

**THE EFFECTS OF USING THE INTERNET ON  
INDIVIDUAL'S SOCIALIZATION BASED ON  
PERSONALITY TRAITS**

Thesis submitted to the

Institute of Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

by

Esmā GÜNAY

Fatih University

June, 2011

**Esmā GÜNAY**

**M.S. Thesis In Psychology**

**June 2011**

**THE EFFECTS OF USING THE INTERNET ON  
INDIVIDUAL'S SOCIALIZATION BASED ON  
PERSONALITY TRAITS**

Thesis submitted to the  
Institute of Social Sciences  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

by

**Esmā GÜNAY**

Fatih University

June, 2011

© Esmā GÜNAY

All Rights Reserved, 2011

## **APPROVAL PAGE**

**Student** : Esmâ Gnây  
**Institute** : Institute of Social Sciences  
**Department** : Psychology  
**Thesis Subject** : The Effects of Using the Internet on Individual's Socialization  
Based on Personality Traits  
**Thesis Date** : June 2011

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Tolga ARICAK  
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assist. Prof. Sevim CESUR  
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Sevim CESUR \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Osman Tolga ARICAK \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Ali Murat YEL \_\_\_\_\_

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Institute of Social Science

Assoc. Prof. Mehmet KARAKUYU  
Director

## **AUTHOR DECLARATIONS**

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.
2. The program of advanced study of which this thesis is part has consisted of:
  - i) Research Methods course during the undergraduate study
  - ii) Examination of several thesis guides of particular universities both in Turkey and abroad as well as a professional book on this subject.

Esmâ GÜNAY

June, 2011

## ABSTRACT

Esma GÜNAY

June, 2011

### THE EFFECTS OF USING THE INTERNET ON INDIVIDUAL'S SOCIALIZATION BASED ON PERSONALITY TRAITS

While it was found in some studies that the use of internet effects the socialisation of the individual positively in relation to the characteristics of the individual by alleviating the loneliness, it was found in some studies that the use of internet effects the socialisation of the individual negatively in relation to the characteristics of the individual by increasing the feeling of loneliness. The aim of this study is to investigate relation between using the internet and socialization process of individuals depending on their personality traits.

The sample of this study consists of 1411 individuals (979 females, 432 males). Data were collected via the internet. The participants were administered Socio-Demographic Information Form, UCLA Loneliness Scale, Short-Form Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire and Online Cognition Scale. In the regression models which are designed to examine the effects of the subdimensions of the cognitive state on the internet scale over the subdimensions of the personality scale, positive effect of decreased impulse control ( $\beta=0,019$ ) and the positive effect of distraction ( $\beta=0,039$ ) over neuroticism are seen. There is a negative effect of distraction ( $\beta=-0,023$ ) over extraversion subdimension of personality. There is a positive effect of social support ( $\beta=0,014$ ) over psychoticism subdimension of personality.

The main hypothesis of the study personality is a mediator between online cognition and loneliness. So we constituted three different regression models to examine the effect of online cognition on loneliness, the effect of personality on loneliness and the effect of online cognition and personality on loneliness for this purpose. The results of these three separate regression models show that the personality is the moderator variable between decreased impulse control and loneliness. Furthermore, the results of the analyses show that the personality is the mediator variable between distraction and loneliness.

**Key words:** Personality traits, socialization, the internet

## KISA ÖZET

Esmâ GÜNAY

Haziran, 2011

### KİŞİLİK ÖZELLİKLERİNE BAĞLI OLARAK İNTERNET KULLANIMININ BİREYLERİN SOSYALLEŞMESİNE ETKİSİ

Yapılan bazı çalışmalarda internet kullanımının kişilik özellikleri ile ilişkili olarak bireyin sosyalleşmesini olumlu yönde etkilediği yani yalnızlığını azalttığı bulunurken, bir kısmında ise internet kullanımının kişilik özellikleri ile ilişkili olarak bireyin sosyalleşmesini olumsuz yönde etkilediği yani yalnızlığını arttırdığı bulunmuştur. Bu çalışmanın amacı bireylerin kişilik özelliklerine bağlı olarak internet kullanımları ile sosyalleşme süreçleri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir.

Bu çalışmanın örneklemini 1411 kişi oluşturmaktadır (979 kadın, 432 erkek). Veriler internet üzerinden toplanmıştır. Çalışmada katılımcılara Sosyo-Demografik Bilgi Formu, Ucla Yalnızlık Ölçeği (UCLA), Eysenck Kişilik Anketi Gözden Geçirilmiş/Kısaltılmış Formu (EKA-GGK) ve İnternette Bilişsel Durum Ölçeği uygulanmıştır. İnternette bilişsel durum ölçeğinin alt boyutlarının kişilik ölçeği alt boyutları üzerindeki etkilerini incelemek için yapılan regresyon analizlerinde nörotizm kişilik alt boyutuna azalmış impuls kontrolün ( $\beta=0,019$ ) ve dikkat dağıtmanın ( $\beta=0,039$ ) pozitif etkisi görülmektedir. Dışa dönüklük kişilik alt boyutu üzerinde dikkat dağıtmanın negatif etkisi ( $\beta=-0,023$ ) vardır. Psikotizm kişilik alt boyutu üzerinde sosyal desteğin pozitif etkisi ( $\beta=0,014$ ) vardır.

Bu çalışmanın ana hipotezi kişiliğin internet kullanımı ve yalnızlık arasında ara değişken olduğudur. Bu amaçla, sırayla internette bilişsel durumun yalnızlık üzerine etkisi, kişiliğin yalnızlık üzerine etkisi, internette bilişsel durum ve kişiliğin birlikte yalnızlık üzerine etkisini incelemek için üç ayrı regresyon modeli yaptık. Yapılan bu üç ayrı regresyon modelinin sonuçları, kişiliğin azalmış impuls kontrol ile yalnızlık arasında tam ara değişken olduğunu göstermektedir. Ayrıca analiz sonuçları kişiliğin dikkat dağıtma ile yalnızlık arasında da kısmi ara değişken (mediator variable) olduğunu göstermektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Kişilik özellikleri, sosyalleşme, internet

# **DEDICATION**

To MY FAMILY



## LIST OF CONTENTS

Approval Page.....	iii
Author Declarations.....	iv
Abstract.....	v
Kısa Özet.....	vi
Dedication.....	vii
List of Contents.....	viii
List of Tables.....	xiii
List of Abbreviations.....	xiv
Acknowledgements.....	xv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1. 1 Problem.....	1
1. 2 The Aim of the Study.....	3
1. 3 Significance of the Study.....	3
1. 4 Assumptions of the Study.....	3
1. 5 Limitations of the Study.....	3
1. 6 The Main Hypothesis of the Study.....	4
1. 6. 1 The Sub-Hypotheses of the Study .....	4
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW .....	5
2.1 Personality .....	5
2.1. 1 Two aspects of Personality: Character and Temperament.....	6
2. 1. 1. 1 Character.....	6
2. 1. 1. 2 Temperatment.....	6
2. 1. 2 Factors Constituting Personality.....	7
2. 1. 2. 1 Hereditary and Physical Factors.....	7

2. 1. 2. 2	Social and Environmental Factors.....	8
2. 1. 3	Personality Theories.....	9
2. 1. 3. 1	Psychoanalytic Personality Theories.....	9
2. 1. 3. 2	Behaviouristic Personality Theories.....	10
2. 1. 3. 3	Humanistic Personality Theories.....	12
2. 1. 3. 4	Trait and Factor Theories.....	13
2. 2	Socialization.....	16
2. 2. 1	Socialization Theories.....	17
2. 2. 1. 1	Psychoanalytical Theory.....	17
2. 2. 1. 2	Acculturation Theory.....	17
2. 2. 1. 3	Learning Theory.....	18
2. 2. 2	Socialization Factors.....	18
2. 2. 2. 1	Primary Groups in Socialization .....	19
2. 2. 2. 2	Secondary Groups in Socialization.....	19
2. 2. 3	Basic Setbacks Against Socialization.....	20
2. 3	Internet .....	21
2. 3. 1	Internet in Turkey .....	22
2. 3. 2	What does Internet Provide?.....	22
2. 3. 3	Informatics as the Social Extension of Internet and Information	23
2. 3. 4	Use of Internet and Personality Traits.....	23
2. 3. 5	Internet and Socialization.....	24
2. 3. 5. 1	Some Researches in Our country Concerning Internet and Socialization.....	25
2. 3. 6	The Usage of Internet with Problems and Addiction of the Internet .....	27
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>METHOD .....</b>	<b>30</b>
3. 1	Sample.....	30
3. 2	Data Collection Tools.....	32
3. 2. 1	Socio-Demographic Data Form.....	32
3. 2. 2	UCLA Loneliness Scale.....	33

3. 2. 2. 1	Reliability of Original UCLA Loneliness Scale.....	33
3. 2. 2. 2	Validity of Original UCLA Loneliness Scale.....	34
3. 2. 2. 3	Studies Maintained over UCLA Loneliness Scale in Turkey.....	34
3. 2. 2. 4	Reliability of UCLA Loneliness Scale.....	34
3. 2. 2. 5	Validity of UCLA Loneliness Scale.....	35
3. 2. 3	Short-Form Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK).....	35
3. 2. 3. 1	Reliability of Short Form- Original Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK).....	36
3. 2. 3. 2	Validity of Short Form- Original Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK).....	36
3. 2. 3. 3	Studies conducted on Short Form- Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK).....	37
3. 2. 3. 4	Reliability of Short Form- Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Questionnaire (EKA-GGK).....	37
3. 2. 3. 5	Validity of Short Form- Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK).....	38
3. 2. 4	Online Cognition Scale.....	38
3. 2. 4. 1	The Reliability and Validity of the Original Online Cognition Scale.....	39
3. 2. 4. 2	The Publication That Mention of the Online Cognition Scale in Turkey.....	39
3. 2. 4. 3	Reliability of Online Cognition Scale.....	39
3. 2. 4. 4	The Validity of Online Cognition Scale .....	40
3. 3	Process.....	40
3. 4	Statistical analysis.....	41
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>42</b>
4. 1	Ucla Loneliness Scale (Version3).....	42
4. 2	Eyscenk Personality Inventory.....	42

4. 3 Online Cognition Scale.....	43
4. 4 Internet Usage Characteristics of the Sample.....	44
4.5 Findings Related To Differentiation of Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points In Relation With Demographic Characteristics.....	47
4. 5. 1 Findings Related To Gender Variable Differences.....	47
4. 5. 2 Findings Related To Age Variable Differences.....	49
4. 5. 3 Findings Related To Education Variable Differences.....	52
4. 6 The Correlations between the Variables in This Study.....	55
4. 7 Findings Related To Effects of Cognitive State on the Internet and Personal Traits over Loneliness Points.....	57
<b>CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>60</b>
5. 1 Properties of the Sampling.....	61
5. 2 Interpretation of Findings Related To Differentiation of Cognitive State of the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points In Terms of Demographic Characteristics.....	63
5. 2. 1 Interpretation of Findings Regarding the Sex Variable Differences .....	63
5. 2. 2 Interpretation of Findings Regarding the Age Variable Differences .....	65
5. 2. 3 Interpretation of Findings Regarding the Education Variable Differences .....	68
5. 3 Interpretation of The Correlations Between the Variables in This Study.....	70
5. 4 Interpretation of Findings Related To Effects of Cognitive State on the Internet and Personal Traits over Loneliness Points.....	72
5. 4. 1 Findings of the Regression Analyses Carried Out to Predict the Effect of Online Cognition on Personality Traits.....	73
5. 4. 2 Findings of the Regression Analyses Carried Out to Predict the Effect of Online Cognition and Personality Traits on Loneliness.....	75
5. 5 Conclusion.....	76

5. 6 The Limitations of the Study.....	77
5. 7 Clinical Effects of This Study.....	78
5. 8 Suggestions for Future Studies.....	78
REFERENCES .....	79
APPENDICES.....	99
Appendix A.....	99
Appendix B.....	102
Appendix C.....	104
Appendix D.....	106

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 3.1</b> Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Participants.....	31
<b>Table 4.1</b> Internet Usage Characteristics of the Sample.....	45
<b>Table 4.2</b> Differentiation of Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points In Terms of Gender Variable (Independent Sample t- test).....	48
<b>Table 4.3</b> Differentiation of Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points In Terms of Age Variable (One-Way Anova).....	51
<b>Table 4.4</b> Differentiation of Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points In Terms of Education Variable (One Way Anova).....	54
<b>Table 4.5</b> Findings Related To Relations Between Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points.....	56
<b>Table 4.6</b> Effects of Cognitive State on the Internet (Independent Variable) Over Personal Traits (Mediator Variable).....	57
<b>Table 4.7</b> Effects of Cognitive State on the Internet (Independent Variable) and Personal Traits (Mediator Variable) over Loneliness (Dependent Variable).....	58

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>UCLA</b>	:University of California Los Angeles Loneliness Scale
<b>EKA-GGK</b>	: Short-Form Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire
<b>OCS</b>	: Online Cognition Scale
<b>SPSS</b>	:Statistical Package for Social Sciences
<b>cited in</b>	:transmitting in Author
<b>p.</b>	:page

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I am glad to take opportunity to thank firstly my supervisor Assist. Prof. Sevim Cesur for his genuine help end very special encouragement throughout the research.

I am also grateful to my thesis committee members; Assoc. Prof. Tolga Arıca and Assoc. Prof. Ali Murat Yel.

My family, without them, nothing would be possible. They are the ones that make me who I am, and in whatever I do, they have their imprints, too.

I would like to express my great appreciation to my colleagues and friends for their valuable informations and comments on my academic and scientific problems.

Lastly, I would like to thank to Ismail Hakkı Yavuzcan, Zeynep Odemis, Vildan Celik, Merve Cavusoglu, Emre Aci and Sundus Sancakoglu for their understanding, motivation and patience.



# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1. 1. Problem

It is clear that people do not resemble each other. Despite the similarities of the environmental situations, responses may change in the same situation for the same stimulus. When causes and consequences of these differences been determined it was observed that “concept of personality” became apparent (Hogan, 1996). One’s personality may undergo a change according to some factors such as inherent, environmental, genetic, natural etc. Looking at that, it would not be wrong to say that personality is a structured process. Undoubtedly, there are some other factors that affect the personality such as social settings and culture. Theorists, studying on personality development, posited a disparate theoretical framework to describe personality. In line with these theories of personality; there are some psychological factors that have effect on personality development; that is; to gain his/her independence, success and self-confidence wish, crave for being liked, congratulated, and demand of having good social interaction (Kulaksizoglu, 2000).

Group interaction or socialization is a fundamental thing shaping personality features (Aydin, 2002). During the process of personality shaping, acculturation or with another name socialization debated with respect to social norms and standards transferred by constitutions like family, government and economic system, is significant. Isen and Batmaz (2002) describe socialization as a process that people learn to find social relationships. Experimental learning, taking part and social support comprise socialization. Family atmosphere is usually the first place that socialization takes place. During the age of 12 years instruments of early

socialization of the child involve the family, school atmosphere, internet, television, the public, peer group interactions etc.

Lately, comprehensive technological improvements have affected people in many aspects. It can be said that thanks to these changes human life somehow became easier, so technological improvements affect people's lives on the positive side. However, technology have also negative effect on human beings. According to the research focusing on social aspect, it is indicated that individuals are separated from the society for the sake of computer networks. As a result people suffer depression and loneliness (Nie & Erbring, 2000).

Teenagers are not aware of the fact that they coalesce themselves with the computer and internet. Some studies show that families use computer and internet less than their children who are aged between 13-19 (Gross, 2000; Nie & Erbring, 2000). Internet population was comprised by teenagers and in 2005 it is expected that 77 million adolescent will go online all around the world ((NUA Internet Survey 2001). This type of internet users as its name suggests pass their time online. Moreover, they exceed all age groups in their use of chat, instant messaging and other new forms of electronic communication tools (Montgomery, 2000). People's using of internet as a communication tool more and more makes internet a strong agent of socialization. Adolescents employ internet both as a physical and social space, they talk to each other on the internet, make friends, discuss issues, find work, play games, and perform many of the actions that normally they perform in the physical environment (Damer, 1997). Many of the studies have shown that internet's negative effects are increasing day by day (Gross, 2000).

In a study made by "Network Wizard", an American origin company has found that annually there is nearly 40% increase in the usage of internet. This rate is also valid for our country so we can say that internet is being used more and more by each day. The relationship between the usage of internet and social relations and possible impacts should be examined (Sumer, 2001). In a nutshell, in individual's social lives significance of internet cannot be undermined.

## **1. 2. The Aim of the Study**

Recently, advanced technologic developments have influenced human beings in various ways. One part of these effects makes human life easier, so positively influences it. But the technologic developments also make people have some emotions. Loneliness or social isolation, perhaps recently, is one of the emotions affecting human life the most. The aim of this study is to investigate relation between using the internet and socialization process of individuals depending on their personality traits.

## **1. 3. Significance of the Study**

The findings of this study will contribute to the literature. The relation between using the internet and socialization processes of young person depending on their personality traits will be explored in this study. The findings of this study will provide increasing of our understanding of why young person use the internet and explore this medium's role as an agent of socialization.

## **1. 4. Assumptions of the Study**

1. Personality characteristics, socialization, and the internet usage can be measured concepts.
2. Reflect the real degree of the scales used in this research based on information that people give accurate and realistic.
3. It is assumed that the sample group represents the cosmos universe of the research.

## **1. 5. Limitations of the Study**

1. This research is limited with measurement tools used in this study and subtests.
2. The results of the studies are limited with used statistical techniques.
3. This research is limited with 'the aim of the study' questions in the section.

## **1. 6. The Main Hypothesis of the Study**

Personality is a mediator between online cognition and loneliness

### **1.6. 1. The Sub-Hypotheses of the Study**

H0: Online cognition scores are not differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H1: Online cognition scores are differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H0: Personality scores are not differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H1: Personality scores are differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristic.

H0: Loneliness scores are not differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H1: Loneliness scores are differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2. 1. Personality**

Since the scope of personality is too wide, it is difficult to make a definition agreed upon. This difficulty also stems from the scope of personality's being too wide though being able to judge about an individual within this frame. Personality is not something depending on a few characteristics of an individual. Practically, it includes all the characteristics of individual and the interaction of these characteristics (Ozguven, 1992). Erkus (1994) defines personality as all of the cognitive, affective and behavioural characteristics of individual that differentiate him/her from the rest. Cuceloglu (2000) defines personality as a form of relation one establishes with internal and external environment and that is distinctive from other individuals and that is consistent and structured. According to another definition, personality is a dynamic organization of psychobiological systems that determine the harmony of individual across experiences (Cloninger, Svrakic & Pryzbeck, 1993). It may be thought its being dynamic stems from the fact that it is a self-renewing system and it continuously develops and changes. Concept of personality expresses integration of individual's biologic and psychological structures, behavioural patterns, competencies and interests together and in point (Akiskal & Hirschfeld, 1983).

In short, personality is the whole of an individual's characteristic and distinctive behaviours; and physical, mental and affective characteristics and this behaviour pattern reflects special harmony ways one uses in life (Isik, 2000).

## **2. 1. 1. Two Aspects of Personality: Character and Temperament**

Personality, temperament and character are concepts that are generally confused but different from each other.

### **2.1. 1. 1. Character**

Expressing social and moral characteristics of personality, character is the whole of general characteristics establishing and shaping mental power of an individual (Erdogan, 1991). Beginning to develop with the effect of family, school and environment as of childhood character develops and grows mature with punishment and awarding method, rational thinking, affective adoptions and taking as example (Guney, 1997). Character corresponds to individual differences in voluntary targets and values. Cloninger developed a general psychobiologic theory in order to define the structure and development of personality (Cloninger 1987, Cloninger et al., 1993). This model includes three dimensions of character assumed to grow mature in adulthood and to affect their own concepts: Self-directedness, cooperativeness and self transcendence. Self-directedness comprises of one's accepting his/her responsibility about his choices, determining meaningful aims and development of talent and confidence in solving the problems. Cooperativeness comprises of social acceptance, empathy, kindness and being virtuous. Self transcendence comprises of self-love, interpersonal identification and moral acceptance (Cloninger et al., 1993).

### **2.1. 1. 2. Temperament**

Being a concept emphasizing fundamental and distinctive characteristics belonging to an individual, temperament means change of peculiar, quite restricted and affective reactions in quantitative and qualitative terms within daily life according to Koknel (1984). Psychobiologic theory developed by Cloninger (1993) comprises of four dimensions of temperament assumed to be independent from each other genetically and stable against stationary and cultural effects during life at middle level; these dimensions are novelty seeking, harm avoidance, reward dependence and persistence. Novelty seeking can be seen as a hereditary bias in interaction of behaviours such as expansiveness, flying into a temper and avoiding

prevention when investigative activity, impulsive decision making and possibility of receiving award in response to novelty. Second temperate factor harm avoidance can be seen as a hereditary bias in inhibiting prudent behaviours such as pessimistic concerns, fear of uncertainty and feeling embarrassed against others and behaviours like getting tired quickly. Third temperate factor reward dependence can be seen as a hereditary bias in continuity of behaviours that display themselves as over-sensitivity, adherence and dependence on other's approval. Fourth temperate factor persistence can be seen as a hereditary bias in continuity of behaviour despite prevention, tiredness and interval reinforcement (Cloninger, 1987).

### **2.1. 2. Factors Constituting Personality**

Personality cannot be handled as behaviour in an individual time slot. Personality is the whole constituted by past, present and future. In this case, personality will be established by traces of the past, implementations of present and basic tendency of future. Personality of an individual emerges after a complicated process based on long years and influences it a lifelong (Turker, 2009). In this respect, it is possible to see personality as an observable aspect reflecting on actions of habits and characteristics in one's life (Zel, 2001).

