birth and 8-12th week, may be till the twelfth week. Baby's behaviors towards a person (a figure) include orientation to that person, tracking his/her eye movements, smiling, grasping and reaching. Generally in this period, babies stop crying when they see a face or hear a voice. In the second phase, orientation and signals start to occur towards more than one figure. During this period which lasts until the sixth month or more according to the conditions, the infant prominently orients towards mother-figure rather than towards others. In the third phase, while the baby discriminates his behavior patterns towards people, his repertoire of responses widen to comprise following moving mother, greeting her when she comes back and centering her to explore environment. During this period which lasts throughout the second and the third year, friendly behaviors towards others wanes and subsidiary attachment-figures are specified in certain other people. While the baby approaches cautiously to strangers, his attachment to mother-figure becomes apparent for all to see (Bowlby, 1969).

After the third phase, the baby starts to conceive his mother as an independent object. Even though it cannot be assumed that the baby has an understanding of what affects his mother's behaviors to move towards or away from him or what steps he can take to change her behavior, this situation changes sooner or later. The child eventually starts to understand some of his mother's set-goals and plans to achieve them by observing his own behavior and its effects on others. By this way, a much more complex relationship called partnership starts to develop between the child and the mother. Without any doubt, it is relative to say at which phase the baby attaches to his mother. Obviously he is not attached in the first phase, in the same way he is so in the third phase. However, whether the child is attached to his mother in the second phase

may differ with regard to the definition of attachment that is internalized (Bowlby, 1969).

Studies related to attachment process started with John Bowlby (1958)'s researches in Tavistock clinic. He studied with children who had to be away from the loved-ones and investigated the effects of this situation on children's developments. According to Bowlby (1969), attachment theory is a theory that explains the reasons of individuals' emotional bonding tendencies towards the important ones. The need and the tendency of emotional attachment refer to attachment system which is evolutionarily functional and essential for infants to survive. Attachment system helps infants protect themselves from environmental dangers which they may face by maintaining proximity to care givers (generally mother) (Sümer & Güngör, 1999). The need of proximity maintenance manifests itself generally when the infant is frightened or hurt due to a dangerous or bewildering situation. At times like these, the caregiver acts as a safety heaven to ensure the infant's safety and comfort. The baby with ensured sense of security uses the attachment figure as a secure base to turn towards nonattachment behaviors such as exploration or game (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Mary Ainsworth participated into Bowlby's study group to ensure whether the experimental research design was used in understanding child development as well as the attachment style he/she adopts. After that, Ainsworth created a laboratory study called strange situation in which she studied mother-child interactions in an experimental setting.

Strange situation developed by Ainsworth et al. (1978) was a laboratory study in which they observed how exploratory behavior is influenced by presence of mother, absence of mother and other conditions. They focused on three fundamental situations: in what extent babies use their mothers as a secure base, how they respond to strangers' efforts to establish intimacy and how they cope with the anxiety caused

by absence of mother in a strange environment. Additionally, strange situation was created to examine the extent to which attachment behavior outmaneuvers exploratory behavior in situations such as entrance of a stranger, separation from and reunion with mother. 56 babies, 49-51 weeks of age, were observed in the strange situation study which consisted of eight episodes and lasted for approximately 20 minutes. The episodes of strange situation are as presented in table 2.1. (Ainsworth et al. 1978, p.37).

Table 2.1.

Episodes of strange situation

Episode 1	(O) introduces the room to (M) and (B), then (O) leaves.
Episode 2	(B) explores the room, (M) does not participate.
Episode 3	(S) enters room, talks to (M) and then shows a toy to (B). (M) leaves room.
Episode 4	(S) acts upon (B). If (B) is happy, (S) does not participate. If (B) is distressed, (S) tries to comfort (B).
Episode 5	(M) enters, (S) leaves the room. If (B) is distracted, (M) makes (B) to play again. Then, (M) leaves the room after saying "bye bye".
Episode 6	(B) is alone in the room.
Episode 7	(S) enters room and acts like in episode 4.
Episode 8	(M) enters, (S) leaves. After the observation of reunion, the situation is terminated.

(S): Stranger   (M): mother   (O): Observer   (B): baby

At the end of the procedure, Ainsworth et al. (1978) found that children demonstrate three different behavioral patterns classified as secure, avoidant and anxious/ambivalent patterns. Babies in secure classification endeavored to contact with their mother and sought for proximity when their mother came back. Babies labelled as avoidant seemed to avoid their mother when she came back even though they were looking for them during the separation time. And the babies in anxious

ambivalent classification demonstrated anger and cried on reunion. Although they exhibited signs for proximity-seeking, they did not let their mothers cuddle them.

According to Bowlby (1969), attachment and exploratory systems are subsidiary systems that attachment needs are fulfilled: the baby feels free and searches for exploration to take control over environment. According to Ainsworth et al. (1978), for securely attached babies, proximity of the mother even just to make an eye contact with her refers to a secure base for them to explore the environment. On the contrary, anxious/ambivalent babies show limited exploratory actions whether their mother is present or absent in the environment. Since their mother cannot serve as a secure base with regard to the fact that their attachment needs are not fulfilled, a new stimulus or situation frightens them a lot and exploration cannot come into prominence for anxious-ambivalent babies. Avoidant babies suppress distress during separation and protest physical contact with their mother when they came back due to their fear of rejection. Even though they continue exploration, their play is rigid, impaired and they seem like devoid from pleasure. In brief, securely attached babies display exploration confidently and pleasurably more than insecurely attached babies (avoidant and anxious/ambivalent babies) (Green & Campbell, 2000).

When examining the behavioral patterns of the parents whose child is classified as having secure, anxious/ambivalent or avoidant attachment, their actions can represent their attachment relations with their own figures. Ainsworth et al (1978) deduced from interviews with parents that insecurely attached children's parents accept their own feelings and talk about their past attachment relations in a clear and comfortable way. On the contrary avoidant children's parents trivialize their attachment experiences, even they ignore and deny them. This behavioral pattern shows similarity with avoidant children's neglectful conducts towards their mothers. In other respects,

anxious/ambivalent children's parents are still preoccupied with their own attachment needs. According to Crain (1992), the reason why they can not fulfill their children's attachment needs in a consistent way may derive from their own unfulfilled attachment experiences with their parents (cited in Kart, 2002). These consequences are based on the fact that attachment patterns acquired in early periods of parent-child relation are internalized and these patterns form a basis towards how individuals establish and maintain relationships with others (Colins & Read, 1990). In other words, as a result of recurrent interactions with caregivers, babies learn what to expect and how to regulate their behaviors hereunder (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). These assumptions construct a basis for mental representations called as internal working models by Bowlby (1969,1973,1980).

According to Bowlby (1973, 1980), internal working models that function as prototypes for later social interactions are divided into two types: working models of self and working models of others. While working models of self comprise beliefs and expectations related to individual's own lovability, working models of others cover beliefs and expectations related to attachment figure's sensitiveness and emotional accessibility. These mental representations are complementary. If the child develops an internal working model of others that his caregiver is accessible, reliable and caring, then he constructs an internal working model of self that he is worth to love, care and trust. On the other hand, if the caregiver remains unresponsive to child's needs or reacts in an inappropriate or inconsistent way, then the child labels the caregiver as rejectionist and himself as unworthy or incompetent. These complementary models are constructed by the child in the first couple of years in his life and in later years, these models are used in the relationships with his significant ones. In this manner, working models function as a mechanism for cross-age

continuity in attachment style and are significant to understand the role of early relationships on adult relationships (Collins & Read, 1990).

With regard to Bowlby's and Ainsworth's ideas and findings, Hazan & Shaver (1987) investigated whether individuals' romantic experiences are influenced by their parent-child attachment styles. In accordance with this purpose, they designed a love quiz and printed it in a local magazine. The study was conducted with 620 of over than 1200 replies. The love quiz/questionnaire consisted of three parts: The first part comprised of 56 statements related to participants' most important relationships. These statements were adapted from preceding love scales (e.g., Hatfield & Sprechel; 1986; Hindy & Schwarz, 1984) or advised by previous literature on child-caregiver attachment (e.g., Ainsworth et al. 1978). The second part of the questionnaire contained questions based on whether the person is included in a romantic relation or not. If he is/not in a relation, the length of the romantic relationship and the frequency in which the person has been in love etc. are also considered as the main questions in the study. The last part was related to their attachment styles and attachment history. It contained questions related to participants' childhood relationships with their parents and the parents' relationships with each other. There were also some questions to assess subjects' mental models based on conscious beliefs about romantic love. For instance, whether love lasts forever or whether there is one-true-love etc. Additionally, participants were asked to choose one of the three paragraphs (secure, avoidant, anxious/ambivalent) related to participants' feelings in a relationship. According to results of the study, 56% of participants defined themselves as secure, 25% of them as avoidant and 19% of them as anxious/ambivalent. Love experiences were described as happy, friendly and trusting by secure lovers; as fear of intimacy, jealousy, emotional highs and lows by avoidant lovers and as involving obsession,

jealousy, sexual attraction, emotional highs and lows. Related to attachment history with their parents, secure people stated sincere relationships with them. While avoidant people perceived their mothers as cold and rejecting, anxious/ambivalent people evaluated their father as unfair.

Campos, Barrett, Lamb, Goldsmith and Stenberg (1984) summarized the proportions of three attachment styles in American studies on child-caregiver attachment as 62% secure, 23% avoidant, and 15% anxious/ambivalent. In Hazan and Shaver (1987)'s study, individuals classified themselves meaningfully as secure (56%), avoidant (25%) and anxious/ambivalent (19%) with regard to the descriptions of these attachment styles and the percentages were akin with the results of American studies. According to the study, while secure lovers reported themselves as friendly, blessed, trustful, and supportive for their partners, avoidant lovers described themselves as jealous, emotionally instable and being afraid of intimacy. Anxious/ambivalent lovers stated that they live through their love as obsession, hunger for connection, emotional instability, extreme sexual attraction and jealousy.

Bartholomew's four-category model of attachment

According to Bartholomew (1990), Hazan and Shaver (1987)'s study is significant since it transfuses the child-caregiver attachment approach into the terms associated with adult relationships. Hazan and Shaver (1987)'s study represents that avoidant attachment style is associated with an active fear of intimacy rather than a detached access to the relationships. The correlates of avoidant styles are indicatives of a person who discredits others but also who has strong feelings towards his partner in his relationships. Therefore, avoidant people were like ambivalent people in terms of evaluating themselves less confident than secure ones and stating emotional instability and jealousy in their relationships. To make explicit characteristics of attachment

styles and to make more valid attributions to attachment styles, Bartholomew (1990)

suggested an expanded model of adult attachment based on Bowlby (1973, 1980)'s

conceptions of internal working models of self and others.

Figure 2.1.

Bartholomew's four-category model of attachment (Bartholomew, 1990, p.163)

MODEL OF SELF

(dependence)

		Positive	Negative
		(low)	(high)
MODEL OF OTHERS	**Positive**	**SECURE** Comfortable with intimacy and autonomy	**PREOCCUPIED** Preoccupied Ambivalent Overly dependent
(avoidance)	(low)		
	Negative (high)	**DISMISSING** Denial of attachment Dismissing Counter-dependent	**FEARFUL** Fear of attachment Avoidant Socially avoidant

As mentioned before, internal models of self and others are constructed interactively.

Children interfuse their caregivers' accessibility with their own love-worthiness.

Models of the self can be constituted as either positive or negative with regard to

children's self-esteem (the self as worthy or the self as unworthy). In a similar way,

the model of others can be evaluated as either positive or negative based on the

assumption that the other is caring or uncaring. It is important to highlight that

nobody's actual experiences can perfectly match with one of the prototypes of four cells since individuals construct their internal working models from various experiences in their lifetimes. Hence, it is not expected from a person to display a single attachment style; rather a person may portray separate degrees of resemblance to two or more prototypes. In the final analysis when an individual is characterized as the best coherent cell, this situation refers to that the individual's experiences usually make way for outcomes closer to that cell rather than others. Additionally with this four-category model, individuals are not only appointed to a single label, but also they can be evaluated according to their place determined by the intersection of two dimension: the self and others model. For instance, a person who does not match with secure and dismissing prototypes, but who shows aspects of preoccupied and fearful prototypes would have negative self-image according to one dimension, but neutral self-image based on the other dimension (Bartholomew, 1990).

When an individual is positive on both model of self and others dimension, his prototypical attachment style is called as secure attachment. Individuals correspond to secure prototypes have positive contemplations from others such as support and trust and have a positive self-esteem as worthy of love and attention (Bartholomew, 1990). As a result of this, they are more likely to have positive views about the human nature and social world around them. They value others as accessible when they are needed and they do not display fear of intimacy or abandonment based on their fulfilled attachment needs in their childhood. Thus, they do not experience separation anxiety in high extent (Collins & Read, 1990). Secure people exhibit high self-esteem as they feel that they are worthy to love from the other people whom they have no critical interpersonal problems (Bartholomew, 1990). For instance, since they are confident about their partners' love and comfortable for asking support from their partners, they

experience healthy relationships including less jealousy and try to protect their relationships more than insecure people (Karakurt, 2001).

When a person has low levels in self-esteem shaped by the feelings of unworthiness and excessive dependence on others' social approval, this attachment style is labelled as preoccupied attachment which corresponds to ambivalent attachment style in Hazan and Shaver (1987)'s study. Individuals in this group who live through inconsistent or intensive parenting styles in their childhood may deduce that their own valuelessness clarifies the absence of love on attachment figure's part. Based on this deduction, they develop a dependency for other's approval and deep-rooted feeling of unworthiness (Bartholomew, 1990). Based on their lack of self-confident, they experience frequent fear of rejection and abandonment (Cooper, Shaver & Collins, 1998). On the other hand, their positive model of others motives them to approve their unstable self-worth by way of extreme closeness in relationships which results in vulnerability to excessive distress when their proximity needs are not fulfilled (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). They fall in love easily and live through endemic breakups and reunions (Cooper, Shaver & Collins, 1998). When they are in love, they simply become obsessive to their relationships and have unrealistic expectations from them with regard to preoccupied individuals' strong desires to be accepted (Sümer & Güngör, 1999).

When children experience rejection in their attachment history or have psychologically unavailable care givers, two forms of adult avoidance prototypes are developed. One of them is dismissing attachment group. They are situated in the intersection of positive model of self and negative model of others. A way of constructing a positive self-concept as worthy of love and attention in the presence of rejection by care giver is to hold of oneself and enhance a model of self as fully

sufficient on one's own (Bartholomew, 1990). Dismissing people abstain from proximity with others due to their negative expectations, they sustain their positive self-concept as a high sense of self-worth by assertively disclaiming the value of closeness and emphasizing the significance of independence (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994).

The second form of adult avoidance prototypes is fearful attachment. Individuals in this group have both negative model of self and others. Due to the rejection of caregiver, fearful people determine that others are careless and inaccessible when they are needed correspondingly they are not worthy to love. People who display this pattern crave for social proximity, yet they abstain from social contact pursuant to their fear of rejection (Bartholomew, 1990). Even though they are highly reliant on others for the affirmation of their self-concept as worthy, on the grounds of their negative evaluations of others they refuse proximity to refrain from the pain of potential loss (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). Due to their avoidance patterns in social interactions, they are characterized as being shy and lacking self-confidence (Magai, Hunziker, Mesias & Culver, 2000)

Additionally, model of self and model of others can be conceptualized as referring to dependence and avoidance. In the horizontal axis symbolized as dependence level, while high dependency indicates a model of self based on others' approval and appreciation, low dependency corresponds to a model of self which is internalized and relatively independent from others' confirmation. The vertical axis symbolized as avoidance level represents level of willingness for close relationships and quality of expectations related to others. With this respect, while dismissing and fearful groups are similar in terms of avoidance from close relationships, they differ from each other in the sense of dependence on others to protect their self-worthiness. Similarly, while

preoccupied and fearful groups are similar in the way of dependence levels, they draw apart in terms of intimacy desires. Preoccupied individuals make effort to reach out others to meet their dependency needs. On the other hand, fearful people avoid intimacy in order not to experience disappointments (Sümer & Güngör, 1999).

2.2.Subjective Well-Being (SWB)
Subjective well-being (SWB) is a concept that comprises people's efforts to understand the worthy of their existence. These efforts are digitized by statistical analyses and how much individuals' are satisfied with their works, marriages livings etc. becomes cognitively measurable. In other words, SWB is the scientific name of how individuals evaluate their lives. These evaluations can be made based on a general judgement (e.g. life satisfaction, sense of achievement), life domains (e.g. marriage, work) and emotional feelings about events or situations in their lives. That is why SWB is a general concept that comprises all the studies related to what underlies individuals might call satisfaction or happiness (Diener, Oishi, Lucas, 2003). According to World Health Organization (1948, p. 100) "*Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity*". The emphasis on well-being concept in the definition of health is generally used interchangeably with subjective well-being, psychological well-being and quality of life (Dodge, Daly, Huyton & Sanders, 2012). Even though these concepts are directly associated with the conditions that provide individuals positive functioning and happiness, they are not completely same but substantially related to each other. It is thought that to discuss these concepts in detail and to explain their relation with SWB will reveal the concept of subjective well-being in a more explicit way (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

There is a variety of definitions and views about happiness in literature. For instance, according to Aristotle, happiness is a final goal or an eventual destination that individuals desire for their own sake. (Chekola, 1975). People keep chasing after happiness because they incorrectly think that they will be happy when the next goal is completed, the next social relationship is gained or the next problem is passed over. Therefore, individuals' happiness and unhappiness are simply momentary responses to changes in their lives (Diener, Lucas & Scollon, 2006). Happiness is only a temporary mood (Yacobi, 2015) whereas subjective well-being is more about long-term state of mind rather than momentary emotions (Diener et al., 1999). Individuals' moods, emotions, and their evaluations about events vary overtime; subjective well-being researchers investigate these changes but also explore the longer-term mean level differences (Diener, Oishi & Lucas, 2003). According to Diener & Ryan (2009), happiness is attributed to pleasant emotions and moods and to general evaluations like life satisfaction. On the other hand, subjective well-being is an umbrella concept (e.g. happiness, life satisfaction) that represents individuals' level of well-being based on their subjective evaluations about their lives.

According to World Health Organization (1997, p. 1) "*Quality of life is an individual's perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns"*. Quality of life comprises of different domains such as health status, work life balance, education, social connections, personal security, civic engagement and governance, environment and subjective well-being (OECD, 2013). According to Diener and Suh (1997) two recent approaches have been found to measure quality of life: objective or social indicators which refer to societal measures that consider individuals' objective conditions (e.g. homicide rates, police per capita etc.) in a given

culture and measurement of subjective well-being. SWB is a key factor for quality of life (Diener & Ryan, 2009) which is a key component for well-being (OECD, 2013; Dodge et al. 2012). Well-being can be perceived as the interpretation of quality of life through individuals' subjective practices of environmental situations along with personal filters (Langlois & Anderson, 2002).

According to Myers (2001), well-being represents a functional life in all domains such as social, personal and environmental areas which orient towards feeling healthy in an optimum level and integrate body, mind and spirit effectively. Well-being as well as subjective well-being is related to individual's positive functioning. But, while subjective well-being refers to individual's subjective judgements and emotions related to his life, well-being is associated with individual's life style and life standard that provide him positive feelings.

Since well-being concept comprises different domains such as quality of life, subjective well-being, psychological well-being, life satisfaction etc., (Dodge et al., 2012), several psychologists and philosophers define well-being in different conceptions. But, these conceptions gather around two philosophies: hedonism and eudaimonism. Hedoism defines well-being concept as pleasure and happiness. On the other hand, eudaimonism explains it as self-actualization, experiencing meaning in life or realization of individual's potential. These two approaches are distinguished not only in terms of defining concepts of well-being, but also to the degree they use subjective or objective criteria to determine wellness (McMahan & Estes, 2011). While hedonism centers on individuals' subjective states of mind, eudaimonism revolves around practices which are objectively good for the individual (Kagan, 1992 cited in McMahan & Estes, 2011).

Psychological well-being originates in eudaimonic approach which institutes that well-being underlines the actions associated with deep values that make individuals feel alive. While subjective well-being originates in hedonic approach is more related to emotions such as excitement, happiness, calmness, psychological well-being is associated with feeling competent, making efforts, being able to focus on, setting objectives, feeling confident etc. (Waterman, 1993). Thus, Ryff (1989) distinguished psychological well-being from subjective well-being and introduced the six domains of psychological well-being: self-acceptance, environmental mastery, purpose in life, positive relations with others, personal growth, and autonomy.

On the contrary of traditional definition of mental health, SWB does not simply mean presence of negative emotions. In other words, SWB does not refer to being joyful without having any serious worries (Diener & Suh, 1997). In fact, subjective well-being is all about individuals' judgments about how good their life is. They do not have to be energetic or joyous all the time, but everybody wants to believe that their life goes on in the way they would like to have. The thought that if a person acts cheerful, then he has a high level of subjective well-being is a misunderstanding. In fact, individuals experience subjective well-being when they work for and advance towards their goals that mean important values for them (Diener & Tov, 2012).

Subjective well-being not only comprises of positive feelings, but also individuals' judgements that their lives are satisfying and fulfilling and that positive affects stem from the belief that their lives are good (Diener & Tov, 2012). As the term pinpoints, SWB researchers principally center upon individuals' internal evaluations of well-being since without taking their views into account no one can determine what is good for them. Thus, SWB researchers differ from policy makers, academics or economists in terms of consideration of what is important. For instance, while an economist

would determine the quality of job by individuals' preferences in the matter of this work vs. other work, a SWB researcher would ascertain quality of job by individuals' experiences (both positive and negative) and also satisfaction regarding to the position (Diener & Suh, 1997).

SWB is a general explicit area that consists of three components rather than a simple construct. It covers an affective component which is divided into pleasant affect and unpleasant affect and also a cognitive component: life satisfaction (Diener et al. 1999). Affect refers to experiencing emotions and moods (Diener & Suh, 1997) and life satisfaction refers to "*a conscious cognitive judgment of one's life in which the criteria for judgment are up to the person*" (Pavot & Diener, 2009, p.102). Table 2.2. represents the components of subjective well-being

Table 2.2.

 Components of subjective well-being (Diener et al. 1999, p. 277).

Pleasant Affect	Unpleasant Affect	Life Satisfaction
Joy	Guilt and shame	Desire to change life
Elation	Sadness	Satisfaction with current life
Contentment	Anxiety and worry	Satisfaction with past
Pride	Anger	
Affection	Stress	Satisfaction with future
Happiness	Depression	Significant others' views of one's life
Ecstasy	Envy	

As it is indicated in table 2.2, subjective well-being has emotional and cognitive aspects of one's life. Specifically, in the emotional domain, it includes positive

feelings such as joy, elation, contentment etc. and negative feelings like sadness, anger etc. In the cognitive domain, it encompasses the act of satisfying one's psychological needs such as desire to change life, satisfaction with current life etc. Life satisfaction is positively correlated withpleasant affect while it is neatively correlated with unpleasant affect. For instance, Kalı-Soyer and Satan (2015) found that individuals with positive life orientations have high levels of life satisfaction. In this study, individuals having high levels of hope and optimism indicate positive attitudes toward their lives.

Since SWB is based on affective and cognitive evaluations of one's life, there are some factors affecting individuals' subjective well-being levels. One of these factors is personality. Gutierrez, Jimenez, Hernandez and Puente (2005) conducted a study to examine correlations between subjective well-being and the Big Five Personality dimensions (openness, consciousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism). In the study subjective well-being was determined by means of positive affect, negative affect and affect balance which calculated positive affect through the formula minus negative affect plus a constant of 5 in the interest of avoiding negative values. The study showed that personality has a significant link with SWB. According to the results, neuroticism was the highest predictor of affect balance, followed by extraversion. The dimension most strongly related to positive affect was extraversion, whereas the dimension most strongly related to negative affect was neuroticism. Openness was linked to both positive and negative affects since it is the characteristics that let individuals to practice positive affect as well as negative affect.

Another predictor of subjective well-being is income or wealth. In cross-cultural studies, individuals in rich countries report higher subjective well-being levels than poor countries. But it is important to take into consideration that rich countries differ

from poor nations in terms of democracy, equalitarianism etc. These factors may inflate wealth-SWB correlations. So, one should think that individuals' subjective well-being levels may be affected by national income indirectly (e.g. benefits of living in a democratic country) rather than direct affect of wealth. Additionally, in intra-national studies rich individuals indicate higher level of SWB than poor individuals. On the contrary of these results, income change over time has a little affect on SWB (Diener et al. 1999). Diener et al. (1993) conducted a study with individuals who had gone down or up in a considerable extent income over a decade. They did not find any significant difference in these individuals' SWB levels. This finding can be clarified by adaptation theory which claims that if individuals stay stable for over a time period, they adapt new conditions effectively (cited in Diener et al. 1999).

Another factor determining individuals' subjective well-being levels is cultural factors. People living in individualistic countries report higher SWB level than people living in collectivistic countries (Diener & Suh, 1997). This may cause from the fact that emotions are valued differently across cultures (Tov & Diener, 2007). For instance, Miller, Wang, Sandel and Cho (2002) carried on a study to compare the mothers' beliefs about self-esteem in childrearing in terms of American culture and Taiwanese culture. In American culture, self-esteem is viewed as one of the most crucial constructs of healthy development and mothers care about the development and maintenance of their children's sense of self-esteem. In other repects, in Taiwanese culture, self-esteem is viewed as insignificant or even undesirable and mothers either do not care about or value it as a psychological vulnerability. Since self-esteem is a pivotal determinant of life satisfaction which is one of the components of SWB, different perceptions of self- esteem across cultures affect the perception of SWB (Tov & Diener, 2007). Besides these, individuals experience a meaning in life

which influences their subjective well-being level when their personal goals and cultural norms are coherent with each other. For instance, imagine a worker who does not really mind helping his co-workers in his company. All he cares is to do his work right and on time. In a culture like Japanese where being cooperative with others is a cultural norm, he may not feel like a well-beloved member of the society. On the contrary, in American culture where independence and being able to take care of oneself is a cultural norm, he may feel good because of the idea that he is an independent member of the society. On these bases, culture has an important role on individuals' SWB levels (Oishi, 2000).

