Investigation of university students' identity types and spiritual well-being levels

Bunyamin Cetinkaya

Faculty of Education, Giresun University, Giresun, Turkey.

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to investigate university students' identity types and spiritual well-being levels in terms of a range of variables. 298 students from various university departments participated in the study. Identity Scale, Spiritual well-being Scale and Personal Information Form were used in the study. This study was a descriptive study based on survey model. The study data was subjected to normality tests and analyzed according to the results on the tests. Mann Whitney U Test, Kruskal Wallis H Test and Spearman rho correlation coefficient technique were used to analyze the data. As a result of the study, the students' identity types significantly varied by gender and year of study variables. The students' spiritual well-being levels significantly varied by gender, year of study, field of study, and paternal education level. There was a low positive correlation between identity types score and spiritual well-being score.

Keywords: Spiritual well-being, personal identity, social identity, collective identity.

E-mail:bumi55@gmail.com. Tel: 90-506-672-3390.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of identity is a concept intensively investigated in many areas, including cultural, social, political, etc. However, this dates back to early 1900s. According to Sozen (2019), there's been worldwide interest in identity in the name of modernity, rather than economy since 1930s. According to him, new social theories evaluate the issue of identity and new status of the individual with the discourse of subject, i.e. ego, individual, self, rather than people in the form of individuals. There are also authors who see identity as a result of being modern (Giddens, 1991). "Actually, the concept of identity is not far from modernity. The concept of consciousness at least demonstrates the close connection between modernity and identity" (Sozen, 2019). Initially addressed in religious, occupational, political subjects, the concept of identity has been addressed in ethical, interpersonal relationships and social life matters (Gorp, 2005), and it is one of the most fascinating and interesting concepts of today's world (Askin, 2007). Identity is a combination of one's personal characteristics such as values, thoughts, feelings and social relationships such as belonging, love and

recognition (Coskun, 2004), a characteristic and an indicator of nature (Askin, 2007).

The concept of self is like an area which belongs to a person when s/he interacts with others and distinguishes anyone other than him/her. In development of self, a person's own observations about himself/herself as well as attributes reflected on the person from others are effective (Ozen and Gulacti, 2010). The self-concept also includes the identity concept as a more comprehensive concept. Identity is seen as a part of self-concept (Bilgin, 2003). Identity distinguishes a person from others with his/her answers to the questions "who am I?" and "where do I belong to?" and refers to his/her uniqueness (Budak, 2009; Ozdil, 2017; Turan and Ozkan, 2019). A person's answers to the questions "who am I?" also represent his/her individual identity. On the other hand, the question "who are we?" refers to collective identity (Alaca, 2017a; Yazici, 2016). Identity is also defined as awareness of a person about who s/he really is Aslan and Donmez (2013), a conscious understanding of a person or a society about his/her or their possessions (Simsek, 2002), an active organization of individuals' instincts,

capabilities and beliefs (Marcia, 1980).

Our thoughts about ourselves are established by the place and time in which we have lived since childhood (Brown, 1998). In other words, the place and time in which one lives have a notable effect on how one perceives oneself, who one sees oneself as and the level of self-esteem. There are many theoretical approaches about formation and development of identity. Some of these claim that identity takes place in a psychosocial environment, whereas some claim that it takes place in an interactional background (Karagulle, 2018). Theories about identity development, including social comparison theory (Festinger, 2007), symbolic interaction theory (Mead, 1970), psychosocial development theory (Erikson, 1968), social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1986) have set forth different opinions about factors affecting identity development and development process of individuals. In addition to these theories, Marcia (1966) defined four key identity statuses: identity achievement, moratorium, foreclosure and identity diffusion. According to Erikson (1968), who is a pioneer of psychosocial theory, an important identity development theory, the most important task of adolescence is identity development and identity consists of two different elements, being ego identity and self-identity (Erikson, 1968). Identity forms through experiences as from childhood. It is claimed that if an individual develops a successful identity, s/he will have a healthy structure, but if an individual fails to develop a successful identity and experiences identity diffusion, s/he will be an inconsistent person with no purposes or goals (Erikson, 1968; Schwartz, 2001).