Personality can change according to various factors such as environment and genetics. With the interaction of these two factors our personality is shaped. (Goldstein, 1981; Eroglu, 1996).

#### **2.1. 2. 1. Hereditary and Physical Factors**

Heredity is the major factor determining personality. A child has his/her parents' character and personality traits because of the DNA make up. Without doubt, a person's environment affects a person's personality, however, the main point is that, in learning process, role of the perception cannot be undermined and perception comes from heredity. Genetic transmission of characteristics from parents to offspring can shape personality to a certain extent. Hair and eye colour, skin colour and body type manifest at birth. Additionally, aptitude or learning capacity or tendency to a specific body of knowledge is all included in hereditary. Hereditary

specifies to which extent personality features which can be improved (<http://www.scribd.com>).

Strong genetic influences on Cloninger's disposition features have been watched in a wide range of age groups from adolescence (Heiman et al., 2004), to young adulthood (Ando et al., 2004), and older adulthood. Biometrical hereditary analyses have shown both a powerful component for disposition and characteristic features in adults. Counter to expectations, nearly there is not any indicator for shared environmental effects on character (Ando et al., 2004; Gillespie et al., 2003). Maybe this discovery is less confusing in the light of the disproportionate dependence on adult participation in personality research (Heiman et al., 2004). Not many twin studies have assessed Cloninger's personality model in childhood when character has not crystallized.

However, it is not possible to put forward exactly which characteristic of an individual is transmitted by way of heritage. It is known that social factors are also influential in determining personality (Zel, 2001).

## **2. 1. 2. 2. Social and Environmental Factors**

An addition to inborn factors, family wide environmental effects are significant for personality improvement. Socialization is not a mechanical processes happening itself. The societal and cultural structure one lives in is an important factor in formation of personality. When environmental circumstances are recalled, the family of the child first comes to mind (Turker, 2009). Being the most important and influential factor in formation of personality, family is the first social group that people encounter. Since the family is the first place where individuals begin to learn social values, it is the first source and model of socialization (Zel, 2001). Children learn both some behaviour patterns and social values by taking their parents as model. With children's growing up environmental circumstances begin to change; while the effect of the family reduces the effect of psychosocial variables such as friends, school, teacher, culture and social structure begin to increase (Turker, 2009).



### **2. 1. 3. Personality Theories**

The prominent theories concerning personality can be summarized as follows.

#### **2. 1. 3. 1. Psychoanalytic Personality Theories**

First theory is Freudian view proper including Sigmund and Anna Freud and the ego psychologist of whom Erik Erikson is widely known. The next one may be called the transpersonal perspective. It has a much more physical streak and will be represented here by Carl Jung. And the third has been called the social psychological view, and involves Alfred Adler, Karen Horney, and Erich Fromm (Boeree, 2006).

A view of mental life from the perspective of inner conflict, especially conflicts outside the awareness is the necessary defining characteristic of a psychodynamic approach to personality and psychopathology. Various differing opinions result from this common ground of emphasizing contradictory forces in the mind (Thomas and Segal, 2006).

As it is known, Sigmund Freud was the founder of psychoanalyses as a theory. Psychoanalyses are a way of examining the human brain, and a method of treatment. Psychoanalyses have been the most challenging, extensive and complex method to comprehend human behaviour both normal and pathological. Its goal is to explain the countless forms of psychopathology, and also it is interested in key cognitive, emotional and motivational aspects of personality improvement. Possible biological bases of these processes are included. It also tries to examine nearly every position of human experience, sexual and aggressive wishes and behaviours, interpersonal functioning, creativity in art, music and literature, the psychology of humour, dreams and fantasies, several positions of memory (experiences such as dejavu and so-called screen memories), the repetition of maladaptive patterns of behaviour; the meanings of religion, rituals, politics, and international conflict; the psychology of historical figures; reports of alien abduction; psychoanalytic approaches to anthropology etc. are involved in this (Thomas and Segal, 2006).

Major theorists are Carl Jung (1968), Alfred Adler (1927), and Karen Horney (1950). They dealt with Freud's extreme stress on sexuality in personality improvement and his inadequate appreciation of sociocultural determinants of personality. Above mentioned theorist were named neo-Freudians. Freudian analysts at the time supported the idea that they did not worth to name their alternative versions psychoanalytic (cited in Boeree, 2006).

Since above mentioned theorists also dwelled on conflict and supported the idea that conflicting forces in mind could engender to psychopathology and as they also concerned with the phenomena of transference and resistance in the treatment situation, psychodynamic, a more expansive term, started to be used. But the neo-Freudians protested the idea that conflict was not to be found in biologically rooted sexual and aggressive instinct but in the discourse of interpersonal relationship and sociocultural forces. All these separations from Freud's theory have been based on the contradiction to his biological stress on instinctual drives (Thomas & Segal, 2006).

Currently, we are in the theoretical pluralism age. In that age the field approves the designations of theorists as psychoanalytic or psychodynamic. Meanwhile, we are more inclined to use the term psychoanalytic when we refer to theories that are in association with Freud's theories. Moreover, as well as so-called neo-Freudians whose theories have still influence, in the evolution of psychoanalyses, we have discussed both elaborations of Freudian theory and two main theoretical approaches: these are object-relation theories and Kohut's (1971) self psychology (Greenberg & Mitchell, 1983). These theories have not been propounded in an extensive, systematic set of offers with clearly testable predictions. Also, we have not seen any well-done effort to integrate the several psychoanalytic theories. One of the attempts to synthesize traditional Freudian theory was made by Rapaport (1960), but that attempt was disregarded to a large extent.

### **2. 1. 3. 2. Behaviouristic Personality Theories**

In this perspective, with the observations of behaviour and environment and their relations, it is thought that the answers are wrong. Both cognitivists and

behaviourists opt for quantitative and experimental methods. Behaviourists are on the opinion that alike reactions given in differing situations do not imply that his behaviour is caused by a drive or trait. Also, they do not support the idea that situation alone determines behaviour (Thomas & Segal, 2006). On the contrary, melding of individual's present situation and history determines the possibility of behaviour. Functional analyses of the disparate situations will unveil contextual similarities that elicit the behaviour based on the individual's support history relative to those stimulus conditions. In another saying, people become vulnerable to the situations they have experienced within the same settings. B. F. Skinner and Albert Bandura are representatives of the behaviourist approach (Boeree, 2006).

B.F. Skinner is among the most famous psychologists concerning behaviourism. Generally, behaviourism supports that people respond to stimuli as it can be predicted, and accordingly those who control the stimuli control the person. There are only reactions to sensed pleasures and pains. So, the basic idea can be said that if one wish to behave irrationally, she/he must be sure of that unreasonable actions are punished and vice versa. As the time passes, the illogical will disappear, because the agent realized in the end that these kinds of actions lead him/her to pain (Kohn, 1999).

Skinner established his entire system on operant conditioning. The organism is in the process of "operating" on the environment that means it is confusing around its world, doing what it does. In the process of operating, the living creature comes across a special kind of stimulus named a reinforcing stimulus or reinforce. This special stimulus can increase the operant, that means, the action that occurs just before the reinforce. This is called operant conditioning, that is, there is a consequence after the behaviour and organism's inclination to repeat the action in the future is changes by the nature of the consequence (Kohn, 1999).

As for social learning theory developed by Albert Bandura, social learning theorists believe that consciousness is as important as environmental circumstances as determinants of behaviours. In social learning theory, it is defended that one does not behave passive against environmental conditioning, one can resist when others try to keep him under control. Individual develops quite consistent expectations beginning from childhood about which behaviours will result in which results and

which results stem from his own behaviours and which results stem from outside of him. Bandura's Social Learning Theory postulates that people get information interactively through observation, imitation and modeling (Boeree, 2006).

### **2.1. 3. 3. Humanistic Personality Theories**

The approach is the humanistic approach, comprehended as including existential psychology. Usually based on including a reaction to psychoanalytic and behaviourist theories, it is commonly believed that the replies are to be found in consciousness or experience. Most of the humanists prefer Phenomenological methods. Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers are the presenters of the first, one that is, and humanistic method. The second is existential psychology. In Europe and Latin America philosophy based humanism is famous. We will touch upon Victor Frankl who is an existential psychologist (Boeree, 2006).

It is rumoured that existence of humanistic psychology movement started in the beginnings of 1950. And this existence expanded surpassing the mailing list of Abraham Maslow (Boeree, 2006). Obviously, Abraham Maslow was the first positive psychologist, as he propounded that existentialism may give birth to the establishment of a new branch of psychology which is completely evolved and genuine. These new branches of psychology suspend the focus from the psychopathology of the average person to the genuine, self-actualized individual (Maslow, 1964). The theory of hierarchy of needs is possibly the most known theory of Maslow. This theory is comprised by five levels. These are: 1. physiological needs, 2. safety and security needs, 3. the need for love and belonging, 4. esteem needs, and lastly 5. The need for self actualization.

The most effective humanistic psychologist is, in all likelihood, Carl Rogers. His theory of personality is radically phenomenological due to his stress upon the phenomenological field of tentative person. So, he put emphasis on the significance of freedom, responsibility and authenticity. In particular, he believed in individual dignity and human potential to growth (Thomas & Segal, 2006). Roger's personality theory is entitled self theory. Here the word "self" branched out from the receptive field through a process of differentiation; the outcome of interaction with the world,

specially the evolutionary interaction with fundamental others. The word self can be identified as “ the organized, coherent, conceptual gestalt composed of perceptions of the characteristics of the “I” or “me” and the perceptions of the relationship of the “I” or “me ” to others and to various aspects of life, with the values given to these receptions (Rogers, 1959).

Viktor Frankl’s experiences in Nazi death camps gave way to his theory and therapy. Freud and Adler were his workmates. Freud’s concept of unconsciousness was acceptable to him. However, he regarded the will to meaning was more important for human improvement than the will to pleasure. Existential analysis aims to bring to awareness and enlarge the hidden logos. It refers to the particular therapeutic process included in assisting people to be aware of their meaning in life. The duty of the logotherapy is to aid the patient to uncover meaning in life (Thomas & Segal, 2006). Conscience is among the main concepts of Viktor Frankl. He regards conscience as a kind of unconscious spirituality which is dissimilar to instinctual unconscious that Freud and others put emphasis on. The awareness is only one of the many factors. It is the kernel of our being and creator of our individual unity (Frankl, 1996).

#### **2.1.3.4. Trait and Factor Theories**

Some theories trying to explain the personality structure don't underline observable qualities of personality but rather define how they emerge. Tip defines the concept as a certain trait.

For instance; McCrae and Costa identified characteristics intensively as property of personal disparities in inclinations to show coherent patterns of thoughts, feelings, and actions. (Crae & Costa, 2003). This description seems coherent to many of the current views of characteristics and conform to their operationalization in personality trait measures. Maybe the oldest approach to an understanding of human personality is the characteristic (Zel, 2001). Moreover, this approach is most known among personality theories, as it is evidenced by the lexicon of characteristic terminology found in every human language (Dixon, 1977). Human mind can easily assign long-lasting characteristics like timidity, cheerfulness, interest, courtesy and diligence to

oneself and other people. Actually, after Mischel's effective critique, in the 1970s, most of the psychologists were in the opinion that characteristic features were sole cognitive fictions, as peculiarly mythological as Adad, god of the storm. However, in the last centuries, certain tentative studies have clarified the nature, structure, origins and consequences of personality traits. The information now supplies abundant justification for mankind's choice for characteristic explanations, since one's character in fact gives many clues about human behaviour. Psychologists studying characteristic attribution processes have decided that people are ready to ascribe behaviour to such traits, even when situational factors may be significant (cited in Ross, 1977). Indeed, in the 1970s, following Mischel's (1968) influential critique, many psychologists thought traits were mere cognitive fictions, as quaintly mythological as Adad, god of the storm. In the last quarter century, however, rigorous empirical research has clarified the nature, structure, origins, and consequences of personality traits. The data now provide ample justification for humanity's predilection for trait explanations, because traits do indeed explain much of human behaviour (McCrae & Costa, 2003).

Eysenck and Eysenck were the pioneers of the trait approach of personality theories. They studied individually and provided a similar approach in personality studies. Factor analyses gave birth to the traits which defined as theoretical construct based on observed intercorrelations between a number of separate habitual responses (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1984). According to Eysenck, there are three main personality characters, and one of these was extroversion-introversion. Cognitive explanations of extroversion-introversion continuum were suggested in the last 20 years. Each explanation has a disparate point of view and thus emphasizing a different aspect of these personality traits in their explanations. While the personality theory included dimensions of neuroticism and extroversion-introversion when it was first developed, Eysenck added the dimension of psychoticism later (Lewis et al., 2002). While extroversion represents sociality and impulsiveness, the people getting high points at this level are defined as people who love communicating with others, who are clubbable and who prefer being with people rather than being alone. It is claimed that neuroticism dimension sign affective consistency or over-reactivity and someone who receives high point at this level can be uneasy, depressive, tense, timid, and too affective and have low self-confidence (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). It was found that

distinctive traits defined by Eysenck are related to certain affections and behaviours. It was found that neuroticism was related to tendency toward displaying low self respect, affective and illogical behaviours. Extroversion was associated with being social, going to parties, kidding, having many friends, impulsiveness, uncontrolled affections and sometimes untrusting personal characteristics. Finally, psychoticism was found related to aggression, distantiation, antisocial behaviours and insensible behaving (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). Eysenck stated that these distinctive personal characteristics were independent dimensions.

In this study, investigating the concept of personality based on Eysenck's personality theory. Because Eysenck's approach to personality assessment was the first popular scalable mathematical methodology. Previous theories generally placed a person within one of the defining types, or between two types, or attributed a mixture of types to a person's personality. Eysenck used extensive research and questionnaires to build a personality inventory. We also used this personality inventory in this study.

There are many potential factors that are involved in shaping a personality. These factors are usually seen as coming from heredity and the environment. Research by psychologists over the last several decades has increasingly pointed to hereditary factors being more important, especially for basic personality traits such as emotional tone. However, the acquisition of values, beliefs, and expectations seem to be due more to socialization and unique experiences, especially during childhood. Some hereditary factors that contribute to personality development do so as a result of interactions with the particular social environment in which people live. There are many potential environmental influences that help to shape personality. In short socialization is a concept associated with personality. The aim of this study is to investigate relation between using the internet and socialization process of individuals depending on their personality traits. So the next section will be mentioned socialization.

## **2. 2 Socialization**

What makes a human is his social interaction with his circle, his thinking and displaying meaningful actions. People are not born with culture. Culture passes down, and it can be transferred by their teachers, parents and others. This wide process of obtaining culture is called as socialization. Socialization is defined in some sources as “a process that individuals go through beginning from their childhood until they are able to maintain their lives as a person who has a certain degree of education and culture” and explained as follows a process that allows societal culture to be transmitted from generation to generation, that begins in the family and continues by means of primary and secondary groups, that includes customs, traditions, religion, values, knowledge and talents of the society they are born (Badawi, 1986).

Socialization is not only a process covering childhood and realizing in family and school. Socialization process continues lifelong. People learn the culture they are involved and the expectations of other people from them as well as developing themselves and their potentials in this process. Value judgments of society and concepts as right, wrong, good, bad are also learnt in the process of socialization (Bahar, 2008). Childhood and youth have an important place in the process of socialization. It is a course of action by which all people learn from one another. In the early days of our lives we learn something from other people; and most probably we go on our social learning throughout life. This process is defined according to the age as childhood, adolescence, adult and elderliness (Bahar, 2008). Research made to learn the role of social discourse in the socialization of adolescents showed that discourse has a rich tradition constructed on the significance of examining and understanding the process inherent between a person and their environment (Adams & Gullotta, 2000). Teenagers communicate through enlarged family structures, neighbourhoods, communities, and socioeconomic contexts. They live in different regions, focus on different fields in school and also they have easy access to different sources. These variations made it essential to investigate how different social contexts affect the processes and results of teenager development (Templeton et al., 2008).



However, today together with industrialization and technological developments people tend to individualise. This individualization push people to loneliness. Rubenstein and Shaver state that every year 35 million American people suffer from loneliness at the beginning of 1980s (Ernst & Cacioppo, 1999).

### **2. 2. 1. Socialization Theories**

Socialization theories are handled under three subheadings as psychoanalytical theory, acculturation theory and learning theory.

#### **2. 2. 1. 1. Psychoanalytical Theory**

The first theoretical approach that was put forward regarding both definition and process of socialization and that lasted its effect for a long time in later research is psychoanalytical theory. The leader and strong defenders of this approach is Freud. Freud handled individual's personality formation in socialization as an affective-impulsive process in 1900s. He related moral development of individual to concept of "balance" in relations of "id", "ego" and "superego". According to Freud, stemming from genetic quality of child, this situation is later shaped with the effect of parents and other persons with whom he interacts closely. Later, Freud adopted the effect of environmental factors to genetic characteristics he grounded in socialization of individual and thus a new dimension was added to psychoanalytical view. However, the basic factor is the genetic characteristics of the individual (Kagitcibasi, 1979).

#### **2. 2. 1. 2. Acculturation Theory**

Another theoretical approach to socialization is anthropological approach. Especially, in 1930s it gained popularity with socialization definitions of anthropologists in the form of transmitting the culture in society to next culture. According to this theory, individual learns the culture he is involved and reflects this culture on his behaviours. Other than this view handling socialization in terms of solely culture, some anthropologists adopted the view that genetic qualities of individual play role in socialization apart from acculturation as well as adopting the

genetic theory that Freud views as principal element in the process of socialization. Meanwhile, anthropologists like Kroeber and Malinowski developed the theory that society culture was transmitted to individual together with the effect of individual's genetic personality formation in the process of socialization. According to this theory developed, every culture is different from other one. Then, development of personality cannot be put forth with intercultural generality of societal-psychological phenomenon and processes such as roles regarding gender, raising children and mental illnesses. These change from culture to culture. However, the first anthropologists who paid attention to the issue claimed that the individuals of a society would display similar characters since they were under the effect of the same institutions and the same environment. According to this theory developed, individual mental factors are independent reasons of cultural societal behaviour and political and economic situation can even be explained with personal characteristics of individuals in that society (Aziz, 1982).

### **2. 2. 1. 3. Learning Theory**

In 1930s when intense studies regarding socialization were done, another approach that was also put forward by anthropologists and that showed its effect for a long time later and that most of today's researchers ground on is called "learning and behaviour theory". According to this theory, socialization is an effect of orders maintained and only a cause of orders that may happen in the future. Therefore, in this approach socialization influence settled structure and personality of society members and become a functioning integrated by the culture. Personality gains the quality of being an interval variable both as a result and cause of culture (Aziz, 1982). Today, in "learning and behaviour" theory particularly taken as the adopted view it is emphasized that individual takes the culture in society by means of learning, he displays them in his behaviours and impact the next society in this way (Bandura, 1977).

### **2.2. 2. Socialization Factors**

Socialization factors are handled as primary groups and secondary groups below.

### **2. 2. 2. 1. Primary Groups in Socialization**

One of the widest and most fundamental distinctions in the process of socialization is the distinction of “primary” and “secondary” group. Primary group is the small groups one is in close and direct relation such as family, close relatives, friends in solving his problems, mutual help, protecting each other. It holds the person within the consciousness of “us” as an organ of the group (Demir & Acar, 1992). Primary group includes especially family, peers, friends and play groups, school. As can be figured from the definitions in the structure of such a group, relation’s being head to head, intensity of frequency and length of time feature the effect of such groups in socialization (Aziz, 1982). The period in which intense effect of primary groups in process of socialization is seen is childhood and youth period. The individual shapes his societal quality and purposes by means of primary groups. There are certain features in qualifying such groups as primary groups: Candid relations are developed in psychological terms, the feeling of being a part of a common whole is experienced, and the individual feels himself in the common life and purposes of the group at least in terms of one purpose (Lundberg et al., 1970). As the person proceeds to adulthood, the significance and effect of primary groups relatively decreases and are replaced by secondary groups.

### **2. 2. 2. 2. Secondary Groups in Socialization**

As humans leave their close, intimate relations of primary groups in their relations, they approach the secondary groups in which relations are more affective. Secondary group is type of group in which person develops relatively shorter, formal, and weak and mostly artificial relations. Distant relatives, persons one encounters sometimes, crowds, the city lived, nation, party, factory and similar groups could be given as examples of secondary group (Demir & Acar, 1992). Mass communication tools and internet are also classified as secondary groups on the grounds that they do not involve personal interaction directly (Eklin, 1995). While the effect rates of mass communication tools, especially internet, increase in proportion to the place opened to the messages of mass communication tools, the level of effect may also vary as per the quality of interaction of primary and

secondary groups with the individual because of mass answer to the messages of mass communication tools (Eklin, 1995).

### **2.2. 3. Basic Setbacks Against Socialization**

Inadequacy of guidance in the society, social circle's being formalistic, arrangement of relations only according to pragmatic norms, ideological isolation, "us" understanding's failing to develop in the society, the feeling of citizenship and domination of common past understanding and similar reasons influence socialization in a negative way. National and international migration sometimes leads to problems in socialization of an individual. Harmony with the migrated society is an important problem. Unfamiliarity with the values in the society migrated impact socialization (Bahar, 2008).