Social relations with others is also one of the predictors of SWB. For instance, when marriage is taken into consideration, it increases individuals' level of life satisfaction by providing them emotional and economical support (Diener et al., 1999). Shields and Wooden (2003) carried on a study to examine the effects of marriage on individuals' subjective well-being levels. In the study, couples reported higher SWB level than single ones. And also, there was not a significant difference between SWB levels of married couples and cohabiting couples. According to Diener et al. (1999), even though marriage is a predictor of SWB because of its contributions related to social and economic rewards, these contributions are likely to be based on cultural factors. Especially in individualistic cultures in which marriage is placed in a high value, married people report higher level of SWB than divorced people due to that marriage may be the only way for intimacy and social support. Divorced or widowed people in collectivistic countries reported higher level of SWB compared to divorced or widowed people in individualistic countries, presumably since it is easier to access social support in collectivist cultures than in individualist cultures.

Another factor related to SWB is peer and parent attachments. Ma and Huebner (2008) examined the impacts of peer and parent attachments on adolescents' life satisfaction which is one of the components of SWB. They found both peer and parent attachments are positively correlated with life satisfaction. But, parent attachment predicts life satisfaction stronger than peer attachment. Moreover, Özer (2009) investigated the relation between university students' attachment styles and levels of SWB. The results revealed that secure attachment style is positively correlated with SWB whereas dismissing, fearful and preoccupied attachment styles are negatively correlated with SWB. In other words, when university students' levels of SWB increase, their secure attachment scores increase whereas their fearful, dismissing and preoccupied attachment scores decrease.

Theoretical Background of Subjective Well-Being

Bottom-Up and Top-Down Theories

According to bottom-up theories, happiness is the result of situations that bring joy to individual's life. In other words, a happy life is nothing more than the sum of the happy moments. A person feels happy as he lives through happy moments or experiences. On the other hand, top-down theories are based on the approach that taking pleasure from life arises from individuals' existence. It states that the person has a general characteristic related to living happiness. In other words, individuals have a tendency to live through their lives in a positive way and that tendency affects the instant interactions between individual and the world. In short, the distinction between bottom-up and top-down theories roots in the question whether the individual feels happy as a consequence of his joyful living or his happy feeling causes him to take pleasure his livings. (Diener, 1984, cited in Türkdoğan, 2010).

Bottom-up theories are rooted in Wilson's idea of that fulfilling the universal human needs lead to happiness. Several studies reveal that many of pleasures are associated to SWB (Diener et al. 1999). To illustrate, Stallings, Dungam, Gutz, Baker and Bengtson (1997) found that experiencing daily pleasurable situations generates pleasant affect while experiencing daily undesirable situations creates unpleasant affect. According to this approach, if an individual is satisfied in important life fields such as family, friendship, work or marriage, he exhibits high level of SWB (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004). According to Diener et al. (1999), bottom-up factors can be interpreted as external events, situations and demographics. But still, it is a fact that demographic factors such as age, sex, income, race, marital status, education explain less than %20 percent of subjective well-being variance. On the basis of this fact, researchers are more inclined to explain SWB via top-down factors rather than bottom-up factors (Tüzgöl-Dost, 2004).

According to top-down theories, individuals' states of mind are affective to perceive the world in terms of their interpretations of life events. A person with a positive state of mind may view or perceive a particular event as "happier" than a person with a negative state of mind (Diener and Ryan, 2009). Individual differences in how people perceive the world result in differences in subjective well-being. Some people catch and experience the pleasant aspects of life more than others. To illustrate, an extraverted person is very advantageous to achieve happiness and subjective well-being (Diener, Lucas & Shigeburo, 2005).

Telic Theories

According to Telic theories, happiness is achieved by reaching a goal or fulfilling a need (Diener &Ryan, 2009). According to Wilson (1967), when the needs are fulfilled, it brings about happiness and satisfaction. In the contrary case, it creates

unhappiness. Maslow's hierarchy of needs (psychological needs, safety, love/affection, self-esteem, to self-actualization) is an example for his theory. Subjective well-being is acquired according to the satisfaction of each need. If the need at any level in hierarchy is left unfulfilled, the individuals' negative emotions and responses increase, and their subjective well-being levels decrease (Durayappah, 2011). Telic theories suggest that goals are learned needs. The discrimination between the innate universal needs and the goals which are perceived as need in consequence of learning is made. For example, safety is an universal need while being successful at work life can be seen as a learned need (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004).

Specifically, the level of accessibility and attainability of the goals have a great impact on both one's emotions and life satisfaction levels. According to Telic theories, making progress toward goals makes people act in positive ways whereas failing to achieve goals causes people to exhibit negative reactions. Hence, the goals are at the center of the affect system (Diener et al. 1999). Cantor and Sanderson (1999) suggest that decisiveness about reaching a set of goals provides a sense of meaning to daily life and enables people to be planned and organized. Moreover, setting goals may help people handle with daily life problems easily and maintain their personal well-being especially in difficult times.

Pomerantz, Saxon and Oishi (1998) investigated the effects of having more goals on SWB. As Telic theories suggested, they found that individuals with more goals reported higher subjective well-being, life satisfaction, self-esteem and positive affect. On the other hand, the results of study revealed that they have more symptoms of anxiety due to the high pressure to acquire those goals (cited in Diener et al., 1999). Thus, it should be highlighted that the types of goals influence the impacts of goals on subjective well-being. To illustrate, individuals' level of subjective well-being

increases when they pursue a type of goal that is feasible and compatible (Diener et al. 1999). Otherwise, goals which are too high or unrealistic lead to unhappiness. The reason for this situation is that individuals fall into despair or depression as they realize that there is a gap between the actual self and the ideal self (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004). According to self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987), actual self refers to one's perceived attributes in which he/she or others believe he/she actually possesses whereas ideal self is described as one's perceived attributes in which he/she or others would like him/her, ideally, possess.

According to Dierner (1984), there are several factors affecting subjective well-being in telic theories. First of all, individuals may choose goals contributing to their short term happiness. But, having long term goals may affect happiness in a negative way because of the possibility that they might interfere with other goals. Second factor is that individuals' goals and desires might conflict with each other. For instance, an individual wants to be promoted till the end of the year. To achieve his goal, he has to spend long hours at work. In the meantime, he needs to spend more time with his family. In such cases, to fulfill all these desires and goals might be impossible. Third one is that individuals may experience unhappiness due to the lack of desires or goals. And the last one is that people may have to live through the failing by the reason of restrictive life conditions (cited in Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004).

Activity Theory

Activity theory is built on the assumption that happiness arises from individuals' activities. Aristotle is the first and the most important theorist of this theory. According to him, happiness is achieved by well-structured activities defined with holistic terms such as hobbies, social interactions and sports etc. The theory highlights the fact that self-consciousness may cause a decline in happiness based on the fact that

thinking over and over again about achieving happiness is a self-destructive attitude. With regard to this approach, if a person concentrates on the important activities, happiness comes naturally (Diener, 1984, cited in Saygın, 2008).

According to Lyubomirsky, Sehldon and Schade (2005), it is significant to underline that any particular activity does not result in happiness. Because individuals have different interests, values, enduringnesses, tendencies that incline them to profit more from some activities than others. To illustrate, social activities may bring happiness to extraverts more than introverts or individuals with high nurturance motives may achieve more happiness from activities that give them opportunities to take care of others than individuals with low nurturance motives. At this point, it is crucial that the activity is intentional activity which means goal-oriented actions in which individuals can select to engage. When factors impacting individuals' happiness levels are taken into consideration, past researches suggest that circumstances account for approximately %10, genetics explain for 50% and intentional activities represent 40% of total variance related to happiness.

According to Diener (1984), the main distinction between telic theories and activity theories is based on these theories' approaches towards subjective well-being resources. In telic theory, the resource of subjective well-being is the last state at which the individual achieved his goal. On the other hand, in activity theory the resource is the process of activities and livings. In other words, motivation does not represent the ultimate goal in the pathway of subjective well-being, but refers to the process in which the individual try to attain SWB in his life (cited Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004).

Csikzentmihalyi's Flow Theory

Csikzentmihalyi's Flow theory is a happiness theory based on activities because the theory comprises the process of tending towards activities that serve to individuals' self-actualization. According to theory, during the activities individual takes pleasure and derives self-improvement by doing activities matching with his life purpose (Sahranç, 2008). The concept of flow is a state in which individuals are besotted with the activity that they cut themselves off from the outside world. Flow is a state of mind that people want to pursue whatever they are doing like nothing else is important anymore. Making music, rock climbing, dancing, sailing and chess etc. are examples of flow activities since they move individuals away from stressful daily life. During flow experience, individuals are so concentrated that there is no left attention to think something else or worry about something. In that state, self-awareness is vanished and time perception is lost. Activities lead to flow experiences are so satisfying that people want to pursue what they are doing without thinking what they achieve from activity or if it is hard or dangerous (Csikzentmihalyi, 1990).

It is easier to find out what makes people happy when activities bring about flow experiences are taken into consideration, because, the sum of the flow experiences match up to happiness and psychological well-being (Csikzentmihalyi, 1990; Sahranç, 2008). According to Csikzentmihalyi (1999), one of the ways to increase individuals' level of subjective well-being is to provide them activities that lead them to flow experiences. Living flow experiences causes a raise in pleasant feelings and a decline in unpleasant feeligs. In other words, Flow theory emphasizes on that individuals' subjective well-being levels change based on their flow experiences.

Adaptation Theory

Adaptation and orientation to present conditions is the center point of subjective well-being theories. Evolution makes us prepared to external conditions. As it is known,

human bodies comply with cold, heat, high pressure etc. In a similar way, personality also adapts to good and bad conditions and thus individuals do not remain too long in a bad or good state of mind. People's emotional systems respond to new conditions very strongly, but these responses diminish over time. Additionally, when individuals' subjective well-being levels are taken into consideration, generally recent events have a stronger effect than past events (Diener et al. 1999).

Researchers readily agreed to adaptation theory since evidence based on the fact that SWB weakly correlates with external conditions such as demographics supported the idea. For example, literature related to SWB state that when all the demographic variables (e.g. age, income etc.) are taken together, they explain less than %20 percent of subjective well-being variance (Diener et al., 2006). And also, longitudinal studies related to changes in individuals' subjective well-being levels ascertain evidence for the theory. For instance, Silver (1982) conducted a study to report emotional changes in people who had spinal cord injuries. The study showed that even though these people's strongest emotion is sadness a week after the injury, their positive emotions override their negative emotions related to their injuries by the eighth week because they adapted to bad conditions and the bad conditions' effects on their emotions diminished over time (cited in Diener et al. 1999).

Brickman, Coates, and Janoff-Bulman (1978) investigated the emotional changes in lottery winners and compared the results with a control group. Firstly, participants were asked to rate the lottery winning on a scale in which 0 stands for the worst possible thing that could happen and 5 stands for the best possible thing that could happen. Then they were asked how happy they were before winning, how happy they are now and how happy they assume to be in a couple of years Even though the lottery winners rated the winning as 3.78, there were no significant difference in lottery

winners' and control group's happiness levels. In other words, winners were not happier than control group. Additionally, participants' pleasure levels obtained from seven daily activities or events such as talking with a friend, getting a compliment or buying clothes etc. were compared between two groups. Lottery winners reported these activities less pleasurable than control group. Since, lottery winning raised winners' standards. Thus, they rated ordinary activities less pleasurable than controls. Adaptation theory is based on a standard composite of individuals' own experiences. An individual is happy as long as his daily activities are better than his standard. But, if these activities which are above the standard continue, then the adaptation occurs and his standards rise. As a result, individual's happiness level decreases (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004).

Social Comparison Theory

In regard to Festinger (1954), people have urges to contrast themselves with others and get information about their capacities and opinions. With this urge, they evaluate themselves according to others who they see as a standard level. For Wood (1989), there are two types of social comparison: upward and downward comparison. In upward comparison, the one makes an evaluation based on the other ones who are better than him (in terms of life conditions etc.). In downward comparison, he assesses himself via the others who are worse than him.

Due to individuals' frequent use of upward comparison, they feel inadequate about themselves leading to low self confidence and self-esteem. Such a focus with the related low-esteem, depressive feelings and low life satisfaction leads a person to unhappiness and low subjective well-being. Upward comparisons construct unpleasant feelings such as depression, envy, anger. Moreover, upward standards result in defining performances as poor performances based on the idea of doing worse than

others and this idea decreases self-esteem (Smith, Parrott, Diener, Hoyle, & Kim, 1999). Even though upward comparison is disadvantageous because of making people feel dissatisfied about their own situations; it is also advantageous by the reason of providing information to improve themselves (Taylor, Wood, & Lichtman, 1983). For instance, upward standards could also function as models to upgrade performances. Lirgg and Feltz (1991) carried on a study to explore the effects of peer models on students' motor performances. The results showed that the students who watched skilled peers do better performances than students who watched unskilled peers. Observational learning shaped via upward standards is very effective in performance improvements.

The relation between downward comparisons and subjective well-being is generally observed when individuals' self-esteem and physical health hang by a thread. Two different processes can be mentioned in downward comparisons. In the first one, people feel better when they notice that there are others who have the same problem. The judgment that I'm not the only one with this problem increases people's subjective well-being levels. In the second one, individuals enhance their subjective well-being by comparing themselves with others who are in worse conditions. The judgement that there are people who are worse off than me, in this case I'm fine prevents individuals from despair or unhappiness (Yetim, 2011). Taylor, Wood, and Lichtman (1983) found that breast cancer patients use downward comparisons as a cope mechanism for their illness. For instance, the women who had lumpectomy (removal of the lump) spontaneously considered themselves better off than women who had had mastectomy (removal of the entire breast). Older cancer patients compared themselves with younger patients and felt sorry for them. While these patients reported these statements, mastectomy patients did not compare themselves

with lumpectomy patients. Same was valid for young patients in terms of comparison with older patients because others who had the edge over threatened their self-esteem (Corcoran, Crusius & Mussweiler, 2011).

2.3. Locus Of Control (LOC)

The concept of locus of control developed by Rotter (1954) was originated from social learning theory. Individuals tend to attribute the responsibility of what happened to them either to themselves or to the external forces such as fate, chance or luck. The point where these forces focus on either inside or outside of individual is called as locus of control (Rotter, 1966).

In regard to Marsh and Weary (1995), LOC is defined as individual's generalized expectancies based on the forces which determine reward and punishment. While internally oriented people interpret events as a result of their own behaviors; externally oriented people believe that external forces have control over events. To illustrate, a failure is referred as insufficient preparation by internals, on the other hand for externals it is a result of a force that they don't have any control. The thought that people have no control over events affects individuals' solution seeking desires in a negative way. Internals believe that possibility of achieving goals is directly related to their efforts and ability of learning from their experiences and they set high goals. On the other hand, externals believe that there is no link between their efforts and the outcomes they achieve with these endeavors. They perceive luck as a determinant factor for important events (Leftcourt, 1982 cited in Bernardi, 2001).

Considerable studies on internal vs external locus of control orientation have been investigated behavioral and attitudinal differences between internals and externals since 1960s (Archer, 1980). Tokat, Kara & Ülkgün (2007) conducted a study to find the relationship between managers' problem solving approaches and locus of control

orientation. The study revealed that internally oriented people think more about their judgements and decisions; they use more effective communication skills and they have higher self-acceptance and self-respect levels than externally oriented people. It was also indicated that internal managers are more responsible, self-confident, sociable, emotionally stable and objective than external ones. Internally oriented people are more likely to help and exhibit courtesy behaviors within the organization. To achieving harmony among employees, to complete jobs at desired quality and time, and to provide job satisfaction and motivation for employees is closely related to the voluntary help and courtesy behavior of all employees in an organization. From this point of view, employees with internal locus of control in an organization may be advantageous in terms of facilitating the achievement of organizational goals (Basım & Şesen, 2006).

Noor (2002) pointed out external females have lower job satisfaction than internal females. This result is not only true for females but also for males. Studies reveal that external locus f control is negatively correlated with job satisfaction (Demirkol, 2006; Aslan, 2006; Kaplan-Güler, 2016). It has been stated that internals are able to use their creativity to face of negative situations arising from the work, to demonstrate their abilities and to be in an effort to improve themselves. Based on these goals, they fulfill their tasks and responsibilities in a constructive and consistent manner. As a result of these, internal people have higher level of job satisfaction than external ones (Canbay, 2007). Related concept to locus of control in work life is not just job satisfaction. Because of the fact that internal people unlike external ones discern their desirable outcomes based on their efforts, internals are more motivated than externals in work life (Ng, Sorensen & Eby, 2006). Moreover, Maltby, Day and Macaskill (2007) found that internals are braver than externals about changing jobs. Internals are more likely

to take action to change their jobs than externals while externals merely complain about it (cited in Yıkılmaz, 2014).

In literature, academic life is found to be strongly associated to LOC. Acedemic success is positively correlated with internal locus of control while it is negatively correlated with external locus of control (Kalechstein & Nowicki, 1997; Nelson & Mathias, 1995). This result indicates internal locus of control is more functional than external locus of control in terms of effective learning behavior and high performances in academic areas (Buluş, 2011). Moreover, Rose and Medway (1981) investigated whether teachers' locus of control affects students' achievements in their study. The results indicated that internal teachers tend to have more successful students than external teachers. Internal locus of control has not only a significant role at school achievement but also success in life. Keleş (2000) found that internally oriented individuals are tend to take more time to think and value success more than externals. Especially in cognitive activities, internal people are more successful than external people.

Several studies indicate that internals have higher marital satisfaction than externals (Basat, 2004; Myers & Booth, 1999; Doherty, 1981). According to Doherty (1981) internal people are more likely to feel responsible on marital events than external ones and thus they take an active role to deal with the problems in their marriage. Compared to internals, external people are more likely to display a passive stand toward their marriage. In their marriage life, externals generally exhibit externalization which means not taking any responsibility for problems and accusing the other spouse for distress. Externalization in marriage commonly leads to marital conflict which affects marital satisfaction in a negative way (Lantz & Snyder,1969 cited in Basat, 2004). Additionally, Basat (2004) found LOC orientation as a

determinant of sexual satisfaction in her study. She reported that internal people have higher sexual satisfaction than external ones.

Moreover, some psychological concepts are related to locus of control. One of these concepts is self-efficacy. Although LOC and self-efficacy beliefs are interchangeably used in literature, they are different concepts. Self-efficacy refers to confidence about behaviors, however locus of control is more about the confidence in being capable of controlling the outcomes of behaviors (Judge, Erez & Bono, 1998). Studies reveal that internal locus of control has a positive relation with self-efficacy, whereas external locus of control has a negative relation with self-efficacy (Ajzen, 2002; Takeda, 2003; Backenstrass, Schwarz, Fiedler, Joest, Reck, Mundt & Kronmueller, 2006). Another concept pertinent to LOC is self-esteem. Externals tend to feel more inadequate in regulating the outcomes of their conducts because they believe that they have no control over their lives but external forces such as happenstance, destiny etc. shape their life circumstances. (Ashby, Kottman & Draper, 2002). This idea makes them think about themselves in a negative way, resulting in having low self-esteem (Aytan, 2010). The other concept linked to the locus of control is perfectionism. According to Hewitt and Flett (1991), socially prescribed perfectionism consists of externally motivated beliefs that are based on others' expectancies imposed to the individual to make him perfect whereas self-oriented perfectionism refers to internally motivated beliefs that making efforts to be perfect is important for oneself (cited in Stoaber, 2015). Therefore, internal locus of control is related to self-oriented perfectionism, while external locus of control is pertinent to socially prescribed perfectionism (Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein & Masher, 1995).

According to Arslan, Dilmaç and Hamarta (2009) there is a positive correlation between locus of control and anxiety. Compared to those with an internal locus of

control, individuals with an external locus of control exhibit more anxiety and avoidance in their attachment behaviors. Generally, internal individuals are more likely to be healthy (both physically and mentally) than external ones. Internals experience less anxiety and depression and they overcome stress efficaciously (Schultz & Schultz, 2001).

Generally, internal people show more resilience against negative environmental forces, respond more when their personal freedom is limited and perceive themselves more effective, confident, active and independent individuals. In other respects, external people are more passive and less confident about themselves and others based on their beliefs that they don't have any control on environment (Basım & Şeşen, 2006).

All these studies present that being internal is a positive personality trait, whereas being external is an obstacle in people's lives. This judgement directs researchers to explore the factors effecting individuals' locus of control (Yeşilyaprak, 1988). One of these factors is age. Especially during the childhood, there is a positive correlation among internal locus of control and age (Rohner, Chaille & Rohner, 1980). In the beginning, babies are desperate. They can't control their own lives. They are completely dependent on their mothers. In other words, they have to be external. But, over time shifting from externality to internality is natural. As time passes by, children start to take some decisions by themselves, to be relatively independent towards their family and to become more adequate by themselves (Başal & Dönmez, 1985). After the childhood, results of the studies that investigate the relation among age and locus of control orientation vary. One of the findings is that people become more external as they age. Nurmi, Pulliainen and Salmela-Aro (1992) explain this result as people, by time, become more interested in the areas that they don't have too much control such

as health or their children's lives. As a result, they turn into more external. On the other hand another finding is that people become more internal by time. Dibekoğlu (2006) found younger administers are more external than older administers. This may cause from that as people grow older, they become more knowledgeable, experienced and confident. As a result, they rely less on generalized expectancies and become more internal than in their young hood times (Knoop, 1981). Thus, they rely less on generalized expectancies to evaluate their own behaviors, thoughts or feelings. This makes them form an internal disposition toward life.

Another factor making people incline to internality or externality dimension is their parents' attitudes. Studies reveal that locus of control is affected by parents' attitudes (Yeşilyaprak, 1988). Parents who are warm, supportive, consistent about discipline practices reinforce their children's internal locus of control more than parents who are critical, punisher, rejective, and over-controlling (Kotkovsky, Crandall & Good, 1967). Parents' over-controlling and intentive attitudes cause children to feel insecure, to have disappointments and to display inappropriate behaviors in the society. All these behavioral patterns lead children to be dependent on others (Yavuzer, 1991). Children raised in the families where the parents use beating as a discipline practice are affected negatively in terms of moral development. As a result, these children can't decide whether their behaviors are right or wrong and they regulate their behaviors based on external rewards or punishments. In other words, they become more external than internal (Kaval, 2001).

Life events also affect individuals' locus of control orientation. When people face with a hard period in which all hopes are wasted, all problems are intense; they feel inadequate, their sense of self-esteem decreases and their belief in themselves declines. During these times, a shift in locus of control orientation occurs from

internality to externality (Başal & Dönmez, 1985). Another life event that influences locus of control orientation is marriage. According to Ross (1991) marriage may cause an increase in the sense of control due to greater social support. In other respects, it may cause a decline in the sense of control due to limitations on autonomy and independence.

The main goal of researchers (Odacı, Kalkan, Balcı & Yılmaz 2003; Sardoğan, Kargusuz & Karahan, 2006; Alpars, 2007; Selcen, 2009; Ünüvar, 2012) who conduct studies related to factors affecting individuals' locus of control, is to shift individuals' externality through internality to make their lives more effective. In accordance with this purpose, several studies were conducted (Yeşilyaprak, 1988). A psychoeducational program based on reality approach (Ünüvar, 2012), a control focus training program (Selcen, 2009) and a reflection training program (Alpars, 2007) were conducted by researchers to shift subjects' locus of control orientation from externality to internality. The researchers reported an increase in subjects' levels of internal locus of control. Additionally, Sardoğan et al. (2006) observed a decrease in the levels of external locus of control of university students who participated a human relations skill training program. Besides that Odacı et al. (2003) explored the effects of social skills training program on LOC. It was stated that social skills training program is effective for leading to an increase on subjects' internalities.

Since having a sense of control has become one of the most popular research subjects, copious of studies and books have been dedicated to the theory, research and applications of this concept (Shapira, Schwartz & Astin, 1996). As a result of these studies in which the question of "control of what" was investigated, researchers developed locus of control scales with specific purposes (Basat, 2004). To illustrate, Health Locus of Control Scale (Wallston, Wallston, Kaplan & Maides, 1976); Oral

Health Locus of Control Scale (Long, 2006); Prison Locus of Control Scale (Pugh, 1992); The Depression Locus of Control Scale (Whitman, Desmond & Price, 1987); Academic Locus of Control Scale (Trice, 1985); Fetal Health Locus of Control Scale (Labs & Wurtule, 1986); Teacher Locus of Control Scale (Rose & Medway, 1981); Parent Health Locus of Control Scale (Devellis, Devellis, Blanchard, Kulotz, Luchok & Voyce, 1993); Children's Health Locus of Control Scale (Parcel & Meyer, 1978); Economic Locus of Control Scale (Furnham, 1986); Mental Health Locus of Control Scale and the Mental Health Locus of Origin Scale (Hill & Bale, 1980) are some examples for locus of control scales in specific contexts.

Theoretical Background of Locus of Control

Rotter's Social Learning Theory

Behaviorists claim that a person's behavior is a consequence of his response to external stimuli. They believe that environment stimulates a particular behavior and whether the behavior re-emerges depends on how a person is affected by the behavior (Weegar & Pacis, 2012). Thus about learning, their focus is the outcome of the behavior. They state that given the right environmental effects, every learner gains identical understanding. On the other hand, the constructivists consider learning as a seeking for meaning (Bush, 2006). They generally focus on how learners perceive, process, organize, interpret and generalize the stimulus in learning (Yeşilyaprak, 1988). Behaviorists define learning as the act of linking between stimuli and response, either via classical or operant conditioning. On the other hand, cognitivists claim that human behavior is a complex entity and state that it cannot be explained solely by the associations between stimulus and response. However, both theoretical perspectives consider learning as an attempt to understand the events and situations in which an individual is involved in. (Fidan, 1986). Rotter's social learning theory (1954-84)

harmonizes the two important theories in modern psychology: behavioral theory and cognitive theory (Dönmez, 1985; Yeşilyaprak, 1988). According to Rotter (1966), most of learned behaviors are the results of the interaction between individual experiences with other people and mental processes.