For an individual, "having an identity" is something desired but "having no identity" is not desired by anyone (Verkuyten, 2005). Having an identity or not, leads to one's assessment of oneself as positive or negative. A positive assessment of oneself increases self-esteem (Aslan and Donmez, 2013), which has positive implications on social and collective identities (Aygun, 2004; Coskun, 2004). Personal identity represents a person's own answers to the questions "who am I? What are my attributes? and what is my position?" (Simsek, 2002) and independence and uniqueness of the individual (Aslan, 2013). However, one should bear in mind that a person forms his/her identity as a result of his/her acquisitions from his/her environment and the society s/he lives in (Karagulle, 2018).

Social identity theory advanced by Tajfel and Turner in 1970s (Turner, 1975) emphasizes identity formation through social constructs for which an individual has a sense of belonging (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel and Turner, 1986). In the years following construction of social identity theory, studies on measuring personal and social identities, the main theme of the theory, started (Cheek and Briggs, 1982). Although personal identity and social identity are referred to as two separate types of identity,

they are mostly intertwined and overlap (Yazici, 2016). In terms of interpersonal relationships, social identity, defined as a representation of identity, may arise from a person's description of himself/herself or his/her roles in social relationships (Bilgin, 2007). Sense of belonging, which arises from a person's becoming a member of a group to which s/he feels himself/herself close to by identifying himself/herself with the group, comprises social identity. This is the identity that connects the person to a group in which s/he feels that s/he belongs, i.e. social identity (Bas, 2016).

One of the most important actors of identity development is the socialization process (Ulug, 1999). However, in the case of identity development, we cannot think personal, social and collective elements apart from each other (Simsek, 2002). Personal identity means an individual's answer to the question "who am I?", combined with his/her social-emotional perception of his/her own attributes and position, whereas social identity means that a person feels that she belongs in a group or community or s/he can identify with that group or community (Simsek, 2002). Collective identity is described as a sense of consciousness and belonging of a group of people the limits of whom are specified by a specific cultural society (Bilgin, 1999) based on their similarities and differences (Alperen, 2008; Tural, 1988) that they are distinctive, privileged and unique (due to race, ethnical heritage, religion, etc.) (Alaca, 2017b; Alperen, 2008; Bilgin, 2007). Collective identity also means the social identity gained in order to internalize all the elements belonging to and specific to a culture and to be similar to them (Ozdil, 2017).

In the current century, one of the biggest problems of humanity is "existential emptiness" or "meaninglessness" (Corey, 2013). Psychology is a branch of science that deals with human beings, and it also deals with spiritual well-being, which means a spiritually healthy human being. One's being spiritually healthy is thought to also help him/her to be morally well (Acar, 2014). In other words, if one has spiritual well-being, s/he can be mentally healthier, closer to peace, and much happier than others. The concept of well-being, which is one of the topics of positive psychology, is also used synonymously with feeling happy (Gulacti, 2009; Miquelon and Vallerant, 2006; Topuz, 2013). Well-being in general represents striving for perfection (Ryff, 1995). However, the concept of spiritual well-being has even become more important due to the increase in the number of people who no longer strive for this and cannot adapt to the developments arising from the rapid changes in the world and experience resulting mental problems (Stanard et al., 2000). Spiritual well-being, conceptualized by Poloutzian and Ellison (1982), is one of the types of well-being. It is a concept that includes both one's spiritual side and well-being (Gursu and Ay, 2018). Spiritual well-being can be considered as two