Today, the concept of socialization has gained a new dimension with the spread of internet use. "Online communities" come in very different shapes and sizes, ranging from virtual communities that connect geographically distant people with no prior acquaintance who share similar interests, to settings that facilitate interactions among friendship networks or family members, to community networks that focus on issues relevant to a geographically defined neighborhood (Smith & Kollock, 1999). In this day and age where use of computing or internet is integral in essentially all types of work, youth are teaching themselves the technical skills that they will find useful later on in life. This is a new form of socialization that is occurring in a unique way because information is democratized and youth have much more influence in what they are exposed to. Socialization is the social process in which people are engaged in throughout experiences in their life, learning the patterns of their culture, including social norms and behaviours. This new way of socialization can link different cultures and generations from all over the world. Perhaps excessive amounts of internet use will facilitate a new generation, tolerant of different cultures in ways which can break down barriers. There have been many empirical studies regarding the relationship between socialization or loneliness and the internet. First hypothesis is that over use of internet leads to loneliness (Morahan and Schumacher, 2003). The second hypothesis asserts that lonely individuals become more engaged with the use of internet due to the social web and changing internet relationships

(Frieze et al., 1979). But some theorists have suggested that usage of internet increases social interaction and support (Silverman, 1991). The aim of this study is to investigate relation between using the internet and socialization process of individuals depending on their personality traits. So the next section will be mentioned internet.

### **2. 3. Internet**

With the word “internet”, electronic networks through which people can get information and talk to people with the help of pcs and other digital tools giving way to person-to-person communication and information access. Internet comprises of different types of computers used by people and institutions and different operating systems used by such computers (Balay et al., 2006). By ensuring computers in different form from each other, internet allows people to see the same information on the screen and assess it.

In the 1960s the internet spring from the technologic warriors of the US Defense Department Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to impede a Soviet changeover or destruction of American interactions in the event of nuclear battle. Scheduling of the internet engendered a new learning culture that is social in nature. That new access of information allowed young people to share, discuss, influence and learn interactively from each other and from the medium (Hoffman & Novak, 1999).

From its beginning to the end of 1994, having reached to 110 countries, 10.000 computer networks, more than 3.000.000 computers and more than 25 million users, internet made a big explosion in 1995 when web page were launched and reached to 60 million. This number was expected to rise 10% every month by 1996. It is estimated there are 5 million users in Turkey currently and 300 million users in the world (Balay et al., 2006). As of the end of 1997, it was estimated that there were nearly 30,000 computers connecting to internet in Turkey (<http://www.po.metu.edu.tr>). Spreading to each square of world with a big speed, internet is one of the biggest communication and advertisement means of the century (Balay et al., 2006).

### **2. 3. 1. Internet in Turkey**

Internet came to Turkey around 1993. Internet first came with Network of Turkey University and Research Institutions established under the leadership of Aegean University. Turkey was introduced to Internet with the connection established by a rented line between Ankara-Washington on April 12, 1993. Therefore, April 1993 was accepted as birthday of internet in Turkey. In the same year METU and Bilkent universities also published the first Turkish websites. In 1994, giving internet accounts to institutions and companies was initiated. Meanwhile, the first internet service provider Tr.net was put into service. Turkey's first internet infrastructure TURNET began to provide service in 1996. Internet Supreme Commission was established within the body of Ministry of Transportation in 1998. Later, this commission continued operating with the name of Internet Commission. Commission declared between 8-21 April as "Internet Week". Even though the week was celebrated each year and did not attract attention too much recently, it undertook a big function in internet's reaching to public opinion in Turkey (<http://www.melihbayramdede.com>).

Like the whole world, internet was first used with the aim of information at the beginning. In parallel with the development in the world in 1995, Turkish entrepreneurs also began to use internet environment with an increasing demand day by day especially for the purposes of advertisement and marketing interactively in the direction of users' expectations (Balay et al., 2006).

### **2. 3. 2. What does Internet Provide?**

Internet provides many services supported with TCP/IP protocol. For example, a user who has internet access may access the information in any other computer connected to internet, take them on his own computer and send file/information to another computer connected to internet from his own computer if he is authorized to. This feature is known as file transfer protocol. Similarly, the users over internet may send e-mails to each other (<http://bid.ankara.edu.tr>).

The most important function of internet is communication. One may establish communication with any part of the world by means of internet, he/she may conduct research and save the required information and documents to his/her own computer (Balay et al., 2006).

### **2. 3. 3. Informatics as the Social Extension of Internet and Information**

Informatics emphasizes the social extension of information by characterizing the effort of interpersonal sharing of information that is, spreading information within the society and between societies. The fact that informatics is an interpersonal social process shadowed forth itself with internet's spreading and began to play a role influencing change over societies (Balay et al., 2006). Internet became an alternative to newspaper and television ensuring communication of news among masses and allowed people to make transfer of news simultaneously which was not present in traditional means. This synchronization made interpersonal communication of news a social phenomenon and anyone connecting to internet had the chance to communicate with anyone else in any place of the world.

### **2. 3. 4. Use of Internet and Personality Traits**

Some research showed that there is a relation between usage the internet and personality traits. Hamburger and Artzi (2002), investigated the relation between personality traits, using of the internet and loneliness in their study. They found using of the internet is a result of loneliness and neurotic personality. In a one-year longitudinal study, Kraut et al. (1998), found that people who spent more time on the Internet subsequently developed higher levels of depression and loneliness. However, in a follow-up study among participants from the same sample, Kraut et al. (2002) found that the association between daily Internet use and loneliness and depression disappeared. Also, they found that for extraverted individuals daily internet use was positively associated with well-being, whereas negative relationships were found for introverted individuals.

### **2. 3. 5. Internet and Socialization**

Being a communication network that emerged in the direction of people's needs of producing, sharing, storing and reaching information, internet brought multidimensionality to many fields particularly education, health, defence, industry, public sector. Today science, trade, entertainment, advertisement and even chatting were moved to internet environment and people's social activities changed shape by retaining its content (Balay et al., 2006).

Since internet integrates dissimilar modalities of interaction as well as different kinds of content in a single channel, it is unique. These different methods of communication includes mutual interaction, broadcasting, personal reference-searching, discussions within the groups or person/machine interactions, and different kinds of discourse includes text, video, visual images, audio. This dexterity comperes logical claims that the technology will be implicated in many kinds of social change, maybe more effective than television or radio (Di Maggio et al., 2001). Communication will be via e-mail and the internet, but people will not recognize it enter into our lives sneakingly. Much of the investigation into the psychology of the internet has focused on the nature of communication via internet. According to some researchers, this type of communication is totally different from face to face communication (Giles, 2003). Johnson and Lim (1964), discovered an inclination to internet users to disclose more personal information and generally communicate in a less diffidently way than in face to face interaction. This may give birth to entangler factors for researchers expecting that the internet can be seen as a smooth vehicle for speeding up research.

Other technological communication devices support that internet users may replace time online for attention to functionally equivalent social and media activities (Weiss, 1970). Comparatively, considering the internet having a negative or positive effect on community depends on how one regards the things people do with it. For instance, Nie and Erbring (2000) evaluate heavy internet users's choosing e-mail instead of telephone contact as part of their loss of contact with their social environment. Contrary to this, the theory has often been called a bridge between behaviourist and cognitive learning theories because it encompasses attention,



memory, and motivation. Lin (2001) thinks that, online communication, such as e-mail, is expanding the stock of social capital. Witnesses stated a special matter that internet users might cut back the time they spend off-line social interaction and pass less time with written media with television and other media (Nie & Erbring, 2000).

Internet users are members of cyber society and live in cyber space. Cyber society is the network of communications based on electronics created by the world wide web comprising of internet users (virtual reality). Virtual society is produced in the world of virtual reality (Robins, 1999; Inam, 1999). Virtual world is not real; however it may bring us trustable contexts that will help questioning what real world is. One of the most important features of internet that make one happy is that the users have the chance to socialize with people and groups they choose. Virtual environments form new socialization fields alternative to the conditions of social reality (Subasi, 2001). Those coming together in internet socialize not as a result of coincidences or compulsory encounterings but because of their filed of interests and choices. However, users' world becomes narrow in here and their perception of reality changes (Aksoy, 1996).

With its feature marking an era in the life, internet witnesses positive developments, however brought about a number of negativities. According to Fromm, people had to live together so as to defeat the challenges of nature and their fight against nature. Common sharings were required so that they could maintain their lives. The people had to trust and support each other in this period. With the comfort brought by the technological development experienced today, interpersonal interactions were replaced by a world full of computers and machines. People do not need each other so as to live anymore and rather than trying to establish trusting meaningful relations they prefer to keep away from them (Demir, 1990).

### **2. 3. 5. 1. Some Research in Our country Concerning Internet and Socialization**

In his study named "Effects of Internet Use on Societal Participation and Relations and Internet Addiction" Sumer (2001) found that intense use of computer networks or internet and internet addiction led to some negative effects over social relations, communication forms and users' mental health. Determining negative

effects of Internet in social psychological terms, Sumer (2001) stated that internet use leads to isolation from the society, weakening and becoming superficial of relations, loneliness, depression. Besides, he noted that spending long and uncontrolled time over internet might lead to negative effects on the health of users who are developmentally sensitive like children and youth.

Baran and Kulakoglu (2001), grounded their research from the point of symbolic interaction of American sociology ecol: "Internet Use in Internet Cafes and Social-Virtual relations: Ankara example". The research was conducted over 245 internet user in 23 internet cafes at middle and upper-middle socio-economic levels of Ankara. The findings of the research were compared to research results found by Standford Institute and California Los Angeles University (UCLA). As a result of research, it was observed that after internet cafes were closed they were opened to operation very quickly. It was found that youth saw internet cafes as a place for entertainment, spending time and coming together with their friends, youth went to internet cafes together with their friends and didn't stop communicating with each other within the internet cafe and accessed to pornographic sites even though at low and hidden percentage. Besides it was seen that internet use in internet cafes did not lead to social isolation and the users didn't see themselves as addicted, it was emphasized that meeting new technologies was quite important for the youth and internet use was more entertainment aimed rather than being scientific. It was also stated that research findings were quite similar to those of Standford Institute and UCLA.

In their research named "Social and Psychological Effects of Internet: Is Internet An Addiction Creating Social Isolation?" Gurcay and Kumbul (2001) tested whether the clues in theoretical explanations toward internet use habit were used at the level of creating isolation and addiction. A questionnaire including the information of demographic characteristics and internet use was used by grounding on Stanford Institute for the Quantitative Study of Society (SIQSS)'s question form whether internet led to isolation and Addiction Test prepared by Kimberely Young which measures addiction. In the questionnaire filled by 267 persons in internet environment, it was investigated whether internet led to isolation over respondents. As a consequence of the research, it was seen that the more internet addiction

increases the more social isolation may increase. Besides, it was concluded that respondents didn't perceive internet addiction in the same way they perceive gambling or alcohol addiction.

### **2. 3. 6. The Usage of Internet with Problems and Addiction of the Internet**

With the growing technology, the computers and the internet became the indispensable devices for the life. While for the one side those technologies making the life easier by the other side brings now kinds of risks together. Addiction of the internet is also one of the risks that is occurred of technology. This kind of addiction seems with following signs; no success of limitation of usage of internet, attending the usage of it eventhough is has socially and academical damages, feeling the much anksiyete while as the access is limited to internet. And this kind of addiction seems since the mid of 1990's (Oguz et al, 2008).

It was being used only for the work but for the time being is used by the users that are not especially interested in the technology for making the daily works easier or escaping the intensity of work life. "The healthy usage of internet" is as follows according to Davis (2002); to use internet without feeling any disturbance as cognitively or behaviorally, in a suitable period of time ,to reach the required purpose. Some people limit their usage of internet as much as their needs, some of them can not bring any limitation to their usage and they have some difficulties in their work and social lives. The attitudes of patterns that make troubles for the individuals been started to be characterized as "pathological" and "problemeatic" cause of its detrimental and showing the evident changes than normal (Caplan, 2002). The term of "addiction of the internet" was used by Goldberg (1996) and also Golberg did followings; the term of "addiction of the internet" was started to be debated by him, in accordance with the criterions of diagnosis addiction of alcohol in DSM-IV and for all the criterions been enhanced by him also (cited in Souza, 1998). Immediately following Goldberg, some clinicians reported the cases that are showing those signs. Young has started to report the clinical cases in accordance with the signs that were adapted from the "pathological gambling" diagnosis criterions and for the therapy for those people, the (Center for On-line Addiction) been established by him (Chou et al., 2005). After about the cases that were reported

by Young, it was started to be debated whether the usage of internet is a really addiction as the other usage of materials or facts make some pathological attitudes or the heavy usage of internet is an indicator existing psychological problems and appears with this usage of internet. The usage of internet with problems is described as follows according to Davis (2002); it is a psychiatric statement that includes inadaptable ideas and pathological attitudes. The pathological usage of internet is mentioned as following according to Morahan- Martin and Schumacher; is a statement that, using the internet heavily and also cannot get success on limiting this usage of internet and giving the serious damages to person's life.

Internet addiction appears to be a common disorder that merits inclusion in DSM-V. Conceptually, the diagnosis is a compulsive-impulsive spectrum disorder that involves online and/or offline computer usage (Hollander & Stein, 2006) and consists of at least three subtypes: excessive gaming, sexual preoccupations, and e-mail/text messaging (3). All of the variants share the following four components: 1) *excessive use*, often associated with a loss of sense of time or a neglect of basic drives, 2) *withdrawal*, including feelings of anger, tension, and/or depression when the computer is inaccessible, 3) *tolerance*, including the need for better computer equipment, more software, or more hours of use, and 4) *negative repercussions*, including arguments, lying, poor achievement, social isolation, and fatigue (Beard, 2001).

We also have included internet addiction in our study, because some studies as regards to the use of internet indicate that the individuals who use internet at pathologic level feel more alone (Martin & Schumacher, 2000; Ozcan & Buzlu, 2007) but it is reported in some studies that there is no difference (Subrahmanyam & Lin, 2007; Dittman 2004). It has been reported that the social relationships of the individuals defined as internet addicts decrease and they have problems in the interpersonal relationships (Welsh, 1999). It has been expressed that the individuals using the internet intensively are involved in less interaction with their families and friends and allocate less time to them (Kraut et al. 1998; Shim, 2004).

In the light of the literature and findings has been developed the following hypotheses:

*The Main Hypothesis of the Study*

Personality is a mediator between online cognition and loneliness

*The Sub-Hypotheses of the Study*

H0: Online cognition scores are not differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H1: Online cognition scores are differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H0: Personality scores are not differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H1: Personality scores are differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H0: Loneliness scores are not differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H1: Loneliness scores are differentiated significantly according to demographic characteristics.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHOD**

In this part of the research, explanations regarding research model, universe and sample, measuring means used in gathering data, data collection process and statistical techniques applied in analyzing data were be written respectively.

#### **3. 1. Sample**

In this study, data were collected from 1466 people. However, data gathered from 55 people, were taken out from the survey because of some blank parts. Therefore, the study sample consisted of 1411 people (979 women, 432 men). Data were collected via the internet.

A majority of the sampling of this study is composed of female participants. Most of the participants are single, they are mostly in the age group of 15-35 and their education level is high. Participants, most of whom are working, have a middle income level. More detailed demographic information regarding the participants are shown in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1** Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

<b>Tables</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent(%)</b>
<b>Sex</b>	Women	979	69,4
	Men	432	30,6
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Age</b>	15-25	750	53,2
	25-35	529	37,5
	35-45	95	6,7
	45 +	37	2,6
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Educational level</b>	Primary education	34	2,4
	High school	270	19,1
	University	905	64,1
	Master's and doctoral	202	14,3
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Marital status</b>	Single	1070	75,8
	Engaged	33	2,3
	Married	257	18,2
	Divorced / widowed	51	3,6
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Number of children</b>	No	1262	89,4
	1,00	85	6,0
	2,00	64	4,5
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Profession</b>	Worker	63	4,5
	Officer	84	6,0
	Artisans + craftsman	34	2,4
	Academics	59	4,2
	Engineer + lawyer + doctor	90	6,4
	Housewife	35	2,5
	Student	568	40,3
	Teacher	123	8,7
	Inemployed	74	5,2
	Other	281	19,9

	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Socio-economic status</b>	Low	228	16,2
	Medium	1012	71,7
	High	171	12,1
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Where they live now</b>	Province	1161	82,3
	District	231	16,4
	Village	19	1,3
	Total	1411	100,0

**N=1411**

### 3. 2. Data Collection Tools

Socio-demographic data form, UCLA Loneliness Scale (version3), Short-Form Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK) and Online Cognition Scale were applied to the participants.

#### 3. 2. 1. Socio-demographic Data Form

This form is designed for participants to collect information about their socio-demographic and internet usage characteristics. It consists of 18 questions. Seven of these questions related to participants' socio-demographic characteristics. These questions: Gender, age, education level, marital status, number of children, occupation, socio-economic status and place of residence.

The remaining 11 questions related to participants' internet usage characteristics. These questions: The daily use of the internet, in which the environment is connected to the internet the most, is using social networking, chat, whether on the internet did not make the most of what the media friendship happy, in touch with the people on the internet looking for when choosing what is the priority, which is the most comfortable environment, feelings of shared, how it affects the use of internet socialization, wake up at night and does not enter into the internet, uses the internet according to the purposes for which the distribution of the most. It has been shown Appendix A.



### **3. 2. 2 UCLA Loneliness Scale**

All elements of UCLA (University of California Los Angeles Loneliness Scale) Loneliness Scale developed by Russell, Peplau and Ferguson in order to measure loneliness levels of individuals included negative items (Demir, 1989). However, thinking that it led to systemic bias Russell, Peplau and Cutrana revised the items and the items were made as half positive and half negative (cited in Demir, 1989). UCLA Loneliness Scale comprises of 20 items, 10 of them are regularly coded, and the other 10 are reverse coded. In each item of this scale, an expression stating feelings and thoughts about social relations is provided and the individuals are asked to mark how often they experience this situation over a Likert type quad rating scale. The items including positive expressions (1,4,5,6,9,10,15,16,19,20) are graded as “Never (4)”, “Seldom” (3), “Sometimes” (2), “Often” (1). The items including negative expressions (2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18) are graded on the contrary as “Never (1)”, “Seldom” (2), “Sometimes” (3), “Often” (4). “General loneliness point” is acquired for each individual by summing the points they receive from the items. Since grading changes between 1-4 for each item, the highest possible point is 80, the lowest point is 20. If the point is high, it is accepted that loneliness level is high.

#### **3. 2. 2. 1. Reliability of Original UCLA Loneliness Scale**

In researches made using different reliability determining techniques, UCLA Loneliness Scale was found highly reliable. Peplau and Ferguson (1978) found in the first development studies that internal consistency of the scale was 0.96, the reliability acquired by the method of repetition of inventory 2 months later was 0.73. In the study of reviewing scale, Russell, Peplau and Cutrana (1980) found the relation between first scale and revised scale was 0.91 and internal consistency was 0.94 (cited in Demir, 1989). In the research Hojat made with Iranian university students, the internal consistency of the scale was found as 0.89. Besides, two half reliability of the test was calculated and reliability coefficient was found as 0.88 (Demir, 1989). In the research made with high school students, Downey (1985) found the reliability of repetition of test every three months was 0.74 (cited in Demir, 1989).

### **3. 2. 2. 2. Validity of Original UCLA Loneliness Scale**

In many studies conducted it was found that validity of scale was sufficient. In the studies of improving the scale Russell, Peplau and Ferguson (1978) examined the validity between two scales by using Beck Depression Inventory as criterion and found that there was a correlation of 0.67 between two scales. In review of scale Russell, Peplau and Cotrana (1980) determined a correlation of 0.62 between UCLA Loneliness Scale and Beck Depression Inventory (cited in Demir, 1989). In 1982 Hojat found a correlation of 0.57 between two scales, however with Eysenk Personality Inventory's Extroversion subscale a significant relation of 0.47 was determined. Anderson and Horowitz found a correlation of 0.58 between UCLA Loneliness Scale and Beck Depression Inventory in 1983 (Demir, 1989).

### **3. 2. 2. 3. Studies Maintained over UCLA Loneliness Scale in Turkey**

UCLA Loneliness Scale was first used by Yaparel (1984) in our country. After translation, Yaparel conducted a preliminary implementation in order to determine the validity of this scale in our culture. However, UCLA Loneliness Scale was revised so as to be used in postgraduate research by Demir (1990) and independent from Yaparel's (1984) translation, UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3) was used. We also used Ucla Loneliness Scale Version 3 in this study. It has been shown Appendix C.

### **3. 2. 2. 4. Reliability of UCLA Loneliness Scale**

Bilgen (1989), applied the test to 47 university students every 15 days by using the method of repetition of the test and found the coefficient as 0.86. In the study conducted by Demir internal consistency of the test was examined over the responses of 72 respondents to each item and internal consistency coefficient was found as 0.96. Correlation between two implementations was found as 0.94 by using the technique of repetition of test after five weeks (Demir, 1989).

### **3. 2. 2. 5. Validity of UCLA Loneliness Scale**

Using the UCLA Loneliness Scale for the first time in our country, Yaparel examined the validity of test by taking Beck Depression Inventory as criterion and found the validity of similar tests as 0.50 (Yaparel, 1984). In the validity study maintained by Demir, the scale was applied to 36 patients who consulted SSK Dışkapı Hospital Clinical of Psychiatry and METU (Middle East Technical University) Center of Health and Guidance with complaints of intense loneliness as well as other symptoms and to 36 normal respondents who displayed parallelism to patient group in terms of demographic features and who were picked out of personnel and students in METU but who didn't have any complaint. When the averages of points “Normal” and “Patient” groups took out of UCLA Loneliness Scale is controlled with t test, it was found that “patient” group had an average of loneliness .001 higher than “normal” group (Demir, 1989).