The reason why Rotter called his theory as social learning theory is that to Rotter, behavior is shaped through social interactions which are based on fulfilling individuals' needs. While explaining the causes of believes, social learning theory addresses reinforcements as basic variables (Weiner, 1972). Along with personal determinants such as traits, needs and habits, situational factors must be analyzed to explain and handle with any behavior. Interpretation of stimulus as an important situational factor is related to individuals' experiences.

In social learning theory, there are three basic concepts that determine and reveal behavior: expectancies related to whether the results of the behavior will lead to success or not, results obtained from the behavior and psychological situations in which the behavior is formed. Locus of control is associated with the first concept - general expectancy- developed by individuals about whether their behaviors and efforts will result in success or failure with regard to the results of their experiences (Dönmez, 1983).

Individuals perceive and respond reinforcements in different ways. One of the most significant factors that impacts individuals' responses is the perception towards whether the person contemplates the reinforcer deriving from his own actions or external forces independent from his conducts. In other words, the effect of the reinforcement that follows behavior is based on the perception whether person perceive the causal relationship between his own behavior and reinforcement (Rotter, Chance & Phares, 1972). According to this theory, a reinforcement intensifies an

expectancy that a specific behavior will be followed by that reinforcement in the future. Once the individual perceives that his behavior results in reinforcement, in other words the reinforcement is contingent, he builds up an expectancy about it. Expectancies are generalized from a precise situation to a sequence of situations which are detected as similar or related. Generalized expectancies engender prevalent belief for internal versus external control of reinforcement (Rotter, 1966).

Rotter's social learning theory which is based on expectancies is also called as 'expectancy-value' theory. In this theory, individual does a particular behavior because he expects results from that behavior. The result obtained from that particular behavior has a value for him. In a precise situation, if expectancy level or value level is too low, the behavior doesn't occur. To illustrate, if a student knows that when he studies, he gains a plus one (+1) point, he studies to gain that point. If he doesn't want to get that point, he may not study. Or he wants to gain extra point but if he knows even if he studies, he won't be rewarded (low expectancy), then he may not study. Hence Rotter degrades personality behavior into two factors: expectancy and value of the result obtained from behavior. Rotter shares basic concepts with social learning theorists: Bandura and Skinner. Bandura takes notice of social environment and observation, and according to him, human perceptions (cognitive processes) play an important role in his theoretical perspective. Rotter emphasizes the perceptions / cognitive processes of the individuals via his expectancy concept, like Bandura. The term value is akin to Skinner's term – reward. However, the reward in Rotter's theory is not behavioral but perceptual. (Cüceloğlu, 1991).

Attribution Theory

Attribution theory, based on the studies of Fritz Heider (1957), is concerned with the ways individuals explain their behaviors as well as others' ones. It focuses on the

ways people answer "why" questions related to behaviors. According to Heider, people have two kinds of strong motives. The first one is the need to reach a consistent understanding about the world. Second one is the need to control the environment. To reach that understanding and to control the environment, individuals need to estimate how people will act. Otherwise, the world is too random, surprising, inconsistent and dangerous to live in it (Taylor & Peplau, 2005).

Heider reveals the ways in which observable behavior is linked to unobservable causes. According to him, this basic function of individuals helps them to associate enduring changing stimuluses unchanging characteristics of environment. As a result, internal causes and external causes are distinguished. At this point, fundamental problem is whether internal attributions or external attributions are made. Internal attributions which are dependent on individual characteristics such as motives, thrills, attitudes, skills, efforts and capacities. External attributions which are independent from personal attributes, comprise of the factors such as general environment, role limitations chance and characteristics of environment (Köksal, 1991).

In general according to attribution theory and social learning theory, formation of LOC and appearance of two disposition (internal-external locus of control) depend on individuals' perceptions and interpretation skills based on environmental factors and personal characteristics. Both theories suggest that orientation of locus of control (internal-external) roots in whether attributions about the relation between behavior and result are related to internal causes or external causes (Çelik, 2009).

Attribution theory and social learning theory explain the results of a behavior by linking to a cause. The point they drift away from each other is that in attribution theory, causation can change according to situation, but in social learning theory, it is determined with regard to individual. In attribution theory, the result of a behavior

attributes to characteristics of situation such as skill, effort, difficulty of work and chance. On the other hand, in social learning theory it is determined by whether the person has internal locus of control or external locus of control. According to Zuroff (1980) in attribution theory, all the attributions are made after getting the results of behavior. On the other side, LOC belief is deduced before the behavior and it effects behavior. Thus, attribution theory does not explain the formation of behavior and attributions do not have any effect on behavior. But, locus of control has a function on formation of behavior and being internal or external is effective on the results (Yeşilyaprak, 1988).

2.4. Social Anxiety

An individual who is inherently a social being needs to be involved in interactions with other people both to survive and to have a high quality of life. In course of interaction with others, people experience anxiety at a certain level while they are performing, making requests or in situations that all attention is directed to them. This anxiety can be evaluated as necessary and useful especially when it is considered as a protective feeling against strangers to survive. However, to what level this anxiety experiencing in social relations is normal and acceptable and to what level it can be regarded as a psychological disorder is important. When it is taken into consideration that the word –shameless- is used as an insult in most cultures (Farevelli et al., 2001), it can be understood why having a certain level of feeling anxiety and shame is normal (Dogan, 2009).

Most people experience anxiety in esperance of social situations or in particular social contexts such as interviewing for a job, making speech in front of people or asking someone for help. These situations may cause appearance of physical components of anxiety like blushing, increased heart rate, a trembling voice etc. Additionally,

cognitive symptoms such as the thought of being not good enough and behavioral symptons such as turning eyes away or reducing speech time may accompany the physical sensations. Most of the individuals can handle with these physical, cognitive or behavioral phenomena and the arousal caused by them may even help them demonstrate the best performance in that social situation. In the case of co-occurrence of these phenomena before or during the social interactions, they are called as social anxiety (Vertue, 2003).

Even though there is a conflict in the literature about the differentiation between social phobia (SP) and social anxiety disorder (SAD) (Vertue, 2003), these two terms are used interchangeably in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th ed. [DSM–V]; American Psychiatric Association, 2013). According to DSM-V, social anxiety disorder is defined as distinct fear and anxiety that arise in social situations in which the performance is required in front of unfamiliar people with regard to the idea that he or she will behave in a way that will cause to feel abasement or shame. The individual either avoids these social situations or endures them with intense fear or anxiety which is disproportionate to the extent situation in point.

People with social anxiety disorder (social phobia) live through several types of social fear and anxiety. Some of them are social interaction anxiety, fear of scrutiny, fear of both positive and negative evaluations and social appearance anxiety (Levinson & Rodebaugh, 2012). Even though social anxiety is accepted as a whole in most studies, according to Mattrick & Clarke (1998) it has two interrelated dimensions: social interaction anxiety and social observation anxiety. Social interaction anxiety is described as the fear and evasion of expressing oneself to the others such as having a conversation, meeting with new people. On the other hand, social observation anxiety is identified as the fear of scrutiny and evasion of social situations in which the person

is performing in front of other people or being observed by these individuals in specific occations such as eating, drinking or giving a speech. (cited in Sushma, Padmaja & Agarwal, 2016).

According to Rapee and Heimberg (1997), fear of negative evaluation is a core cognitive component of social anxiety. Individuals with social anxiety disorder believe that others are prone to being highly critical, hence, tend to evaluate them negatively. Moreover, they think that others expect them to come up to extremely high standards during social interactions. Since they are doubtful of being capable of corresponding these standards, people with SAD are inclined to assume that they will be evaluated negatively by other people (Haikal & Hong, 2010). This assumption matches with diagnostic criteria for SAD in the DSM-5 (APA, 2013, p. 202), in which "*the individual fears that he or she will act in a way or show anxiety symptoms that will be negatively evaluated*".

Fear of positive evaluation (FPE) is defined as the fear of doing-well in front of other people, as a result, they may be evaluated positively. FPE is related to a sense of boggle link to being evaluated favorably and publicly since it makes a way of direct social comparison of the self to others and for this reason leaves the individual in the spot light (Weeks, Heimberg, & Rodebaugh, 2008). This reduction is consistent with the results of Wallace and Alden (1995)'s study. In the study, they examined the impacts of positive evaluations via structured social interaction roleplays on socially anxious and non-anxious men. The results revealed that anxious people are worried about positive evaluations of others enhance the social standards by which they will be valued in the future, yet they do not assume that their typical performance will be better. In consequence, unlike non-anxious men, they assumed that initial positive evaluations will lead to future negative evaluations. Thus, not only fear of negative

evaluation but also fear of positive evaluation is accepted as a component of social anxiety. Individuals with social anxiety would be expected to abstain from both positive and negative evaluations due to the fact that even positive evaluations eventually lead to negative evaluations of others (Weeks, Heimberg, Rodebaugh & Norton, 2008; Rodebaugh, Weeks, Gordon, Langer & Heimberg, 2012).

2.4.1.Social Appearance Anxiety (SAA)
Most people are willing to look well and make good impressions on others (Yousefi, Hassani & Shokri, 2009). In every communication form, people make efforts to impress others with their appearance, the way they talk or behave. It is normal but when they take into consideration others' evaluations extremely, they may experience social anxiety (Çınar & Keskin, 2015). Some people with SAD center anxiously upon aspects of their own physical appearance. When these people are asked to take into consideration what they are terrified might happen in social interactions that would raise negative evaluations of others, they will give answers related to their appearance such as "I'm ugly", "my clothes are inappropriate" or "my hair is messy" (Moscovitch, 2009).

Social appearance anxiety (SAA) is described as one's own fear and anxiety that arise from negative evaluations of others with reference to one's appearance. When it is included in regression analyses, SAA is a predictor of social anxiety. Moreover, SAA has a positive correlation with constructs of social anxiety described above such as social interaction anxiety, fear of scrutiny and fear of negative evaluation (Hart et al., 2008). According to Levinson and Rodebaugh (2012), when SAA is taken into account as a negative social evaluative fear, there is a distinction between SAA and fear of negative evaluation. While SAA centers specifically upon fears of judgements with regard to appearance, fear of negative evaluation is associated with more general

fears. For this reason, social appearance anxiety can be seen as a specific type of social anxiety.

Another subtype of social anxiety is social physique anxiety which is described as a fear and anxiety that take place in consequence of interpersonal evaluation comprising one's physique (Hart, Leary & Rejeski 1989). Social physique anxiety involves negative evaluation concerns related to one's body form and structure such as body fat, muscle tone and general body proportions rather than concerns related to appearance more broadly such as shape and size of face features or complexion (Hart et al., 2008). Since individuals attach importance not just to physique but also to appearance such as facial symmetry, average face (Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999), examining fear of overall appearance evaluation is a broader construct than fear of physique evaluation (Hart et al., 2008).

SAA is not only associated with the fear of others' negative evaluations about one's appearance but also how an individual perceives his body image (Hart et al., 2008; Dogan, 2009). Body image is defined as individuals' perceptions and attitudes towards their physical characteristics feelings (Cash, 2004). In other words, body image is the internal presentation of physical appearance. This presentation is relative to feelings and thoughts and in particular situations, it shapes individual's behaviors (Öngören, 2015). According to Healey (2014), body image has four dimensions: perceptual, affective, cognitive and behavioral dimensions. Perceptual body image represents the way one sees himself. An individual's actual body and the perception of that body do not always correspond to each other. For instance, an underweight person may perceive himself as fat. Affective body image typifies an individual's feelings (either positive or negative) associated to his body, particularly amount of satisfaction and dissatisfaction a person experiences relative to his appearance, weight and shape.

Cognitive body image includes thoughts and beliefs one has about his body. For instance, a person may think he/she will be better if he/she develops more muscle or she will be more attractive if she can lose some weight. Behavioral body image comprises the behaviors in which an individual engages ın consequence of his body image such as exercising excessively, eating too much or too less.

Body image can be either positive or negative (Dogan, Sapmaz & Totan, 2011). Negative body image may result from the discrepancy between individual's actual body and the ideal body image that a person creates in his mind as well as a physical change in his appearance (e.g. mutilation, a disease that effects physical appearance) (Demir, 2006). In recent times, clinical psychologists and psychiatrists have concentrated on studies related to negative body image and its coping strategies (Cash, 2004) since negative body image highly correlates with psychological disorders such as depression, social anxiety or eating disorders (Grogan, 1999; Healey, 2014). Noles, Cash and Winstead (1985) investigated the relation between body image and depression. In the study, depressed individuals reported poorer body images than non-depressive individuals. Sepulveda, Botella and Leon (2002) conducted a meta-analysis study on body-image related to eating disorders. Meta-analysis study involved the studies with patients of bulimia (an eating disorder characterized by eating a large amount of food followed by vomiting), anorexia (an eating disorder characterized by anxiety of gaining weight, an extreme desire for being thin, perception of an underweight as overweight) and bulimarexia (an eating disorder with presence of symptoms of bulimia and anorexia). The results of the study revealed that negative body image is an important factor for initiation and prolongation of the eating disorder. They suggested that a specific attention to shift negative body image through positive body image should be included in all eating disorder treatments.

Positive body image is not only a low level of negative body image but also it is a multidimensional construct that involves other constructs such as body appreciation, body acceptance and love, broadly conceptualizing beauty and inner positivity. Body appreciation simply refers to gratitude of characteristics, functionality and the health of the body. Body acceptance and love is expression of love and please with the body even if not entirely pleased with all aspects of it. Broadly conceptualizing beauty which means understanding of that all range of appearances such as tall, short, blonde, and brunette can be beautiful is important for individuals to be at peace with themselves. Inner positivity represents the positive feelings (e.g. optimism, understanding, happiness) with body. Individuals who have high level of these constructs are the ones expressing positive body image (Tylka & Wood-Barcalow, 2015)

In general, positive body image is associated with the positive feelings about the self and life (Cash & Fleming, 2002). For instance, Güler (2015) carried on a study to explore the impacts of body image on university students' levels of hopelessness and life satisfaction. The results ascertained that positive body image is positivelt correlated with level of life satisfaction whereas it is negativelty correlated with level of hopelessness. Sel (2016) examined the effects of body image satisfaction on university students' level of self-esteem, SAA and fear of negative evaluation. He found that while body image satisfaction is positively correlated with self-esteem, it is negatively correlated with fear of negative evaluation and SAA. From this point of view, SAA can be seen as a result of negative body image related to one's body and appearance (Dogan, 2010).

Theoretical Background of Social Anxiety

Cognitive Theories

Cognitive theory focuses on individuals' dysfunctional thoughts and cognitive distortions which refer to irrational thinking patterns that influence their perceptions of reality, generally in a negative manner. Thus, the corner stone of cognitive theory is the statement that *"The way you think affects the way you feel"* (p. 31). According to the theory, cognition plays a significant mediative function between the situation and the affect. When the anxiety is taken into consideration, triggering situation leads to anxious thought or appraisal which leads to anxious feeling. For instance, if a person who is going to give a public speech expects the audience to be friendly, his social anxiety will be low. However, if he expects the audience to be critical and judgmental, his social anxiety will be high. Even though in both scenarios, the situation (giving a public speech) is the same, experienced level of social anxiety is different with regard to the difference in evaluating the situation (Clark & Beck, 2011).

According to social anxiety model suggested by Clark and Wells (1995), an individual with social anxiety enhances a variety of assumptions about himself and his social word based on his early experiences. These assumptions can be related to extremely high standards for social performance (e.g. I must always have something interesting to say), conditional beliefs associating the results of performing in a particular way (e.g. If I keep quiet, people will think I'm boring) and unconditional negative beliefs about the self (e.g. I'm foolish, I'm weird). When an individual with social anxiety faces to a feared social situation, these negative assumptions are activated and direct the individual to perceive the relevant social situation as dangerous. He believes he will fail to demonstrate the desired level of performance (e.g. I'll blush, I'll look stupid) and reads unclear even positive cues as a sign of negative evaluation of others. As a result, this social situation creates anxiety. Once the individual faces the fear of negative evaluation, he gives full attention to monitor and observe himself (processing

of self as a social object). This situation makes impossible to notice the real evaluations of others and lead the individual to believe his assumptions. As a result, vicious circle is created. In their model, Clark and Wells highlighted the safety seeking behaviors which refer to acts to prevent or minimize the anxiety in feared social situations. For instance, individuals with social anxiety often report that they memorize their speech because of their fear to sound silly.

According to another social anxiety model suggested by Rapee and Heimberg (1997), in a social situation an individual with social anxiety creates a mental representation related to how audience sees him. The mental representation comprises of individual's appearance and behaviors presumably seen by audience which refers to people who are watching, judging and evaluating the individual. It should be noted that these people are not necessarily intentional observers but rather they may potentially notice the individual's appearance and behavior. The individual focuses on internal cues such as blushing, increased heart rate etc. and external cues which are generally negative evaluations of audience such as frowns, grunts etc. With the combination of attentional resources and mental representations, the individual concurrently sets a high performance standard that he thinks the audience would expect from him. The distinction between his mental representation of the performance (appearance and/or behavior) and his perception of the audience's high standard related to his performance assign the possibility of negative evaluation from audience. The envisaged negative evaluation reveals anxiety. The behavioral, cognitive and psychological components of anxiety affect the individual's mental representations of his performance as evaluated by the audience and the cycle is renewed.

Attachment theory

According to attachment theory developed by Bowlby, the attachment between the individuals and their care-givers has a significative effect on these individuals' social relations with others (Bartholomew, 1990). Researches in attachment theory literature (e.g. Brennan, Clark & Shaver, 1998, Sümer, 2006) confirm that there are two fundamental attachment dimensions: anxiety and avoidance. While anxiety dimension related to attachment includes extreme proximity desire, social support seeking, fear of rejection and abandonment and alarmism towards these threats, avoidance dimension related to attachment includes proximity avoidance, discomfort with intimacy and extreme self-esteem not to search social support. At a level of categories, low levels in anxiety and avoidance dimensions refer to secure attachment, high levels in these dimensions indicate insecure attachment (Brennan et al., 1998; Sümer, 2006, Kırımer, Akça & Sümer, 2014). According to Bartholomew (1990), people with secure attachment styles have healthy social relations with others whereas insecure people experience social interaction problems in their lives. Insecure people believe that they are not worth being loved and these beliefs affect their performances negatively in social situations. As a result, anxiety related to social situations is developed with the contributions of repeated negative social experiences and it turns into a vicious circle (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991 cited in Ceylan, 2011).

Self-Presentation Theory

Self-presentation occasionally called impression management is a process to create self-images and hence to affect how others' perceive and treat the individual (Schlenker & Leary, 1982, Kenrick, Neuberg & Cialdini, 2009). Self-presentation serves three main reasons. First, it helps individuals achieve desirable resources from others. For instance, during the interview a man who wants to get the job must deliver the positive impression to his interviewer. Second, it serves as a way of creating a

self-image. An individual is able to manage his impressions about himself by controlling the impressions others have about him because an individual's self-image is affected relatively by how he thinks others evaluate him. For example, it is easier for a person to evaluate himself as funny if others verify that view by laughing. Third, self-presentation allows individuals' social interactions to run smoothly. To illustrate in social context, people generally ignore their friends' slight boasts not just because it would hurt their friends but also it would annoy others (Kenrick, Neuberg & Cialdini, 2009).

Self-presentation can be seen as a strategic editing of information. For instance, when an individual prepares for a first date, he tries his best to make good impression on partner (e.g. choosing his best clothes to wear, arriving on time etc.). During the conservation, he tries to mention his strengths (e.g. his history knowledge) and abstain from his weaknesses (e.g. his failed past relationships). Since individuals have different selves –a man is a father, a teacher, a husband, a dancer-, self-presentation serves as a means of displaying the most appropriate self according to the context one is involved in. However, sometimes self-presentation fails and the fear of self-presentational failure is called as social anxiety (Kenrick, Neuberg & Cialdini, 2009). With reference to self-presentation theory developed by Leary and Kowalski (1995), before or during the social interactions when people desire to make a good impression on others but also have doubts to achieve that, they experience social anxiety. In the occurrence of social anxiety, self-presentational motivation is important. If the people are not motivated to leave a good impression on others, since their self-presentational level is low, they do not experience social anxiety. Higher levels of self-presentational motivation indicates higher levels of social anxiety (cited in Ceylan, 2011).

According to the origin of self-presentation theory, people experience social anxiety when two conditions are met a) when an individual is motivated to make a good impression b) when he has doubts to do that successfully. Later, the theory was extended by including the fear of relational devaluation which refers to the fear that others will not evaluate the relationship with the person as close, as important or as valuable as the person wishes. In most of the social encounters such as job interviewing, dating with a person or including in a group, others must evaluate the individual as important or value. When all types of social anxieties such as speech anxiety, performance anxiety, separation anxiety and stage fright etc. are taken into consideration, they are in common with the fact that the individuals are afraid of that they will not successfully make the desired impression on others. As a result of this failure, they assume that others devalue the relationship between them and thus individuals will not get the desired responses (Vertue, 2003).

2.5. Studies Related to Attachment Styles

Barnum, Urbana-Champain and Perrone-McGovern (2017) carried out a study to assess predictor powers of attachment styles and self-esteem levels on SWB levels among survivors of childhood sexual trauma. The data of the study were obtained from 213 undergraduate students via Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ), The Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (ECRS), The Multidimensional Sexuality Questionnaire (MSQ) and Brief Multidimensional Students' Life Satisfaction Scale (BMSLS). The findings of the study showed that BMSLS scores were positively and significantly correlated with ECRS and MSQ scores whereas they were negatively and significantly correlated with CTQ scores. The total contribution of three predictor variables was 24% of variance in subjective well-being.

Amani (2016) conducted a study to explore whether attachment styles were significant predictors of aggression or not. The data of the study were collected from 150 university students via Adult Attachment Style Inventory (AAS) and Aggression Inventory. Pursuant to the results of the correlation analyses, while aggression scores were negatively correlated with secure attachment style, they were positively correlated with avoidant and ambivalent attachment styles. Additionally, the results of regression analysis ascertained that attachment styles predicted 27% of variance in aggression scores. While secure and ambivalent attachment styles were significant predictors of aggression scores, avoidant attachments style was not pivotal influencer on aggression scores.

Moghadam, Rezaei, Ghaderi & Rostamian (2016) conducted a study to explore the differences among attachment styles and happiness scores of medical students with regard to gender, education level, marital status and grade point average. The sample of the study consisted of 200 medical students. Adult Attachment Style Scale and Oxford Happiness Inventory were used to obtain data. According to the findings of the study, there were no significant differences in attachment styles in terms of gender and grade point average. Unlike secure and ambivalent attachment styles, avoidant attachment style differed significantly with regard to marital status. Additionally, happiness scores differed significantly only with regard to gender. To assess whether attachment styles and demographic variables were significant predictors of happiness scores or not, regression analysis were conducted. All these variables explained the 18% of variance in happiness scores. Only secure attachment style, gender and grade point average were significant predictors of happiness.

Li and Fung (2014) explored the impacts of avoidant attachment style on SWB. The sample of study consisted of 56 married couples. The data was obtained from the

avoidant attachment subscale of the Experiences in Close Relationships and Subjective Happiness Scale. According to the results of the study, avoidant attachment style was significantly and negatively correlated with subjective well-being levels of married couples. When older couples were compared with younger ones, the malignant effect of avoidant attachment on SWB was weaker for wives but stronger for husbands.

Türe (2013) explored the associations between social anxiety, parental perception and attachment styles in terms of demographic variables among medical students. Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale, Parental Bonding Instrument, Relationship Scale Questionnaire were applied to 398 medical students. Sub dimensions of Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale (Social avoidance, Social fear) scores differed significantly with regard to place of residence, whom to live with, number of friends and parental environment in which they were grown up. Social fear and avoidance scores of university students were negatively correlated with parental bonding scores for fathers and mothers. Additionally, while secure attachment style was negatively correlated with social avoidance and social fear, other attachment styles (dismissing, preoccupied, fearful) were positively correlated with them.

Aslangiray (2013) examined whether university students' attachment styles and perceptions related to their gender roles in society predict their perceptions of their body images. Data of the study were collected from 427 university students via The Body Esteem, Experiences in Close Relationships II and Socialization of Gender Roles scales. The results of multiple regression analysis revealed that there was a negative correlation between traditional gender roles and body image whereas there was a positive correlation between body image and egalitarian gender roles. Predictor variables of the study explained 13% total variance of criterion variable. Additionally,

to ascertain the effects of gender and parents' education levels on university students' body images, multivariate analysis of variance was conducted. In accordance with results of MANOVA, only the effect of mothers' education levels was significant. Students whose mothers were postgraduate have lower body image scores than students whose mothers were not graduated from university.

Karreman and Vingerhoets (2012) carried out a study with the aim of investigating the relations between attachment styles and psychological well-being (WB) by considering the possible mediating roles of emotion regulation and resilience. The Attachment Style Questionnaire, Emotion Regulation Questionnaire, Resilience Scale, The WHO-Five Well-Being Index were used to collect data from 632 individuals. Findings showed that fearful and preoccupied attachment styles were negatively and significantly with psychological well-being, secure attachment style was positively and significantly correlated with well-being whereas dismissing attachment style did not show significant correlation with WB. Findings of multiple mediation model laid bare significant relations with resilience and emotion regulation for secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles, expressing associations with well-being. While reappraisal and resilience were partly mediating the secure attachment's effect on WB, they were completely mediating dismissing and preoccupied attachments' effects on WB. Additionally, fearful attachment had indirect effect on WB via mediating roles of appraisal and resilience.