concepts, being spiritual and well. Spiritual is shown as a concept related to metaphysics and spirituality, i.e. one that is immaterial. Combining these two concepts, spiritual well-being represents a person's pleasant state (Gomez and Fisher, 2003). Although the concept of spirituality is confused with the concepts of religion and religious belief, they do not mean the same (Adams, et al., 2000; Bekelman et al., 2007; Ingersoll, 1994). The most important difference between them is the difference in scope. People may be spiritual but not believe in any religion. In many countries of the world there are countless individuals who are not religious but are highly spiritual. Because of this feature, spirituality is a much more inclusive concept. In addition, the effort of religion to gather individuals under a single religious identity and social roof does not exist in spirituality. However, the influence of spirituality on individuals' behavioral patterns is greater than religion. Spiritual well-being can be defined as the feeling of holding on to life, loving oneself and nature, being stronger against compelling events and maintaining commitment to life (Ugurluoglu and Erdem, 2019), communicating with others, having the sense of meaning and goal of life (Hawks et al., 1995). Surbhi (2013) defines spiritual well-being as the degree of understanding one's spirituality and sense of well-being arising from spiritual attitudes and determination. The concept of spiritual well-being is discussed in two dimensions. The first includes the dimension of one's relationship with a religious belief system or a higher power (vertical dimension), and the second includes the dimension of feelings (horizontal dimension) about the meaning and purpose of life independent of a religious structure (Ellison, 1983; cited in Gursu and Ay, 2018; Moberg and Brusek, 1978). A person with spiritual well-being has a clear meaning and purpose for life and further questions and strives on himself/herself to maintain his/her excellence (Emmons, 1999).

The concepts of identity and spiritual well-being, which are believed to have significant effects on each other, have been popular concepts of recent years and discussed in the literature. Whether there is a relationship between identity types and spiritual well-being levels, and whether some variables affect identity types and spiritual well-being levels have been subjects of interest, and when the literature on this issue was searched, no study has been published exactly on this subject. However, there's a considerable amount of literature on identity types, identity development and spiritual well-being with different variables, and some of these are cited as references in the current article. The importance of our work lies in the fact that it gives an insight into whether there is any relationship between identity types (personal, social, collective) and spiritual well-being levels, which were two of the most important topics of the last century, and whether they are affected by different variables, and the fact that this study will provide guidance to further studies on this subject. In addition, this study is also important because the findings of this study will be deemed significant for university students and their parents and taken into consideration.

METHODOLOGY

Research goal

In this research, the model of survey has been used. General survey models are survey studies conducted In a universe with a lot of elements to reach a general judgment about the universe based on the entire universe or a group of samples to be taken from the universe (Karasar, 2015). This study was conducted to investigate university students' identity types and spiritual well-being levels in terms of a range of variables.

Study group

In this research sample consisted of 298 students at Faculty of Teaching of Erzincan Binali Yildirim University.

Data collection tools

Demographic information form

The personal information form prepared by the researcher was used to determine various variables about the participants.

Spiritual well-being scale

The validity study in Turkey of the Spiritual Well-Being Scale, first developed by Paloutzian and Ellison (1982), was performed by Eksi and Kardas (2017). The scale is a five-point Likert type scale consisting of total of 29 items, and the answers are as I totally disagree- I totally agree (1-5). It contains three sub-dimensions: transcendence, harmony with nature and anomie. Cronbach's alpha values for transcendence, harmony with nature and anomie were .95, .86 and .85, respectively, and the total value was .88. It is clear that those who had a high score from the scale has a high level of spiritual well-being and those who had a low score has a low level of spiritual well-being. In this study, Cronbach's alpha value was .88.

Identity scale (IS)

Identity scale developed by Cheek and Briggs (1982) measures the importance given by an individual to

various identity attributes at individual, social and collective level. Identity scale consists of individual, social and collective sub-scales. In the validity and reliability study of the scale performed by Coskun (2004) to obtain a Turkish version of the scale, total correlations of items were in the range of .34-.60, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .79, internal consistency coefficients were .76, .78 and .80 for personal, social and collective identity sub-scales, respectively and test-retest reliability coefficient was .86. The lowest score obtained from the whole scale is 25, and the highest score is 125. IS is applied to adolescents and adults individually or as a group. There's no time limitation in application. Reliability coefficients obtained in the study were as follows: Identity Scale: .89, personal identity: .87, social identity: .74, collective identity: .71.

Data collection

The scales were applied to university students studying at Faculty of Teaching of Erzincan Binali Yildirim University. Before the scales were applied, the participants were briefed about the aim of the research and how the scale will be applied. Applications took approximately 20 minutes.