### **3. 2. 3. Short-Form Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK)**

After Eysenck developed personality theory, many scales measuring personality were developed. These were respectively Maudsley Medicine Questionnaire (MTA, 40 items), (Eysenck, 1952), Maudsley Personality Inventory (MKE, 48 items), (Eysenck 1959), Eysenck Personality Inventory (EKE, 57 items) (Eysenck & Eysenck 1964), Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA, 90 items) (Eysenck & Eysenck 1975) and Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (100 items) (cited in Karancı, Dirik & Yorulmaz, 2007). All of these scales are reliable and valid measuring means in personality measure, since they are long scales they lead to a number of problems in evaluation of traits in research. Therefore, short personality scales were needed and studies in this direction were made. One of them is Short-From Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK 48 or originally EPQR-S). EKA-GGK comprises of 48 items and 4 subscales (Karancı et al., 2007). These subscales are extroversion (12 items), neuroticism (12 items), psychoticism (12 items) and lie (12 items). Lie subscale is a control scale in which all the validity of test is tested. While EKA-GGK48 is a reliable and valid scale, thinking that it is still a long scale in order to measure personal characteristics in adult sample groups Francis et al. (1992) reviewed Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck and

Eysenck 1975) and revised short form of the same questionnaire (48 items) and formed EKA-GGK. Questionnaire includes totally 24 items and evaluates personality at 3 basic factors: extroversion, neuroticism, psychoticism. Besides, lie subscale aims to prevent the bias during the implementation of the questionnaire and to control its validity. In this questionnaire in which each factor is evaluated with 6 items, the participant is asked to answer 24 questions as Yes (1) - No(0). The point that can be taken for each trait varies between 0 and 6 (Karanci et al., 2007). It has been shown Appendix B.

### **3. 2. 3. 1. Reliability of Short Form- Original Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK)**

Francis et al (1992) applied EKA-GGK48 and EKAGGK to university students in England, Canada, America and Australia and sufficient introversion for three subscales was found (cited in, Karanci et al. 2007). Introversion coefficient was found between 0.70-0.77 for neuroticism, between 0.74-0.84 for extroversion, and between 0.70-0.77 for internal consistency coefficient of total score. Consistency coefficient for psychoticism was found too low (0.33-0.52).

### **3. 2. 3. 2. Validity of Short Form- Original Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK)**

For simultaneous validity the relations between subscales of original Eysenck Personality Questionnaire and subscales of EKAGGK48 were examined. Correlation of extroversion, neuroticism and lie subscales vary between 0.84 and 0.90. However, correlations of psychoticism subscale was found rather low (0.44-0.52). Few studies examining EKA-GK48 factor structure and validity were made in order to evaluate intercultural similarities and differences of traits (Katz & Francis 2000; Forrest et al., 2000). The studies conducted displayed that Eysenck's personality dimensions differed according to sex (Maltby & Talley, 1998; Forrest et al., 2000). Sub dimensions of EKA-GGK were also found to differ according to gender like EKA (Forrest et al., 2000). While females received higher points in neuroticism and lie subscales compared to males, males tend to receive higher points than women in psychoticism subscale. In some researches males received higher points in

extroversion subscale; however this finding was not supported in other studies (Francis, 1993; Hanin et al., 1991).

### **3. 2. 3. 3. Studies conducted on Short Form- Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK)**

EKA-GGK's long form was previously adapted to Turkish by Topcu (1982). Since the number of items in the researches conducted abroad recently regarding traits was lower, EKA-GGK is preferred in evaluating traits as it is more practical and more time-saving and more trustable and valid in evaluation. Therefore, adaptation of EKA-GGK to our language and studies of validity and reliability were conducted by Karanci et al. (2007) so as to use in studies regarding personality in Turkey, to ensure parallelism with up to date literature and facilitate contribution to literature from our country. For structure validity, relations between Eysenck personality dimensions, perceived parent attitudes, fears and self-respect were examined. Besides, aforementioned difference between sexes in EKAGGK was tested for its validity in Turkish (Forrest et al., 2000; Shevlin et al., 2002).

### **3. 2. 3. 4. Reliability of Short Form- Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK)**

Since EKA-GGK items are evaluated with the option of dual answer and there is not any continuous variable, Kuder-Richardson 20 method was used to measure the reliability. Kuder-Richardson alpha values are .78, .65, .42 and .64 for extroversion, neuroticism, psychoticism and lie dimensions respectively. Test-repetition test reliability study of EKA-GGK was conducted over 21 university senior class students every 2,5 weeks. As a result of implementation, Pearson Correlation coefficient was computed and it was seen that found correlations were significant. Test-repetition test correlations of neuroticism, extroversion, psychoticism and lie subscales were as follows; (0.82, 0.84, 0.69, 0.69,  $p < .001$ ) (Karanci et al., 2007).

### **3. 2. 3. 5. Validity of Short Form- Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA- GGK)**

In order to evaluate construct validity of scale, the correlational relations of EKAGGK with subscales of KAET-Ç (Mother-over protective attitudes, mother-negatory attitudes, Mother- emotional warmth, father-over protective attitudes, father-negatory attitudes, father -emotional warmth) self respect and Fear Scanning Scale (KTE-III) and correlations of 3 subscales of KA-GGK with KAET-Ç, KTE III and self respect scales were found in the expected way. Results support the construct validity of scale. When it is evaluated whether there is any difference in sub-dimensions according to sex with multi-directional variance analyses, only a difference between men and women was found at lie level (Karanci et al., 2007).

### **3. 2. 4. Online Cognition Scale (OCS)**

OCS is scale that was built up by Davis et al. (2002); assessing the usage of internet with problems, is a scale that is assessing the usage of internet with problems during four months ,a scale in the type of septet likert. Changing form “surely not agree” till “surely agree” with 36 items. OCS is assessing the ideas/comments about internet (Ozcan, 2005). The scale is formed as “decreased impulse control, social support, loneliness / depression and distraction” with four sub scales. Loneliness / depression (6 questions) includes the depressive ideas about worthlessness and loneliness for the usage of internet with problems. Descending Impulse Control (10 questions) includes following; descended impulse control for the usage of internet, getting no success eventhough thinking of the descend of internet, getting no success eventhough thinking of the descend of usage of internet and always thinking to do something about internet. Social Support (13 questions) is the most complex and acarpous social support group among the sub groups. Most of the researchers are mentioning about the usage of internet for the people who are searching the social support or who afraids of the socially refusing are heavily sensitive of this. Distraction (7 questions) includes the escaping/ avoiding of an action that shoul be done. Evaluation of the scale is done with calculating the total points and sub scale points. The calculating the point of scale, the points of expressions are concatenated from 1 to 7 as from “surely not agree” to “surely

agree”. Whether the level of the point is higher means “the usage of internet with problems”. It has been shown Appendix D.

### **3. 2. 4. 1. The Reliability and Validity of the Original Online Cognition Scale**

The coefficient has been found as  $\alpha=93$  in the study of reliability and validity that Davis has made of his OCS. According to the explanatory factor analyses, there has been set four sub dimensions. Confidence of re-testing was found as  $r= 87.1$  both samples as clinical and organizational, the validity of it been tested (Ozcan, 2005). The OCS demonstrated high internal consistency as a total measure of problematic Internet use ( $\alpha = 0.94$ ) and for each of the four OCS dimensions: social support ( $\alpha = 0.87$ ), loneliness/depression ( $\alpha = 0.77$ ), decreased impulse control ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ), and distraction ( $\alpha= 0.81$ ). Item-total correlations were highly significant, ranging from 0.47 to 0.77 for social comfort, 0.49 to 0.81 for loneliness/depression, 0.50 to 0.76 for diminished impulse control, and 0.55 to 0.80 for distraction (Davis et al., 2002).

### **3. 2. 4. 2. The publication that mention of the Online Cognition Scale in Turkiye**

The OCS has been used by Ozcan for the first in Turkiye in 2005. Ozcan has made the studies of the test about its validity and reliability with the datas collected from the sample group of students in 2005. After about the studies of Ozcan about validity and reliability, Oguz and his friends (2008) and Tahiroglu and his friends (2010) also used the OCS in their studies.

### **3.2. 4. 3. Reliability of Online Cognition Scale**

In the study of Reliability was made by Ozcan, in the test-re-test application, for the total scale points of Pearson Momentums multiplication corelation coefficient is .90, for the social support sub groups is .87, for the loneliness / depression sub groups is .76, for the descending impulse control sub groups is .89 and for the abstraction sub groups is .85 ( $p<0.001$ ).

The internal consistency of the scale has been determined by the Alpha coefficient and in the 36th item and in the analyses with the total points, the internal consistency

of the scale was found as .91. The total point Reliability coefficients of relation that calculates the variance of every item of OCS and total point variance and changes between .17 and .66. At the point of relation between the variance of every item and sub group point variance is between 40-73. The contribution of sub group of every artical and the contribution to the total points and the contribution of sub group to the total points have been found as enough statistically.

#### **3. 2. 4. 4. The Validity of Online Cognition Scale**

In the study of validity was made by Ozcan (2005), for the related validity scale of OCS ; By considering the OCS's sub groups, it was researched , the usage time of internet, The Scale of Beck for Depression, UCLA Loneliness Scale and Social Support Scale that perceived as multidimensionally. OCS and all its subgroups has been found reverse relational with; the usage time of internet, The Scale of Beck for Depression, UCLA Loneliness Scale and Social Support Scale that perceived as multidimensionally. In the studies of the analyses of factor, it was found the the OCS's structure of factor is compatible with its original form ( $\chi^2=0.416$ , GFI=0.999, CFI=1.0, RMSEA=0.006 ).

#### **3. 3 Process**

Scale battery has been formed by adding directive that was mentioned in the data collection tools section as one of the scales.

In the directive it is indicated that it will be examined the relationship between using the internet of individuals and some different variables, responses will be used for only researching, datas of the obtained will be evaluated collectively and so there is no need to write the names. The majority of individuals who is participated in the study use the social sharing networks (friendfeed, facebook, twitter, etc.). The data were collected from the period covering the months of July and August of 2010. All participants completed the battery in about 20 minutes.



### **3. 4. Statistical Analyses**

SPSS 17.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) for windows program was used for statistical analyses during findings of the study is being evaluated. Descriptive statistical methods (frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation) were used during the study for data is being evaluated. Anova, correlation and regression analyses were used as hypothesis testing.

The findings are interpreted in the 95% confidence interval 0.05 significance level.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **RESULTS**

The aim of this study is to investigate how the personality traits mediate the internet's effect on socializing. To achieve this, statistical processes on the scales used in this study were be quoted. Second, internet usage characteristics of the sample have been investigated. Third, t-test analyses and one-way ANOVA analyses which are used to investigate gender, age and education differences related to the variables mentioned are quoted. Fourth, correlation analyses to examine the relations between the mentioned variables. Then regression and mediator analyses which are used to determine the main objectives of the study are quoted.

#### **4. 1. Ucla Loneliness Scale (Version3)**

In this study, the total point, which is derived by adding 20 items of Ucla Loneliness Scale, is used as dependent variable in the analyses (M= 42.9, SD= 9.9, Min= 21.0 Max= 79.0). Scale's cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was found as .92.

#### **4. 2. Eyscenk Personality Inventory**

Neuroticism, extraversion, psychoticism and lie, four factors of Eyscenk Personality Inventory are used as independent variables. A mean point is acquired by adding up items 1, 9, 11, 14, 18 and 21 in dimension of neuroticism which is the first factor and consists of 6 items (M=3,3, SD= 1.9, Min=.00 Max=6.00). Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of this dimension is found as .71.

A mean point is acquired by adding up items 2, 4, 13, 15, 20 and 23 in dimension of extraversion which is the second factor and consists of 6 items (M=3,7 SD= 2.0, min=.00 Max=6.00). Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of this dimension is found as .80.

A mean point is acquired by adding up items 3, 6, 8, 12, 16 and 22 in dimension of psychoticism which is the third factor and consists of 6 items ( M= 1.7, SD= 1.2, Min=.00 Max=6.00). Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of this dimension is found as .44.

A mean point is acquired by adding up items 5, 7, 10, 12, 19 and 24 in dimension of lie which is the fourth factor and consists of 6 items (M= 3.3, SD= 1.7, Min=.00 Max=6.00). Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of this dimension is found as .59.

#### **4. 3. Online Cognition Scale**

Four factors of Online Cognition Scale, social support, loneliness -depression, decreased impulse control and distraction are used as independent variables in this study. A mean point is acquired by adding up items 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 26 and 31 in dimension of social support which is the first factor and consists of 13 items (M= 29.9, SD= 13.6, Min= 13.0, Max= 91.0). Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of this dimension is found as .85.

A mean point is acquired by adding up items 2, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 35 in dimension of loneliness-depression which is the second factor and consists of 6 items (M= 14.7, SD= 7.4, Min= 9.0, Max= 7.4). Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of this dimension is found as .76.

A mean point is acquired by adding up items , 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 21, 34 and 36 in dimension of decreased impulse control which is the third factor and consists of 10 items (M= 25,7, SD= 11.7, Min= 9.0, Max= 49.0). While adding these 10 items, 12<sup>th</sup> item is reversed. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of this dimension is found as .84.

A mean point is acquired by adding up items 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32 and 33 in dimension of distraction which is the fourth factor and consists of 7 items (M= 20.0, SD= 9.3, Min= 7.0, Max= 49.0). Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of this dimension is found as .80.

#### **4. 4. Internet Usage Characteristics of the Sample**

In this study, data were collected from 1466 people. However, data gathered from 55 people, were taken out from the survey because of some blank parts. Therefore, the study sample consisted of 1411 people (979 women, 432 men). Data were collected via the internet.

When the internet use habits of the participants are analyzed, it is observed that their daily internet use times are long. While 40 % of the participants expresses that they use internet for 2-3 hours daily, 50 % of the participants states that they use internet for more than 4 hours on a daily basis. A great majority of participants stated that they connected to the internet mostly at home. Again, most of the participants join and use the social networking sites. More than half of them chats through internet and most of them are pleased with their friends at the real-social life at most. The ratio of the individuals who meet through internet and become friends in the real life remains at about 39,5 %. Participants give priority to the existence of real friendship, age group, interests and deep conversation, respectively when selecting the people they are communicating through the internet. It is clear that participants demonstrate their emotions most easily in the real-social environment and they use internet so as to be aware of the latest developments. More than half of the participants stated that the use of internet did not influence their socialisation. More detailed internet usage characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1** Internet Usage Characteristics of the Sample

<b>Tables</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
<b>Daily average internet usage</b>	0-1 hours	152	10,8
	2-3 hours	557	39,5
	4-5 hours	382	27,1
	6-7 hours	158	11,2
	More than 8 hours	162	11,5
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Connected to the internet environment</b>	From school	41	2,9
	From home	1059	75,1
	From work	290	20,6
	From mobile phone	21	1,5
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>The use of social sharing network</b>	Yes	1315	93,2
	No	96	6,8
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Chat</b>	Yes	783	55,5
	No	628	44,5
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>The most happiest friendship environment</b>	Social environments	1122	79,5
	Virtual environments	23	1,6
	Both environments	266	18,9
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>The situation of the internet friends who meet in real life</b>	Yes	557	39,5
	No	854	60,5
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Sought priority in touch with people on the Internet owned</b>	Age group	311	22,0
	Being against sex	62	4,4
	Fields of interest	309	21,9
	Be the same city	9	0,6
	Social status	50	3,5
	Occupation	18	1,3
	Political foresight	39	2,8
	Support the same team	2	0,1

	Flowing conversation	122	8,6
	Communicate with friends in real life	362	25,7
	Physical distance	29	2,1
	Other	98	6,9
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Emotions are shared the most comfortable environment</b>	Social environments	861	61,0
	Virtual environments	148	10,5
	Both environments	402	28,5
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>Socialization effects of internet use</b>	Increases	330	23,4
	Decreases	302	21,4
	Not affect	779	55,2
	Total	1411	100,0
<b>At night, wake up the status of connecting to the internet</b>	Yes	170	12,0
	No	1241	88,0
	Total	1411	100,0
	Be aware of current developments	848	60,1
	Playing	74	5,2
	Chat	52	3,7
	Accessing social-sharing networks	235	16,7
	Get to know new people	1	0,1
	Internet banking	8	0,6
<b>The internet is used for what purpose the most</b>	News to follow	20	1,4
	To check the email	53	3,8
	Watch videos with sexual content	2	0,1
	Watch movies or listen to music	8	0,6
	Do research	48	3,4
	In my free times to assess	40	2,8
	To relax when I'm tired and unhappy	22	1,6
	Total	1411	100,0

**N=1411**

## **4.5. Findings Related To Differentiation of Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points In Terms of Demographic Characteristics**

### **4. 5. 1. Findings Related To Gender Variable Differences**

A t-test analysis is carried out to determine if there are gender differences on the results from Ucla Loneliness Scale (Version 3), Online Cognition Scale and Eyscenk Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK).

The difference between group mean values from the result of t-test which was done to determine if the loneliness points of the participants were changing depending on gender variable was not found statistically significant [ $t(1409)=-1,906$ ;  $p>.05$ ]. According to results of t-test, social support scores of participants significantly differentiated among gender groups [ $t(1409)=-4,65$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. According to results of t-test, loneliness -depression scores of participants significantly differentiated among gender groups [ $t(1409)=-3,69$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Men's loneliness-depression points are higher than women's loneliness-depression scores. According to results of t-test, decreased impulse control scores of participants significantly differentiated among gender groups [ $t(1409)=-5,14$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Men's decreased impulse control points are higher than women's decreased impulse control points. According to results of t-test, distraction scores of participants significantly differentiated among gender groups [ $t(1409)=-1,658$ ;  $p>.05$ ].

According to results of t-test, neuroticism scores of participants significantly differentiated among gender groups [ $t(1409)=3,49$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Women's neuroticism points are higher than men's neuroticism points. According to results of t-test, extraversion scores of participants significantly differentiated among gender groups [ $t(1409)=2,86$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Women's extraversion points are higher than men's extraversion points. According to results of t-test, psychoticism scores of participants significantly differentiated among gender groups [ $t(1409)=-2,03$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Men's psychoticism points are higher than women's psychoticism points. According to results of t-test, lie scores of participants significantly differentiated among gender groups [ $t(1409)=4,42$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Women's lie points are higher than men's lie points (see Table 4.2).

**Table 4.2** Differentiation of Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points In Terms of Gender Variable (Independent Sample t-test)

	<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>Loneliness</b>	Women	979	42,630	9,981	-1,906	0,057
	Men	432	43,727	9,920		
<b>Social Support</b>	Women	979	28,672	12,779	-4,646	<b>0,000</b>
	Men	432	32,530	15,028		
<b>Loneliness-depression</b>	Women	979	14,177	7,151	-3,695	<b>0,000</b>
	Men	432	15,817	7,912		
<b>Decreased Impulse Control</b>	Women	979	24,598	11,398	-5,136	<b>0,000</b>
	Men	432	28,037	12,028		
<b>Distraction</b>	Women	979	19,812	8,967	-1,658	0,098
	Men	432	20,741	10,000		
<b>Neuroticism</b>	Women	979	3,436	1,895	3,495	<b>0,000</b>
	Men	432	3,056	1,863		
<b>Extraversion</b>	Women	979	3,810	1,997	2,856	<b>0,004</b>
	Men	432	3,481	1,979		
<b>Psychoticism</b>	Women	979	1,638	1,165	-2,025	<b>0,043</b>
	Men	432	1,789	1,342		
<b>Lie</b>	Women	979	3,463	1,693	4,424	<b>0,000</b>
	Men	432	3,032	1,663		

\*p<.05; N: 1411 (979 Women, 432 Men)



#### **4. 5. 2. Findings Related To Age Variable Differences**

One way ANOVA analyses is carried out to determine if there are age differences on the results from UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3), Online Cognition Scale and Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK).

According to results of oneway ANOVA, loneliness scores of participants significantly differentiated among age groups [ $F(3, 1407)=6,563$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Loneliness scores of the ages 15-25 are significantly higher than those of the ages 25-35. The loneliness points of the ages 15-25 are higher than the ages 45 and more. According to results of oneway ANOVA, social support scores of participants significantly differentiated among age groups [ $F(3,1407)=1,107$ ;  $p>.05$ ]. According to results of oneway ANOVA, loneliness -depression scores of participants significantly differentiated among age groups [ $F(3,1407)=4,000$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Results from complementary post-hoc analyses which was run to determine the sources of the differences suggest that loneliness-depression points of the ages 15-25 are higher than the loneliness-depression points of the ages 25-35. According to results of oneway ANOVA, decreased impulse control scores of participants significantly differentiated among age groups [ $F(3,1407)=10,148$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Results from complementary post-hoc analyses which was run to determine the sources of the differences suggest that decreased impulse control points of the ages 15-25 are higher than the decreased impulse control points of the ages 25-35. Decreased impulse control points of the ages 15-25 are higher than the decreased impulse control points of the ages 35-45. Decreased impulse control points of the ages 15-25 are higher than the decreased impulse control points of the ages 45 and more. According to results of oneway ANOVA, distraction scores of participants significantly differentiated among age groups [ $F(3,1407)=8,562$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Results from complementary post-hoc analyses which was run to determine the sources of the differences suggest that distraction points of the ages 15-25 are higher than the distraction points of the ages 25-35. Distraction points of the ages 15-25 are higher than the distraction points of the ages 35-45. Distraction points of the ages 15-25 are higher than the distraction points of the ages 45 and more.

According to results of oneway ANOVA, neuroticism scores of participants significantly differentiated among age groups [ $F(3,1407)=6,593$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Results from complementary post-hoc analyses which was run to determine the sources of the differences suggest that neuroticism points of the ages 15-25 are higher than the neuroticism points of the ages 25-35. Neuroticism points of the ages 25-35 are higher than the neuroticism points of the ages 45 and more. According to results of oneway ANOVA, extraversion scores of participants significantly differentiated among age groups [ $F(3,1407)=1,254$ ;  $p>.05$ ]. According to results of oneway ANOVA, psychoticism scores of participants significantly differentiated among age groups [ $F(3,1407)=0,767$ ;  $p>.05$ ]. According to results of oneway ANOVA, lie scores of participants significantly differentiated among age groups [ $F(3,1407)=21,818$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Results from complementary post-hoc analyses which was run to determine the sources of the differences suggest that lie points of the ages 15-25 are lower than the lie points of the ages 25-35. Lie points of the ages 25-35 are lower than the lie points of the ages 35-45. Lie points of the ages 25-35 are lower than the lie points of the ages 45 and more. Test results are shown in Table 4. 3.