Ayberk (2011) explored the relationships between social anxiety and attachment styles with regard to gender, socio-economical, number of siblings, birth order, place of residence and parents' attitudes. In the study, Social Anxiety Scale and Relationships Scales Questionnaires were used to obtain data from 1020 university students in Education Faculty of Muğla University. In the study, significant

differences in preoccupied attachment style in terms of place of residence and parents' attitudes were found. Students living in villages had higher preoccupied attachment scores than students living in townships. Students growing up with overprotective parenting style had higher levels of preoccupied attachment style than students growing up with other parenting styles (neglectful, authoritarian, democratic and inconsistent). Moreover, significant differences in dismissing attachment style with regard to gender and parents' attitudes. Female students had more dismissing attachment styles than male students. Students growing up with overprotective parenting style had higher levels of dismissing attachment style than students growing up with other parenting styles (neglectful, authoritarian, democratic and inconsistent). Additionally, students' secure attachment scores differed significantly in terms of parents' attitudes. Students growing up with neglectful parenting style reported higher levels of secure attachment style than students growing up with other parenting styles (overprotective, authoritarian, democratic and inconsistent). Moreover, there were significant differences in sub dimensions of social anxiety: avoidance, anxiety of being criticized and personal insignificance in terms of socio-economical, place of residence and parents' attitudes. In general, all attachment styles were significantly and positively correlated with sub dimensions of social anxiety scale. Correlation coefficients between study variables ranged from 0,15 to 0,67.

2.6.Studies Related to Subjective Well-Being (SWB)
Seki and Dilmaç (2015) investigated the path model including the variables: social appearance anxiety (SAA), subjective well-being (SWB) and values adolescents have. The data were collected from 600 students via Human Values Scale (responsibility, friendship, peacefulness, respect, honesty and tolerance), SAA Scale and SWB Scale. The structural equation model modeling was applied to detect the direct effects of

values on SAA and SWB, the direct effect of SAA on SWB and the indirect effect of values on SAA. The results of structural equation model revealed that, each path in the model was statistically significant. When adolescents' values increase, their SWB levels increased and their SAA levels diminished. Additionally, there was a negative linear relationship between SAA and SWB. In other words, as adolescents' subjective well-being levels increased, their social appearance anxiety levels diminished.

Ye and Lin (2015) explored the associations between locus of control (LOC), loneliness, SWB, and preference for online social interaction. The sample of the study comprised of 436 university students. Locus of Control Scale, UCLA Loneliness Scale, Campbell Index of Well-Being and Preference for Online Social Interaction Scale (POSI) were used to obtain data. SWB was positively correlated with POSI whereas it was negatively correlated with loneliness. While locus of control was positively and significantly correlated with loneliness and POSI, it was negatively correlated with subjective well-being. Loneliness and subjective well-being had a complete mediating eff ect between the associations of locus of control and preference for online social interaction.

Öztürk (2013) investigated the relations between university students' levels of subjective well-being, spirituality, optimism, anxiety, positive and negative affect. The sample of the study consisted of 875 undergraduate students. The measures of study were Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS), Satisfaction with Life Scale, Life Orientation Test (LOT), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), and Spirituality Scale. The findings revealed that SWB was positively and significantly correlated with positive affect, spirituality, optimism whereas it was significantly and negatively correlated with anxiety and negative affect. When the demographic variables were taken into account, there was a significant difference in university students' levels of

subjective well-being with regard to their genders. While male students had higher levels of positive affect than female students, they had lower levels of life satisfaction than female students.

Fitria, Khan and Almigo (2013) carried out a study to explore the effects of life satisfaction on social anxiety. The sample of study consisted of 105 international students in Sultan Idris Education University. Life Satisfaction Scale and Social Interaction Anxiety Scale were used to collect data. Prior to main analysis, significant differences on study variables with regard to gender and age were detected. With regard to the t-test results, the only significant difference was related to life satisfaction in terms of age. Students 24-27 years old reported higher levels of life satisfaction than students 20-23 years old. According to findings of multiple regression analysis, life satisfaction was negatively correlated with social anxiety and it made 6,1% contribution to predict the levels of social anxiety.

Oktan (2012) conducted a study with the aim of designating predictive power of body image and rejection sensitivity on subjective well-being. The sample of the study was 332 university students in Education Faculty of Karadeniz Technical University. Body Perception Scale, Rejection Sensitivity Scale and Subjective Well-Being Scale were used to obtain data from students. Prior to main analysis, correlation coefficients between study variables were computed. Rejection sensitivity had a positive correlation with body image whereas it had a negative correlation with SWB. And also, body image was negatively correlated with subjective well-being. With regard to the results of regression analysis, the combination of rejection sensitivity and body perception predicted 23% of total variance related to subjective well-being.

Stocks, April and Lynton (2012) explored the association between locus of control (LOC) and SWB with regard to demographic variables in China and South-Africa.

Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale and Satisfaction with Life Scale were sent electronically to participants at the China European International Business School (CEIBS) and the Graduate School of Business at the University of Cape Town (UCT). 49 responses from Southern African set and 62 responses from China set were accepted as valid from 168 responses. The rest was eliminated because of the incomplete data. Participants of the study consisted of students and academic staff. In accordance with the findings of the study, while Chinese demonstrated high levels of external locus of control, Southern-Africans exhibited high levels of internal locus of control. Subjective well-being levels in China were higher than the ones in Southern-Africa. Even though the correlation between LOC and SWB was not significant in Southern-Africa, it was significant and negative in China. In Southern-Africa, there were no significant differences in subjective well-being with regard to demographic variables whereas there was a significant difference between locus of control and gender. On the other hand in China, there was no significant difference in LOC with regard to demographic variables whereas there was a significant difference in SWB in terms of gender.

Dave, Tripathi, Singh and Udainiya (2011) examined the associations between locus of control, subjective well-being and self-efficacy among university students. The data was obtained from 36 university students via Locus of Control Scale, Satisfaction with Life Scale and General Self Efficacy Questionnaire. According to the results of ANOVA, the main effects of self efficacy and locus of control on subjective well-being were significant, however their interaction effect was not significant. Subjective well-being was positively and significantly correlated with locus of control whereas it was negatively and significantly correlated with general self efficacy.

Eryılmaz (2011) carried on a study with the aim of investigating whether there is a relation between adolescents' levels of subjective well-being and their positive expectations towards the future. The sample of study consisted of 233 adolescents. The data was collected by the use of Adolescents' Subjective Well-Being Scale and Positive Future Expectations Scale. The results of independent samples t-test revealed that university students' levels of subjective well-being did not differ in terms of gender. To assess the predictive role of positive future expectations on subjective well-being, simple linear regression analysis was conducted. Results indicated that positive future expectations explained the 34% of variance in subjective well-being.

2.7. Studies Related to Locus of Control (LOC)

Özdemir (2016) carried out a study with the aim of investigating the impacts of personality traits on locus of control. The sample of the study were 581 undergraduates and the measures of the study were Sociotropy-Autonomy Scale, and Locus of Control Scale. Two multiple regression analyses were carried on to investigate the predictive values of sub dimensions of personality traits scale on internal locus of control and external locus of control. According to the results of regression analyses, while autonomous personality trait explained 8,1% of total variance of external locus of control, sociotropic personality trait explained 1% of total variance of internal locus of control.

Angelova (2016) investigated the individuals' locus of control levels in terms of gender, marital status, education, occupational status and place of residence. The data were obtained from 608 participants by the use of Locus of Control Scale. In accordance with the results of the study, 77,7% of the participants had external locus of control whereas the remaining 22,3% of the participants had internal locus of control. Individuals' levels of locus of control were not significantly different in terms

of gender, status and place of residence. On the other hand, there were significant differences in participants' locus of control orientation with regard to education, marital status and occupational status. Singles reported higher levels of external locus of control than married, divorced or widowed ones. In terms of occupational status, secondary school and university students demonstrated higher levels of external locus of control.

Hazrati and Parvin (2015) examined whether there is a relation between attachment styles (secure, anxious and avoidant) and locus of control. The data were obtained from 305 secondary school students via Adult Attachment Style Scale and Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale. Findings of the study demonstrated that locus of control was significantly and positively correlated with anxious and avoidant attachment styles while it was not significantly correlated with secure attachment style. Additionally, regression analyses were conducted to explore whether parents' age predicted secondary school students' attachment styles. There were no significant relations between attachment styles and parents' age.

Hejazi and Kia (2015) investigated whether the associations between locus of control (LOC), attachment styles and emotional intelligence in divorcing couples were different from non-divorcing couples. The sample of the study consisted of 100 divorcing couples and 100 non-divorcing couples. Measures of the study were Adult Attachment Scale, Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale and Emotional Intelligence Inventory. Findings of the study brought out that avoidant attachment style was not significantly correlated with LOC in both groups (divorcing and non-divorcing couples). On the hand, secure attachment style was significantly and positively correlated with LOC in non-divorcing couples but not in divorcing couples. For ambivalent attachment, there was a positive significant correlation with LOC in

non-divorcing couples whereas there was no significant correlation with LOC in divorcing couples. When emotional intelligence and attachment styles were taken into account, significant correlations were obtained between emotional intelligence and secure attachment styles (positive correlation), and between ambivalent attachment style and emotional intelligence (negative correlation) in both groups. LOC was significantly and positively correlated with emotional intelligence for both groups.

Seyhan (2013) carried out a study with the aim of assessing associations between styles of faith (absolute, flexible, stressed and transforming), LOC and psychological well-being among university students. The data of the study were collected from 955 university students in use of Locus of Control Scale, Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale and Styles of Faith Scale. With reference to the findings of the study, people who had high scores on absolute faith sub scale reported high levels of locus of control whereas individuals who had high scores on flexible faith stated high levels of internal locus of control. While psychological well-being was positively correlated with absolute and flexible sub dimensions, it was negatively correlated with transforming and stressed sub dimensions. LOC was negatively correlated with psychological well-being.

Şar and Işıklar (2012) explored the predictive values of LOC, optimism and subjective well-being on sporters' sport self-confidence. The data of study were acquired from 463 athletes by Locus of Control Scale, Subjective Well-Being Scale, State and Trait Sport Confidence Inventory and Optimism Scale. It was found that sportive confidence was positively and significantly correlated with sporters' levels of subjective well-being, locus of control and optimism. The results of the regression analysis laid bare that sporters' levels of subjective well-being, locus of control and optimism explained 88% of total variance in sport confidence.

Eroğlu (2012) conducted a study to assess differences in athletics students' LOC levels in terms of demographic variables: gender, income, parents' education levels and sport branches. The data of the study were collected from 725 athletes via Locus of Control Scale. There was significant difference in athletes' locus of control levels in terms of sport braches whereas there were no significant differences in these variables in terms of gender, parents' education level and income. Additionally, locus of control were positively and significantly correlated with athletes' ages and class levels.

Taş (2011) examined the relations between meaning in life (present meaning & searched meaning), satisfaction with life, social comparison and locus of control among teachers. The data of the study was collected from 363 teachers via Meaning in Life Scale, Satisfaction with Life Scale, Social Comparison Scale and Locus of Control Scale. According to the findings of the study, locus of control was negatively correlated with all of the study variables. Satisfaction with life was positively correlated with present meaning and social comparison whereas it was negatively correlated with searched meaning. Social comparison was positively correlated with the sub dimensions of meaning in life.

2.8. Studies Related to Social Appearance Anxiety (SAA)

Chakarvarti and Lal (2016) carried out a study to assess the relationship of emotional intelligence with social physique anxiety and performance of sprinters. The inventory of emotional intelligence (intra-personal awareness, inter-personal awareness, intrapersonal management and inter-personal management) and Social Physique Anxiety Scale were applied to 23 splinters (8 high performers and 15 low performers) to obtain data. Social physique anxiety was significantly and negatively correlated with all dimensions of emotional intelligence. Similarly, competition performance was

negatively and significantly correlated with all dimensions of emotional intelligence. There were significant differences in social physique anxiety with regard to performance of sprinter. High performance sprinters reported higher levels of social physique anxiety than low performance sprinters.

Telli and Ünal (2016) studied the differences in university students' levels of social appearance anxiety with regard to demographic variables. The data of the study were collected from 200 university students via Social Appearance Anxiety Scale (SAAS). Since the normal distribution was ensured, non-parametric tests were used in the analyses: Kruskal Wallis tests for place of residence, age, class level and departmet, Mann Whitney-u test for gender were used. In reference to the findings of the study, university students' levels of social appearance anxiety differed significantly in terms of age, department and class level. In other words, as the university students got older, their levels of SAA increased.

Kılıç (2015) conducted a study with the aim of examining whether university students' self-esteem and loneliness levels significantly predicted their social appearance anxiety levels. The data were obtained from 1385 university students via Social Appearance Anxiety Scale (SAAS), Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) and UCLA Loneliness Scale (ULS). According to Pearson correlation analyses, while SAAS was positively and significantly correlated with ULS, it was negatively and significantly correlated with RSES. There was a negative significant correlation between ULS and RSES. The results of regression analysis showed that university students' self-esteem and loneliness levels explained 33% of total variance in their social appearance anxiety levels.

Robinson and Lewis (2015) conducted a study to examine the associations between social physique anxiety, body image (appearance orientation, health orientation, and

weight preoccupation) and sporting participation. The data of the study were collected from 93 individuals by the use of Social Physique Anxiety Scale and Body Image Scale. The results revealed that study variables differed significantly in terms of gender. Women reported higher levels of social physique anxiety, appearance orientation, health orientation, and weight preoccupation than men. Confidence in sports was positively and significantly correlated with social physique anxiety, appearance evaluation, fitness evaluation and orientation, body satisfaction whereas it was negatively and significantly correlated with appearance orientation, weight preoccupation and self-classified weight.

Kang, Johnson and Kim (2013) explored relations between SAA, personality traits, clothing in relation to self as a structure and clothing functions to asses university students' use of clothing to alter their mood. The data were obtained from 310 university students via Perfectionism Scale, The Big 5 Personality Test, Social Appearance Anxiety Scale, Proximity of Clothing to Self Scale, Functions of Clothing Scale and Use of Clothing to Alter Mood Scale. Pursuant to the results of the study, social appearance anxiety was positively and significantly correlated with perfectionism and neuroticism. Individuals who had high levels of social appearance anxiety were in tendency to pick clothing to ensure comfort and to camouflage flaws in appearance and assurance.

Özcan, Subaşı, Budak, Çelik, Gürel and Yıldız (2013) investigated how well depression, anxiety, level of income and parents' education levels predict social appearance anxiety and self-esteem. With this purpose, they collected data from 176 participants via Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES), Social Appearance Anxiety Scale (SAAS), Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI). Before conducting regression analyses, correlation analyses were carried on. The

outcomes brought out significant positive correlations between study variables. While level of income had negative correlations with all study variables, level of parents' education had negative correlations with only BDI and BAI. According to regression analyses, while BDI, BAI, level of income and parents' education levels contributed with a ratio of 58% to total variance related to self-esteem, these predictive variables predicted 49% of total variance associated with social appearance anxiety.

Şahin, Barut, Ersanlı and Kumcağız (2012) examined the relation between adolescents' levels of social appearance anxiety and self-esteem. The sample of the study comprised of 2222 adolescents aged between 11 and 15 years. The Social Appearance Anxiety Scale and Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale were used to collect data from adolescents. Pearson Correlation Analyses were conducted to detect the relations among study variables. According to the findings of the study, there was a negative significant correlation between self-esteem and social appearance anxiety. The findings indicated that increases in levels of self-esteem cause decreases in levels of social appearance anxiety.

Claes, Hart, Smiths, Eynde, Mueller and Mitchell (2012) conducted a study to assess the psychological properties of Social Appearance Anxiety Scale (SAAS) in eating disorder patients. The data of the study was obtained from 60 female eating disorder patients via Social Appearance Anxiety Scale, Eating Disorder Inventory (EDI), Dimensional Assessment of Personality Psychopathology (DAPP) and Depression Screener Questionnaires (DSQ). The results of confirmatory factor analysis showed that SAAS was a unidimensional measure. To assess internal consistency, Cronbach alpha coefficient was used and excellent internal consistency was found ($\alpha=0,96$). To test the convergent validity, correlations between SAAS and EDI, DAPP,DSQ were investigated. The results revealed that social appearance anxiety was positively

correlated with drive for thinness, body mass index, body dissatisfaction, emotional problems (e.g. depression, anxiety) and interpersonal problems (e.g. submissiveness). In the light of the findings, Social Appearance Anxiety Scale was found a reliable measure.

3.METHOD

This chapter introduces the methological procedures of the present study. It includes research design, sampling process and characteristics of participants, data collection instruments of the study with their reliability and validity scores, data collection procedure and finally data analysis procedures.

3.1.Research Design

Overall design of the current study was correlational design. The researches in which the relationships between two or more variables are studied without any manipulation of the variables are called correlational researches. In correlational researches, only the associations among naturally occurring variables *are* studied except the cause and effect relations between them. Correlations can be used to make predictions about the existence of cause and effect relation; but definitely it cannot be interpreted as causation (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz and Demirel, 2008). Correlational designs can be divided into two categories according to their purposes. The first category is explanatory studies whose purposes are to clarify the understanding of important phenomena by analyzing relationships among variables. The second one is prediction studies whose purposes are to predict the value of a variable from the other variable by analyzing the relationships among these variables. The variable which is used to make a forecast is called predictor variable; the variable about which the forecast is made is called the criterion variable (Frankel and Wallen, 2006).

The present study aimed to examine whether four types of attachment styles, two dimensions of locus of control and the levels of subjective well-being significantly predicted the levels of social appearance anxiety of university students or not. Based on this objective, the study was defined as a predictive correlational study. The

predictor variables were attachment styles, locus of control and subjective well-being. The criterion variable was the levels of social appearance anxiety.

3.2. Sampling Method and Participants

The population of this study was the undergraduate students of Yeditepe University. The size of the population was 18.053 students according to the data provided by Yeditepe University Student Affairs on 27.04.2017. Based on this information, the sample size was calculated with regard to the following formula (Baş, 2010, p.39).

$$n = Nt^2 p(1-p) / d^2(N-1) + t^2 p(p-1)$$

Where (n) is sample size, (N) is population size, (t) is confidence level (1,96), (p) is the probability that the observed data would occur (0.50) and (d) is error rate (0.05). By using this formula sample size was found 385 students. In the light of this information, the data of the present study was collected from 330 female and 90 male students, in total 420 university students of Yeditepe University. In order to reach the participants of the study, convenience sampling method was utilized. Convenience sampling method refers to data collection from population members that the researcher can reach conveniently (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç-Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2015). Characteristics of the sample according to gender, age and department are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1.

Characteristics of the sample

	Groups	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Female	330	78,6	78,6
	Male	90	21,4	100
	Total	420	100	
Age	18-20 (1)	139	33,1	33,1
	21-22 (2)	181	43,1	76,2
	23≤ - (3)	100	23,8	100
	Total	420	100	
Department	Social sciences	224	53,3	53,3
	Life sciences	196	46,7	100
	Total	420	100	

The sample of the study consisted of 330 female students (78,6%) and 90 male students (21,4%). 139 participants (33,1%) were 18-21 years old. 181 participants (43,1%) were 21-22 years old. 100 participants (23,8%) were older than 22 years old. Considering the distribution of students by departments; 224 students (53,3%) were from social science departments and 196 students (46,7%) were from life science departments.

3.3. Instruments
Demografic Information Form

A demografic information form (Appendix-1) was developed by the researcher as a first part of the survey package. The form consisted of questions that were related to participants' gender, age and department.

Relationships Scales Questionnaire (RSQ)

RSQ was developed by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) to measure the types of attachment styles. The scale was created with the items taken from Hazan and Shaver's (1987) Attachment Measure Paragraphs, Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) Relationship Questionnaire and Collins and Read's (1990) Adult Attachment Scale (cited in Sümer & Güngör, 1999). The scale consists of 30 items. 17 of them are used for attachment styles. The rest of the items are used for assessing attachment dimensions including 3 factors –close, depend and anxiety- (Collins & Read,1990). The scale produces four attachment styles which are called as secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing.

RSQ is a 7 Likert type scale in which item reponses range from 1 "totally does not describe me" and 5 "totally describes me". There are five items in secure and dismissing attachment subscales whereas there are four items in preoccupied and fearful attachment subscales. Normally there are 17 items for these attachment styles, but 1 item is used for 2 subscales by coding that item reversely. Each subscale's score is obtained via dividing the total subscale score by the number of items in that subscale. As a result, each subscale has a score ranging from 1 to 7 (Griffin and Bartholomew, 1994).

In the reliability studies of RSQ, Cronbach alpha values of the subscales ranged between 0.41 and 0.71. Although the internal consistency reliability values were low,

acceptable level of test-retest reliability coefficients (0.53 for females and 0.49 for males) were found (Griffin and Bartholomew, 1994).

Turkish adaptation of RSQ (Appendix-2) was conducted by Sümer and Güngör (1999) with a Turkish sample of 123 university students. Principal Component Analysis yielded two factors over Eigenvalue 1. First factor (43%) and second factor (33%) explained 76% of total variance. Secure and fearful subscales were loaded in the first factor. Preoccupied and dismissing subscales were loaded in the second factor. Internal consistency reliability coefficients for four subscales ranged between 0.27 and 0.61. Test-retest correlation coefficients varied between 0.54 and 0.78.

For the present study, reliability coefficients of each subscale in Relationship Scales Questionnaire were investigated. Cronbach alpha coefficients of secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment style subscales were 0,29, 0,62, 0,36 and 0,54, respectively. In the original study of the scale, these values ranged between 0,41 and 0,71. In the adaptation study of Relationships Scales Questionnaire, Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged between 0,27 and 0,61. Thus, it can be said that reliability coefficients were consistent with the ones in original and adaptation studies.

Subjective Well-Being Scale (SWBS)

The scale (Appendix-3) was developed by Tuzgöl-Dost (2004) to detect subjective well-being levels of individuals by measuring their cognitive evaluations about their lives and frequency and intensity of positive and negative feelings they go through. The scale consists of 46 items based on different theories that explain subjective well-being. In the scale, there are statements about finding life meaningful and having goals (Telic Theory), activities of interest (Activity Theory), comparison of individual's current state with his past, other people and his wishes (The Multiple Discrepancy Theory), family and friendship relations based on love, support and trust

(Bottom-up Theory), satisfaction of personality traits, optimism, hopefulness, and confidence (Top-down Theory) and lastly positive and negative feeling statements (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004).

It is a 5 Likert type scale. Responses range from 1 "completely false for me" and 5 "completely true for me". The scale comprises of 46 items that 20 of them have negative statements and the rest have positive statements. The lowest score is 46 and the highest score is 230 for the scale. Higher scores indicate higher subjective well-being (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004).

In the validity studies of SWBS, 16 specialists from different fields (Guidance and Psychological Counseling, Psychology, Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Turkish Language) were asked to rate how appropriate each item measures subjective well-being. For each item, average ratings were calculated and the items below the average rating were removed from the scale. For the construct validity of the scale, Principle Component Analysis and factor analysis were applied. Principal Component Analysis yielded fourteen factors over Eigenvalue 1. However, there was a sharp decrease between eigenvalues of factor 1 and factor 2. According to the fact that most of the total variance (22,52%) was explained by the first factor, presence of a general construct was accepted. The scale was also compared to Beck Depression Inventory to test convergent validity. Results indicated a negative correlation (r= -0.70, p=0.01) between Beck Depression Inventory and Subjective Well-Being Scale (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004).

In the reliability studies of SWBS, internal consistency coefficient was found 0.93. To estimate test-retest reliability, the scale was applied twice with a two-week interval. It was found that the test-retest reliability coefficient was 0.86 (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004). In

the present study, Cronbach alpha coefficient of subjective well-being scale was 0,92 which was consistent with the reliability coefficient of original study.

Rotter's Internal External Locus of Control Scale (RIELOCS)

RIELOCS was developed by Rotter (1966) as self-report measure. The aim of the scale is to assess generalized control expectations of individuals on the dimension of internality-externality (Dağ, 1991). RIELOCS is a forced-choice scale consists of 29 items with 2 choices. 6 of them (1, 8, 14, 19, 24 and 27) are filler items written for participants in order to make them not to notice the main purpose of the scale. The choices expressing the externality in the items are scored with 1 point. The first choice of the items 2, 6, 7, 9, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 29 and the second choice of items 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 22, 26, 28 are scored with 1 point. The choices expressing internality in the items are not scored. Thus, the lowest score is 0 and the highest score is 23 for RIELOCS. High scores point out higher external focus of control belief as the determinant of reinforcements in life (Rotter, 1966).

The reliability studies of RIELOCS were done with the data obtained from up to 2100 participants in four different samples. Rotter (1066) reported that Spearman-Brown split half and KR-20 reliability coefficients varied between 0.65 and 0.79 and test-retest reliability coefficients ranged between 0.49 and 0.83 in different samples. For the variability studies, firstly RIELOCS was compared with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. An average correlation of -0.22 was obtained between two scales. Secondly, factor analysis was conducted. It yielded one general factor and several additional factors including a few items with significant loadings in it. So, these additional factors were isolated.

Turkish adaptation of RIELOCS (Appendix-4) was conducted by Dağ (1991) with two different samples of university students. Data for reliability studies were obtained

from 99 psychology students (18 males and 81 females). Data for validity studies were obtained from 53 psychology students in that sample. Data for factor analysis were acquired from a sample of 532 university students in different departments. In the reliability studies, KR-20, Cronbach Alpha and test-retest reliability coefficients were found 0.68, 0.70 and 0.83, respectively (p<0.001). For criterion validity studies, Learned Resourcefulness Scale developed by Rosenbaum (1980) and The *Symptom Checklist‑90‑R* (*SCL‑90‑R*) developed by Derogatis (1977) and adapted by Dağ (1991) were compared to RIELOCS. Results indicated a negative correlation of -0.29 between RLRS and RIELOCS and a positive correlation of 0.21 between SCL-90-R and RIELOCS (p<0.001). For the construct validity of the scale, Principle Component Analysis and factor analysis were applied. Principle Component Analysis yielded 7 factors over Eigenvalue 1. All these 7 factors explained 47.7% of total variance.

For present study, KR-20 reliability coefficient of locus of control scale was 0,61. It was 0,68 in the adaptation study of the scale while KR-20 reliability coefficients varied between 0,65 and 0,79 in the original study of the scale. Thus, it can be said that reliability coefficient was consistent with the ones in original and adaptation studies

Social Appearance Anxiety Scale (SAAS)

Social Appearance Anxiety Scale was developed by Hart Hart, Palyo, Fresco, Holle and Heimberg (2008) to measure the anxiety that people live through because of the negative evaluations made by the others due to their overall appearance. The scale is 16 item self-report measure. Participants rate how characteristic each item is on a Likert-type scale varying from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). The lowest score is 16 and the highest score is 80 for SAAS. High scores indicate higher levels of social appearance anxiety (Hart et al., 2008).