Data analysis

In the study, the relationships between spiritual well-being levels and identity types of the university students were identified and variation of these variables in sub-groups was examined. Normality tests, Mann Whitney-u, Kruskal Wallis test were used to analyze the data depending on the variables. The relationship between dependent variables was analyzed by calculating Spearman rho correlation coefficient.

RESULTS

According to the values in Table 1, 67.8% of the participants were female and 32.2% were male. By year of study at the university, 59.1% of the participants were students in 1st year of study and 9.7% were in 4th year of study. The percentages of field of study were as follows: Turkish Teaching 22.5%, Psychological Counseling and Guidance 62.5%, Art Teaching 10.4% and Music Teaching 4.4%. In terms of parental education level, 48% of the participants' mothers have primary school degree and 5% have a university degree or a higher degree. 28.2% of the participants' fathers have a primary school degree and 19.5% are illiterate. The percentages of parents were as follows: tolerant parents: 57.4%; authoritative parents: 21.8%; democratic parents: 17.1%

and negligent parents: 3.7%.

As shown in Table 2, identity total scores and total scores from personal identity, social identity, collective identity sub-scales and spiritual well-being scales and the scores from sub-groups did not have normal distribution according to Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk normality analysis results so non-parametric test techniques were used in comparison tests.

As a result of the comparison of Gender groups in terms of Spiritual Well-Being and Life Satisfaction Scores by Mann-Whitney U Test, there was a statistically significant difference between spiritual well-being (U = 8123.500, p < 0.05) and personal identity scores (U = 7936.500, p < 0.05) of gender groups, whereas there was no statistically significant difference between Social Identity (U = 8839.500, p > 0.05), Collective Identity (U = 9475.000, p > 0.05) and Identity Total scores (U = 9430,000, p > 0.05). Mean spiritual well-being rank score of females (157.28) was higher than that of males (133.12). When mean ranks by identity types subscales were compared, females' scores by personal identity (158.21) and identity total scores (150.82) were higher than males' scores (131.17) and (146.73), respectively, whereas males' scores by social identity (158.42) and collective identity scores (151.80) were higher than females' scores 145.26 and 148.41, respectively (Table 3).

Table 4 shows Kruskal-Wallis H test results of the scores related to spiritual well-being and identity types of students at various grade levels. According to the analysis results, there was no statistically significant difference between spiritual well-being (X2 = 5.826, p > 0.05), Personal Identity (X2 = 3.250, p > 0.05), Social Identity (X2 = 2.281, p > 0.05) and Identity total (X2 = 5.553, p > 0.05) scores. However, there was a statistically significant difference between collective identity (X2 = 10.445, p < 0.05) scores. As a result of Mann-Whitney U test performed to identify the source of significant variation in collective identity scores, the first year students had a significantly high mean ranks than the 3rd year students. 1st year students (159.43) had the highest mean rank by spiritual well-being scores, whereas 3rd year students (132.70) had the lowest mean rank. By personal identity scores, the 1st year students had the highest mean rank (156.51) and the 3rd year students had the lowest mean rank (134.53), by social identity scores, the 2nd year students had the highest mean rank (170.11) and the 3rd year students had the lowest mean rank (143.79), by identity total scores, the first year students had the highest mean rank (157.32) and the 3rd year students had the lowest mean rank (129.92).

Table 5 shows Kruskal-Wallis H test results of the scores related to spiritual well-being and identity types of students at various fields of study. According to the analysis results, there was no statistically significant difference between spiritual well-being (X2 = 1.281,

Table 1. Frequency and percentage distributions of the participants' personal information

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Female	202	67.8
	Male	96	32.2
Year of Study	1st year of study	176	59.1
	2nd year of study	32	10.7
	3rd year of study	61	20.5
	4th year of study	29	9.7
Field of Study	Turkish	67	22.5
	Psychological counseling and guidance (PCG)	187	62.8
	Art	31	10.4
	Music	13	4.4
Maternal Education Level	Illiterate	58	19.5
	Primary school	143	48.0
	Secondary school	31	10.4
	High school	51	17.1
	University and Higher Education	15	5.0
Educational Status of Father	Illiterate	15	5.0
	Primary school	84	28.2
	Secondary school	81	27.2
	High school	70	23.5
	University and Higher Education	48	16.1
Perceived Parental Attitudes	Authoritative	65	21.8
	Democratic	51	17.1
	Negligent	11	3.7
	Tolerant	171	57.4

Note: Total number of participants: 298.