**Table 4.3** Differentiation of Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points In Terms of Age Variable (One-Way Anova)

	<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>P</b>
<b>Loneliness</b>	15-25	750	43,880	9,910	6,563	<b>0,000</b>
	25-35	529	42,176	10,050		
	35-45	95	42,074	9,539		
	45+	37	38,027	8,862		
<b>Social Support</b>	15-25	750	30,457	13,869	1,107	0,345
	25-35	529	29,212	13,556		
	35-45	95	29,274	13,241		
	45 +	37	28,270	9,605		
<b>Loneliness- depression</b>	15-25	750	15,167	7,430	4,000	<b>0,008</b>
	25-35	529	14,444	7,455		
	35-45	95	12,695	6,951		
	45 +	37	13,243	7,270		
<b>Decreased Impulse Control</b>	15-25	750	27,120	11,901	10,148	<b>0,000</b>
	25-35	529	24,384	11,508		
	35-45	95	23,158	10,222		
	45 +	37	20,378	9,203		
<b>Distraction</b>	15-25	750	21,045	9,196	8,562	<b>0,000</b>
	25-35	529	19,524	9,507		
	35-45	95	17,463	8,784		
	45 +	37	15,811	6,424		
<b>Neuroticism</b>	15-25	750	3,480	1,835	6,593	<b>0,000</b>
	25-35	529	3,206	1,940		
	35-45	95	3,084	1,961		
	45 +	37	2,297	1,777		
<b>Extraversion</b>	15-25	750	3,649	1,993	1,254	0,289
	25-35	529	3,730	2,002		
	35-45	95	3,874	2,001		
	45 +	37	4,216	1,960		
<b>Psychoticism</b>	15-25	750	1,701	1,232	0,767	0,512
	25-35	529	1,633	1,227		
	35-45	95	1,821	1,111		
	45 +	37	1,730	1,283		
<b>Lie</b>	15-25	750	3,075	1,614	21,818	<b>0,000</b>
	25-35	529	3,471	1,713		
	35-45	95	4,021	1,839		
	45 +	37	4,757	1,188		

\*P<.05; N=1411

#### **4. 5. 3. Findings Related To Education Variable Differences**

One way ANOVA analysis is carried out to determine if there are education differences on the results from UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3), Online Cognition Scale (OCS) and Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK).

According to results of oneway ANOVA, Loneliness scores of participants significantly differentiated among education groups [ $F(3,1407)=5,634$ ;  $p < .05$ ]. Results from complementary post-hoc analyses which was run to determine the sources of the differences suggest that loneliness points of the high school are higher than the loneliness points of the postgraduate. The loneliness points of the university are higher than the loneliness points of the postgraduate. According to results of oneway ANOVA, social support scores of participants significantly differentiated among education groups [ $F(3, 1407)=1,736$ ;  $p < .05$ ]. According to results of oneway ANOVA, Loneliness -depression scores of participants significantly differentiated among education groups [ $F(3,1407)=4,372$ ;  $p < .05$ ]. Results from complementary post-hoc analyses which was run to determine the sources of the differences suggest that loneliness -depression points of the primary school are lower than the loneliness -depression points of the postgraduate. The loneliness -depression points of the university are lower than the loneliness -depression points of the postgraduate. According to results of oneway ANOVA, decreased impulse scores of participants significantly differentiated among education groups [ $F(3,1407)=1,107$ ;  $p > .05$ ]. According to results of oneway ANOVA, decreased distraction scores of participants significantly differentiated among education groups [ $F(3,1407)=1,811$ ;  $p > .05$ ].

According to results of oneway ANOVA, neuroticism scores of participants significantly differentiated among education groups [ $F(3,1407)=10,472$ ;  $p < .05$ ]. Results from complementary post-hoc analyses which was run to determine the sources of the differences suggest that neuroticism points of the primary school are higher than the neuroticism points of the postgraduate. The neuroticism points of the high school are higher than the neuroticism points of the university. The neuroticism points of the university are higher than the neuroticism points of the postgraduate. According to results of oneway ANOVA, extraversion scores of participants significantly differentiated among education groups [ $F(3,1407)=0,362$ ;  $p > .05$ ]. According to results of oneway ANOVA, psychoticism scores of participants

significantly differentiated among education groups [ $F(3,1407)=2,766$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Results from complementary post-hoc analyses which was run to determine the sources of the differences suggest that psychoticism points of the high school are higher than the psychoticism points of the postgraduate. According to results of oneway ANOVA, lie scores of participants significantly differentiated among education groups [ $F(3, 1407)=4,423$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Results from complementary post-hoc analyses which was run to determine the sources of the differences suggest that lie points of the high school are lower than the lie points of the postgraduate. Lie points of the university are lower than the lie points of the postgraduate. Test results are shown in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4** Differentiation of Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points In Terms of Education Variable (One Way ANOVA)

	<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>P</b>
<b>Loneliness</b>	Primary Education	34	45,118	9,467	5,634	<b>0,001</b>
	High School	270	44,496	10,325		
	University	905	42,892	9,875		
	Master and PhD	202	40,891	9,658		
<b>Social Support</b>	Primary Education	34	30,500	14,943	1,736	0,158
	High School	270	31,478	14,862		
	University	905	29,534	13,454		
	Master and PhD	202	29,005	12,241		
<b>Loneliness-depression</b>	Primary Education	34	12,088	6,667	4,372	<b>0,005</b>
	High School	270	14,922	7,846		
	University	905	14,390	7,301		
	Master and PhD	202	16,084	7,351		
<b>Decreased Impulse Control</b>	Primary Education	34	24,971	13,224	1,107	0,345
	High School	270	26,793	12,457		
	University	905	25,444	11,571		
	Master and PhD	202	25,163	10,918		
<b>Distraction</b>	Primary Education	34	17,971	8,926	1,811	0,143
	High School	270	21,111	9,858		
	University	905	19,902	9,080		
	Master and PhD	202	19,970	9,520		
<b>Neuroticism</b>	Primary Education	34	3,912	1,712	10,472	<b>0,000</b>
	High School	270	3,704	1,767		
	University	905	3,303	1,911		
	Master and PhD	202	2,782	1,872		
<b>Extraversion</b>	Primary Education	34	3,588	2,105	0,362	0,780
	High School	270	3,611	2,008		
	University	905	3,746	1,982		
	Master and PhD	202	3,698	2,040		
<b>Psychoticism</b>	Primary Education	34	1,794	1,274	2,766	<b>0,041</b>
	High School	270	1,811	1,255		
	University	905	1,686	1,214		
	Master and PhD	202	1,490	1,198		
<b>Lie</b>	Primary Education	34	3,618	1,939	4,423	<b>0,004</b>
	High School	270	3,244	1,665		
	University	905	3,262	1,663		
	Master and PhD	202	3,708	1,790		

\*P<.05; N=1411

#### **4. 6. The Correlations Between the Variables in This Study**

The Pearson correlation values between dependent, independent and mediator variables are shown in Table 4.5. As seen in Table 4.5, loneliness is found to be related positively with social support, loneliness -depression, decreased impulse control and distraction which are the subdimensions of Online Cognition Scale (OCS). Likewise, loneliness is found to be related positively with neuroticism and psychoticism which are the subdimensions of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK) whereas it is found to be related negatively with extraversion and lie. Social support subdimension is found to be positively related to decreased impulse control, distraction, neuroticism and psychoticism whereas it is found to be related negatively with extraversion and lie. Loneliness-depression subdimension is found to be positively related to decreased impulse control, distraction, neuroticism and psychoticism whereas it is found to be related negatively with extraversion and lie. Decreased impulse control is found to be related positively with distraction, neuroticism and psychoticism whereas it is found to be related negatively with extraversion and lie. Distraction is found to be related positively with neuroticism and psychoticism whereas it is found to be related negatively with extraversion and lie. Neuroticism is found to be related positively with psychoticism whereas it is found to be related negatively with extraversion and lie. There is a negative relation between psychoticism and lie (see Table 4.5).

**Table 4.5** Findings Related To Relations Between Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points

<b>Variables</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>
1 <b>Loneliness</b>		0,251**	0,274**	0,281**	0,309**	0,526**	-0,471**	0,141**	-0,146**
2 <b>Social Support</b>			0,690**	0,696**	0,592**	0,160**	-0,169**	0,202**	-0,106**
3 <b>Loneliness-depression</b>				0,755**	0,643**	0,195**	-0,183**	0,161**	-0,127**
4 <b>Decreased Impulse Control</b>					0,633**	0,217**	-0,172**	0,168**	-0,161**
5 <b>Distraction</b>						0,247**	-0,192**	0,159**	-0,213**
6 <b>Neuroticism</b>							-0,231**	0,084**	-0,139**
7 <b>Extraversion</b>								0,033	-0,000
8 <b>Psychoticism</b>									-0,157**
9 <b>Lie</b>									

\*p<,05

\*\*p<,01



#### 4. 7. Findings Related To Effects of Cognitive State on the Internet and Personal Traits over Loneliness Points

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), the conditions for a variable to be a mediator variable are:

- (a) Independent variable has an effect on mediator variable,
- (b) Independent variable has an effect on dependent variable,
- (c) Mediator variable has an effect on dependent variable and when the mediator variable is added to the model, the independent variables lose their effects on the dependent variables (moderator variable) or decrease their effects (mediator variable).

**Table 4.6** Effects of Cognitive State on the Internet (Independent Variable) Over Personal Traits (Mediator Variable)

Independent Variables	Neuroticism		Extraversion		Psychoticism		Lie	
	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	T	$\beta$	t
<b>Constant</b>	2,185	16,635**	4,731	33,713**	1,065	12,379**	4,116	34,645**
<b>Social Support</b>	-0,006	-1,137	-0,006	-1,096	0,014	<b>3,817**</b>	0,007	1,524
<b>Loneliness-depression</b>	0,004	0,342	-0,017	-1,47	0,001	0,074	0,011	1,077
<b>Decreased Impuls Control</b>	0,019	<b>2,691**</b>	-0,004	-0,566	0,003	0,680	-0,015	<b>-2,370*</b>
<b>Distraction</b>	0,039	<b>5,328**</b>	-0,023	<b>-3,006**</b>	0,006	1,341	-0,039	<b>-5,904**</b>
<b>F</b>	25,745		16,28		16,044		18,383	
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	0,066		0,042		0,041		0,047	

\* p<0,05 ; \*\* p<0,01

In the regression models which are designed to examine the effects of the subdimensions of the cognitive state on the internet scale over the subdimensions of the personality scale, positive effect of decreased impulse control ( $\beta=0,019$ ) and the positive effect of distraction ( $\beta=0,039$ ) over neuroticism are seen.

There is a negative effect of distraction ( $\beta=-0,023$ ) over extraversion subdimension of personality. There is a positive effect of social support ( $\beta=0,014$ ) over psychoticism subdimension of personality. There are negative effect of

decreased impulse control ( $\beta=0,015$ ) and the negative effect of distraction over lie subdimension of personality.

**Table 4.7** Effects of Cognitive State on the Internet (Independent Variable) and Personal Traits (Mediator Variable) over Loneliness (Dependent Variable)

		<b>Loneliness (Model 1)</b>		<b>Loneliness (Model 2)</b>		<b>Loneliness (Model 3)</b>	
<b>Independent Variables</b>		$\beta$	T	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t
<b>OCS</b>	<b>Constant</b>	34,917	51,622**	-	-	39,275	39,688
	<b>Social Support</b>	0,024	0,868	-	-	0,019	0,831
	<b>Loneliness- depression</b>	0,074	1,293	-	-	0,038	0,834
	<b>Decreased Impuls Control</b>	0,079	<b>2,192*</b>	-	-	0,025	0,880
	<b>Distraction</b>	0,210	<b>5,608**</b>	-	-	0,071	<b>2,336*</b>
	<b>Constant</b>	-	-	42,562	51,206**	-	-
<b>EKA-GGK</b>	<b>Neuroticism</b>	-	-	2,208	<b>19,891**</b>	2,088	<b>18,664**</b>
	<b>Extraversion</b>	-	-	-1,889	<b>-18,148**</b>	-1,775	<b>-16,966**</b>
	<b>Psychoticism</b>	-	-	0,876	<b>5,230**</b>	0,705	<b>4,173**</b>
	<b>Lie</b>	-	-	-0,419	<b>-3,446**</b>	-0,309	<b>-2,526*</b>
	<b>F</b>	43,412		258,947		136,991	
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	0,107		0,423		0,436		

\*  $p < 0,05$  ; \*\*  $p < 0,01$

Examining Table 4.7, three regressions showing the effect of cognitive state on the internet over loneliness, effect of personality over loneliness and effect of both cognitive state on the internet and personality together over loneliness are seen, respectively. Comparing Model 1 and 3, the effect of the decreased impulse control over loneliness is  $\beta=0,039$ ;  $t:2,192^*$  but after the personality subdimensions are added to the model (Model 3), it is seen that this effect of the decreased impulse control is lost. This result shows us that personality is the moderator variable among decreased impulse control and loneliness. Namely, decreased impulse control affects the loneliness only by the mediation of personality.

Comparing Model 1 and 3 for one of the subdimensions of cognitive state on the internet, distraction, the effect of the distraction over loneliness is  $\beta=0,210$ ;  $t:5,608^{**}$  but after the personality subdimensions are added to the model (Model 3), it is seen

that this effect is decreased to  $\beta=0,071$ ;  $t:2,336^*$ . This result shows us that personality is the mediator variable between distraction and loneliness. So, distraction affects loneliness both directly and the mediation of personality.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **DISCUSSION**

Being a communication network that emerged in the direction of people's needs of producing, sharing, storing and reaching information, internet brought multidimensionality to many fields particularly education, health, defence, industry, public sector. Today science, trade, entertainment, advertisement and even chatting were moved to internet environment and people's social activities changed shape by retaining its content. The internet is a critically important research site for psychologists, because it is a medium uniquely capable of integrating modes of communication and forms of content.

Using the internet have influenced human beings in various ways. One part of these effects makes human life easier, so positively influences it while other part of these effects makes human life difficult. Loneliness or social isolation, perhaps recently, is one of the emotions affecting human life the most. While it was found in some studies that the use of internet effects the socialisation of the individual positively in relation to the characteristics of the individual by alleviating the loneliness, it was found in some studies that the use of internet effects the socialisation of the individual negatively in relation to the characteristics of the individual by increasing the feeling of loneliness. The aim of this study is to investigate relation between using the internet and socialization process of individuals depending on their personality traits.

A secondary aim of the research is to examine whether the sociodemographic variables such as age, education and gender show difference in terms of the variables in question. In this part, results obtained on the basis of subtitles in the section of

findings will be discussed in the light of relevant literature. Afterwards, limits of the study and its contributions to the clinical field will be specified and some recommendations will be presented for future studies.

### **5.1. Properties of the Sampling**

A majority of the sampling of this study is composed of female participants. Most of the participants are single, they are mostly in the age group of 15-35 and their education level is high. Participants, most of who are working, have a middle income level. Thus, it can be argued that the individuals participating in this study have a low potential of experiencing loneliness when their statuses of sex, education, income and working are taken into consideration. According to the studies conducted so far, men, the individuals with a high education level and those having a high income level experience less loneliness than women, individuals with a low education level and those having a low income level, respectively. In the study conducted by Cecen (2007) on university students, it was found that male students experienced more emotional loneliness when compared to the female students.

In the study carried out by Batigun (2006) on a sampling consisting 1230 individuals within the age range of 17-65, it was determined that being male and having a low education level increase the loneliness emotions of an individual.

When the properties of the sampling are examined, it can be said that they are at risk in terms of civil status and age as married individuals are expected to experience less loneliness owing to a higher social support. Likewise, middle aged and older individuals are expected to experience less loneliness when compared to the young people. In some studies, it was observed that younger individuals, single people, economically dependent and unemployed people experienced more loneliness (Sayil & Devrimci-Ozguven, 2003; Ozguven & Sayil, 1999; Palabiyikoglu et al., 1997).

When the internet use habits of the participants are analyzed, it is observed that their daily internet use times are long. While 40 % of the participants expresses that they use internet for 2-3 hours daily, 50 % of the participants states that they use internet for more than 4 hours on a daily basis. It is thought that the participants are

under the risk of internet addiction in terms of the internet use hours. In the study carried out by Batigun and Hasta (2010), it was detected that the internet addicts connect to internet for  $2.17 \pm 0.70$  hours on average per day. This equals to a total time exceeding 15 hours per week. We have found in our study that the participants use the internet for over 28 hours on average per week. Many different times have been reported so far in studies conducted regarding the internet addiction. For example, while Young states that the group defined as internet addict connects to internet for 39 hours on average per week, Yang ve Tung (2004) specify this time as 21 and Eijnden et al. (2008) report as 9. This differences are attributed to the variance of criteria used in the definition of addiction and to the measurement tools selected accordingly while it is stated that the method which is used is also effective (Yellowless & Marks, 2007). Some studies as regards to the use of internet indicate that the individuals who use internet at pathologic level feel more alone (Martin & Schumacher, 2000; Ozcan & Buzlu, 2007) but it is reported in some studies that there is no difference (Subrahmanyam & Lin, 2007; Dittman 2004). It has been reported that the social relationships of the individuals defined as internet addicts decrease and they have problems in the interpersonal relationships (Welsh, 1999). It has been expressed that the individuals using the internet intensively are involved in less interaction with their families and friends and allocate less time to them (Kraut et al., 1998; Shim, 2004).

A great majority of participants stated that they connected to the internet mostly at home. Again, most of the participants join and use the social networking sites. More than half of them chats through internet and most of them are pleased with their friends at the real-social life at most. The ratio of the individuals who meet through internet and become friends in the real life remains at about 39,5 %. Participants give priority to the existence of real friendship, age group, interests and deep conservation, respectively when selecting the people they are communicating through the internet. It is clear that participants demonstrate their emotions most easily in the real-social environment and they use internet so as to be aware of the latest developments. More than half of the participants stated that the use of internet did not influence their socialisation. It is observed in many studies that the individuals experiencing problems in their social relationships frequently resort to internet in order to re-establish and maintain their personal relationships and they

replace internet in face to face communication (Inderbitten et al., 1997). It was determined in our study that the participants mostly communicate with their friends from the real-social life through the internet. Many people try to get the satisfaction of interpersonal relationships that they can not get in the real life from internet (Kraut et al., 1998). Individuals who can not express themselves in a real and proper manner in their daily lives try to establish meaningful relationships through the internet. At this point, it can be thought that the interpersonal relationship types gain importance. When the characteristics of the individuals having inhibitor styles in their interpersonal relationships are taken into consideration (who love teasing with the people, get furious easily etc.), it can be evaluated that it is inevitable for these people to experience problems in their social relationships due to their these characteristics. This situation may be making people more inclined to internet with an aim of establishing meaningful relationships. As stated by Morahan-Martin (1999), a further level of internet use may trigger a vicious circle by causing loneliness to increase or socialisation to decrease.

## **5. 2. Interpretation of Findings Related To Differentiation of Cognitive State on the Internet, Personal Traits and Loneliness Points In Terms of Demographic Characteristics**

### **5. 2. 1. Interpretation of Findings Regarding the Sex Variable Differences**

Whether the cognitive state, personal characteristics and loneliness scores show difference according to sex variable in the internet was examined through the T-Test analyses.

There are various opinions in the literature as regards to the fact that the variable of loneliness differs between men and women. Thus, a T-Test was also conducted in our research in order to examine this question and no significant difference was found between men and women. According to the results of the research where loneliness and sex variables were addressed, significant differences were not found between girls and boys during adolescence in terms of loneliness levels while it was reported that boys experienced much more loneliness than girls during young adulthood years (Jones, Freeman & Goswick, 1981; Wittenberg & Reis, 1986).

Different views are available in the literature as regards to whether social support, loneliness-depression, decreased impulse control and distraction which are subdimensions of online cognition scale show difference between men and women. Therefore, T-Test analyses were also conducted in our study in order to address this question and significant differences were found between men and women in terms of social support, loneliness-depression and decreased impulse control variables. Social support, loneliness-depression and decreased impulse control scores of men are higher than the scores of women. However, a significant relationship could not be found between men and women in terms of the variable of distraction. While a sex – based difference was found in some of the studies conducted on social support and sex, it was not found in some other studies. It was detected in studies carried out on young people that girls have more supporters, more support and more friends than boys and girls get more satisfaction from their friendships (Gillock & Reyes, 1999; Frey & Rothlisberger, 1996). Bayram determined in his study (1999) where he examined the relationship between spiritual sign and social support that girls perceived more support than boys. It was found in a study where the social support sources of men and women were compared that women received the social support from their husbands, children or friends (Mireault & DeMan, 1996). When the researches related to loneliness-depression and sex are analyzed, women are roughly twice as likely as men to experience depression (Nolen & Hoeksema, 1990). Contrary to the literature, our study indicated that the social support and loneliness-depression scores of men were higher than women. It is thought that the single individuals constituting the majority of the sampling participating in our study may be effective in this finding.

As for the decreased impulse control variable, some studies put forward that there are differences between sexes in terms of this variable (Winkler et al., 2005; Chabrol et al., 2009). It was reported in studies conducted in different countries that a majority of the individuals who were detained or put into prison due to impulsivity was male (Ozen et al., 2005; McMurrin et al., 2009). In our study, decreased impulse control scores of men were found to be higher than those of women, as well. Analyses is consistent with the literature and the expectations.