Reliability and validity studies were conducted with 3 different samples of university students. Data obtained from a sample of 512 university students, were used for explanatory factor analysis. Another sample of 853 participants provided data for confirmatory factor analysis. Data obtained from the last sample of 541 participants were used to measure convergent validity and test-retest reliability of the scale. Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the scale were 0.94, 0.94 and 0.95 for 3 different samples. The test-retest reliability coefficient was 0.84. For criterion validity studies, Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (BFNES), Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and Social Physique Anxiety Scale (SPAS) were used. Results indicated a positive correlation of 0.82 with DFNES; 0.52 with BDI and 0.59 with SPAS ($p<0.005$). Based on CFA results, combined with the EFA findings, SAAS was accepted as unidimensional measure (Hart et al., 2008).

Turkish adaptation of the scale (Appendix-5) was conducted by Doğan (2010) with a sample of 340 university students (197 males and 143 females). Factor analysis yielded a general factor accounted for % 53.4 of total variance. To assess the criterion validity of the scale, Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale developed by Leary (1983) and adapted by Çetin, Doğan ve Sapmaz (2010) was used. There was a positive correlation between scales ($r=0.60$, $p<0.001$). For the reliability studies, test-retest, split-half, internal consistency reliability coefficients and the item-total correlations were measured. Item-total correlations varied between 0.32 and 0.82 ($p<0.001$). Test-retest, split-half and internal consistency coefficients were 0.85, 0.88 and 0.93, respectively ($p<0.05$).

In the present study, Cronbach alpha coefficient of social appearance anxiety scale was 0,95 while it was 0,94 in the original study of the scale. In the adaptation study of social appearance anxiety scale, Cronbach alpha coefficient was 0,93. Thus, it can be

said that reliability coefficient was consistent with the ones in original and adaptation studies.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

First of all, necessary permissions were taken from Yeditepe University Ethics Committee. Then, the researcher made personal visits to the directors of selected faculties and departments and asked their collaborations for the study. After arranging the appointments with professors and instructors, data were collected from Yeditepe University at the beginning of the second semester in 2016-2017 academic year. Prepared survey packet contained all the instruments with a cover of informed consent form which was given to each student by the researcher during arranged classroom hours. The instruments in the survey packet were administered in the following order: Informed Consent Form, Demographic Information Form, Relationships Scales Questionnaire (RSQ), Subjective Well-Being Scale (SWBS), Rotter's Internal External Locus of Control Scale (RIELOCS) and Social Appearance Anxiety Scale (SAAS). At the beginning of the data collection, students were informed about the purpose of the study and assured about confidentiality and anonymity by the researcher in each class. Students were not asked to give any personal information such as name, surname, student ID number etc. The participation was strictly voluntary. The completion of survey packet lasted for approximately 25 minutes.

3.5. Data Analyses

Before conducting the main analyses, firstly internal consistency reliability analyses of RSQ, SWBS, RIELOCS and SAAS were carried out for the present sample. Later, differences among the participants' scores obtained from study variables were examined in terms of three demographics: gender, department and age. Since normal distributions of study variables were ensured, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA)

for age variable and independent samples t-tests for gender and department variables were computed. Independent samples t-test is used to assess whether there is a significant difference among the means of two independent groups. On the other hand, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to designate whether there are significant differences among the means of two or more independent groups (Büyüköztürk, 2015). In the main analyses of the study, firstly Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to assess the correlations among the variables. Then, the multiple regression analysis were conducted to determine the predictive roles of attachment styles, levels of subjective well-being and locus of control on the level of social appearance anxiety. All statistical analyses in this study were conducted through subprograms of SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 20.0.

4.RESULTS

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for three independent variables (attachment styles, locus of control and subjective well-being) and the dependent variable (social appearance anxiety) used in this study are presented in the Table 4.1.

Table 4.1.

Descriptive statistics for the main variables of the study

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Min-Max
Attachment Styles				
Secure	420	4,10	,92	1,20-7,00
Fearful	420	3,62	1,10	1,00-6,50
Preoccupied	420	3,97	1,07	1,00-7,00
Dismissing	420	4,29	,94	1,60-7,00
Subjective Well-being	420	171,26	26,77	79,00-266,00
Locus of Control*	420	12,52	3,81	1,00-23,00
Social Appearance Anxiety	420	31,55	14,32	16,00-80,00

*Higher scores indicate external locus of control whereas lower scores indicate internal locus of control

For secure attachment style, mean score was 4,10, standard deviation was 0,92 and minimum maximum scores ranged between 1,20 and 7,00. For fearful attachment style, mean score was 3,62, standard deviation was 1,10 and minimum maximum scores ranged between 1,00 and 6,50. For preoccupied attachment style, mean score was 3,97, standard deviation was 1,07 and minimum maximum scores ranged between 1,00 and 7,00. For dismissing attachment style, mean score was 4,29, standard deviation was 0,94 and minimum maximum scores ranged between 1,60 and 7,00. For

subjective well-being mean, score was 171,26, standard deviation was 26,77 and minimum maximum scores ranged between 79 and 266. For locus of control, mean score was 12,52, standard deviation was 3,81 and minimum maximum scores ranged between 1 and 23. For social appearance anxiety, mean score was 31,55, standard deviation was 14,32 and minimum maximum scores ranged between 16 and 80.

In the Relationship Scales Questionnaire, each participant had a score on four different attachment subscales and the highest score in the subscales determined the participant's attachment style. Table 4.2. represents the frequencies and percentages of attachment styles of participants in the present study.

Table 4.2.

Frequencies and percentages of attachment styles

Attachment Styles	N	%
Secure	146	34,8
Fearful	43	10,2
Preoccupied	96	22,9
Dismissing	135	32,1
Total	420	100,0

According to results of study, 146 participants (34,8%) were securely attached while 43 participants (10,2%) were fearfully attached. 96 participants (22,9%) had preoccupied attachment styles whereas 135 participants (32,1%) had dismissing attachment styles.

As a second step in descriptive analyses, to decide either parametric tests or non-parametric tests are used, normality of variables was assessed by skewness and kurtosis values. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), the values of skewness

and kurtosis between -1,5 and +1,5 are considered acceptable in order to prove normal univariate distribution.

Table 4.3.

Skewness and Kurtosis values of study variables

Variables	N	Mean	Skewness	Kurtosis
Attachment Styles				
Secure	420	4,10	-0,002	0,202
Fearful	420	3,62	-0,049	-0,303
Preoccupied	420	3,97	0,156	-0,006
Dismissing	420	4,29	0,076	-0,253
Subjective Well-being	420	171,26	-0,316	0,155
Locus of Control	420	12,52	-0,208	-0,022
Social Appearance Anxiety	420	31,55	1,260	1,159

As it is presented in Table 4.3, skewness and kurtosis values were -0,002 and 0,202 for secure attachment subscale, -0,049 and -0,303, for fearful attachment subscale, 0,156 and -0,006 for preoccupied attachment subscale, 0,076 and -0,253 for dismissing attachment subscale, -0,316 and 0,155 for subjective well-being scale, -0,208 and -0,022 for locus of control scale and 1,260 and 1,159 for social appearance anxiety scale. All skewness and kurtosis values of study variables are in acceptable range. In the light of such information, parametric tests were used in the present study.

4.2. Demographic variables

Differences among the participants' scores obtained from attachment styles, subjective well-being, locus of control and social appearance anxiety scales were examined in terms of three demographic variables: gender, department and age. Since

normal distributions of study variables were ensured, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for age variable and independent samples t-tests for gender and department variables were computed.

Attachment styles

Attachment styles with regard to gender

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' attachment styles with regard to gender?" independent sample t-test was conducted. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4.

Independent samples t-test results related to attachment styles with regard to gender

Attachment Styles	Group	N	Mean	SD	t-test	
					t	p
Secure	Female	330	4,02	0,91	-3,734	**0,00***
	Male	90	4,42	0,91		
Fearful	Female	330	3,66	1,11	1,587	0,11
	Male	90	3,45	1,07		
Preoccupied	Female	330	4,02	1,04	1,817	0,07
	Male	90	3,79	1,15		
Dismissing	Female	330	4,26	0,93	-1,337	0,18
	Male	90	4,41	0,97		

*$p<0.05$

As illustrated in Table 4.4, with regard to gender while there was no significant difference among university students' fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles [$t(418)= 1,587$, $p>0,05$; $t(418)= 1,817$, $p>0,05$; $t(418)= -1,337$, $p>0,05$], there was a significant difference among their secure attachment styles [$t(418)= -3,734$, $p<0,05$]. Male students (M=4,42; SD=0,91) were more securely attached than female students (M=4,02; SD=0,91).

Attachment styles with regard to department

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' attachment styles with regard to department?" independent sample t-test was conducted. The results of the analyses are shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5.

Independent samples t-test results related to attachment styles with regard to department

Attachment					t-test	
Styles	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Secure	Social sciences	224	4,07	0,91	-0,900	0,369
	Life sciences	196	4,15	0,93		
Fearful	Social sciences	224	3,47	1,11	-2,909	**0,004***
	Life sciences	196	3,78	1,08		
Preoccupied	Social sciences	224	4,09	1,02	2,529	**0,012**
	Life sciences	196	3,83	1,10		
Dismissing	Social sciences	224	4,2	0,95	-2,093	0,037
	Life sciences	196	4,39	0,93		

*$p<0.05$

According to Table 4.5, findings for secure attachment style [$t(418)= -0,900$, $p>0,05$] and for dismissing attachment style [$t(418)= -2,093$, $p>0,05$] in terms of department variable demonstrated no significant difference. On the other hand, fearful attachment style [$t(418)= -2,909$, $p<0,05$] and preoccupied attachment style [$t(418)= 2,529$, $p<0,05$] pointed out a significant difference in terms of department variable. For fearful attachment style, students in life sciences (M=3,78; SD=1,08) had higher

scores than students in social sciences (M=3,47; SD=1,11). For preoccupied attachment style, students in social sciences (M=4,09; SD=1,02) had higher scores than students in life sciences(M=3,83; SD=1,10).

Attachment styles with regard to age

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' attachment styles with regard to age?" one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Findings related to mean scores, standard deviation and Levene's test are laid out in Table 4.6 and the results of ANOVA analysis are shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.6.

Descriptive statistics of attachment styles with regard to age

Attachment Styles	Group	N	Mean	SD
Secure	18-20 (1)	139	3,94	0,82
	21-22 (2)	181	4,02	0,97
	23≤ - (3)	100	4,47	0,88
	Total	420	4,10	0,92
Fearful	18-20 (1)	139	3,92	1,04
	21-22 (2)	181	3,48	1,10
	23≤ - (3)	100	3,46	1,13
	Total	420	3,62	1,10
Preoccupied	18-20 (1)	139	3,98	1,08
	21-22 (2)	181	3,95	1,06
	23≤ - (3)	100	4,00	1,06
	Total	420	3,97	1,07
Dismissing	18-20 (1)	139	4,36	0,90
	21-22 (2)	181	4,27	0,97
	23≤ - (3)	100	4,22	0,95
	Total	420	4,29	0,94

Table 4.7.

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results related to attachment styles with regard to age

Attachment Styles		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sig. difference
Secure	Between Groups	18,22	2	9,11	11,152	**0,00***	**1-3** **2-3**
	Within Groups	340,82	417	0,81			
	Total	359,04	419				
Fearful	Between Groups	18,95	2	9,47	7,949	**0,00***	**1-2** **1-3**
	Within Groups	497,22	417	1,19			
	Total	516,18	419				
Preoccupied	Between Groups	0,20	2	0,10	0,087	0,917	--
	Within Groups	482,68	417	1,15			
	Total	482,88	419				
Dismissing	Between Groups	1,41	2	0,70	0,788	0,455	--
	Within Groups	375,00	417	0,89			
	Total	376,41	419				

*$p<0,05$

Results of one way analysis of variance revealed that preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles did not differ significantly by age [$F(2,419)= 0,087$, $p>0,05$; $F(2,419)= 0,788$, $p>0,05$]. On the other hand, secure and fearful attachment styles differed significantly in terms of age [$F(2,419)= 11,152$, $p<0,05$; $F(2,419)= 7,949$, $p<0,05$]. In order to figure out in which groups significant differences were exist, LSD

tests were computed. According to LSD results, for secure attachment style, students in group 3 (M=4,47; SD=0,88) were more securely attached than students in group 2 (M=4,02; SD=0,97) and group 1 (M=3,94; SD=0,82). For fearful attachment style, students in group 1 (M=3,92; SD=1,04) were more fearfully attached than students in group 2 (M=3,48; SD=1,10) and group 3 (M=3,46; SD=1,13). These findings were consistent with each other because as time passes by while students' secure attachment scores increased, their fearful attachment scores decreased.

Subjective well-being

Subjective well-being levels with regard to gender

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' subjective well-being levels with regard to gender?" independent sample t-test was conducted. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8.

Independent samples t-test results related to subjective well-being levels with regard to gender

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-test	
				t	p
Female	330	171,76	27,38	0,727	0,468
Male	90	169,44	24,45		

As illustrated in Table 4.8, there was no significant difference among university students' subjective well-being levels in terms of gender [$t(418)$= 0,727, $p>0,05$].

Subjective well-being levels with regard to department

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' subjective well-being levels with regard to department?" independent sample t-test was computed. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9.

Independent samples t-test results related to subjective well-being levels with regard to department

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-test t	t-test p
				t	**p**
Social sciences	224	173,08	26,96	1,492	0,136
Life sciences	196	169,18	26,45		

According to independent samples t-test results, there was no significant difference among university students' subjective well-being levels based on their departments [*t*(418)= 1,492, *p*>0,05].

Subjective well-being levels with regard to age

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' subjective well-being levels with regard to age?" one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed. Findings related to mean scores, standard deviation and Levene's test are illustrated in Table 4.10 and the results of ANOVA analysis are shown in Table 4.11.

Table 4.10.

Descriptive statistics of subjective well-being levels with regard to age

Group	N	Mean	SD
18-20 (1)	139	168,28	25,96
21-22 (2)	181	171,39	26,40
23≤ - (3)	100	175,17	28,25
Total	420	171,26	26,77

Table 4.11.

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results related to subjective well-being levels with regard to age

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2759,91	2	1379,95	1,934	0,146
Within Groups	297515,74	417	713,46		
Total	300275,66	419			

Results of one way analysis of variance revealed that university students' subjective well-being levels did not differ significantly in terms of age [F(2,419)= 1,934, *p*>0,05].

Locus of control

Locus of control levels with regard to gender

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' locus of control levels with regard to gender?" independent sample t-test was conducted. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12.

Independent samples t-test results related to locus of control levels with regard to gender

				t-test	
Group	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Female	330	12,87	3,81	3,663	**0,000***
Male	90	11,23	3,55		

*p<0.05

As illustrated in Table X, there was a significant difference among university students' locus of control levels in terms of gender [*t*(418)= 3,663, *p*<0,05]. Female students (M=12,87; SD=3,81) were more externally oriented than male students (M=11,23; SD=3,55) in terms of their locus of control.

Locus of control levels with regard to department

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' locus of control levels with regard to department?" independent sample t-test was conducted. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13.

Independent samples t-test results related to locus of control levels with regard to department

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-test	
				t	p
Social sciences	224	12,33	3,94	-1,096	0,274
Life sciences	196	12,73	3,66		

According to independent samples t-test results, there was no significant difference among university students' locus of control levels based on their departments [$t(418)$= -1,096, $p>0,05$].

Locus of control levels with regard to age

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' locus of control levels with regard to age?" one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Findings related to mean scores, standard deviation and Levene's test are presented out in Table 4.14 and the results of ANOVA analysis are illustrated in Table 4.15.

Table 4.14.

Descriptive statistics of locus of control levels with regard to age

Group	N	Mean	SD
18-20 (1)	139	13,38	3,43
21-22 (2)	181	12,39	3,77
23≤ - (3)	100	11,55	4,15
Total	420	12,52	3,81

Table 4.15.
One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results related to locus of control levels with regard to age

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sig. difference
Between Groups	201,88	2	100,94	7,124	0,001*	1-2
Within Groups	5908,92	417	14,17			1-3
Total	6110,80	419				

*$p<0,05$

Results of one way analysis of variance revealed that university students' locus of control levels differed significantly with regard to age variable [$F(2,419)=7,124$, $p<0,05$]. In order to determine which groups show significant differences, LSD tests were conducted. According to LSD results, mean scores of students in group 1 (M=13,38; SD=3,43) were higher than students in group 2 (M=12,39; SD=3,77) and group 3 (M=11,55; SD=4,15). In other words, younger students were more external than older students in terms of locus of control.

Social appearance anxiety

Social appearance anxiety levels with regard to gender

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' social appearance anxiety levels with regard to gender?" independent sample t-test was conducted. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16.

Independent samples t-test results related to social appearance anxiety levels with regard to gender

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-test	
				t	p
Female	330	32,04	14,80	1,339	0,181
Male	90	29,76	12,32		

As illustrated in Table 4.16, there was no significant difference among university students' social appearance anxiety levels with regard to gender [$t(418)= 1,339$, $p>0,05$].

Social appearance anxiety levels with regard to department

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' social appearance anxiety levels with regard to department?" independent sample t-test was computed. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17.

Independent samples t-test results related to social appearance anxiety levels with regard to department

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-test	
				t	p
Social sciences	224	32,83	15,57	1,961	0,051
Life sciences	196	30,09	12,62		

According to independent samples t-test results, there was no significant difference among university students' social appearance anxiety levels based on their departments [$t(418)= 1,961$, $p>0,05$].

Social appearance anxiety levels with regard to age

In order to answer "Is there a significant difference among university students' social appearance anxiety levels with regard to age?" one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed. Findings related to mean scores, standard deviation and Levene's test are illustrated in Table 4.18 and the results of ANOVA analysis are presented in Table 4.19.

Table 4.18.
Descriptive statistics of social appearance anxiety levels with regard to age

Group	N	Mean	SD
18-20	139	32,92	14,58
21-22	181	31,94	13,55
23≤ -	100	28,96	15,10
Total	420	31,55	14,32

Table 4.19.

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results related to social appearance anxiety levels with regard to age

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	960,21	2	480,10	2,354	,096
Within Groups	85037,41	417	203,92		
Total	85997,62	419			

Results of one way analysis of variance revealed that university students' social appearance anxiety levels did not differ significantly in terms of age [F(2,419)=2,345, *p*>0,05].

4.3. Correlations among the study variables

Prior to regression analysis, in order to assess the correlations among university students' attachment styles (secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing), subjective well-being, locus of control and social appearance anxiety levels, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted. The results of analysis are presented in Table 4.20.

Table 4.20.

Pearson correlation coefficients among study variables

	Secure	Fearful	Preoccupied	Dismissing	SWB	LOC	SAA
Secure	1						
Fearful	-0,395*	1					
Preoccupied	-0,096	-0,010	1				
Dismissing	-0,209*	0,547*	-0,193*	1			
SWB	0,370*	-0,292*	-0,224*	-0,156*	1		
LOC	-0,183*	0,188*	0,095	0,114	-0,222*	1	
SAA	-0,354*	0,259*	0,375*	0,146*	-0,535*	0,248*	1

*$p<0.01$ **SWB=Subjective well-being, LOC=Locus of control, SAA=Social appearance anxiety

The results revealed that intercorrelations among predictor variables (secure, fearful, preoccupied, dismissing, subjective well-being and locus of control) and criterion variable (social appearance anxiety) ranged from -0,010 to 0,547. These results stated low to moderate correlations among predictor variables and criterion variable. While social appearance anxiety was significantly and positively correlated with locus of control (r=0,248, $p<0.01$), fearful (r=0,259, $p<0.01$), preoccupied (r=0,375, $p<0.01$) and dismissing attachment styles (r=0,146, $p<0.01$), it was significantly and negatively correlated with secure attachment style (r=-0,354, $p<0.01$) and subjective well-being (r=-0,535, $p<0.01$). In other words, as participants' social appearance anxiety levels decreased, their external control orientations, fearful, preoccupied and

dismissing attachment style scores decreased. Additionally, as university students' social appearance anxiety levels decreased, their secure attachment style scores and subjective well-being levels increased.

As seen in Table 4.20, locus of control was significantly correlated with secure and fearful attachment styles, subjective well-being and social appearance anxiety whereas it was not significantly correlated with preoccupied (r=0,095, *p*>0.01) and dismissing attachment styles preoccupied (r=0,114, *p*>0.01). While locus of control had a positive correlation with fearful attachment style (r=0,188, *p*<0.01) and social appearance anxiety (r=0,248, *p*<0.01), it had a negative correlation with secure attachment style (r=-0,183, *p*<0.01) and subjective well-being (r=-0,222, *p*<0.01). In locus of control scale, higher scores refer to externality and lower scores refer to internality. Thus, as university students become more internal, their fearful attachment scores and social appearance anxiety levels decrease. Additionally, as they become more internal, their secure attachment style scores and subjective well-being levels increase.

Subjective well-being was significantly and positively correlated with only secure attachment style (r=0,370, *p*<0.01). On the contrary, it was significantly and negatively correlated with fearful (r=-0,292, *p*<0.01), preoccupied (r=-0,224, *p*<0.01) and dismissing attachment styles (r=-0,156, *p*<0.01), locus of control (r=-0,222, *p*<0.01) and social appearance anxiety (r=-0,535, *p*<0.01). Put it differently, as university students' subjective well-being levels increased, their fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment style scores, external control orientations and social appearance anxiety levels diminished. Additionally, as university students' subjective well-being levels increased, their secure attachment style scores increased.

Dismissing attachment style was significantly correlated with all other variables except locus of control (r=0,114, *p*>0.01). It had a positive correlation with fearful attachment style (r=0,547, *p*<0.01) and social appearance anxiety (r=0,146, *p*<0.01) while it had a negative correlation with subjective well-being (r=-0,156, *p*<0.01), secure (r=-0,209, *p*<0.01) and preoccupied attachment style (r=-0,193, *p*<0.01). Preoccupied attachment style was not significantly correlated with secure (r=-0,096, *p*>0.01) and fearful attachment styles (r=-0,010, *p*>0.01). Lastly, fearful attachment style was significantly and negatively correlated with secure attachment style (r=-0,395, *p*<0.01).

4.4. **Multiple Regression Analysis Executed to Social Appearance Anxiety**

Preparatory to multiple regression analyses, normality, linearity and homoscedasticy assumptions were checked via graphs in SPSS. To test multicollinearity assumption, correlation matrix of study variables, VIF and tolerance values were examined. Higher than 0,80 correlation coefficients between predictor variables, lower than 0,20 tolerance values which refer to the variance ratio of an independent variable that cannot be explained by other independent and higher than 10 variance inflation factor (VIF) values indicates multicollinearity problem in the regression analysis (Büyüköztürk, 2015). As represented in table 4.20. all the correlation coefficients between predictor variables were lower than 0,80, tolerance values were higher than 0,20 (0,76 for secure attachment style; 0.60 for fearful attachment style; 0,88 for preoccupied attachment style; 0,66 for dismissing attachment style; 0,78 for subjective well-being; 0,92 for locus of control) and VIF values were lower than 10 (1,30 for secure attachment style; 1,66 for fearful attachment style; 1,12 for preoccupied attachment style; 1,50 for dismissing attachment style; 1,27 for

subjective well-being; 1,08 for locus of control). When these values were taken into consideration, multicollinearity problem was not detected for the present study.

A standard multiple regression analysis was conducted to assess how well university students' secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles, subjective well-being levels and locus of control levels predicted their social appearance anxiety levels. Results of multiple regression analysis are presented in table 4.21.

Table 4.21.

Results of Multiple regression analysis for attachment styles, subjective well-being and locus of control

	B	Std. error	β	T	p	Correlations	
						Zero-order	partial
Constant	48,128	6,923	-	6,952	**0,000***	-	-
Secure	-2,158	0,672	-0,139	-3,211	**0,001***	-0,354	-0,156
Fearful	0,424	0,634	0,033	0,669	0,504	0,259	0,033
Preoccupied	3,806	0,539	0,285	7,066	**0,000***	0,375	0,328
Dismissing	1,278	0,707	0,085	1,809	0,071	0,146	0,089
SWB	-0,201	0,023	-0,375	-8,720	**0,000***	-0,535	-0,394
LOC	0,361	0,148	0,096	2,434	0,015	0,248	0,119

R=0,634	R^2=0,402
$F_{(6,413)}$=46,202	p=0,000*

*$p<0.01$

A moderate negative correlation (r=-0,35) between secure attachment style and SAA, a low positive correlation (r=0,25) between fearful attachment style and SAA, a moderate positive correlation (r=-0,37) between preoccupied attachment style and SAA, a low positive correlation (r=-0,14) between dismissing attachment style and

SAA, a moderate negative correlation (r=-0,53) between SWB and SAA and a low positive correlation (r=-0,24) between LOC and SAA were exist, however when other variables were controlled for each pair the partial correlations between predictor variables and SAA were r=-0,15, r=0,03, r=0,32, r=0,08, r=-0,39 and r=0,11 respectively.

Results in Table 4.21 stated that social appearance anxiety was significantly predicted by secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles, subjective well-being and locus of control (R=0,634, R^2=0,402, $F_{(6,413)}$=46,202, $p<0,01$). The combination of these three predictor variables explained 40% of total variance related to social appearance anxiety (R^2=0,402). According to standardized regression coefficients (β), predictor variables' order of significance on social appearance anxiety was subjective well-being (β=-0,375), preoccupied attachment style (β=0, 285) and secure attachment style (β=-0,139). When t-test results related to significance of regression coefficients were considered, preoccupied ($p=0,000<0,01$) and secure (p=0,001<0,01) attachment styles and subjective well-being ($p=0,000<0,01$) were significant predictors of social appearance anxiety whereas fearful ($p=0,504>0,01$) and dismissing ($p=0,071>0,01$) attachment styles and locus of control ($p=0,015>0,01$) did not have a significant effect on SAA.With regard to the results of regression analysis, the regression equation was found as follows:

SAA= 48,128 – 0,139*Secure + 0,033*Fearful + 0,285*Preoccupied +

0,085*Dismissing - 0,375*SWB + 0,096*LOC

5.DISCUSSION

5.1. Demographic Variables
Attachment Styles

In the present study, the differences among fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles in terms of gender were not found. These findings are congruent with the results of Yeter (2016)'s and Topkara (2014)'s studies. Yeter (2016) and Topkara (2014) conducted studies with university students and examined the significant differences between attachment styles and gender. They found that university students' fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles did not differ according to their genders. On the other hand, there was a significant difference between gender and secure attachment style in the present study. Male students had more secure attachment scores than female students. This result is consistent with the results of Altundağ (2011)'s, Çelik (2004)'s and Büyükşahin (2001)'s studies in which male undergraduates had higher levels of secure attachment than female ones.