Table 2. Normality analysis of scores from spiritual well-being and identification scales.

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Spiritual well-being	.076	298	.000	.960	298	.000
Personal identity	.122	298	.000	.890	298	.000
Social identity	.087	298	.000	.973	298	.000
Collective identity	.078	298	.000	.983	298	.001
Total identity	.058	298	.018	.977	298	.000

$p > 0.05$), Personal Identity ($X2 = 1.151$, $p > 0.05$), Social Identity ($X2 = 6.385$, $p > 0.05$), Collective Identity ($X2 = 7.248$, $p > 0.05$) and Identity total ($X2 = 4.800$, $p > 0.05$) scores. Considering mean ranks of the groups, in terms of spiritual well-being, the students from the department of art teaching had the highest mean rank (153.00) and the students from the department of music teaching had the lowest mean rank (125.27), and by personal identity scores, the students from the department of Turkish teaching had the highest mean rank (150.87) and the students from the department of Art teaching had the lowest mean rank (135.39), by social identity scores, the students from the Department of Music Teaching had the highest mean rank (187.50) and the students from the

Table 3. Comparison of gender groups in terms of spiritual well-being and identity scores by Mann-Whitney U test.

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	U	p
Spiritual well-being	Female	202	157.28	8123.500	.024
	Male	96	133.12		
Personal identity	Female	202	158.21	7936.500	.011
	Male	96	131.17		
Social identity	Female	202	145.26	8839.500	.217
	Male	96	158.42		
Collective identity	Female	202	148.41	9475.000	.750
	Male	96	151.80		
Total identity	Female	202	150.82	9430.000	.702
	Male	96	146.73		

Table 4. Comparison of grade levels in terms of spiritual well-being and identity scores by Kruskal-Wallis H test.

Grade level		N	Mean rank	Degree of freedom	X2	P	Significant Difference
Spiritual well-being	1st year of study	176	159.43	3	5.826	.120	_*
	2nd year of study	32	136.70				
	3rd year of study	61	132.70				
	4th year of study	29	138.67				
Personal identity	1st year of study	176	156.51	3	3.250	.355	_*
	2nd year of study	32	143.41				
	3rd year of study	61	134.53				
	4th year of study	29	145.19				
Social identity	1st year of study	176	147.18	3	2.281	.516	_*
	2nd year of study	32	170.11				
	3rd year of study	61	143.79				
	4th year of study	29	152.88				
Collective identity	1st year of study	176	162.14	3	10.445	.015	
	2nd year of study	32	144.22				1st year of study - 3rd year of study
	3rd year of study	61	123.93				
	4th year of study	29	132.43				
Total identity	1st year of study	176	157.32	3	5.553	.135	_*
	2nd year of study	32	156.36				
	3rd year of study	61	129.92				
	4th year of study	29	135.67				

_* there was no significant difference.

department of Art teaching had the lowest mean rank (128.48), by collective identity scores, the students from the department of Turkish teaching had the highest mean rank (172.20) and the students from the department of

Table 5. Comparison of fields of study in terms of spiritual well-being and identity scores by Kruskal-Wallis H test.