There are also different views in the literature as regards to the fact that neuroticism, extraversion and psychoticism which are subdimensions of Short-Form-Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire differ between men and women. Thus, T-Test analyses were performed in order to examine this question in our study and significant differences were found between men and women in terms of variables of neuroticism, extraversion and psychoticism. Neuroticism and extraversion scores of women were found to be higher than those of men. However, psychoticism scores of men were found to be higher than the psychoticism scores of women. In the study that was carried out by Lynn and Martin (1997). Mean gender differences on Eysenck's three personality traits of extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism were collated for 37 nations. Women obtained higher means than men on neuroticism in all countries, and men obtained higher means than women on psychoticism in 34 countries and on extraversion in 30 countries.

### **5. 2. 2. Interpretation of Findings Regarding the Age Variable Differences**

Cognitive status of Internet, personality traits, and loneliness scores differed according to the age variable were examined whether any differentiate or not with the One-Way ANOVA analyses. There are many various notions in the literature whether is there any differentiate or not of the Loneliness scores differ from the average age of the variable. Social relations are important for individuals of all ages. All human life, need to interact with others and build relationships. Today, for many reasons interpersonal relationships deteriorate, and observed a rapid increase in the number of people who are deprived of proximity. Loneliness is also adversely affecting the individual's life, increasingly appears to be a significant problem (Kılıç & Sevim, 2005). Loneliness and the age variable in this study to investigate the relationship between the One-Way ANOVA analyses revealed a statistically significant difference between group averages. The differs of complementary resources in order to determine post-hoc analyses revealed that the loneliness scores of between 15-25 years is higher than between 25-35 age loneliness scores. Even the loneliness scores of 15-25 years is higher than 45 loneliness scores.

In other words, individuals with the period of adolescence and early adulthood living in more isolation. This finding is consistent with the literature. In a study

examining the effect of age was the level of loneliness (Kozakli, 2006), were decreased with increasing age level of loneliness. Similar results were obtained in studies abroad (Orzeck & Rokach, 2004). In a study conducted with university students in different cultures (Le Roux & Connors, 2001) reported no effect on the age level of loneliness. There are many various notions in the literature whether is there any differentiate or not of the Online Cognition Scale of sub-dimensions of social support, loneliness-depression, decreased impulse control and attention on the differentiation according to the direction of the age variable. Therefore, in this study to examine this question with the One-Way ANOVA analyses revealed that the mean difference between groups was not significant in terms of social support variables. Generally, people maintain with the other numerous social connections throughout their life. However, during the later part of adulthood rates of social interaction begin to decline (Cartensen, 1986). Later-life relationships become fewer in number, but deeper in intensity and quality (Cartensen, 1986; Fredrickson & Cartensen, 1998). However, there is no evidence was found in a similar direction in our study. Loneliness-depression, decreased impulse control and distraction in terms of the variables had a statistically significant difference between the group averages. Complementary resources in order to determine the differences in post-hoc analyses revealed that depression scores of between 15-25 years is higher than between 35-45 years loneliness-depression scores. In other words, the period of adolescence and early adulthood individuals experiencing has got more depression-loneliness. Depression can occur at any age from infancy to old age. But the common view that depression is usually appear between 18 to 44 to form more frequently between the ages of the reproductive period (Anthony & Petronis, 1991).

In this study, scores of decreased impulse control and attention to deploy scores between 15-25 years is higher than the other age groups. Decreased impulse control and distraction scores were higher scores in the analyses are consistent with the literature because many studies of adult individuals and adolescents, the adult individuals are impulsive and their attention is seen the more dispersed than adolescents (Rubia, 2002; Mercugliano 1999). Over an individual's personality traits from childhood to adolescence and adolescence to adulthood are expected to be more clear and precise. The Personality-Revised Short Form Eysenck Questionnaire'in (EKA-GGK), the sub-dimensions of neuroticism, extraversion and psikotizmin differ

from the direction of the age variable, an adequate level of research is not available in the literature. However, in this study to examine this question in terms of one-way ANOVA analyses revealed that neuroticism scores had a statistically significant difference between group means.

Complementary resources in order to determine the differences in post-hoc analyses revealed that 15-25 years between and 25-35 years neuroticism scores were higher neuroticism scores than 45 years and above. Consistency dimension of neuroticism or emotional over-reactivity and indicates that this high scores person on this scale may have been suggested the anxious, depressed, tense, timid, over-emotional and low self-confidence person (Eyscenk & Eyscenk, 1975). Smith and his friends (1986) was found that neuroticism can be associated with older age in his study; Nimnuan and his friends (2001) studys were found that neuroticism is more common in young women and youths. In our study, neuroticism is more common to the individuals between the ages of 15-35. But the one-way ANOVA analyses revealed that the mean difference between groups in terms of extraversion and psychoticism scores were not statistically significant.

Negative communication patterns of parents in early childhood to healthy development of the self as an obstacle in the face of stressful situations encountered in adulthood may lead to the emergence of psychotic reactions have been suggested. However, subsequent studies have not obtained evidence to support it (Van & Jones, 1999; Nimnuan et al., 2001). Age variable, with some examining studies about the relationship between extraversion of individuals to the ages of 25-35, extraversion, enthusiasm, and using tactics to achieve results, according to the behavior of individuals between the ages of 45-55 were found to be high (Stoffey Kabacoff, 2001; Bova & Kroth, 2001 ). In some studies, one of the demographic variables of age, has no significant effect on extraversion were found. (Jurkiewicz, 2000; Halliman, 1998).

### **5. 2. 3. Interpretation of Findings Regarding the Education Variable Differences**

Cognitive status of internet, personality traits, and loneliness scores differed according to the education variable were examined with the One-Way ANOVA analyses. Loneliness scores differ from the average education variable to investigate as a result of the One-Way ANOVA analyses was statistically significant difference between group averages. The differs of complementary resources in order to determine post-hoc analyses revealed that the loneliness scores of the high schools and universities is higher than master loneliness scores.

After the period from childhood to adolescence and early adulthood in individuals continuing education, developmental processes, such as choosing a profession and then performing the same settlement, and interpersonal interactions and the socialization of social situations that are expected to demonstrate at least average level of performance. However, adolescence, adulthood and childhood and extending up and down between 13 to 20 years covering the transition period and this period corresponds to the normal educational process in the high school, college and university period (Baymur, 1994).

In our study, the majority of the sample is considered among the 15-25 years at high school and college education at the level that these people is more loneliness than people with master. This finding has shown good consistent with literature too. Because The studies has shown that the Feelings of loneliness is seen quite often among adolescents (Eskin, 2001; Hortacsu, 2003). According to some studies of individuals Just in terms of educational level, the level of education increases, living alone were less (Liu & Guo, 2007; Invention, 1997).

There are many various notions in the literature whether is there any differentiate or not of the Online Cogniton Scale of sub-dimensions of social support, loneliness, depression, decreased impulse control and attention to distributing literature on the differentiation in terms of the direction of the training is available in variable. Therefore, in this study to examine this question with the One-Way ANOVA analyses revealed that the loneliness, depression scores were statistically significant difference between group averages. Complementary resources in order to determine

the differences in primary education and the university's post-hoc analyses revealed that the scores of loneliness-depression to the primary education and the university's is lower than master. In other words, individuals with graduate level education are more loneliness-depression.

This finding is not consistent with the literature and expectations. Batlas (2000) made a study of the elderly in nursing homes and he has found that the depression of women in higher levels of education is lower than low levels of education. Unal and Ozcan (2000) studies has shown the low level of education as a risk factor for depression. The one-way ANOVA analyses revealed that social support, decreased impulse control and distraction scores mean the difference between the groups was not statistically significant. However, some studies of individuals with these three sub-dimension was found relationship between level of education. Noble (2002) in his study of those with high level of education, level of education and training is low, compared to those with a high level of perceived social support decreases. The perceived social support identified in the fall. Decreased impulse control and distraction of the studies are usually associated with low levels of education or childhood (Wasserstein, 2005; Rasmussen & Gillberg, 2000). However, our study found no significant relationships.

There are many various notions in the literature whether is there any differentiate or not of the Personality-Revised Short Form Eyscenk Questionnaire'in (EVA-GGK), the sub-dimensions of neuroticism, extraversion and Psychoticism. Therefore, in this study to examine this question, the one-way ANOVA analyses revealed that the mean difference between groups in terms of neuroticism and psychoticism scores were statistically significant. Complementary resources in order to determine the differences in post-hoc analyses revealed that primary, high school and university neuroticism score is higher than master neuroticism scores.

Neuroticism scores high school is higher than the university's. Psychoticism scores of high school is higher than the scores of master. In other words, the lower educational level is causing the increasing to the Neuroticism and psychosis scores. This analyses is consistent with the literature and expectations. By increasing the duration of training is increasing the awareness of the problems of individuals

providing a better coping (Gulec & Sayar, 2005). This also reduces the incidence of neurotic or psychotic behavior (Karanci et al., 2007; Creed, 1998). The mean difference between the groups in terms of extraversion scores were not statistically significant. But as cited in Handley (1973), there are a number of studies (Savage, 1966; Enwistle, 1970; Kline & Gale, 1971) that have been conducted to find out the possible link between extroversion/ introversion and educational success of learners.

### **5. 3. Interpretation of The Correlations Between the Variables in This Study**

In this study, the dependent variable, independent variable and the moderator-mediator variable and the relationship between the Pearson correlation analyses was conducted to determine the direction of this relationship. Looking at the results of the analyses of loneliness; Online Cognition Scale's subscales of social support, loneliness - depression, decreased impulse control and distraction were associated with the positive direction. To spend a lot of time on the internet is driven to the people is loneliness, isolated to the people from their individuals belonging and their social environment, weakening the ties of kinship and friendship issues has discussing in today's scientific circles constantly. This aspect of the lower dimensions of online Cognition Scale'in be positively related with the loneliness and the literature is consistent with expectations. Kraut and his friends (1998), the internet is a powerful communication tool, created in real life and the tight bonds of social activities taking place, people begin to address the real social life, leaving the virtual social activities, expects. At the same time, over using internet is causing reduction of the educational performance, less time in social activities outside the home, and separation of parents and friends of individuals born with weaker results, such as establishing relationships (Sanders et al., 2000) also are claimed. Shotton (1991) was the first to hypothesize that those who were more likely dependency suffered from computer dependency were more likely to maintain a schizoid lifestyle and feel comfortable with prolonged periods of social isolation. Thus, it is equally as likely that those who suffer from internet addiction do not experience the same feelings of alienation others feel when spending long periods of time sitting alone. Additionally, the internet's interactive capabilities may help the on-line user to feel a sense of connectedness among other users despite being physically alone.

Kraut and his friends (1998) carried out research with 93 families for 2 years and followed 93 families providing all the requirements for the internet connection for two years to research family communication, and mutual social support. At the end of two years, have found that the decrease to the family communication, and mutual social support. Rheingold (1993) and Turkle (1995), one of the first researchers reported that there is relationship between loneliness and Internet use to the life.

Likewise, the loneliness, the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EKA-GGK), the sub-dimensions of neuroticism and psychoticism were found correlated positively with the extroversion was associated with a negative direction. In other words, loneliness increases with increasing neuroticism and psychoticism, extroversion is decreasing. As a result of these analyses is consistent with expectations and the literature. Some people because of personality are expected to remain more exposed to traumatic events that produce the loneliness (Anderson, 1993).

Wiseman, Mayseless and Sharabany's (2004) in their study, investigated the relationship between personality traits and work with the loneliness as a result of the structure of individuals with an outgoing personality, thanks to the personality traits, to establish social relationships with other people as a result of heat was found to be low levels of loneliness. Cheng and Furnham (2002), their study is the precursor of loneliness expressed psikotikliğin directly. In other words, individuals with psychotic features in the life of solitude in this structure contains negatively.

Online Cognition Scale'in subscales and Short Form-Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire'in (EKA-GGK), the correlation between sub-dimensions were also analyzed. As a result of the analyses; Online Cognition Scale'in sub-dimensions of social support, loneliness, depression, decreased impulse control and with the distraction of Short Form-Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire'in (EKA-GGK), between the neuroticism and psychoticism subscales has found a positive correlation and has found negative relationship with extroversion. In other words, social support, loneliness, depression, decreased impulse control is increasing the psychoticism and neuroticism and also decreasing the extroversion. This analysis is consistent with expectations and the literature.

Some of the studies suggest that personality and emotional health is supporting the relationship between internet use may factors. For example, Kraut and his friends (2002) study showed that the personality factor of extraversion has mediated of the relationship between internet use and emotion. Showing lower levels of negative affect users with frequent, less loneliness, and greater self-esteem has categorized as extraverts tended to benefit from internet use.

More intrapersonal frequent users tended to have a contrasting pattern of greater loneliness, negative affect and lower self-esteem. Wolfradt and Doll (2001) found that personality traits influenced motives for internet use. In their study, the trait of neuroticism has connected with purposes of entertainment and interpersonal communication to use as motivation of the internet. Extraversion has connected only with the interpersonal communication motive. In differences between the above-mentioned studies, Engelberg and Sjoberg (2004) have found no association between internet use and personality characteristics. When the role of gender has considered along with internet use, Amichai-Hamburger and Ben-Artzi (2003) has found that personality has connected with internet use for women, but not men. Their study has showed that extraversion has negatively related and neuroticism has positively related, to the use of online social sites for women; but for men there has no significant relationship between personality and use of social websites.

Landers and Lounsbury (2006) in their study of 117 participants examined the relationship between personality characteristics and internet use. As a result of the study has found a negative correlation between extraversion and the use of the internet.

#### **5. 4. Interpretation of Findings Related To Effects of Cognitive State on the Internet and Personal Traits over Loneliness Points**

The aim of this study is to investigate relation between using the internet and socialization process of individuals depending on their personality traits. For the examine the aim of the study regression analyses was performed with the mentioned variables. The findings are discussed in this section.



#### **5. 4. 1. Findings of the Regression Analyses Carried Out to Predict the Effect of Online Cognition on Personality Traits**

In the regression models which are designed to examine the effects of the subdimensions of the online cognition scale over the subdimensions of the personality scale positive effect of decreased impulse control and the positive effect of distraction over neuroticism are seen. In other words, the increase in decreased impulse control and distraction has been found to be associated with the increase of neuroticism. In some studies, neuroticism has been referred to as low frustration tolerance, nervousness and rejection sensitivity (Karanci et al., 2007). Within this scope, the results of the research are consistent with the expectations and literature. In the study carried out by Barratt (2005), the personality traits of impulsive and aggressive people were found to be less extroverted and more neurotic. In the study carried out by Gulec et al. (2009) with the patients, it was found that impulsive behaviors are highly associated with aggression, extroversion, neuroticism and anger. In other studies conducted with impulsive and distracted individuals, it can be seen that these people might become more introverted, lonely and angry and thus demonstrate neurotic personality traits (Ercan & Aydin, 2000; Yavuzer, 2000; Bagwell et al., 2001).

There is a negative effect of distraction on the extraversion sub-dimension of personality. In other words, the more extroverts the individual is, the less distracted he/she is. Distraction, which is the sub-dimension of Online Cognition Scale, includes using internet to avoid an activity which needs to be done. It is choosing internet to get away from stressful lives and thoughts constantly straying through the mind (Davis, 2002). Bagby and Parker (2001) revealed in their studies that extroversion and distraction are associated with each other. Introvert and extravert's differ was argued with respect to their distraction by Eysenck (1967). They are ranged as introverts have been shown to have a lower optimum arousal threshold hence they do not need much stimulation before passing their optimum functioning level. The extraverts have higher optimum arousal thresholds and hence tend to seek arousal or stimulating situations. The extensive psychophysiology evidence that supports this hypothesis was reviewed Stelmach (1981). Gray (1964) connected these categories with the Russian ideas of strong (extravert) and weak (introvert) nervous

systems. Actually, Gray's (1981) theory suggests that neuroticism may act as a mediating factor between extraversion and task performance. Vermonlayeva-Tomina (1964) found that those with a strong nervous system tended to learn more in distracting situations than those with a weak nervous system. Morgenstern, Hodgson and Law (1974) found that extraverts actually performed better in the presence of distractions than they did in silence, while introverts showed a deficit in performance.

Social support has a positive effect on the sub-dimension of personality. In other words, the increase in social support has been found to be associated with the increase in psychoticism. This result of the research is inconsistent with the literature and expectations, because many studies conducted in this area found that social support has a positive effect on the mental health of the individual (Hussong, 2000; Yavuzer 1992; Kilicci, 1992). Barrera and Ainlay (1983) defined social support as the number of individuals whom the individual needs. Rosa (1987) defines social support as the incidents reducing the negative effects of behaviors. According to Caplan, social support is the support obtained from the relatives helping individuals to trigger their psychological resources and sharing their duties to cope with their emotional problems (cited in Eylen, 2001). Erol (1992) stated that children of families with inadequate social support are psychologically more troubled (cited in Eylen, 2001). In our study, contrary to the literature, the positive relationship between the psychoticism and social support, which is the sub-dimension of Online Cognition Scale, is caused by the complexity of this sub-dimension, because many researchers assert that lonely individuals use the internet to seek social support and over rejection sensitive individuals use the internet not to live through any social rejection. That is, social support sub-dimension defines an adaptive situation, not a pathologic one. However, the fact that the use of internet has surpassed the real life relations and the cases where individuals trust online relationships excessively might be defined within the pathological process (Davis et al., 2002).

#### **5. 4. 2. Findings of the Regression Analyses Carried Out to Predict the Effect of Online Cognition and Personality Traits on Loneliness**

There have been many empirical studies regarding the relationship between loneliness and the internet. First hypothesis is that overuse of internet leads to loneliness (Morahan & Schumacher, 2003). The second hypothesis asserts that lonely individuals become more engaged with the use of internet due to the social web and changing internet relationships (Frieze et al., 1979). But some theorists have suggested that usage of internet increases social interaction and support (Silverman, 1991). The usage of internet may be beneficial or benign when kept to 'normal' levels, however high levels of internet usage which interfere with daily life have been linked to a range of problems, including decreased psychosocial well-being, relationship breakdown and neglect of domestic, academic and work responsibilities (Beard 2002; Weiser 2001). Brignall and Van Valey (2005) mentioned that young people who have grown up with the internet employ online activity as an important form of social interaction. Shaw and Gant's (2002) study of internet usage, loneliness and perceived support was based on 20 US undergraduate internet chat dyads. Likewise, Amichai-Hamburger and Ben-Artzi (2003) used a small sample of Israeli undergraduates in their study of personality, loneliness and internet usage. They tried to put forward whether the internet is the cause or effect of loneliness. A second model was developed in this phase of the study. These are:

Model 1- The use of internet increases loneliness.

Neuroticism-----→ Use of Internet-----→ Loneliness

Model 2- The use of internet is the result of loneliness.

Neuroticism-----→ Loneliness-----→ Use of Internet

As a result of the statistical analyses, Model 2 (the use of internet is the result of loneliness) has been found to be true especially for women. This clearly shows that lonely women often use the internet and try to cope with their loneliness this way. We conducted our study through the hypothesis that there is a mediator or moderator variable between the use of internet and loneliness. We constituted three different regression models to examine the effect of online cognition on loneliness, the effect of personality on loneliness and the effect of online cognition and personality on

loneliness for this purpose. The results of these three separate regression models show that the personality is the moderator variable between decreased impulse control and loneliness (Baron & Kenny, 1986). That is, decreased impulse control affects loneliness only through personality. Furthermore, the results of the analyses show that the personality is the mediator variable between distraction and loneliness. That is, Distraction affects loneliness both directly and via the personality. These findings support the main hypothesis of the study and are consistent with the expectations and literature. Decreased impulse control sub-dimension has been defined as the most determinant sub-group in identifying problematic internet use in studies of Davis (2002) and Ozcan and Buzlu (2005). Decreased impulse control causes the individual to constantly think about internet although he wants to reduce his use of internet. Decreased impulse control is also associated with dangerous and risky behaviors like online gambling, child pornography, sending viruses to others (Ozcan and Buzlu, 2005). Innately vigilant and private people may drawn to such anonymous interactive features of the Internet as this allows them to converse with others in uninhibited ways and form new relationships with greater ease than in real life circumstances. Anonymous electronic communication may also attract less conforming individuals who use the medium to rant radical ideologies or discuss taboo social belief systems they maintain, yet in real life either self-inhibit or find few others who share those views. If these individuals also display emotionally reactive tendencies, they may draw upon such a medium to emote in ways that are restricted by social convention. Outbursts of anger, over-sexualized comments, or blunt remarks which are typically self-monitored thoughts in real life may form the basis of typed messages to fellow on-line users in interactive forums. These specific personality traits may place an individual at a greater risk to develop pathological Internet usage because the on-line world created inside their screens becomes the only outlet for such expression (Young & Rodgers, 1997; Yang, 2001).

## **5. 5. Conclusion**

It has been examined that whether the variables of sex, age and education which are included in the socio-demographic data change according to the points obtained from the sub-dimensions of the scales used in the study. It has been found that the point averages of social support, loneliness-depression, decreased impulse control,

neuroticism, extroversion and psychoticism of those who participated in the survey showed significant differences in accordance with the sex variable. It has been found that the point averages of loneliness, loneliness-depression, decreased impulse control, distraction and neuroticism of those who participated in the survey differentiated significantly according to the age variable and their point averages of loneliness, loneliness-depression, neuroticism and psychoticism differentiated significantly according to the education variable. The correlation relations between the sub-dimensions of the scales have also been examined and meaningful results have been obtained.