The study results are congruent with the theoretical approach (Baumrind, 1971) which states that parenting styles play a determinant role on the development of secure attachment style in children. Authoritarian parenting style which includes low acceptance and high control over children is negatively correlated with secure attachment style (Doinita & Maria, 2015). In Turkey, parenting style is more authoritarian for the girls than the boys since they perceive that the girls are more susceptible to the threats and danger as they become more independent (Şendil, 2003). Based on this fact, it can be said that in Turkey, the girls have insecure attachments with their parents due to the prevalent parenting attitudes.

According to results of the present study, there were significant differences in fearful and preoccupied attachment styles with regard to department. University students in

life sciences had more fearful attachment styles than university students in social sciences. Besides, students in life sciences reported lower preoccupied attachment style scores than students in social sciences. On the other hand, secure and dismissing attachment styles did not differ in terms of department. When examining the results of Yeter (2016)'s and Topkara (2014)'s studies, they figured out that attachment styles did not differ in terms of students' departments. Unlike the results of present study, they stated that there are no meaningful differences between one's attachment style and his department. It can be claimed that there are inconsistent results regarding this relation and based on one's department, it is risky to understand one's attachment style.

In the present study, there were no significant differences in preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles with regard to age. These results are consistent with results of studies made by Topkara (2014), Dede (2015), Yeter (2016) and Eren (2016) in which they found that individuals' preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles did not vary in terms of their ages. On the other hand, secure and fearful attachment styles differed according to the age variable. 18-20 aged students and 21-22 aged students had lower secure attachment style scores than students older than 23. Additionally, 18-20 aged students had higher levels of fearful attachment style than 21-22 aged students and students older than 23 years old. In other words, over time as students' secure attachment levels increase, their fearful attachment levels decrease.

Connell and Moss (2011) conducted a research to provide a review of study results on the stability of attachment styles. For instance, Zhang and Labouvie-Vief (2004) carried on a study to investigate the stability of attachment styles in 370 individuals. They applied the measure to participants three times over a six-year period. The results of the study revealed variability as well as stability on attachment styles.

According to this result, they examined the factors affecting the change in attachment styles. They stated that life events (e.g. loss of a parent, life threatening illnesses with in the family) and coping strategies related to these life events have a great impact on the variability of attachment styles. For example, integrative coping (e.g. involving in an interaction with the world in a flexible way) and a better state of well-being are influential on changes towards secure attachment. Another factor affecting variability was age. According to the results, older individuals become more securely attached, but less preoccupied than young individuals (cited in Connell & Moss, 2011).

Subjective Well-Being

According to the findings of the study, university students' subjective well-being levels did not differ according to gender. This result is supported by several studies in subjective well-being literature (e.g. Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004; Kartal, 2013; Tatay, 2015; Çağlayan-Tunç, 2015; Bushi, 2016). Tuzgöl-Dost (2004), Çağlayan-Tunç (2015) and Bushi (2016) investigated the university students' subjective well-being levels in terms of gender. They found no significant difference between SWB and gender. Additionally, Kartal (2013) reported no significant difference in secondary school students' subjective well-being levels with regard to their gender. Tatay (2015) studied with adolescents and did not find significant difference between their subjective well-being levels and gender. All these studies (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004; Kartal, 2013; Tatay, 2015; Çağlayan-Tunç, 2015; Bushi, 2016) showed that individuals' subjective well-being levels did not differ in terms of gender. Additionally, Çevik (2010) explored the predictive value of gender on high school students' subjective well-being levels. With reference to the findings of the study, gender was not a pivotal determinant of SWB.

When the culture is taken into consideration, significant differences in subjective well-being levels with regard to gender might be expected. For instance, in our culture being male is more valued than being female. According to this, while males are more advantageous than females, females face with more difficulties than males. This situation may make way for higher levels of subjective well-being in males than females (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004). On the other, as males are more valued than females, their responsibilities towards others (e.g. being head of family) and expectations from them (e.g. putting bread on family table) increases. Thus, the difference between females' and males' SWB levels may vanish (Aztürk, 2013).

In the present study, the difference in university students' subjective well-being levels in terms of department was not ascertained. Results of Erbaş (2012)'s and Bushi (2016)'s studies support this finding. Erbaş (2012) and Bushi (2016) conducted studies with university studens and found no significant differences between subjective well-being and department. On the other hand, Tuzgöl-Dost (2004) found significant differences in students' subjective well-being levels with regard to their faculties. Students in faculty of economics and administrative sciences reported higher levels of subjective well-being than students in faculty of engineering. Students of both faculties had similar conditions such as probability of finding a job, attributed statutes to jobs etc. Thus, Tuzgöl-Dost (2004) stated that faculty variable might influence subjective well-being because of not characteristics of departments but uncontrolled variables.

According to findings of the study, there was no significant difference among students' subjective well-being levels in terms of age. Kermen (2013) and Nur-Şahin (2011) investigated whether there were significant differences between the university students' subjective well-being levels and their ages or not. They found that students'

subjective well-being levels did not differ with regard to their ages. On the other hand, in subjective well-being literature studies in which older individuals reported higher levels of subjective well-being than younger individuals are encountered (e.g. Ryff, 1989; Eryılmaz & Ercan, 2011). Longitudinal studies in subjective well-being research show that as individuals get older, their life satisfaction levels increase and their negative affect scores decrease (Lyubomirsky et al. 2005). According to Telic theories, as people achieve their goals, their happiness levels increases (Diener &Ryan, 2009). This can be an explanation why individuals' subjective well-being levels upswell as they get older (Lyubomirsky et al. 2005). Nur-Şahin (2011)'s, Kermen (2013)'s and the present study conducted with university students. The reason why there is no significant difference in terms of age may be derived from limited age ranges.

Locus of control

In the present study, a significant difference in university students' locus of control levels in terms of gender was found. Female students had higher scores than male students with regard to locus of control. High scores on locus of control scale indicate external locus of control orientation while low scores point internal locus of control orientation (Rotter, 1966). According to this, for the present study, female students were found more external than male students. Kıcır (2010) and Zahidi and Mohsin (2011) examined university students' locus of control orientations in terms of gender. They found that female students had higher locus of control scores than male students. Taş (2011) and Aypay (2009) explored whether there were significant differences between locus of control and gender among teachers or not. The results of their study ascertained that female teachers reported higher levels of locus of control than male teachers. Additionally, Güler (2016) studied with lawyers and found that female

lawyers had higher scores on locus of control than male lawyers. All these studies (Aypay, 2009; Kıcır, 2010; Zahidi & Mohsin, 2011; Taş, 2011; Güler, 2016) showed that females were more externally oriented than males.

Why females show higher levels of locus of control than males can be explained via parenting styles in which they are exposed to in their culture. Knowingly or unknowingly, parents teach their children how to think, behave, feel and perceive by their parenting styles. Parenting styles which have impacts on children's personality developments are associated with children' locus of control orientations. For instance, protective parenting style is related to external locus of control because it may render the child to dependent on others. Additionally, children raised by protective parents expect support from others to achieve their goals and to solve their problems. These characteristics are similar to characteristics of external individuals. Since in our culture, female children are raised with protective parenting style more than male children (Alisinanoğlu, 2003), females are more externally oriented than males.

With reference to findings of study, there were no significant differences in students' locus of control levels in terms of department. This finding is consistent with Yaşar (2006)' study. Yaşar (2006) conducted a study to investigate high school students' locus of control levels. The sample of the study comprised of 363 students from Science High school, Vocational high school and Anatolian high school. Results of the study revealed no significant difference in high school students' locus of control levels with regard to their departments. Moreover, Altın (2010) carried out a study with the aim of exploring university students' locus of control levels with regard to demographic variables. The sample of the study consisted of 450 students in School of Physical Education and Sport. Findings of the study showed that students' locus of levels did not differ according to department.

In the present study, a significant difference in students' locus of control levels in terms of age was found. Older students had lower scores than younger students with regard to locus of control. According to this, for the present study as students got older, their scores on locus of control scale decreased. This result is congruent with several studies (e.g. Taş, 2011; Çevirici, 2014; Demir, 2014; Karakaş, 2015). For instance, Çevirici (2014) examined married couples' locus of control orientations in terms of their age. She found that individuals older than 46 years old had lower locus of control scores than individuals aged between 20 and 25 years. In a similar manner, Demir (2014) explored married couples' locus of control levels according to their ages. The results revealed that individuals older than 53 years old had lower locus of control scores than individuals who were 31-41 years old. Karakaş (2015) investigated the differences in locus of control levels with regard to age among women ranged from 20 to 65 ages. She reported that older women had lower scores than younger women. Taş (2011) conducted a study to examine locus of control levels of teachers. He reported that as teachers' ages increased, their locus of control scores decreased.

With regard to these studies (Taş, 2011; Çevirici, 2014; Demir, 2014; Karakaş, 2015), as individuals' ages increase, they become more internally oriented. It is a fact that as people grow older, they become more knowledgeable, experienced and confident (Knoop, 1981). Thus, one can say that they rely less on generalized expectancies to evaluate their own behaviors, thoughts or feelings. This makes them form an internal disposition toward life.

Social Appearance Anxiety

Findings of the study revealed that there was no significant difference between students' social appearance anxiety levels and gender. Several studies with different age groups (Şahin, 2012; Işıkol-Özge, 2013; Yüceant, 2013; Dinç, 2016; Gül, 2016) in

literature support this finding. For instance, Yüceant (2013) examined university students' social appearance anxiety levels. He reported no significant difference between social appearance anxiety and gender. Dinç (2016) and Gül (2016) explored high school students' social appearance anxiety levels in terms of gender and found no significant differences between them. Şahin (2012) and Işıkol-Özge (2013) studied with secondary school students and obtained akin results. Additionally, Abonoz (2016) obtained the akin finding from adolescents with social physique anxiety scale. According to the results of his study, adolescents' social physique anxiety levels did not differ in terms of their genders. All these studies (Şahin, 2012; Işıkol-Özge, 2013; Yüceant, 2013; Dinç, 2016; Gül, 2016) suggest that males and females have similar levels of social appearance anxiety.

In the present study, a significant difference in university students' social appearance anxiety levels in terms of their departments was not obtained. In a similar way, Yıldırım et al. (2011) explored the social anxiety levels of university students in Education faculty. They found no significant difference in their social anxiety levels regarding to students' departments. On the other hand, Alemdağ (2013) conducted a study to examine prospective teachers' social appearance anxiety levels. Study findings revealed that prospective teachers in sport sciences had lower social appearance anxiety levels than prospective teachers in other departments. Alemdağ (2013) claimed that prospective teachers in sports science were more comfortable with their appearance based on the fact that sports are effective on individuals' confidence levels. But, in the sample of present study, there were no students in sports sciences.

With reference to findings of study, there was no significant difference in university students' social anxiety levels in terms of age. The results of the Dinç (2016)'s and Şahin (2012)'s studies support this result. However, results of the studies that

investigate the relation among age and social appearance anxiety vary. For instance, Yüceant (2013) found that university students' social appearance anxiety levels increase over time. On the other hand, Alemdağ (2013) reported that university students' social appearance anxiety levels decrease over time. Thus, it can be stated that one's social appearance anxiety level is changeable depanding on the context in which he is involved.

5.2.Predictors Social Appearance Anxiety

Prior to regression analysis, in order to assess the correlations among university students' attachment styles (secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing), subjective well-being, locus of control and social appearance anxiety levels, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted. According to the results of Pearson correlation analysis, university students' subjective well-being levels were significantly and positively correlated with secure attachment style whereas they were significantly and negatively correlated with fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles. This result is supported by Özer (2009)'s study. Özer (2009) investigated the relations between university students' attachment styles and subjective well-being levels. The results revealed a positive significant correlation between secure attachment style and subjective well-being whereas it revealed negative significant correlations between insecure attachment styles (fearful, preoccupied and dismissing) and subjective well-being.

Since life satisfaction is a sub dimension of subjective well-being (Diener et al. (1999), it can be said that the present study is supported by Başer-Şeker (2009)'s and Karreman and Vingerhoets (2012)'s studies in which life satisfaction and attachment styles are examined. Başer-Şeker (2009) and Karreman and Vingerhoets (2012) carried on studies to investigate the relations between life satisfaction and attachment

styles. Başer-Şeker (2009) studied with 634 high school students while Karreman and Vingerhoets (2012) studied with 632 individuals. The results of these studies revealed that subjective well-being was significantly and positively correlated with secure attachment style whereas it was significantly and negatively correlated with preoccupied and fearful attachment styles. When life satisfaction was considered as a subdimension of subjective well-being, Özer (2009)'s, Başer-Şeker (2009)' and Karreman and Vingerhoets (2012)' studies showed that while subjective well-being is positively correlated with secure attachment style, it is negatively correlated with unsecure attachment styles (fearful, preoccupied and dismissing).

Kankaton (2008) examined the relation between university students' attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance) and their levels in subjective well-being components (life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect). With reference to the results of the study revealed that life satisfaction was both negatively correlated with anxiety and avoidance dimensions, however the correlations among them were not significant. Positive affect was significantly and negatively correlated with only avoidance dimension. On the other hand, negative affect was both positively and significantly correlated with anxiety and avoidance dimensions.

According to Brenann et al., (1998), there are two dimensions of attachment: anxiety and avoidance. Anxiety dimension is described as the extent to which people experience fear of rejection and abandonment and need excessive social support and proximity. Avoidance dimension is defined as the extent to which people have low self-esteem to search for social support and prefer limited intimacy. Low levels in anxiety and avoidance dimensions refer to secure attachment, high levels in these dimensions indicate insecure attachment (Brennan et al., 1998; Sümer, 2006, Kırımer, Akça & Sümer, 2014). Additionally, high levels of subjective well-being indicate low

levels of negative affect and high levels of both positive affect and satisfaction with life (Diener et al. 1999). With this respect, results of Kankaton (2008)'s study supported the results of present study.

As it is seen in the studies, individuals' subjective well-being levels are influenced by their adult attachment styles (Karreman & Vingerhoets, 2012; Li & Fung, 2014). The self-model which refers to the beliefs associated to one's lovability and the others-model which refers to the beliefs related to accessibility of others contribute to individuals' subjective well-being levels (Li & Fung, 2014). To illustrate, securely attached people have more positive feelings than insecurely attached people with regard to their positive conceptions about themselves and others. On the other hand, insecurely attached people with either one of negative self model and others model or both experience less positive feelings than securely attached ones based on their doubts about themselves' lovability or accessibility of others when needed (Collins & Read, 1990).

With regard to Bartholomew (1990)'s approach in attachment theory, one can say that individuals with secure attachment style exhibit high levels of subjective well-being since they perceive themselves as worthy to love and others as supportive when they are needed. In spite of securely attached people, individuals with insecure attachment styles (fearful, preoccupied and dismissing) may demonstrate low levels of subjective well-being with regard to different reasons. For people with preoccupied attachment style (negative on self model), it may cause from their feelings of unworthiness. For people with dismissing attachment style (negative on other model), it may drive from their fear of rejection and abandonment. For people with fearful attachment style (negative on self model and other model) it may arise from their feelings of unworthiness and unreliableness of others.

Another finding of the study was that locus of control was significantly and negatively correlated with secure attachment style whereas it was significantly and positively correlated with fearful, dismissing and preoccupied attachment styles. In locus of control scale, high scores indicate external locus of control while low scores point internal locus of control. In the light of this information, secure attachment style is associated with internal locus of control whereas unsecure attachment styles are related to external locus of control. This result is supported by some studies in literature (e.g. Demirkan, 2006; Dilmaç, Hamarta & Arslan, 2009; Hazrati & Parvin, 2015).

Demirkan (2006) investigated the relations between individuals' attachment styles and locus of control (LOC). The results of the study revealed that LOC was significantly and negatively correlated with secure attachment style whereas it was significantly and positively correlated with fearful attachment style. There were no significant correlations between preoccupied and dismissing attachments styles and LOC. Dilmaç, Hamarta and Arslan (2009) explored the relations between university students' locus of control orientations and their attachment dimensions (anxiety and avoidance). With reference to the results of study, LOC was positively and significantly correlated with both of attachment dimensions. Increasing in levels of these attachment dimensions refer to insecure attachment styles and increasing scores in locus of control indicate external locus of control. Thus, this result can be interpreted as external locus of control positively correlated with unsecure attachment styles which is supported by the result of present study.

Hazrati and Parvin (2015) examined whether there is a relation between secondary school students' attachment styles (secure, anxious and avoidant) and their locus of control orientations. Findings of the study demonstrated that locus of control was

significantly and positively correlated with anxious and avoidant attachment styles while it was not significantly correlated with secure attachment style. Collaterally, Hejazi and Kia (2015) investigated associations between these variables in divorcing and non-divorcing couples. They found that avoidant attachment style was not significantly correlated with LOC in both groups (divorcing-non-divorcing). On the hand, secure attachment style was significantly and positively correlated with LOC in non-divorcing couples and not in divorcing couples. For ambivalent attachment, there was a positive significant correlation with LOC in non-divorcing couples whereas there was no significant correlation in divorcing couples.

In general, internal locus of control is associated with secure attachment style (Jankowska et al. 2015; Hejazi & Kia, 2015) whilst external locus of control is related to fearful attachment style (Demirkan, 2006). Responsibility of events is attributed to external forces by externally oriented people whereas it is attributed to individuals' themselves by internally oriented people (Rotter, 1966). In other words, the distinction between externals and internals is the belief that whether they have control over life events or not (Marsh and Weary, 1995). According to Solmuş (2004), internals are more confident, active and effective than externals. Additionally, they are more resistant to negative external forces and addicted to their independency than external ones.

With regard to Bartholomew (1990)'s approach in attachment theory, one can say that since securely attached people (positive on both the self-model and the other model) repose confidence in themselves and others, they also believe in themselves to take control over events. Thus, they may demonstrate internal locus of control orientation. People with preoccupied attachment style have low self-esteem and high dependence on others' approval with regard to their negative self -model and positive others

model. Besides people with dismissing attachment style are afraid of rejection and abandonment due to their positive self- model and negative others model. Even though people with fearful attachment (negative on self-model and others model) need extremely others' approvals, yet they avoid intimacy because of their fear of rejection. It can be stated that when all these facts related to unsecure attachment styles are taken into consideration, they may not be adequately confident to take responsibility of events in their lives and may prefer to attribute the responsibility to external forces. That might be why they exhibit external locus of control orientation.

Another finding of the study was that locus of control was negatively correlated with subjective well-being. In other words, internals reported higher levels of subjective well-being than externals. This result is supported by several studies (e.g. Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004; Cenkseven, 2004; Tülek, 2011; Dave, Tripathi, Singh & Udainiya, 2011; Stocks, April & Lynton, 2012).

Tuzgöl-Dost (2004) investigated whether there is a significant difference in university students' subjective well-being levels in terms of locus of control orientation. The result revealed a significant difference between these two variables. Internal students' mean scores in subjective well-being scale were higher than external ones. Similarly, Cenkseven (2004) explored the differences of university students in terms of subjective well-being components (pleasant affect, unpleasant affect and life satisfaction) with regard to locus of control. According to results of the study, pleasant affect, unpleasant affect and life satisfaction scores differed significantly with regard to locus of control. Internals had higher pleasant affect and life satisfaction scores and lower negative affect scores than externals.

Stocks, April and Lynton (2012) explored the association between locus of control and subjective well-being in China and South-Africa. Even though the correlation

between locus of control and subjective well-being was not significant in Southern-Africa, it was significant and negative in China. Dave, Tripathi, Singh and Udainiya (2011) examined the relations between university students' levels of locus of control and subjective well-being. Subjective well-being was negatively and significantly correlated with locus of control. Seyhan (2013) carried out a study with the aim of assessing association between locus of control and psychological well-being among university students. Locus of control was negatively correlated with psychological well-being. Additionally, Tülek (2011) conducted a study with married couples to assess the predictive role of locus of control on subjective well-being (SWB). She found a significant and negative relation between them. According to results of regression analysis, LOC was a pivotal determinant of SWB and it contributed to 1,8% of total variance related to SWB.

In general, studies discussed above (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004; Cenkseven, 2004; Tülek, 2011; Dave, Tripathi, Singh & Udainiya, 2011; Stocks, April & Lynton, 2012) showed that internally oriented people had higher levels of SWB than externally oriented people. According to Solmuş (2004), an important difference between internal and external locus of control is the attributions they make related to success and failure. Internals take responsibility of events and believe that they are the reason of why they succeed or fail. However, externals attribute the success and failures to external forces. They do not generally take responsibility for their behaviors and they have a great tendency to blame others. With regard to these, it is expected that internals attribute their happiness to internal forces and externals attribute their happiness to external forces (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004).

In the light of this expectation, one can say that when externals believe that their happiness is controlled by external forces like luck, faith etc. This idea make them feel

anxious, which result in low levels of subjective well-being. On the other hand, even if internals face with obstacles in their lives, they may stand against the negative effects of these obstacles since they prefer looking for a solution to these problems and dealing with them profoundly rather than just complaining about them. Thus, their subjective well-being levels remain high.

As a main purpose, to assess the predictive roles of university students' secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment styles, subjective well-being (SWB) and locus of control (LOC) levels on their social appearance anxiety (SAA) levels, multiple regression analysis was conducted. According to the results of regression analysis, all these predictor variables predicted 40% of total variance related to students' social appearance anxiety levels. When t-test results related to significance of regression coefficients are considered, preoccupied and secure attachment styles and subjective well-being were significant predictors of social appearance anxiety whereas fearful and dismissing attachment styles and locus of control did not have a significant effect on SAA. According to standardized regression coefficients, predictor variables' order of significance on social appearance anxiety was subjective well-being, preoccupied attachment style and secure attachment style.

With reference to regression analysis, subjective well-being was the variable which had the highest correlation with social appearance anxiety and there was a significant negative correlation between them. This finding is also supported by Seki and Dilmaç (2015)'s study. They explored the relation between high school students' subjective well-being levels and social appearance anxiety levels. According to the results of the study, there was a negative correlation between them. In other words, as high school students' social appearance anxiety levels increase, their subjective well-being levels decrease. In the same manner, Tuzgöl-Dost (2004) investigated whether there is a

significant difference in university students' subjective well-being levels in terms of satisfaction with appearance. The results revealed a significant difference between them. With reference to the result, university students who were satisfied with their appearances had higher subjective well-being levels than students who were unsatisfied with their appearances. These results support the result of present study.

Öztürk and Mutlu (2010) carried out a study to investigate the relation between university students' levels of social anxiety and subjective well-being. The results of the study showed that subjective well-being was negatively correlated with both social anxiety and interaction anxiety. Queen and Freitag (1978) explored the association between individuals' levels of social anxiety and life satisfaction. The results revealed that there was a negative correlation between them. Fitria, Khan and Almigo (2013) carried out a study to explore the effects of life satisfaction on social anxiety among international university students of Sultan Idris Education University. According to the findings of multiple regression analysis, life satisfaction was negatively correlated with social anxiety and it made 6,1% contribution to predict of social anxiety. All these studies mentioned above are in line with the results of present study.

Oktan (2012) conducted a study with the aim of designating predictive power of body image and rejection sensitivity on subjective well-being among university students. Low scores on body image scale indicate positive body image whereas high scores point negative body image. Rejection sensitivity was positively correlated with body image whereas it was negatively correlated with subjective well-being. And also, body image was negatively correlated with subjective well-being. With regard to the findings of regression analysis, the combination of rejection sensitivity and body perception predicted 23% of total variance related to subjective well-being.

Since life satisfaction is a component of subjective well-being Diener et al. (1999), all these studies (Seki & Dilmaç, 2015; Tuzgöl-Dost, 2004; Öztürk & Mutlu, 2010; Queen & Freitag, 1978; Fitria, 2013) revealed that as individuals' social anxiety levels increase, their subjective well-being levels decrease. This inference is consistent with the result of this study which is as university students' social appearance anxiety levels' increase, their subjective well-being levels decline. Similar results support Hart et al. (2008)'s claim that social appearance anxiety is a specific type of social anxiety. According to Maricic and Stambuk (2015), social anxiety and subjective well-being are associated with each other. Subjective well-being comprises of three components: a) life satisfaction which includes desire to change life, satisfaction with current life, past and future, significant others' views of one's life b) Pleasant affect encompasses positive feelings such as happiness, affection, elation etc. c) unpleasant affect contains negative feelings like anger, guilt, social anxiety, worry etc. (Diener et al. 1999).

With this respect, since social anxiety is an unpleasant affect, higher levels of social anxiety result in higher levels of unpleasant affect. Since unpleasant affect is negatively correlated with subjective well-being, one can say that higher levels of social anxiety lay open a road to lower levels of subjective well-being.

The other significant predictors of social appearance anxiety were secure attachment style and preoccupied attachment style. Social appearance anxiety was significantly and negatively correlated with secure attachment style while it was significantly and positively correlated with preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment styles. However, fearful and dismissing attachment styles did not predict social appearance anxiety due to their low correlations. These findings are consistent with the results of several studies in literature (e.g. Erozkan, 2009; Kaya, 2010; Türe, 2013).