Regression analyses have been carried out to examine the relationships between online cognition, personality traits and loneliness. Firstly, the effect of online cognition on personality has been examined. In the regression models, it has been found that decreased impulse control and distraction positively affected the neuroticism sub-dimension of personality; distraction had a negative effect on the extroversion sub-dimension of personality and social support had a positive effect on the psychoticism sub-dimension of personality. In the three separate regression models, it turned out that the decreased impulse control affected loneliness only through the personality and the distraction affected loneliness both directly and through the personality.

The findings might contribute better understanding of the relationship between the use of internet, personality traits and loneliness/ socialization in the future.

## **5. 6. The Limitations of the Study**

This research has some deficiencies. First of all, the findings are cross-sectional data. Thus, the relationships in some of the findings are bidirectional. You should be careful in explaining causality without experimental methods or longitudinal studies.

Secondly, the data have been collected on the internet. We applied the surveying method. It is possible to obtain good results using the interview method in these kinds of studies.

Lastly, the socialization variable has been assessed through the concept of loneliness which is a contrary concept. Therefore, the findings do not provide precise information about the socialization of individuals.

### **5.7. Clinical Effects of This Study**

The results of this study can shed some light on further research and clinical practices in identifying risk groups, and developing preventive interventions and treatment strategies. For instance, implementation of social skill training programs for improvement of communication skills and reducing loneliness are thought to be effective in prevention and treatment of internet dependency

### **5.8. Suggestions for Future Studies**

The method of interview rather than surveying should be applied to precisely determine the effect of personality on the use of internet and socialization.

The loneliness scale used in this study has been inadequate in assessing socialization. If the researchers decide to choose surveying method, they should employ a comprehensive and sophisticated socialization scale to precisely define the relationship between socialization, personality traits and the use of internet.

## REFERENCES

Akiskal, H. S. & Hirschfeld, R. M. A. (1983). The relationship of personality to affective disorders: A critical review. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 40, 801-810.

Aksoy, A. (1996). İnternet ve demokrasi. *Diyalog Dergisi*. 1: 159-170.

Amichai-Hamburger, Y. & Ben-Artzi, E. (2003). 'Loneliness and internet use.' *Computers in Human Behavior*. 19 (1), 71.

Andersson, L. (1993). Loneliness and its relationship with misery. *Psychological Reports*. 73, 584-586.

Ando, J., Suzuki, A., Yamagata, S., Kijima, N., Maekawa, H. et al. (2004). Genetic and environmental structure of Cloninger's temperament and character dimensions. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 18: 379–393.

Antony, J. C., Petronis, K. R. (1991). Suspected risk factors for depression among adults 18-44 years old. *Epidemiology*. 2:123-132.

Aydın, B. (2002). *Gelişim Psikolojisi*. İstanbul: SFN Baskı.

Aziz, A. (1982). Toplumsallaşma ve Kitle İletişim, Ankara Üniversitesi Basın Yayın Yüksekokulu, Yayın No. 2, Ankara.

Badawi, A. Z. (1986). A Dictionary of the Social Sciences, 2nd Edt. Librairie Du Liban, Beyrut.

Bagwell, C. L., Molina, B. S. G., Pelham, W. E., Hoza, B. (2001). Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder and problems in peer relations: predictions from

childhood to adolescence. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 40 (11): 1285-1292.

Bagby, M., Parker, J. D. (2001). Relation of rumination and distraction with neuroticism and extraversion in a sample of patients with major depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. 25 (1), 91-95.

Bahar, H. İ. (2008). Sosyoloji. s:75-83 Ankara: Uluslararası Stratejik Araştırma Kurumu (USAK) Yayınları.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, p:10 New Jersey: Printice Hall.

Baran, A.G. & Kuloğlu, C. (2001). İnternet Cafelerdeki İnternet Kullanımı ve Sanal Sosyal İlişkiler:Ankara Örneği. Bilişim Toplumuna Giderken Psikoloji, Sosyoloji ve Hukukta Etkiler Sempozyumu, 23-24 Mart. Ankara.

Barratt, E. S. (2005). Barratt Impulsiveness Scale, Version 11 (BIS-11). *Impulse-Control Disorders measures*. E Hollander, L Cohen, L Simon (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychiatric Measures*. AJ Rush, HA Pincus, MB First (Eds.), APA, Washington, D.C., 691-693.

Barrera, M.J. & Ainlay, S. L. (1983). The structure of social support: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 11: 133-143.

Batıgün-Durak, A. (2006). An evaluation of the variables of gender, communication skills and loneliness in the probability of suicide. <http://acikarsiv.ankara.edu.tr/fulltext/2753.pdf>

Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 51: 1173-1182

Batlaş, Z. (2000). *Sağlık Psikolojisi*, Remzi Kitapevi, İstanbul, 202.



- Baymur, F. (1994). *Genel Psikoloji*. 13. Baskı. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitapevi.
- Bayram, D. (1999). “Bir grup gençte ruhsal belirti ile sosyal destek ilişkisi”.  
Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.
- Beard, K.W. (2002). ‘Internet addiction: current status and implications for employees’ *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 39, 2-11.
- Brignall, T.W. & Van Valey, T. (2005). ‘The impact of internet communications on social interaction’ *Sociological Spectrum*. 25: 335-348.
- Blanck, G. & Blanck R. (1994). *Ego Psychology: Theory and Practice*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Beard, K. W. & Wolf, E. M. (2001). Modification in the proposed diagnostic criteria for Internet addiction. *Cyberpsychology and Behaviour*. 4: 377–383.
- Boeree, C. G. (2006). *Personality Theories*. Psychology Department, Shippensburg.
- Bova, B. & Kroth, M. (2001). Workplace learning and generation x. *Journal of Workplace Learning*. 13 (2), 57-65.
- Buluş, M. (1997). Üniversite öğrencilerinde yalnızlık. *PAÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 3: 82-90.
- Caplan, S. E. (2002). Problematic internet use and psychological well-being: Development of a theory-based cognitive- behavioral measurement instrument. *Computer Human Behaviour*. 18: 553-575.
- Carstensen, L. L. (1986). Social support among the elderly: Limitations of behavioral interventions. *The Behavior Therapist*. 6: 111-113.
- Chabrol, H., Saint-Martin, C., Sejourné, N. et al. (2009) Contribution of dissociative symptoms to antisocial behavior in a sample of high school students. *Encephale*. 35 (1): 52-56.

Cheng, H., Furnham, A., (2002). Personality, peer relation, and self-confidence as predictor of happiness and loneliness. *Journal of Adolescence*. 25.

Chou C., Condrón L. & Belland J. C.(2005). "A Review of the Research on Internet Addiction", *Educational Psychology Review* 17;4.

Cloninger, C. R. (1986). A Unified Biosocial Theory of Personality and its Role in the Development of Anxiety States. *Psychiatric Developments*. 3: 167-226.

Cloninger, C. R. (1987). A Systematic Method for Clinical Description and Classification of Personality Variants. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 44: 573-588.

Cloninger, C. R., Svrakic D. M. & Pryzbeck, T. R. (1993). A Psychobiological Model of Temperament and Character. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 50: 975-990.

Cloninger, C.R. & Svrakic, D. M. (1997). Integrative Psychobiological Approach to Psychiatric Assessment and Treatment. *Psychiatric Developments*. 60: 120-141.

Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four Ways Five Factors Are Basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 13 (6), 653-665.

Creed, P. A. (1998). "Improving the mental and physical health of unemployed people: Why and how?" *Medical Journal of Australia*. 168.

Cüceloğlu, D. (2000). İnsan ve Davranışı (10. Baskı). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Çeçen, A. R. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin cinsiyet ve yaşam doyumu düzeylerine göre sosyal ve duygusal yalnızlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 3 (2), 180-190.

Damer, B. (1997). Avatars! Exploring and Building Virtual Worlds on the Internet, New York: Peachpit Press.

Davis, R. A., Flett, G. L., & Besser, A. (2002). Validation of a New Scale for Measuring Problematic Internet Use: Implications for Pre-Employment Screening. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*. 5 (4).

Demir, A. (1989). UCLA Yalnızlık Ölçeğinin ODTÜ Öğrencilerine Uygulanması Üniversite Gençliğinde Uyum Sorunları Sempozyum Bilimsel Çalışmaları. Ankara.

Demir, A. (1990). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Yalnızlık Düzeylerini Etkileyen Bazı Etmenler. *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Demir, Ö. & Acar, M. (1992). Sosyal Bilimler Sözlüğü. İstanbul: Ağaç Yayıncılık.

Dimaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Neuman, W. R. & Robinson, J. P. (2001). Social Implications Of The Internet. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 27, 307-336.

Dittman, K. L. (2004). A study of the relationship between loneliness and internet use among university students. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering*, 64 (7-B) 3518.

Dixon, R. M.W. (1977). Where have all the adjectives gone? *Studies in Language*. 1: 19–80.

Eijnden, R. J. J. M., van den Meerkerk, G. J., Vermulst, A. A., Spijkerman, R., Engels, R. C. M. E. (2008). Online communication, compulsive internet use, and psychosocial well-being among adolescents: A longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*. 44: 655-665.

Engelberg, E. & Sjoberg, L. (2004). Internet use, social skills and adjustment. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*. 7: 41-47.

Ercan, E. S., Aydın, C. (2000). Dikkat eksikliği hiperaktivite bozukluğu. İstanbul. Gendaş AŞ.

Erkuş, A. (1994). Psikolojik Terimler Sözlüğü. Ankara: Doruk Yayınları..

Ernst, J. M., Cacioppo, J.T. (1999). Lonely Hearts : Psychological perspectives on Loneliness. *Preventive Psychology*. 8.

Eskin, M. (2001). Ergenlikte yalnızlık, baş etme yöntemleri ve yalnızlığın intihar davranışı ile ilişkisi. *Klinik Psikiyatri Dergisi*. 4: 5-11.

Eylen, B. (2001). Bilgi verici danışmanlığın kanser hastalarının ailelerinin sosyal destek becerileri üzerine etkisi. *Doktora Tezi*. Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Eysenck, H. (1967). *The biological basis of personality*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Eysenck, H. J. & Eysenck, S. B. (1975). Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (adult and junior). London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Eysenck, H.J., Eysenck S.B.G. (1984). Manual of the Eysenck Personality Inventory. Sevenoaks: Hodder & Stoughton.

Frankl, V. E. (1996). Viktor Frankl - Recollections: An Autobiography. (J. and J. Fabray, Trans.) New York: Plenum Publishing.

Francis, L. J. (1993). The dual nature of the Eysenckian neuroticism scales: A question of sex differences. *Personality Individual Difference*. 15: 43–59.

Frederic, E. (1995). Çocuk ve Toplum-Çocuğun Toplumsallaşması, Çev. Nazife Güngör. Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları.

Fredrickson, B. L. & Carstensen, L. L. (1998). *Choosing social partners: How old age and anticipated endings make people more selective*. In M. Powell

Lawton & T. A. Salthouse (Eds.), *Essential Papers on the Psychology of Aging*. New York: New York University Press. 511-538.

Frey, C.U. & Rothlisberger, C. (1996). Social support and school placement on the self-concept of LD students. *Learning Disability Quarterly*. 11: 115-124.

Friedman, H., S. & Schustack, M., W. (1999). *Personality: Classic Theories and Modern Research*. USA: Allyn & Bacon.

Frieze, I., Bar-Tel, D., Carroll, J. (1979). *New Approaches to Social Problems*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 54.

Forrest, S, Lewis, C. A. , Shevlin, M. ve ark. (2000). Examining the Factor Structure and Differential Functioning of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised–Abbreviated. *Personality Individual Difference*. 29: 79-588.

Gillespie N. A., Cloninger C. R., Heath A. C., Martin N. G. (2003). The Genetic and Environmental Relationship Between Cloninger's Dimensions of Temperament and Character. *Personality Individual Difference*. 35:1931–1946.

Giles, D. (2003). *Media Psychology*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gillock, K. L. & Reyes, O. (1999). Stress support and academic performance of urban low-income Mexican-American adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescent*. 28: 259-282.

Gray, J. (1964). *Strength of the nervous system and levels of arousal: A reinterpretation*. In J. Gray (Ed.), *Pavlov's typology*, 289-366. Oxford: Pergamon.

Gray, J. (1981). *A critique of Eysenck's theory of personality*. In H. Eysenck (Ed.), *A model for personality*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Greenberg, J. & Mitchell, S. (1983). *Object relations in psychoanalytic theory*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Gross, E. F. (2000). Adolescent internet use: What we expect, what teens report. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 25: 633-649.

Güleç, H., Sayar, K. (2005). Semptom yorumlama anketinin geçerlik ve güvenilirliği. *Klinik Psikiyatri Dergisi*. 8: 31-36.

Gürçat, C. & Kümbül, B. (2001). İnternetin Sosyal ve Psikolojik Etkileri: İnternet Sosyal İzolasyon Yaratan Bir Bağımlılık mı? Bilişim Toplumuna Giderken Psikoloji, Sosyoloji ve Hukukta Etkiler Sempozyumu, 23-24 Mart. Ankara

Handley, G. D. (1973). *Personality learning and teaching*. London Northumberland Press.

Hanin, Y., Eysenck, S. B. , Eysenck, H. J. et al. (1991). A Cross-cultural study of personality: Russia and England. *Personality Individual Difference*. 12: 265–271.

Halliman, R. (1998). A Coming of Age: A Comparison of organizational performance of baby boom CEOs to CEOs born prior to the baby boom era. *Journal of Management History*. 4 (1), 68-74.

Hamburger, A.Y., Artzi, E.B. (2003). Loneliness and internet use computers. *In Human Behavior*. 9.

Heiman, N., Stallings, M. C., Young, S. E., Hewitt, J. K. (2004). Investigating the genetic and environmental structure of Cloninger's Personality Dimensions in adolescence. *Twin Research*. 7: 462–470.

Hoffman, D. L. & Novak, T. P. (1999). “ The Growing Digital Divide: Implications for an open research agenda.” Owen Graduate School of Management, Vanderbilt University (Nov, 29).

Hogan, B. L. M. (1996). Bone morphogenetic proteins: Multifunctional regulators of vertebrate development. *Genus and Development*. 10(13), 1580-1594

Hollander, E. & Stein, D. J. (2006): Clinical Manual of Impulse-Control Disorders. Arlington, Va, American Psychiatric Publishing.

Hortaçsu, N. (2003). *İnsan İlişkileri*. Ankara: İmge Kitapevi.

Hussong, A. (2000). Perceived peer context and adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 10: 4-14.

İsen, G. & Batmaz, V.(2002). *Ben ve Toplum*. Ankara: Om Yayınları.

Inderbiten, H. M., Walters, K. S., Bukowski, A. L. (1997). The role of social anxiety in adolescent peer relations: Differences among sociometric status groups and rejected sub-groups. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*. 26: 338-348.

İnam, A. (1999). Sanal gerçeğin gerçekliği mi, gerçek gerçeğin sanallığı mı? *Bilgi ve Toplum Dergisi*. 2: 17-22.

Johnson, R. C., & Lim, D. (1964). Personality variable in associative production . *Journal of General Psychology*. 71: 349-350.

Jones, W. H., Freemon, J. E., and Goswick, R. A. (1981). The persistence of loneliness: Self and other determinants, *Journal of Personality*. 49: 27–28.

Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2000). Generation X and the Public Employee, *Public Personnel Management*. 29: 55-81.

Kabacoff, R. & Stoffey, R. (2001). *Age Differences in Organizational Leadership*, MRG Portland, USA.

Karancı, A., Dirik, G., Yorulmaz, O. (2007). Eysenck Kişilik Anketi-Gözden geçirilmiş kısaltılmış formunun (EKA-GGK) Türkiye’de geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*. 18: 1-8.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1979). İnsan ve İnsanlar-Sosyal Psikolojiye Giriş (Üçüncü Baskı). 247-250. İstanbul: Cem Ofset Mat. San. A.Ş

Katz, Y. J. & Francis, L. J. (2000). Hebrew Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire: Short form (EPQR-S) and abbreviated form (EPQR-A). *Social Behaviour Personality*. 28: 555-560.

Kılıççı, Y. (1992). *Okulda Ruh Sağlığı*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Kılınç, H., Sevim, S. A. (2005). Ergenlerde yalnızlık ve bilişsel çarpıtmalar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*. 38: 67-89.

Kohn, A. (1999). Punished by Rewards the Trouble with Gold Stars, Incentive Plans, A's, Praise, and Other Bribes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.

Kozaklı, H. (2006). Üniversite öğrencilerinde yalnızlık ve sosyal destek düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkilerin karşılaştırılması. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Mersin: Mersin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı.

Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, V. H., & Crawford, A. (2002). Internet paradox revisited. *The Journal of Social Issues*. 58: 49–74.

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukophadhyay, T., Scherlis, W. (1998). "Internet Paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being?" *American Psychologist*. 53: 1017–1031.

Kollock, P. & Smith, M. (1998). *Communities and Cyberspace*. London: Routledge.

Kulaksızoğlu, A., (2000). *Ergenlik Psikolojisi*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi.

Landers, R. N. & Lonsburg, J. W. (2006). An investigation of big five and narrow personality traits in relation to internet usage. *Computers in Human Behaviour*. 22 (2), 283-293.



Le Roux, A., Connors, J. (2001). A cross-cultural study into loneliness amongst university students. *South African Journal of Psychology*. 31: 46.

Lewis, C. A. , Francis, L. J., Shevlin, M. ve ark. (2002). Confirmatory factor analysis of the French translation of the abbreviated form of the Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-A). *Europe J Psychol Assess.* 18: 79-85.

Li-Juan, L., Guo, Q. (2007). Loneliness and health-related quality of life for the empty nest elderly in the rural area of a mountainous county in China. *Quality of Life Research*. 16 (8), 1275-1280.

Lin, N. (2001). *Social Capital: a theory of Social Structure and Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lundberg, G. Scrag, C. & Larsen, O. (1970). Sosyoloji, Cilt I-II, Çev. Özer Ozankaya. s. 75-76, Ankara: Türk Siyasi İlimler Derneği Yayını.

Lynn, R. Martin, T. (1997). Gender differences in extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism in 37 nations. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 3 (137): 369-373.

Maltby, J. & Talley, M. (1998). The Psychometric Properties of an Abbreviated Form of the Revised Junior Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (JEPQR-A) among 12-15- year-old U.S young persons. *Personal Individual Difference*. 24: 891-893.

Maslow, A. H. (1964). *Toward a psychology of being*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

McCrae, R.R. & John, O.P. (1992). An Introduction to the Five Factor Model and Its Applications. *Journal of Personality*. 60, 175-215.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.

McMurran, M., Jinks, M., Howells, K. et al. (2009). Alcohol-related violence defined by ultimate goals: a qualitative analysis of the features of three different

types of violence by intoxicated young male offenders. *Aggressive Behavior*. 36 (1): 67-79.

Mercugliano, M. (1999). What is attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder? *Pediatric Clinics of North America*, 46: 831-841.

Mischel, W. (1968). *Personality and assessment*. New York: Wiley.

Modgil, S., & Modgil, C. (Eds.). (1986). *Hans Eysenck: Consensus and controversy*. Barcombe, Lewes, Sussex: Falmer.

Montgomery, K. (2000). Youth and digital media: A policy research agenda. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 61-68.

Morahan-Martin, J. M. (1999). The relationship between loneliness and internet use and abuse. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*. 2: 431-439.

Morahan-Martin J.M., Schumacher, P. (2000). Incidence and correlates of pathological internet use among college students. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 16: 13-29.

Morahan-Martin, J. & Schumacher, P. (2003). "Loneliness and social uses of the Internet," *Computers in Human Behavior*, 19, 659–671.

Morgenstern, S., Hodgson, R. J. & Law, L. (1974). Work efficiency and personality. *Ergonomics*. 17: 211-220.

Nie, N. H. & Ebring, I. (2000). *Internet and Society: A Preliminary Report*. Stanford, CA: Inst. For Quant. Stud. Soc.

Nimnuan, C., Hotopf, M., Wessely, S. (2001). Medically unexplained symptoms: An epidemiological study in seven specialties'. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*. 51: 361-367.

Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1990). *Sex Differences in Depression*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

NUA Internet Surveys (2001). Available:

[www.nua.ie/surveys/how\\_many\\_online/index.html](http://www.nua.ie/surveys/how_many_online/index.html) (1st October).

Oğuz, B., Zayim, N., Özel, D. & Saka, O.(2008) Tıp Öğrencilerinin İnternette Bilişsel Durumları. *Akademik Bilişim Dergisi*. 447-453.

Orzeck, T., Rokach, A. (2004). Men who abuse drugs and their experience of loneliness. *European Psychologist*. 9: 163-169.

Özcan, N. K. (2005). “Problemlı İnternet Kullanımını Belirlemede Yardımcı Bir Araç: “İnternette Bilişsel Durum Ölçeđi”nin Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Geçerlik Ve Güvenirliđi”, *Bağımlılık Dergisi*. 6:19-26.

Özcan, N. K., Buzlu, S. (2007). Internet use and its relation with the psychosocial situation for a sample of university students. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*. 10: 767-772.

Özen, Ş., Ece, A., Oto, R. et al. (2005). Juvenile delinquency in a developing country: A province example in Turkey. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*. 28 (4): 430-441.

Özgüven, H. D., Sayıl, I. (1999). Ankara Üniversitesi Kriz Merkezi'ne bir yıl suresince başvuran yeni vakaların sorun alanları ve tanılarına göre değerlendirilmesi. *Kriz Dergisi*. 7 (1) 7-13.

Özgüven, İ. E. (1992). Hacettepe Kişilik Envanteri El Kitabı. Ankara: Psikolojik Danışma Rehberlik ve Eğitim Merkezi Yayınları.

Palabıykođlu, R., Oral, A., Binici, S. A., Haran, S. (1997). İntihar girişimi olan ve olmayan kriz olgularının çeşitli deđişkenler açısından incelenmesi *Kriz Dergisi*. 5 (1), 25-32.

Peplau, L.A., Russell, D. and Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39.

Peris, R., Gimeno, M. A., Pinazo, D., Ortet, G., Carrero, V., Sanchiz, M. (2002). Online chat rooms: Virtual spaces of interaction for socially oriented people. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*. 5: 43-51.

Rapaport, D. (1960). The Structure of Psychoanalytic Theory: A Systematizing attempt. *Psychological Issues*, 2, Monograph No. 6.

Rasmussen, P., Gillberg, C. (2000). Natural outcome of ADHD with developmental coordination disorder at age 22 years: a controlled, longitudinal, community-based study. *Journal of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 39: 1424-1431.

Rheingold, H. (1993). *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*, Reading: MA: Addison-Wesley.

Robins, K. (1999). İmaj-Görmenin Kültür ve Politikası (Çev: Nurçay Türkoğlu). Ayrıntı Yayınları. İstanbul.

Rogers, C. R. (1959). A Theory of Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships, as Developed in the Client-centered Framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of science* (pp. 184– 256). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ross, L. (1977). The Intuitive Psychologist and his Shortcomings: Distortions in the Attribution Process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. 10:173-220 New York: Academic Press.

Rosa, R.J. (1987). Magnetohydrodynamic energy conversion Hemisphere Publishing, New York, NY

Rubia, K. (2002). The dynamic approach to neurodevelopmental psychiatric disorders: use of fMRI combined with neuropsychology to elucidate the dynamics of psychiatric disorders, exemplified in ADHD and schizophrenia. *Behavioural Brain Research*. 130: 47-56.

Sanders, C. E., Field, T. M., Diego, M., Kaplan, M. (2000). "The Relationship of internet use to depression and social isolation among adolescents." *Adolescence*. 35, 237–242.

Sayı, I., Özgüven, H. D. (2003). Suicide and suicide attempts in Turkey results of the Who/Euro Multicenter Study of suicidal behavior suicide and suicide attempts in Europe Finding from the Who/Euro Multicenter Study on Suicide Hogrefe Publisher.

Silverman, S. (1991). Research on teaching in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. 62 (4), 352-364.

Shim, Y. S. (2004). The impact of the Internet on Teen-agers' Interpersonal Communication Behaviors: the Relation-ship Between Internet Use and Desire for Face-to-Face Communication. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Shotton, M. (1991). The costs and benefits of "computer addiction." *Behavior and Information Technology*. 10(3), 219 - 230.

Smith, GR Jr., Monson, R. A., Ray, D. C. (1986). Patients with multiple unexplained symptoms: their characteristics, functional health and health care utilization. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 146 (1): 69-72.

Somer, O. (1998). Türkçe'de Kişilik Özelliği Tanımlayan Sıfatların Yapısı ve Beş Faktör Modeli. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*. 13 (42), 17-32.

Soylu, Ö. (2002). Üniversite sınavına hazırlanan öğrencilerin ailelerinden sosyal destek algılayıp-algılamama durumlarına göre psikolojik belirtiler yönünden karşılaştırılması. Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi. *Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Adana.

Subrahmanyam, K., Lin, G. (2007). Adolescents on the net: Internet use and well-being. *Adolescence*. 42: 659-677.

Sümer, N. (2001). İnternet Kullanımının Toplumsal Katılım ve İlişkiler Üzerine Etkileri ve İnternet Bağımlılığı. Bilişim Toplumuna Giderken Psikoloji, Sosyoloji ve Hukukta Etkiler Sempozyumu 2001.

Subaşı, N. (2001). Sanal Cemaat Örüntüleri. Bilişim Toplumuna Giderken Psikoloji, Sosyoloji ve Hukukta Etkiler Sempozyumu, 23-24 Mart. Ankara.

Shaw, L.H. & Gant, L.M. (2002). 'In defense of the Internet: The relationship between internet communication and depression, loneliness, self-esteem and perceived social support' *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*. 5: 157-171.

Shevlin, M., Bailey, F., Adamson, G. ve ark. (2002). Examining the Factor structure and sources of differential functioning of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised-Abbreviated. *Personality Individual Difference*. 32: 479-487.

Souza, K. & Barbara, L. (1998). Internet addiction disorder, interpersonal computing and technology. *An Electronic Journal for the 21 th Century*. 6(1- 2).

Sümer, N. (2001). İnternet Kullanımının Toplumsal Katılım ve ilişkiler Üzerindeki Etkileri ve İnternet Bağımlılığı. Bilişim Toplumuna Giderken Psikoloji, Sosyoloji ve Hukukta Etkiler Sempozyumu, 23-24 Mart. Ankara.

Taggar, S., Hackett, R. & Saha, S. (1999). Leadership Emergence in Autonomous Work Teams: Antecedents and Outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*. 52: 899-926.

Tahiroğlu, A., Çelik, G., Fettahoğlu, G., Yıldırım, V., Toros, F., Avcı, A., Özatalay, E. & Uzel, M. (2010). Psikiyatrik Bozukluğu Olan ve Olmayan Ergenlerde Problemlili İnternet Kullanımı. *Nöropsikiyatri Arşivi*. 2010; 47: 241-6

Templeton, B. G., Bush, K., Lash, S. B., Robinson, V. & Gale, J. (2008). Adolescent Socialization in Rural Appalachia: The Perspectives of Teens, Parents, and Significant Adults. *Marriage & Family Review*. 44 (1).

Thoms, S. (1997). People in Organisations; An Active Learning Approach. Malden Balckwell Business Publications.

Thomas, J. C. & Segal, D. (2006). *Comrehensive Handbook of Personality and Psychopatology*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Türker, A. H. (2009). Çocuğun Kişilik Gelişimi. Sağlık Bakanlığı Temel Sağlık Bülteni. 27:3. 1-4

Topçu, S. (1982). Çocuk ve Yetişkinlerde Kişilik Boyutları ile Bu Boyutlarda Kültürler-arası Ayrılıklar. *Basılmamış Doçentlik Tezi*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi: Ankara.

Turkle, S. (1995). *Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the Internet*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ünal, S. & Özcan, E. (2000). Depresyonda hazırlayıcı, ortaya çıkarıcı ve koruyucu etkenler, *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi*. 1 (1) 41-47.

Van Os, J., Jones, P. B. (1999). Early risk factors and adult person environment relationships in affective disorder. *Psychological Medicine*. 29: 1055-1067.

- Vermonlayeva-Tomina, L. B. (1964). In J. Gray (Ed.), *Pavlov's typology*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Wasserstein, J. (2005). Diagnostic issues for adolescents and adults with ADHD. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 61: 535–547.
- Weiss, R. (1970). Effects of Mass Media of Communication. In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, ed. G. Lindzey, E. Aronson, 5: 77-19.
- Weiser, E.B. (2001) 'The functions of internet use and their social and psychological consequences' *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*. 4: 723-743.
- Welsh, L. (1999). Internet use: An exploration of coping style, locus of control and expectancies. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northeastern University.
- Winkler, D., Pjrek, E., Kasper, S. (2005). Anger attacks in depression-evidence for a male depressive syndrome. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*. 74 (5): 303-307.
- Wiseman, H., Mayseless, O., Sharabany, R. (2004). Why are lonely? Perceived quality of early relationship with parents, attachment, personality, predispositions, and loneliness in first year university student. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 40 (2), 237-248.
- Wittenberg, M. T. & Reis, H. T. (1986). Loneliness, social skills, and social perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 12, 121–130.
- Wolfradt, U. & Doll, J. (2001) 'Motives of adolescents to use the Internet as a function of personality traits, personal and social factors' *Journal of Educational Computing Research*. 24: 13-27.



Wolfe, D. (1983). Effects of music loudness on task performance and self-report of college- aged students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*. 31: 191-201.

Wortman, C. (1988). *Psychology*. p:352 New York: Alfred Knoph Inc.

Yanbastı, G. (1990). *Kişilik Kuramları*. s:53 İzmir: E.Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.

Yang, C. K. (2001). Sociopsychiatric characteristics of adolescents who use computers to excess. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 103: 1–6.

Yang, S. C., Tung, C. (2004). Comparison of internet addicts and non-addicts in Taiwanese high school. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 23: 79-96.

Yaparel, R. (1984). *Sosyal İlişkilerde Başarı ve Başarısızlık Nedenlerinin Algılanması ile Yalnızlık Arasındaki İlişki*. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Yavuzer, H. (1992). *Çocuk Psikolojisi*. Remzi Kitapevi. İstanbul.

Yavuzer, H. (2000). *Eğitim ve gelişim özellikleriyle okul çağı çocuğu*. Remzi Kitapevi AŞ.

Yellowlees, P. M., Marks, S. (2007). Problematic internet use or internet addiction? *Computers in Human Behavior*. 23: 1447-1453.

Young, K. S. (1998). Internet addiction: The emergence of a new clinical disorder. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*. 1: 237-244.

Young, K. S. & Rodgers, R. (1997). The relationship between depression and internet addiction. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*. 1 (1), 25-28.

Zel, M. (2001). *Kişilik ve Liderlik:Evrensel Boyutlarıyla Yönetmel Açından Araştırmalar, Teoriler ve Yorumlar*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

<http://allpsych.com/personalitysynopsis/adler.html> (15 April, 2010)

<http://brainmeta.com/personality/fromm.php> (21 May, 2010)

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/23710964/Heredity-Determines-Personality> (2 May 2010.)

<http://www.melihbayramdede.com/2006/11/07/58/turkiyede-internet-ne-zaman-dogdu>. (29 May, 2010)

<http://bid.ankara.edu.tr/yardim/inet-tr-HTML/bolum1.html#14> (2 December, 2009)

<http://www.po.metu.edu.tr/links/inf/css25/bolum2.html#2> (2 December, 2009).



( ) Çok Düşük ( ) Düşük ( ) Orta ( ) Yüksek ( ) Çok yüksek

7. Şuan Yaşadığımız Yer: ( ) İl ( ) İlçe ( ) Köy

8. Günde ortalama kaç saat internet kullanırsınız?

- ( ) 0-1 saat
- ( ) 2-3 saat
- ( ) 4-5 saat
- ( ) 6-7 saat
- ( ) 8 saatten fazla

9. İnterneti en çok hangi ortamdan bağlanırsınız?

- ( ) Okuldan
- ( ) Evden
- ( ) Cafeden
- ( ) İş yerinden
- ( ) Cep telefonundan

10. Sosyal paylaşım ağlarını (facebook, twitter, blogger vb) kullanıyor musunuz?

- ( ) Evet
- ( ) Hayır

11. İnternet ortamında sohbet (chat) yapar mısınız?

- ( ) Evet
- ( ) Hayır

12. En çok hangi ortamlardaki arkadaşlıklar sizi mutlu eder?

- ( ) Sosyal ortamlardaki
- ( ) Sanal ortamlardaki
- ( ) Ayırt etmem

13. İnternette sohbet ederken yeni arkadaşlar edinip onları gerçek hayata taşıdığınız oldu mu?

- ( ) Evet
- ( ) Hayır

14. İnternet ortamında iletişim içinde olduğunuz insanları seçerken önceliğiniz nedir?

- ( ) Yaş grubu
- ( ) Karşı cinsten olması
- ( ) Aynı cinsten olması
- ( ) İlgili alanları
- ( ) Hemşehri olması
- ( ) Sosyal statü
- ( ) Ekonomik durumu
- ( ) Mesleği
- ( ) Siyasi görüşü

- Takım taraftarlığı  
 Akıcı bir sohbet  
 Gerçek yaşamınızdaki arkadaşlarınızla iletişim  
 Fiziksel mesafe (şehir/ ülke) anlamında sizden uzakta olan arkadaşlarınızla iletişim  
 Diğer

15. Duygularınızı en rahat hangi ortamdaki arkadaşlarınızla paylaşabiliyorsunuz?

- Sosyal ortamlardaki  
 Sanal ortamlardaki  
 Ayırt etmem

16. İnternet kullanımınız sosyalleşmenizi nasıl etkiliyor?

- Arttırıyor  
 Azaltıyor  
 Etkilemiyor

17. Geceleri su içmek vb. ihtiyaçlarınız için uyandıığınızda internete baktığınız zamanlar oluyor mu?

- Evet  
 Hayır

18. İnterneti en çok;

- Güncel gelişmelerden haberdar olmak için kullanımım.  
 Oyun oynamak için kullanımım.  
 Sohbet (chat) etmek için kullanımım.  
 Sosyal paylaşım ağlarına (facebook, twitter, blogger vb) erişmek için kullanımım.  
 Yeni insanlar tanımak için kullanımım.  
 İnternet bankacılığı için kullanımım.  
 Haberleri takip etmek için kullanımım.  
 Emaillerimi kontrol etmek için kullanımım.  
 Cinsel içerikli videolar izlemek için kullanımım.  
 Film izlemek veya müzik dinlemek için kullanımım.  
 Araştırma yapmak için kullanımım.  
 Boş vakitlerimi değerlendirmek için kullanımım.  
 Sıkıldığım veya mutsuz olduğum zamanlarda rahatlamak için kullanımım.

## APPENDIX B

### EYSENCK KİŞİLİK ANKETİ- GÖZDEN GEÇİRİLMİŞ KISALTILMIŞ FORMU (EKA-GGK)

Sorulara “EVET” veya “HAYIR” cevabı verecekseniz o şıkkın bulunduğu kutuya (X) işaretini koyunuz. Cevapların doğrusu yanlışı olmadığı gibi cevaplarınızı çabuk işaretleyin ve soruların kesin anlamı üzerinde fazla düşünmeyin. Lütfen her soruyu cevaplandırın.

	EVET	HAYIR
1. Duygu durumunuz sıklıkla mutlulukla mutsuzluk arasında değişir mi?		
2. Konuşkan bir kişi misiniz?		
3. Borçlu olmak sizi endişelendirir mi?		
4. Oldukça canlı bir kişi misiniz?		
5. Hiç sizin payınıza düşenden fazlasını alarak açgözlülük yaptığınız oldu mu?		
6. Garip ya da tehlikeli etkileri olabilecek ilaçları kullanır mısınız?		
7. Aslında kendi hatanız olduğunu bildiğiniz bir şeyi yapmakla hiç başka birini suçladınız mı?		
8. Kurallara uymak yerine kendi bildiğiniz yolda gitmeyi mi tercih edersiniz?		
9. Sıklıkla kendinizi her şeyden bıkmış hissedersiniz mi?		
10. Hiç başkasına ait olan bir şeyi (toplu iğne veya düğme bile olsa) aldınız mı?		
11. Kendinizi sinirli bir kişi olarak tanımlar mısınız?		
12. Evliliğin modası geçmiş ve kaldırılması gereken bir şey olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz?		
13. Oldukça sıkıcı bir partiye kolaylıkla canlılık getirebilir misiniz?		
14. Kaygılı bir kişi misiniz?		
15. Sosyal ortamlarda geri planda kalma eğilimiz var mıdır?		
16. Yaptığınız bir işte hatalar olduğunu bilmeniz sizi endişelendirir mi?		
17. Herhangi bir oyunda hiç hile yaptınız mı?		
18. Sinirlerinizden şikayetçi misiniz?		

19. Hiç başka birini kendi yararınıza kullandınız mı?		
20. Başkalarıyla birlikte iken çoğunlukla sessiz misinizdir?		
21. Sık sık kendinizi yalnız hisseder misiniz?		
22. Toplum kurallarına uymak, kendi bildiğinizi yapmaktan daha mı iyidir?		
23. Diğer insanlar sizi çok canlı biri olarak düşünürler mi?		
24. Başkasına önerdiğiniz şeyleri kendiniz her zaman uygular mısınız?		

## APPENDIX C

### UCLA YALNIZLIK ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıdaki ifadeler, bireylerin hissettiklerini tanımlamaktadır. Lütfen, her bir durum için tanımlanan duyguyu ne sıklıkta hissettiğinizi ilgili rakamı daire içine alarak belirtiniz. Örneğin, “Ne sıklıkta kendinizi mutlu hissedersiniz?” sorusu için kendinizi “hiçbir zaman” mutlu hissetmiyorsanız 1’i, “nadiren” mutlu hissediyorsanız 2’yi, “bazen” mutlu hissediyorsanız 3’ü, “her zaman” mutlu hissediyorsanız 4’ü daire içine alınız.

HİÇBİR ZAMAN      NADİREN      BAZEN      HER ZAMAN  
1                              2                              3                              4

Bence/Benim için

	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Her zaman
1. Ne sıklıkta kendinizi çevrenizdeki insanlarla uyum içinde hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
2. Ne sıklıkta bir arkadaşın eksikliğini hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
3. Ne sıklıkta başvurabileceğiniz bir kişinin olmadığını hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
4. Ne sıklıkta kendinizi yalnız hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
5. Ne sıklıkta kendinizi bir arkadaş grubunun parçası olarak hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
6. Ne sıklıkta çevrenizdeki insanlarla ortak yönlerinizin olduğunu hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
7. Ne sıklıkta artık hiç kimseye yakın olmadığını hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
8. Ne sıklıkta ilgilerinizin ve düşüncelerinizin çevrenizdekilerce paylaşılmadığını hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
9. Ne sıklıkta kendinizi sempatik ve arkadaş canlısı hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
10. Ne sıklıkta kendinizi insanlara yakın hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
11. Ne sıklıkta kendinizi dışlanmış hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
12. Ne sıklıkta diğerleri ile ilişkilerinizin anlamsızlaştığını hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
13. Ne sıklıkta hiç kimsenin sizi gerçekten çok iyi tanımadığını hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
14. Ne sıklıkta kendinizi diğer insanlardan soyutlanmış hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
15. Ne sıklıkta istediğiniz zaman arkadaş bulabileceğinizi hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
16. Ne sıklıkta sizi gerçekten anlayan insanların var olduğunu hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
17. Ne sıklıkta kendinizi içine kapanık hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
18. Ne sıklıkta çevrenizde insanlar olmasına rağmen onların sizinle iletişim içinde bulunmadıklarını hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4



19. Ne sıklıkta konuşabileceğiniz birilerinin var olduğunu hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4
20. Ne sıklıkta başvurabileceğiniz kişilerin olduğunu hissedersiniz?	1	2	3	4

## APPENDIX D

### İNTERNETTE BİLİŞSEL DURUM ÖLÇEĞİ

**YÖNERGE :** Bu anket sizin internet hakkındaki düşünceleriniz, tutumlarınız ve inançlarınızla ilgilidir. Her bir soruyu size uygunluk derecesine göre “1” den “7” ye kadar numaralandırıp ( x ) işareti koyarak belirleyebilirsiniz. Katıldığımız için teşekkürler...

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

Kesinlikle katılıyorum

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1- Kendimi en çok internetteyken rahat hissediyorum							
2-İnternette tanıştığım insanların dışında çok az insan beni seviyor							
3-Kendimi en çok internetteyken güvende hissediyorum							
4-Çoğu zaman internetten çıkmamın üzerinden uzun süre geçtikten sonra bile internetteyken yaşadıklarımı düşünüyorum							
5-İnternetteyken çoğu zaman bir “telaş” veya duygusal bir yoğunluk hissediyorum							
6-İnsanları internet yoluyla , şahsen olduğundan daha iyi tanımak mümkün							
7-İnternette olmak bana çoğu zaman huzur veriyor							
8-İnternetteyken kendim olabiliyorum							
9-İnternetteyken “gerçek hayatta” olduğundan daha fazla saygı görüyorum							
10-Ben interneti kullanmam gerekenden daha sık kullanıyorum							
11-İnsanlar interneti çok fazla kullanmamdan şikayet ediyorlar							
12-Asla planladığımdan daha uzun süre internette kalmıyorum							
13-İnsanlar internette beni olduğum gibi kabul ediyorlar							
14-İnternet üzerinde kurulan ilişkiler günlük hayattaki ilişkilerden daha tatmin edici olabiliyor							
15-İnternette olmadığım zaman, çoğunlukla interneti düşünüyorum							
16-İnternette olduğum zaman en iyi halimde oluyorum							
17-Günlük yaşam internette yapılabileceklere oranla daha az heyecan verici							
18-Arkadaşlarım ve ailemin, internetteki insanların benimle ilgili görüşlerini bilmelerini isterdim							
19-İnternet gerçek hayattan daha “gerçek”							
20-İnternetteyken sorumluluklarımı düşünmüyorum							
21-İnternet aklımdan hiç çıkmıyor							
22-İnternetteyken kendimi daha az yalnız hissediyorum							

23-Uzun süre internette uzak kaldığıma hayal bile edemiyorum									
24-İnternet hayatımın önemli bir parçasını oluşturuyor									
25-İnternete girmediğimde kendimi çaresiz hissediyorum									
26-İnternette gerçek hayatta asla yapamayacağım şeyleri söylüyor ve yapıyorum									
27-Yapacak daha iyi bir işim olmadığında internete giriyorum									
28-Yapmam gereken başka bir iş olduğunda internete daha fazla girdiğimi farkediyorum									
29-İnternetteyken günlük hayatın sorunlarını düşünmek zorunda olmuyorum									
30-İnterneti bazen yapmam gereken bir işi ertelemek için bahane olarak kullanıyorum									
31-İnternetteyken kaygılarımdan uzaklaşabiliyorum									
32-İnterneti çoğu zaman hoş olmayan işlerle uğraşmaktan kaçınmak amacıyla kullanıyorum									
33-İnterneti kullanmak yapmam gereken ama aslında yapmak istemediğim şeyleri unutmanın bir yolu									
34-Zaman zaman istememe rağmen, internet kullanımımı azaltamıyorum									
35-İnterneti bu kadar çok kullanmayı bırakamamam beni rahatsız ediyor									
36-İnternet kullanımım zaman zaman denetimden çıkmış gibi görünüyor									