Türe (2013) and Ayberk (2011) explored the associations between social anxiety and attachment styles among university students. Results of the studies revealed that dismissing, preoccupied and fearful attachment styles were positively correlated with social anxiety. However, in Türe (2013)'s study, social anxiety was negatively correlated with secure attachment style while in Ayberk (2011)'s study, it was positively correlated with the same variable. Öztürk and Mutlu (2010) examined whether there were significant relations between university students' attachment styles and their social anxiety levels or not. Results laid bare that while there was no significant relation between secure attachment style and social anxiety, there were significant and positive correlation between unsecure attachment styles (fearful, dismissing and preoccupied) and social anxiety. Kaya (2010) investigated the relations between secondary school students' attachment styles and their social anxiety levels. The findings showed that social anxiety was positively correlated with anxious/ambivalent and avoidant attachment styles.

Erozkan (2009) explored the predictive values of attachment styles on social anxiety among university students. According to the results of the study, while social anxiety was positively correlated with secure attachment style, it was negatively correlated with fearful, dismissing and preoccupied attachment styles. The results of regression analysis revealed that all attachment styles were significant predictors of social anxiety. They contributed the 12% of total variance related to social anxiety. Collaterally, Ceylan (2011) investigated whether attachment styles are predictors of social anxiety among university students. She found that only fearful attachment style was a significant predictor of social anxiety and it contributed 6% of total variance associated to social anxiety.

According to Hart et al. (2008), both social anxiety and social appearance anxiety encompass fear of negative evaluation. However, while social anxiety is related to general fears of being negatively evaluated, social appearance anxiety is more about the fears related to negative evaluation of one's appearance. Therefore, social appearance anxiety is a specific type of social anxiety. With reference to attachment theory, the reasons why individuals experience social anxiety are rooted in the attachment between the caregiver and the baby. If the child develops negative self-model and others model, he experiences anxiety (Bowlby, 1973/1980). The term anxiety in attachment theory is more likely to be social anxiety since the self-model is associated with the dependency on others' approval (Vertue, 2003). Securely attached individuals (positive on both the self-model and others model) have positive believes about others such as providing support and trust, and have a positive self-esteem as worthy of love and attention (Bartholomew, 1990). On the other hand, even though fearfully attached individuals (negative on both the self and the others models) are highly reliant on others for the affirmation of their self-concept as worthy, on the grounds of their negative evaluations of others they refuse proximity to refrain from the pain of potential loss (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). People with preoccupied attachment style (negative on self model and positive on others model) develop a dependency on other's approval and deep-rooted feeling of unworthiness (Bartholomew, 1990). People with dismissing attachment style (positive on self model and negative on others model) abstain from proximity with others due to their negative expectations, they sustain their positive self-concept as a high sense of self-worth by assertively disclaiming the value of closeness and emphasizing the significance of independence (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994).

With regard to Bartholomew (1990)'s approach in attachment theory, one can say that securely attached people experience less social anxiety than insecurely attached ones since they are confident about themselves and perceive others as supportive and accessible when they needed. On the other hand, people with unsecure attachment styles may experience social anxiety more than securely attached ones because they either have one of negative self-model and others model or both negative self and others models. Among the unsecure attachment styles, preoccupied attachment style may be more prone to social anxiety than other ones since it is the combination of positive self and negative others. Individuals with preoccupied attachment style are excessively dependent on others' approvals.

Another variable whose predictor value on social appearance anxiety was investigated in the study was locus of control. Even though there was a significant correlation between them, locus of control was not a significant predictor of social appearance anxiety with regard to low positive correlation.

Spokas and Heimbergs (2009) investigated the social interaction anxiety levels of university students in terms of locus of control. They used multidimensional locus of control scale with three subscales (internal, external chance and external powerful others). However since internal consistency for internal locus of control subscale was low, they reported the results for external locus of control subscales. They found positive low correlations between external locus of control subscales and social interaction anxiety. Since social appearance anxiety is a specific type of social anxiety (hart et al.), Spokas and Heimbergs (2009)' study results can be considered as a support for presents study. Other than this, studies related to social anxiety and locus of control were not encountered. However, there were studies in which the relation

between locus of control and anxiety was investigated (Akbalık, 2005; Arslan, Dilmaç & Hamarta, 2009; Kıcır, 2010; Talaslıoğlu, 201).

Talaslıoğlu (2011) explored the relation between individuals' locus of control orientation and their anxiety levels. She discussed the results in terms of anxiety dimensions: state anxiety and trait anxiety. She found external oriented people experience both state and trait anxiety than internal oriented individuals. In the same manner, Akbalık (2005) investigated the associations between university students' anxiety levels and their locus of control orientations. According to results of the study, external students reported higher levels of anxiety than internal students. Kıcır (2010) examined the relation between university students' levels of anxiety and locus of control. With reference the results, there was a positive correlation between locus of control and anxiety.

Arslan, Dilmaç and Hamarta (2009) conducted a study to investigate whether trait anxiety and coping with stress (avoidance, problem focused and seeking social support) differ with regard to university students' locus of control orientations. They found there was a significant difference in trait anxiety and problem focus sub dimension with regard to locus of control. Students with external locus of control had higher levels of trait anxiety than students with internal locus of control. Additionally, internal students had problem focused coping with stress scores than external ones. All these studies (Akbalık, 2005; Arslan, Dilmaç & Hamarta, 2009; Kıcır, 2010; Talaslıoğlu, 201) revealed that externals had higher levels of anxiety than internals.

Individuals with external locus of control and internal locus of control differ in terms of their beliefs regarding their controllability on events, situations etc. around them. While internals consider the results of events as dependent to their own behaviors,

externals believe they are dependent on external forces such as faith, luck etc. (Marsh & Weary, 1995). Since externals believe they have no control over events, they experience anxiety and depression more than internal ones (Schultz & Schultz, 2001). All the studies discussed above support this claim. Moreover, externals have lower levels of self-esteem than internals ones with regard to their control beliefs (Saadat et al. 2011). Since self-esteem is important to feel confident in social contexts, externally oriented people with low self-esteem experience social anxiety more than individuals with internal locus of control. One of the explanations of this situation is that externals are more afraid of social situations because social contexts enhance their feelings of impotence (Geist & Borecki, 1982).

With this respect, since externally oriented people have low levels of self-confidence due to their belief that they do not have any control over events, they may become more vulnerable to social demands such as beauty, physical attractiveness etc. They may not find strength to resist the others' demands because of their low confidence levels. Thus, one can say that their weaknesses towards social demands may lay open a road to high levels of social appearance anxiety.

REFERENCES

Abanoz, Ö. (2016). *Egzersiz yapan adolesanların sosyal fizik kaygı durumlarının incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun.

Ainsworth, M. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the Strange Situation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, Self- Efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned Behavior1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *32*(4), 665-683.

Alemdağ, S. (2013). *Öğretmen adaylarında fiziksel aktiviteye katılım, sosyal görünüş kaygısı ve sosyal öz -yeterlik ilişkisinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Karadeniz Teknik University, Trabzon.

Kartal, A. M. (2013). *Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin bazı değişkenlere göre öznel iyi oluş ve iletişim beceri düzeyleri.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ondokuzmayıs University, Samsun.

Alisinanoğlu, F. (2003). Çocukların denetim odağı ile algıladıkları anne tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *1*(1), 97-108.

Alpars, G. (2007). *Düşünme eğitimi programının çocukların denetim odağı algılarına etkisinin ðncelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Selçuk University, Konya.

Altın, A. (2010). *Öğretmen adaylarının algılarına göre sınıf yönetim biçemleri ve denetim odakları.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Selçuk University, Konya.

Altundağ, G. (2011). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde bağlanma stilleri, stresle başa çıkma tutumları ve stresi algılama düzeyinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Haliç University, İstanbul.

Altun-Dinç, M. (2016). *Lise öğrencilerinin sosyal görünüş kaygıları.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun.

Amani, R. (2016). Mother-infant attachment styles as a predictor of aggression. *Journal of Midwifery and Reproductive Health*, *4*(1), 506-512.

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Cautionary statement for forensic use of *DSM-5.* In *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC.

Angelova, N. V. (2016). Locus of Control and Its Relationship With Some Social-Demographic Factors. *Psychological Thought*, *9*(2), 248-258.

Archer, R. P. (1980). Generalized expectancies of control, trait anxiety, and psychopathology among psychiatric inpatients. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *48*(6), 736.

Arslan, C., Dilmaç, B., & Hamarta, E. (2009). Coping with stress and trait anxiety in terms of locus of control: A study with Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *37*(6), 791-800.

Arslangiray, N. (2013). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde beden imajının yordayıcıları olarak bağlanma stilleri ve toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Ashby, J. S., Kottman, T., & Draper, K. (2002). Social interest and locus of control: Relationships and implications. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, *58*(1), 52-61.

Aslan, H. (2006). *Çalışanların iş doyumu düzeylerine göre depresyon, benlik saygısı ve denetim odağı algısı değişkenlerinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ankara University, Ankara.

Ayberk, A. (2011). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin bağlanma stilleri ve sosyal kaygı düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Muğla University, Muğla.

Aytan, M. E. (2010). *Obsesif kompulsif bozukluklarda denetim odağı ve benlik saygısı arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Maltepe University, İstanbul.

Backenstrass, M., Schwarz, T., Fiedler, P., Joest, K., Reck, C., Mundt, C., & Kronmueller, K. T. (2006). Negative mood regulation expectancies, self-efficacy beliefs, and locus of control orientation: moderators or mediators of change in the treatment of depression?. *Psychotherapy Research*, *16*(02), 250-258.

Barnum, E. L., & Perrone-McGovern, K. M. (2017). Attachment, self-esteem and subjective well-being among survivors of childhood sexual trauma. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, *39*(1), 39-55.

Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal relationships*, *7*(2), 147-178.

Basat, Ç. (2004). *An exploration of marital satisfaction, locus of control and self – esteem as predictors of sexual satisfaction.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Basim, H. N., & Şeşen, H. (2006). Kontrol odağının çalışanların nezaket ve yardım etme davranışlarına etkisi: kamu sektöründe bir araştırma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (16), 159-168.

Başal, H. A., & Dönmez, A. (1984). Çevre Büyüklüğü ve 10-12 Yaş İlkokul Çocuklarında Denetim Odağı. *Eğitim Ve Bilim*, *9*(49).

Bernardi, R. A. (2001). A theoretical model for the relationship among stress, locus of control and longevity. *Business Forum*, 26, 27-33.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss, Vol. 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss, Vol. 2: Separation* anxiety and anger. New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss, Vol. 3: Loss sadness and depression*. New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (2007). Babies and toddlers in non-parental daycare can avoid stress and anxiety if they develop a lasting secondary attachment bond with one carer who is consistently accessible to them. *Attachment & Human Development*, 9: 307–319.

Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult romantic attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson ve W. S. Rholes, (Eds.), Attachment theory and close relationships , (pp. 46-76). New York: The Guilford Press.

Brickman, P., Coates, D., & Janoff-Bulman, R. (1978). Lottery winners and accident victims: Is happiness relative*? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 917–927.

Buluş, M. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarında bireysel farklılıklar perspektifinden amaç yönelimleri, denetim odağı ve akademik başarı. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, *11*(2), 529-546.

Bush, G. (2006). Learning about learning: from theories to trends. *Teacher Librarian*, *34*(2), 14-18.

Bushi, B. (2016*). Üniversite öğrencilerinde yeme tutumu, anksiyete ve öznel iyi oluş düzeylerinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Beykent University, İstanbul.

Büyükaşık-Çolak, C. (2010). *Associations Of Psychological Problems With Parental Acceptance-Rejection, Social Support, And Locus Of Control: A Study Conducted With Adolescents.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2013). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. (18. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F., (2015). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (19. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Büyükşahin, A. (2001*). Yakın İlişki Kuran ve Kurmayan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Çeşitli Sosyal Psikolojik Etkenler Yönünden Karşılaştırılması*. Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Ankara University, Ankara.

Campos, J. J., Barrett, K. C., Lamb, M. E., Goldsmith, H. H. & Stenberg, C. (1984). *Handbook of child psychology.* New York: Wiley.

Canbay, S. (2007). *İlköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin iş doyumu ve denetim odağı ilişkisi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.

Cantor, N., & Sanderson, C. A. (1999). 12 Life Task Participation and Well-Being: The Importance of Taking Part in Daily Life. In D. Kahneman, E.Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), Well-being: Foundations of hedonic psychology (pp.230-243). Russell Sage Foundation.

Cash, T. F., & Fleming, E. C. (2002). The impact of body image experiences: development of the body image quality of life inventory. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *31*(4), 455-460.

Cash, T. F. (2004). Body image: Past, present, and future. *Body image*, *1*(1), 1-5.

Ceylan, H. (2011). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal kaygı düzeylerinin yordanması.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ege University, İzmir.

Chakarvarti, D., & Lal, M. (2016). Emotional Intelligence and Its Association with Social Physique Anxiety and Performance among Sprinters. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *8*(2), 71-78.

Chekola, M. G. (1974). *The concept of happiness*. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan.

Claes, L., Hart, T. A., Smits, D., Van den Eynde, F., Mueller, A., & Mitchell, J. E. (2012). Validation of the social appearance anxiety scale in female eating disorder patients. *European Eating Disorders Review*, *20*(5), 406-409.

Clark, D. M. & Wells, A. (1995). A cognitive model of social phobia. In R. Heimberg, M.Liebowitz, D.A.Hope & F.R.Schneier (Eds.), Social phobia: Diagnosis, assessment and treatment. (pp. 69–93). New York: Guilford Press.

Clark, D. A., & Beck, A. T. (2011). *Cognitive therapy of anxiety disorders: Science and practice*. Guilford Press.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*(4), 644-663.

Cooper, M. L., Shaver, P. R., & Collins, N. L. (1998). Attachment styles, emotion regulation, and adjustment in adolescence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*(5), 1380-1397.

Corcoran, K., Crusius, J., & Mussweiler, T. (2011). Social Comparison: Motives, Standards, and Mechanisms. In D. Chadee (Ed.), Theories in Social Psychology (pp. 119-139). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). If we are so rich, why aren't we happy? *American Psychologist*, *54*(10), 821-827.

Cüceloğlu, D. (1996). *İnsan ve Davranışı*, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul.

Çağlayan – Tunç, A. (2015*). Sporun üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal kaygı ve öznel iyi oluş düzeylerine etkisi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Selçuk University, Konya.

Çelik, E. (2009*). Evli öğretmenlerin bağlanma stili, denetim odağı ve bazı nitelikleri açısından evlilik uyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi,* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Çelik, Ş. (2004). *Bağlantı Yönelimli Psikoeğitim Grup Programının Saplantılı Bağlanma Biçimine Sahip Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Bağlanma Biçimleri Üzerindeki Etkisi.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Orta Doğu Teknik University, Ankara.

Çevik, N. (2010). *Lise öğrencilerinin öznel iyi oluşlarını yordayan bazı değişiklikler.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Gazi University, Ankara.

Çevirici, İ. (2014). *Evli bireylerin sosyotropik-otonomik kişilik özellikleri ile iç-dış kontrol odağı arasındaki ilişkinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Hasan Kalyoncu University, Gaziantep.

Çınar, H. ve Keskin, N., (2015). Öğrencilerin Sosyal Görünüş Kaygısının Öğrenim Yeri Tercihlerine Etkisi, *Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges* 14.Bürokon Özel Sayısı.

Dağ, İ. (1990). *Kontrol Odağı, Stresle Başa Çıkma Stratejileri Ve Psikolojik Belirti Gösterme İlişkileri.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Dave, R., Tripathi, K. N., Singh, P., & Udainiya, R. (2011). Subjective Well-being, Locus of Control and General Self-Efficacy among University Students. *Amity Journal of Applied Psychology*, *2*(1), 28-32.

Dede, F. (2015). *Lise öğrencilerinin çatışma çözme yaklaşımlarının bağlanma stilleri ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Çukurova University, Adana.

Demir, E. (2014). *Farklı denetim odağına sahip evli bireylerin evlilik doyumunun incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Gazi University, Ankara.

Demir. B.D.(2006*). Liseye devam eden kız öğrencilerin beslenme alışkanlıkları ve beden algısını etkileyen etmenler.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ankara, Hacettepe University, Ankara ,

Demirkan, S. (2006). *Özel sektördeki yöneticilerin ve çalışanların bağlanma stilleri, kontrol odağı, iş doyumu ve beş faktör kişilik özelliklerinin araştırılması.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Ankara University, Ankara.

Demirkol, İ. (2006). *Avukatlarda iş doyumu, tükenmişlik ve denetim odağının bazı değişkenler bağlamında incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Mersin University, Mersin.

Devellis, R. F., Devellis, B. M., Blanchard, L. W., Kulotz, M. L., Luchok, K., & Voyce, C. (1993). Development and Validation of The Parent Health Locus of Control Scales. *Health Education Quarterly*, 20(2): 211-225.

Dibekoğlu, Z. (2006). *Okul yöneticilerinin denetim odaklarına göre tükenmişlik düzeyleri (Sakarya İli Örneği).* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Sakarya University, Sakarya.

Diener, E., & Suh, E. (1997). Measuring quality of life: Economic, social, and subjective indicators. *Social Indicators Research*, *40*(1), 189-216.

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, *125*(2), 276-302.

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*(1), 403-425.

Diener, E. Lucas, R. E.& Shigeburo, O. (2005) *Oxford Handbook of positive psychology*. In C. R. Snyder, Shone J. Lopez. Oxford University Press.

Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Scollon, C. N. (2006). Beyond the hedonic treadmill: revising the adaptation theory of well-being. *American Psychologist*, *61*(4), 305-314.

Diener, E. & Ryan, K. (2009). Subjective Well-Being: A General Overview. *South African Journal of Psychology*. 39(4). 391-406.

Diener, E., & Tov, W. (2012). National accounts of well-being. In K. C. Land, A. C. Michalos, & M. J. Sirgy (Eds.), Handbook of social indicators and quality of life research (pp. 137-156). New York, NY: Springer.

Dodge, R., Daly, A. P., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. D. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *2*(3), 222-235.

Doğan, T. (2009). *Bilişsel ve Kendini Değerlendirme Süreçlerinin Sosyal Anksiyete Açısından Incelenmesi.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Sakarya University, Sakarya.

Doğan, T. (2010). Sosyal Görünüş Kaygısı Ölçeği'nin (SGKÖ) Türkçe uyarlaması: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *39*(39), 151-159.

Doğan, T., Sapmaz, F., & Totan, T. (2011). Adaptation of the body image coping strategies inventory to Turkish: A validity and reliability study. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*, *12*(2), 121-129.

Doherty, W. J. (1981). Locus of control differences and marital dissatisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 369-377.

Doinita, N. E., & Maria, N. D. (2015). Attachment and Parenting Styles. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *203*, 199-204.

Dönmez, A. (1983). Denetim odağı ve çevre büyüklüğü. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, *16*(1), 37-47.

Dönmez, A. (1985). Denetim Odağı. Kendine Saygı ve Üç Değişken:«Çevre Büyüklüğü, Yaş, Aile Ortamı». *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *10*(55), 4-15.

Durayappah, A. (2011). The 3P model: A general theory of subjective well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *12*(4), 681-716.

Erbaş, M. M. (2012). *Öğretmen adaylarının mükemmeliyetçilik düzeylerinin red duyarlılığı ve öznel iyi oluş düzeylerine göre incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ondokuzmayıs University, Samsun.

Eren, N. (2016). *Yetişkinlerin bağlanma stillerine göre bireylerin öfkeyi ifade etme tarzları, kendilik algısı ve sosyal problem çözme becerisi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Beykent University, İstanbul.

Eroğlu, A. (2012). *Denetim odağının 15-18 yaş arasısporcu öğrencilerde farklı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Aksaray University, Aksaray.

Erozkan, A. (2009). The relationship between attachment styles and social anxiety: An investigation with Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *37*(6), 835-844.

Eryılmaz, A. (2011). Ergen Öznel İyi Oluşu ile Olumlu Gelecek Beklentisi Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, *Düşünen Adam Psikiyatri ve Nörolojik Bilimler Dergisi*, 24 (3): 209-215.

Eryılmaz, A., & Ercan, L. (2011). Öznel iyi oluşun cinsiyet, yaş grupları ve kişilik özellikleri açısından incelenmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, *4*(36), 139-149.

Fidan, N. (1986). *Okulda öğrenme ve öğretme*. Gül Yayınevi.

Fitria, I., Khan, S. U. R., & Almigo, N. (2013). *Life satisfaction and social anxiety among international university students.* Paper presented in Proceeding of the International Conference on Social Science Research (4-5 June, Penang, Malezya, p. 1606-1616).

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, *7*(2), 117-140.

Fleming, T. (2008). A Secure base for adult learning: attachment theory and adult education. *Adult Learner: The Irish Journal of Adult and Community Education, 33*, 53.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., and Hallett, C. J. (1995). Perfectionism and job stress in teachers. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 11, 32 42.

Furnham, A. (1986). Economic Locus of Control. *Human Relations, 39,* 29-43.

Geist, C. R., & Borecki, S. (1982). Social avoidance and distress as a predictor of perceived locus of control and level of self- esteem. *Journal of clinical psychology*, *38*(3), 611-613.

Green, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2000). Attachment and exploration in adults: Chronic and contextual accessibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*(4), 452-461.

Griffin, D. W., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Models of the self and other: Fundamental dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *67*(3), 430-445.

Grogan, S. (1999). *Body image: understanding body dissaticfaction in men, women, and children.*NewYork, NY: Routledge.

Gutierrez, J. L. G., Jimenez, B. M., Hernandez, E. G., & Puente, C. (2005). Personality and subjective well-being: Big five correlates and demographic variables. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38*(7), 1561-1569.

Gül, E. (2016). *Ergenlerde sosyal görünüş kaygısı ve sosyal karşılaştırmanın fonksiyonel olmayan tutum ve bilişsel çarpıtmalarla ilişkisi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Üsküdar University, İstanbul.

Güler, B. K. (2016). *Avukatlarda bazı demografik değişkenlerin tükenmişlik, denetim odağı ve iş doyumu üzerindeki etkisi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Beykent University, İstanbul.

Güler, K. (2015). *Beden imajının üniversite öğrencilerinde yaşam doyumu ve umutsuzluk üzerine etkisi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Beykent University, İstanbul.

Güvenç, E. (2009). *Öğretmen adaylarının algılarına göre sınıf yönetim biçemleri ve denetim odakları.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale.

Haikal, M., & Hong, R. Y. (2010). The effects of social evaluation and looming threat on self-attentional biases and social anxiety. *Journal of anxiety disorders*, *24*(3), 345-352.

Hamarta, E. (2004). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin yakın ilişkilerindeki bazı değişkenlerin (benlik saygısı, depresyon ve saplantılı düşünme) bağlanma stilleri açısından irdelenmesi.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Selçuk University, Konya.

Hart, E. A., Leary, M. R., & Rejeski, W. J. (1989). Tie Measurement of Social Physique Anxiety. *Journal of Sport and exercise Psychology*, *11*(1), 94-104.

Hart, T. A., Flora, D. B., Palyo, S. A., Fresco, D. M., Holle, C., & Heimberg, R. G. (2008). Development and examination of the social appearance anxiety scale. *Assessment*, *15*(1), 48-59.

Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1986). Measuring passionate love in intimate relationships. *Journal of Adolescence*, *9*(4), 383-410.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (3), 511-524

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P.R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5(1), 1-22.

Hazrati, M., & Parvin, N. (2015). Relationship of Attachment Styles and Locus of Control among Third Year Girls of Secondary School. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology* 2, 2(4).

Healey, J. (2014). *Positive body image*. The Spinney pres.

Hejazi, M., & Kia, E. (2015). The relationship between attachment styles and emotional ıntelligence and locus of control in couples applied for divorce compared with that of nondivorcing couples. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *5*(7), 156-170.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological review*, *94*(3), 319-340.

Hill, D. J. & Bale, R. M. (1980). Development of the mental health Locus of Control and mental health locus of origin scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 44,* 148-156.

Hindy, C. G., & Schwarz, J. C. (1984). Individual differences in the tendency toward anxious romantic attachments. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Personal Relationships, Madison, WI.

Işıkol – Özge, F. (2013). *İlköğretim ıı. kademe öğrencilerinin sosyal görünüş kaygıları ile benlik saygıları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (üsküdar ilçesi örneği).* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Yeditepe University, İstanbul.

Jankowska, A. M., Lewandowska-Walter, A., Chalupa, A. A., Jonak, J., Duszynski, R., & Mazurkiewicz, N. (2015). Understanding the relationships between attachment styles, locus of control, school maladaptation, and depression symptoms among students in foster care. *In School Psychology Forum,* 9(1), 49-58.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. E. (1998). The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance*, *11*(2-3), 167-187.

Kahraman, G. (2015). *Beden imajının üniversite öğrencilerinde yaşam doyumu ve umutsuzluk üzerine etkisi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Beykent University, İstanbul.

Kalechstein, A. D. & Nowicki, S. Jr. (1997). A meta-analytic examination of the relationship between control expectancies and academic achievement: An 11 year follow-up to Findley and Cooper. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs,* 123(1), 27-56.

Kalı-Soyer, M. & Satan, A., (2015). *Genç yetişkinlerde yaşam doyumunun yordayıcısı olarak umut, dayanıklılık ve iyimserlik.* Paper presented in 13. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi, (7,8,9 October, Mersin).

Kang, J. Y. M., Johnson, K. K., & Kim, J. (2013). Clothing functions and use of clothing to alter mood. *International Journal of Fashion Design, Technology and Education*, *6*(1), 43-52.

Kaplan- Güler, B. (2016). *Avukatlarda bazı demografik değişkenlerin tükenmişlik, denetim odağı ve iş doyumu üzerindeki etkisi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Beykent University, İstanbul.

Karakaş, B. (2015). *20 – 65 Yaş arası kadınlarda denetim odağı ve öz-yeterlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Haliç University, İstanbul.

Karakurt, G. (2001). *The impact of adult attachment styles on romantic jealousy.* Unpublished master's thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Karreman, A., & Vingerhoets, A. J. (2012). Attachment and well-being: The mediating role of emotion regulation and resilience. *Personality and Individual differences*, *53*(7), 821-826.

Kart, N. M. (2002). *Yetişkin bağlanma stillerinin bazı bilişsel süreçlerle bağlantısı: sağlık personeliyle yapılan bir çalışma.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara University, Ankara.

Kaval, K. (2001). *12 yaş çocuklarında denetim odağını etkileyen bazı değişkenlerin incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Marmara University, İstanbul.

Keleş, O. B., (2000), Eğitim *yöneticilerinde sorun çözme ve denetim odağı ilişkisi (İstanbul ili örneği).* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara University, Ankara.

Kenrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. L., & Cialdini, R. B. (2009). *Social Psychology: Goals in Interaction.* 5th Ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Kermen, U. (2013). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin ihtiyaç doyumu ve öznel iyi oluş düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.

Kıcır, B. (2010). *Üniversite son sınıf öğrencilerinde işsizlik kaygısı: psikolojik etmenler açısından bir inceleme.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ankara University, Ankara.

Kılıç, M. (2015*). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal görünüş kaygıları ile benlik saygıları ve yalnızlık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Selçuk University, Konya.

Kırımer, F., Sümer, N., & Akça, E. (2014). Orta çocuklukta anneye kaygılı ve kaçınan bağlanma: Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri-II–Orta Çocukluk Dönemi Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye Uyarlanması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, *17*, 45-57.

Knoop, R. (1981). Age and correlates of locus of control. *The Journal of Psychology*, *108*(1), 103-106.

Katkovsky, W., Crandall, V. C., & Good, S. (1967). Parental antecedents of children's beliefs in internal-external control of reinforcements in intellectual achievement situations. *Child Development*, 765-776.

Köksal, F. (1991). *Denetim odağı ile saldırgan davranışlar arasındaki ilişkiler.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Atatürk University, Erzurum.

Labs, S M., & Wurtele, S. K. (1986). Fetal Health Locus of Control Scale: Development and validation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54,* 814-819.

Langlois, A., & Anderson, D. E. (2002). Resolving the quality of life/wellbeing puzzle: Toward a new model. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, *25*(3), 501-512.

Levinson, C. A., & Rodebaugh, T. L. (2012). Social anxiety and eating disorders. The role of negative social evaluation fears. *Eating Behaviors*, 13, 27–35.

Li, T., & Fung, H. H. (2014). How avoidant attachment influences subjective well-being: An investigation about theageandgender differences. *Aging & mental health*, *18*(1), 4-10.

Lirgg, C. D., & Feltz, D. L. (1991). Teacher versus peer models revisited: Effects on motor performance and self-efficacy. *Research Quarterly for Exerciseand Sports,* 62, 217-224.

Long, R. B. (2006). *Development of an instrument measuring oral health locus of control: relationship to general health locus of control, oral health care*

experience, and oral health value. Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.

Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M. and Schade, D. (2005). Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology, 9*, 111–131.

Ma, C. Q., & Huebner, E. S. (2008). Attachment relationships and adolescents' life satisfaction: Some relationships matter more to girls than boys. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(2), 177-190.

Magai, C., Hunziker, J., Mesias, W., & Culver, L. C. (2000). Adult attachment styles and emotional biases. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *24*(3), 301-309.

Maricic, A., & Stambuk, M. (2015). The role of loneliness in the relationship between social anxiety and subjective well-being: Using the Social Phobia Inventory (SPIN) as a measure. *Drustvena istrazivanja*, *24*(3), 407-426.

Marsh, K. L., & Weary, G. (1995). Locus of Control. In T. Manstead and M. Hewstone (Eds.), The Blackwell Dictionary of Social Psychology (pp. 381). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

McConnell, M., & Moss, E. (2011). Attachment across the Life Span: Factors that Contribute to Stability and Change. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, *11*, 60-77.

McMahan, E. A., & Estes, D. (2011). Hedonic versus eudaimonic conceptions of well-being: Evidence of differential associations with experienced well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 103, 93-108.

Miller, P.J., Wang, S., Sandel, T., & Cho, G.E. (2002). Self-esteem as folk theory: A comparison of European American and Taiwanese mother's beliefs. *Parenting, Science and Practice, 2*, 209-239.

Moghadam, M., Rezaei, F., Ghaderi, E., & Rostamian, N. (2016). Relationship between attachment styles and happiness in medical students. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, *5*(3), 593.

Moscovitch, D. A. (2009). What is the core fear in social phobia? A new model to facilitate individualized case conceptualization and treatment. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, *16*(2), 123-134.

Myers, J. E. (2001). *Well workbook.* Los Angelas: Mind Garden Publisher.

Myers, S. M., & Booth, A. (1999). Marital strains and marital quality: The role of high and low locus of control. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 423-436.

Nelson, E. S. & Mathias, K. E. (1995). The relationships among college students locus of control, learning styles and selfprediction of grades. *Education Research and Perspectives,* 22(2), 110-117.

Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K., & Eby, L. T. (2006). Locus of control at work: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 1057-1087.

Noles, S. W., Cash, T. F., & Winstead, B. A. (1985). Body image, physical attractiveness, and depression. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *53*(1), 88-94

Noor, N. M. (2002). Work-family conflict, locus of control, and women's weil-being: tests of alternative pathways. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *142*(5), 645-662.

Nurmi, J. E., Pulliainen, H., & Salmela-Aro, K. (1992). Age differences in adults' control beliefs related to life goals and concerns. *Psychology and Aging*, *7*(2), 194-196.

Odacı, H., Kalkan, M., Balcı, S., & Yılmaz, M. (2016). Sosyal beceri eğitiminin ilköğretim öğrencilerinin denetim odağı üzerine etkisi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 20, 49-58

OECD (2013), *How's Life? 2013: Measuring Well-being*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Oishi, S. (2000). Goals as cornerstones of subjective well-being. In E. Diener & E.M. Suh (Eds.), Culture and subjective well-being (pp.463-470). The MIT Press.

Oishi, S. (2000). Goals as cornerstones of subjective well-being: Linking individuals and cultures.

Oktan, V. (2012). Beden İmajı Ve Reddedilme Duyarlılığının Öznel İyi Oluşu Yordama Gücü. *Journal of Educational Sciences & Practices*, *11*(22), 119-134.

Öngören, B. (2015). Sosyolojik açıdan sağlıklı beden imgesi. *Sosyal Ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (34), 25-45.

Özcan, H., Subaşı, B., Budak, B., Çelik, M., Gürel, Ş. C., & Yıldız, M. (2013). Ergenlik ve genç yetişkinlik dönemindeki kadınlarda benlik saygısı, sosyal görünüş kaygısı, depresyon ve anksiyete ilişkisi. *Journal of Mood Disorders*, *3*(3), 107-13.

Özdemir, L. (2016). Kişilik özelliklerinin bir girişimcilik boyutu olan denetim odağı üzerindeki etkisi. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi.* 17(2), 131-149.

Özer, G. (2009). *Öz-Belirleme kuramı çerçevesinde ihtiyaç doyumu, içsel güdülenme ve bağlanma stillerinin üniversite öğrencilerinin öznel iyi oluşlarına etkileri.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Gazi University, Ankara.

Öztürk, A. (2013). *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi öğrencilerinin öznel iyi oluş düzeyleri ile tinsellik, iyimserlik, kaygı ve olumsuz duygu düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Uludağ University, Bursa.

Öztürk, A., & Mutlu, T. (2010). The relationship between attachment style, subjective well-being, happiness and social anxiety among university students'. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *9*, 1772-1776.

Parcel, G. S. & Meyer, M. P. (1978). Development of an instrument to measure children's health Locus of Control. *Health Education Monographs, 6,* 149-159.

Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5(2), 164-172.

Pugh, D. N. (1992). Prisoners and Locus of Control: initial assessments of a specific scale. *Psychological Reports, 70,* 523-530.

Queen, L., & Freitag, C. B. (1978). A comparison of externality, anxiety, and life satisfaction in two aged populations. *The Journal of psychology*, *98*(1), 71-74.

Rapee, R. M., & Heimberg, R. G. (1997). A cognitive-behavioral model of anxiety in social phobia. *Behaviour research and therapy*, *35*(8), 741-756.

Robinson, A., & Lewis, V. (2016). Social Physique Anxiety: An Exploration of Influence on Sporting Confidence and Participation. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research*, *21*(1), 46-59.

Rodebaugh, T. L., Weeks, J. W., Gordon, E. A., Langer, J. K., & Heimberg, R. G. (2012). The longitudinal relationship between fear of positive evaluation and fear of negative evaluation. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, *25*(2), 167-182.

Rohner, E. C., Chaille, C., & Rohner, R. P. (1980). Perceived parental acceptance–rejection and the development of children's locus of control. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied.* 104(1), 83-86

Rose, J. & Medway, F. (1981). Measurement of teachers' beliefs in their control over student outcomes. *Journal of Educational Research*, 14, 185-190.

Ross, C.E. (1991). Marriage and the sense of control. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 53(4), 831-839.

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external control of reinforcement. *Psycohological Monographs,* 80, 1-28.

Rotter, J. B., Chance, J. E., & Phares, E. J. (1972). *Applications of a social learning theory of personality.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*(6), 1069-1081.

Saadat, M., Ghasemzadeh, A., Karami, S., & Soleimani, M. (2012). Relationship between self-esteem and locus of control in Iranian University students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *31*, 530-535.

Sahranç, Ü. (2008). Bir durumluk akış modeli: stres kontrolü, genel özyeterlik, durumluk kaygı, yaşam doyumu ve akış ilişkileri. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16, 122-144.

Sardoğan, M. E., Kaygusuz, C., & Karahan, T. F. (2006). Bir insan ilişkileri beceri eğitimi programının üniversite öğrencilerinin denetim odağı düzeylerine etkisi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *2*(2), 184-194

Saygın, Y. (2008). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal destek, benlik saygısı ve öznel iyi oluş düzeylerinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Selçuk University, Konya.

Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M. R. (1982). Social anxiety and self-presentation: A conceptualization model. *Psychological bulletin*, *92*(3), 641-669.

Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2015). *A history of modern psychology*. Cengage Learning.

Seki, T., & Dilmaç, B. (2015). Predictor relationships between the values the adolescents have and their levels of subjective well-being and social appearance anxiety: A Model Proposal. *Egitim ve Bilim*, *40*(179), 57-67.

Sel, Ş. (2016). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin beden memnuniyeti düzeyleri ile benlik saygısı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi.* Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Beykent University, İstanbul.

Selcen, A. (2009). *Denetim odağı eğitim programının ilköğretim 6. 7. ve 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin denetim odağı düzeylerine etkisi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.

Seligman, M. and Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-14.

Sepulveda, A. R., Botella, J., & León, J. A. (2001). Body-image disturbance in eating disorders: A meta-analysis. *Psicothema*, *13*(1), 7-16.

Seyhan, B. Y. (2013). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde inanç tarzları, denetim odağı ve psikolojik iyi olma hali arasındaki ilişkiler.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara University, Ankara.

Shapiro Jr, D. H., Schwartz, C. E., & Astin, J. A. (1996). Controlling ourselves, controlling our world: Psychology's role in understanding positive and negative consequences of seeking and gaining control. *American psychologist*, *51*(12), 1213-1230.

Shields, M., & Wooden, M. (2003, February). Marriage, children and subjective well-being. In 8th Australian Institute of Family Studies Conference.

Smith, R. H., Parrott, W. G., Diener, E. F., Hoyle, R. H., & Kim, S. H. (1999). Dispositional envy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*(8), 1007-1020.

Solmuş, T. (2004). İş yaşamı, denetim odağı ve beş faktörlük kişilik modeli. *Türk Psikoloji Bülteni*, 10, 196-205.

Spokas, M., & Heimberg, R. G. (2009). Overprotective parenting, social anxiety, and external locus of control: Cross-sectional and longitudinal relationships. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *33*(6), 543-551.

Stallings, M., C. Dunham, M. Gatz, L. Baker, I. Cesa & V. Bengtson. (1997). Relationships among life events and psychological well-being: More evidence for a two factor theory of well-being. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 16, 104-119.

Stoeber, J. (2015). How other-oriented perfectionism differs from self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism: Further findings. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *37*(4), 611-623.

Stocks, A., April, K. A., & Lynton, N. (2012). Locus of control and subjective well-being–a cross-cultural study. *Problems and perspectives in management*, *10*(1), 17-25.

Sushma, B., Padmaja, G., & Agarwal, S. (2016). Well-being, psychosocial problems and social ınteraction anxiety in children. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, Volume 3, Issue 4, No. 59*, 30.

Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (1999). Yetişkin bağlanma stillerinin Türk örneklemi üzerinde psikometrik değerlendirmesi ve kültürler arası bir karşılaştırma. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14(43), 71-106.

Sümer, N. (2006). Yetişkin bağlanma ölçeklerinin kategoriler ve boyutlar düzeyinde karşılaştırılması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 21, 1-22.

Şahin, N. G. (2011). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin kendini açma, öznel iyi oluş ve algıladıkları sosyal destek düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.

Sahin, E., Barut, Y., Ersanli, E., & Kumcagiz, H. (2014). Self-Esteem and Social Appearance Anxiety: An Investigation of Secondary School Students. *Online Submission*, *4*(3), 152-159.

Şar, A. H., & Işiklar, A. (2012). Examınatıon of locus of control, subjectıve well-beıng and optımısm as the predıctors of sport confıdence. *Journal of Physical Education & Sports Science/Beden Egitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, *6*(1).

Şendil, G. (2003). Çocuk,Ergen ve Anne Baba. İstanbul:Çantay Yayınları

Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Osterlind, S. J. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson.

Takeda, T. (2003). Self-efficacy, coping behavior, and the health locus of control in junior high school students with renal disease. *The National Institute of Special Education*, 7, 10–19.

Taş, İ. (2011). *Öğretmenlerde yaşamın anlamı yaşam doyumu sosyal karşılaştırma ve iç-dış kontrol odağının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Sakarya University, Sakarya.

Tatay, E. (2015). *Parçalanmış ve parçalanmamış aileye sahip ergenlerin akademik başarı, öznel iyi oluş ve yalnızlık düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Gaziosmanpaşa University, Tokat.

Taylor, S. E., Wood, J. V., & Lichtman, R. R. (1983). It could be worse: Selective evaluation as a response to victimization. *Journal of social issues*, *39*(2), 19-40.

Taylor, S. E., Peplau, L. A., & Sears, D. O. (2005). *Social Psychology*.(12th Edition). Pearson.

Telli, E., & Ünal, Z. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyo-demografik özelliklerine göre sosyal görünüş kaygısı: bir alan araştırması social appearance anxiety of university students according to sosyo-demographic characteristics: A Field Study. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *8*(15), 134-146.

Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (1999). Facial attractiveness. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, *3*(12), 452-460.

Tokat, B., Kara, H., & Ülkgün, N. (2007). Yöneticilerin Sorun Çözme Yetenekleri ve Kontrol Odağının Belirlenmesi: DPÜ Örneği. *Akademik Bakış-Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E- Dergisi,11,* 1-11.

Topkara, G. (2014). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin yeme tutumları ve yetişkin bağlanma stilleri arasındaki ilişkinin cinsiyete göre karşılaştırılması.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Haliç University, İstanbul.

Tov, W., & Diener, E. (2007). *Culture and subjective well-being*. In S. Kitayama & D.

Trice, A. (1985). An academic Locus of Control scale for college students. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 61, 1043-1046

Tuzgöl-Dost, M. (2004). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin öznel iyi oluş düzeyleri*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Hacettepe University, Ankara

Tülek, N. (2011). *Evli bireylerin öznel iyi olma düzeylerinin yordanması.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ege University, İzmir.

Türe, H. (2013). Tıp fakültesi öğrencilerinde sosyal anksiyete düzeyini etkileyen etkenler, anne-babaya bağlanma ve yetişkin bağlanma biçimleri. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*, *14*, 310-317.

Türkdoğan, T. (2010). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde temel ihtiyaçların karşılanma düzeyinin öznel iyi oluş düzeyini yordamadaki rolü.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Pamukkale University, Denizli.

Tylka, T. L., & Wood-Barcalow, N. L. (2015). What is and what is not positive body image? Conceptual foundations and construct definition. *Body Image*, *14*, 118-129.

Ünüvar, A. (2012). *Gerçeklik kuramına dayalı psiko- eğitim programının lise öğrencilerinin denetim odağı ve yılmazlık düzeyi üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.

Vertue, F. M. (2003). From adaptive emotion to dysfunction: An attachment perspective on social anxiety disorder. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *7*(2), 170-191.

Wallace, S. T., & Alden, L. E. (1995). Social anxiety and standard setting following social success or failure. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *19*(6), 613-631.

Wallston, Wallston, Kaplan & Maides (1976). Development and validation of the Health Locus of Control (HLC) Scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44,* 580-585.

Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(4), 678-691.

Weegar, M. A., & Pacis, D. (2012). A Comparison of Two Theories of Learning-- Behaviorism and Constructivism as applied to Face-to-Face and Online Learning. In Proceedings E-Leader Conference, Manila.

Weeks, J. W., Heimberg, R. G., & Rodebaugh, T. L. (2008). The Fear of Positive Evaluation Scale: Assessing a proposed cognitive component of social anxiety disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 22,* 44–55.

Weiner, B. (1972). Attribution theory, achievement motivation, and the educational process. *Review of Educational Research*, *42*(2), 203-215.

Wetzel, E., Böhnke, J. R., & Brown, A. (2016). Response biases. In F. Leong and D. Iliescu (eds.), The ITC international handbook of testing and assessment (pp. 349-363). Oxford University Press New York.

Whitman, L., Desmond, S. B. & Price, J. H. (1987). Development of a depression Locus of Control scale. *Psychological Reports, 60,* 583-589.

WHOQOL Group. (1997). WHOQOL-BREF, Measuring Quality Of Life.

Wilson, W. (1967). Correlates of avowed happiness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 67, 294– 306.

Wood, J. V. (1989). Theory and research concerning social comparisons of personal attributes. *Psychological Bulletin*, *106*(2), 231-248.

World Health Organization. (1948). Constitution of the world health organization. Chronicle of the World Health Organization.

Yacobi, B. G. (2015). Life and the Pursuit of Happiness. *Journal of Philosophy of Life*, *5*(2), 82-90.

Yaşar, V. (2006). *Farklı liselerde öğrenim görmekte olan 16–18 yaş grubundaki öğrencilerin denetim odağı düzeyleri ile bazı kişilik özelliklerinin karşılaştırılması.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Marmara University, İstanbul.

Yavuzer, H. (1991). *Ana-baba ve çocuk*. Remzi Kitapevi.

Ye, Y., & Lin, L. (2015). Examining relations between locus of control, loneliness, subjective well-being, and preference for online social interaction. *Psychological reports*, *116*(1), 164-175.

Yeter, Ö. (2016). *Bağlanma stilleri, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar doyumu ve kıskançlık ilişkisi: üniversite öğrencileri üzerinde araştırma.* Unpublished Master's Thesis.. Beykent University, İstanbul.

Yetim, Ü. (2001). *Toplumdan Bireye Mutluluk Resimleri*. Bağlam Yayınları. İstanbul.

Yeşilyaprak, B. (1988). *Lise öğrencilerinin içsel ya da dışsal denetimli oluşlarını etkileyen etmenler.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Yıkılmaz, K. (2014). *The effect of locus of control and attribution processes on coping style of victims of mobbing.* Unpublished master's thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Yousefi, B., Hassani, Z. and Shokri, O., (2009), Reliability and Factor Validity of the 7-Item Social Physique Anxiety Scale (SPAS-7) among University Students in Iran, *World Journal of Sport Sciences*, 2(3), 201-204.

Yüceant, M. (2013). *Beden eğitimi öğretmen adaylarının sosyal görünüş kaygı düzeylerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Aksaray University, Aksaray.

Zaidi, I. H., & Mohsin, M. N. (2013). Locus of control in graduation students. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 6(1), 15-20.

APPENDICES

Appendix-1: Demographic Information Form

Açıklama: Aşağıda size ait bazı demografik bilgileri öğrenmek amacıyla yazılmış sorular bulunmaktadır. Lütfen her soruyu dikkatlice okuyup size uygun olan seçeneğin yanındaki parantezin içine çarpı işareti koyunuz. Katkılarınız için teşekkür ederim.

Zeynep PEKİN

1. Cinsiyetiniz: Kadın ( )   Erkek ( )
2. Yaşınız: …..
3. Bölümünüz?

   ....

Appendix-2: Relationship Scales Questionaire (RSQ)

Aşağıdaki maddeler romantik ilişkileriniz dahil olmak üzere yakın ilişkilerinizde (arkadaşlık, dostluk gibi) hissettiğiniz duygulara ilişkindir. Sizden, genel olarak, yakın ilişkilerinizde yaşadıklarınızı dikkate alarak aşağıdaki ifadeleri değerlendirmeniz istenmektedir. Aşağıdaki maddeleri yakın ilişki içerisinde olduğunu kişileri düşünerek cevaplandırınız. Her maddenin ilişkinizdeki duygu ve dşüncelerinizi ne oranda yansıttığını karşılarındaki 7 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde gösteriniz.

1………...…2……..…….3……..…….4……..…….5……..…….6……..…….7

Beni hiç   Beni kısmen
Tamamıyla
Tanımlamıyor   tanımlıyor   beni
tanımlıyor

Sample of items

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Kendimi bağımsız hissetmem benim için çok öenmli.							
6. Başkalarıyla tam anlamıyla duygusal yakınlık istiyorum							
10. Başkalarının bana dayanıp bel bağlaması konusunda oldukça rahatımdır							
13. Başkalarının bana bağlanmamalarını tercih ederim							
15. Başkalarının bana, benim istediğim kadar yakınlaşmakta gönülsüz olduklarını düşünüyorum							
17. Başkaları beni Kabul etmeyecek diye korkarım.							

Appendix-3: Subjective Well-Being Scale (SWBS)

Bu envanterde kişiliğinizin ve yaşamınızın çeşitli yönlerine ilişkin ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Bu ifadeleri tek tek okuyarak, ifadenin size ne derece uygun olduğuna karar veriniz. İfade size "tamamen uygunsa" (5); "çoğunlukla uygunsa" (4); "orta derecede uygunsa" (3); "biraz uygunsa" (2); "hiç uygun değilse" (1) numaralı boşluğun altına (x) işareti koyunuz. Lütfen tüm ifadelere boş bırakmadan cevap veriniz.

Sample of items

	Tamamen uygun (5)	Çoğunlukla uygun (4)	Orta derecede uygun (3)	Biraz uygun (2)	Hiç uygun değil (1)
1.Geleceğe yönelik planlar yapmaktan hoşlanırım					
4.Geriye dönüp baktığımda istediklerimin çoğunu elde edemediğimi görüyorum					
8.Ulaşmak istediğim ideallerim var					
11. Kendimi genel olarak canlı ve enerjik hissederim.					
18. Ailemle olan ilişkilerimden memnunum					
21. Kendimi yalnız hissediyorum					
41. Okumak ve çalışmak benim için zevkli uğraşlardır.					
45. Arkadaşlarıma kendimi istediğim gibi ifade edemiyorum.					

Appendix-4: Rotter's Internal External Locus of Control Scale (RIELOCS)

Bu anket, bazı önemli olayların insanları etkileme biçimini bulmayı amaçlamaktadır. Her maddede 'a' ya da 'b' harfleriyle gösterilmektedir. Lütfen, her seçenek çiftinde sizin kendi görüşünüze göre gerçeği yansıttığınıza **en çok inandığınız cümleyi (uyalnız bir cümleyi) seçiniz ve bir yuvarlak içine alınz.**

Seçiminizi yaparken, seçmeniz gerektiğini düşündüğünüz vey adoğru olmasını arzu ettiğiniz cümleyi değil, gerçekten daha doğru olduğuna inandığınız cümleyi seçininz. Bu anket kişisel inançlarla ilgilidir; bunun için 'doğru' ya da 'yanlış' cevap diye bir durum söz konusu değildir.

Bazı maddelerde her iki cümleye de inandığınızı ya da hiçbirine inanmadığınızı düşünebilirdiniz. Böyle durumlarda, size en uygun olduğuna inandığınız cümleyi seçiniz. Seçim yaparken her bir cümle için bağımsız karar veriniz; önceki tercihlerinizden etkilenmeyiniz.

Sample of items

3. a. İnsanların yaşamındaki mutsuzlukların çoğu, biraz da şanssızlıklarına bağlıdır.
   b. İnsanların talihsizlikleri kendi hatalarının sonucudur.

8. a. İnsanın kişiliğinin belirlenmesinde en önemli rolü kalıtım oynar.
   b. İnsanların nasıl biri olacaklarına kendi hayat tecrübeleri belirler.

11. a. Başarılı olmak çok çalışmaya bağlıdır; şansın bunda payı ya hiç yoktur ya da çok azdır.
    b. İyi bir iş bulmak, temelde doğru zamanda doğru yerde bulunmaya bağlıdır.

14. a. Hiçbir yönü iyi olmayan insanlar vardır.
    b. Herkesin iyi bir tarafı vardır.

19. a. İnsan hatalarını kabul edebilmelidir.
    b. Genelde en iyisi insanın hatalarını örtbas etmesidir.

28. a. Başıma ne gelmişse, kendi yaptıklarımdandır.
    b. Yaşamımın alacağı yön üzerinde bazen yeterince kontrolümün olmadığını hissediyorum

Appendix-5: Social Appearance Anxiety Scale (SAAS)

Aşağıda verilen ölçek sosyal görünüş kaygısını ölçmek için kullanılmıştır.
 Sizden aşağıdaki ifadelere
- (1) Hiç Uygun Değil
- (2) Uygun Değil
- (3) Biraz uygun
- (4) Uygun
- (5) Tamamen uygun
    Şeklinde cevap vermeniz isteniyor. Lütfen ifadeleri doğru ve samimi bie
    şekilde yanıtlayınız.

Sample of items

	1	2	3	4	5
1.Dış görünüşümle ilgili kendimi rahat hissederim.					
2.Fotoğrafım çekilirken kendimi gergin hissederim.					
7. İnsanların beni çekici bulmamalarından korkarım.					
10. İnsanlarla konuşurken görünüşümden dolayı gerginlik hissederim.					
15. Sevdiğim kişinin görünüşümden dolayı beni terk edeceğinden korkuyorum.					
16. İnsanların görünüşümün iyi olmadığını düşünmelerinden endişeleniyorum.					