Field of study		N	Mean rank	Degree of freedom	X2	P	Significant Difference
Spiritual well-being	Turkish	67	146.49	3	1.281	.734	_*
	Psychological counseling and guidance (PCG)	187	151.68				
	Art	31	153.00				
	Music	13	125.27				
Personal identity	Turkish	67	150.87	3	1.151	.765	_*
	Psychological counseling and guidance (PCG)	187	151.98				
	Art	31	135.39				
	Music	13	140.46				
Social identity	Turkish	67	162.81	3	6.385	.094	_*
	Psychological counseling and guidance (PCG)	187	145.57				
	Art	31	128.48				
	Music	13	187.50				
Collective identity	Turkish	67	172.20	3	7.248	.064	_*
	Psychological counseling and guidance (PCG)	187	145.95				
	Art	31	129.02				
	Music	13	132.46				
Total identity	Turkish	67	165.31	3	4.800	.187	_*
	Psychological counseling and guidance (PCG)	187	148.07				
	Art	31	125.15				
	Music	13	146.65				

_* there was no significant difference.

Art teaching had the lowest mean rank (129.02), and by identity total scores, the students from the department of Turkish teaching had the highest mean rank (165.31) and the students from the department of Art teaching had the lowest mean rank (125.15).

Table 6 shows Kruskal-Wallis H test results of the scores related to spiritual well-being and identity types of students by maternal educational level. According to the analysis results, there was no statistically significant difference between spiritual well-being (X2 = 7.539, p > 0.05), Personal Identity (X2 = 4.291, p > 0.05), Social Identity (X2 = 3.976, p > 0.05), Collective Identity (X2 = 1.946, p > 0.05) and Identity total (X2 = 2.658, p > 0.05) scores. Considering mean ranks of the groups, in terms of spiritual well-being, the students whose mothers are illiterate had the highest mean rank (165.55) and the students whose mothers have a university degree or a higher degree had the lowest mean rank (113.30), and by personal identity scores, the students whose mothers have a high school degree had the highest mean rank (168.36) and the students whose mothers have a primary school degree had the lowest mean rank (141.96), by social identity scores, the students whose mothers have a high school degree had the highest mean rank (166.22) and the students whose mothers have a primary school degree had the lowest mean rank (120.97), by collective identity scores, the students whose mothers have a primary school degree had the highest mean rank (153.84) and the students whose mothers have a secondary school degree had the lowest mean rank (131.79), and by identity total scores, the students whose mothers have a high school degree had the highest mean rank (166.26) and the students whose mothers have a university degree or a higher degree had the lowest mean rank (135.83).

Table 7 shows Kruskal-Wallis H test results of the scores related to spiritual well-being and identity types of students with various paternal education levels.

Table 6. Comparison of maternal education levels in terms of spiritual well-being and identity scores by Kruskal-Wallis H test.

Maternal education level		N	Mean rank	Degree of freedom	X2	P	Significant Difference
Spiritual well-being	Illiterate	58	165.55	4	7.539	.110	_*
	Primary school	143	140.94				
	Secondary school	31	152.87				
	High school	51	163.85				
	University and Higher Education	15	113.30				
Personal identity	Illiterate	58	144.27	4	4.291	.368	_*
	Primary school	143	141.96				
	Secondary school	31	158.10				
	High school	51	168.36				
	University and Higher Education	15	159.73				
Social identity	Illiterate	58	142.49	4	3.976	.409	_*
	Primary school	143	149.71				
	Secondary school	31	147.94				
	High school	51	166.22				
	University and Higher Education	15	120.97				
Collective identity	Illiterate	58	152.44	4	1.946	.746	_*
	Primary school	143	153.84				
	Secondary school	31	131.79				
	High school	51	147.50				
	University and Higher Education	15	140.20				
Total identity	Illiterate	58	144.09	4	2.658	.617	_*
	Primary school	143	148.11				
	Secondary school	31	145.05				
	High school	51	166.26				
	University and Higher Education	15	135.83				

_* there was no significant difference.

According to the analysis results, there was a statistically significant difference between spiritual well-being scores ($X2 = 13.114$, $p < 0.05$), whereas there was no statistically significant difference between personal identity ($X2 = 5.429$, $p > 0.05$), Social Identity ($X2 = 3.111$, $p > 0.05$), Collective Identity ($X2 = 2.183$, $p > 0.05$) and Identity Total ($X2 = .766$, $p > 0.05$) scores. As a result of Mann-Whitney U test performed to identify the reason for the significant variation in spiritual well-being scores, the students whose fathers are illiterate had higher spiritual well-being scores than the students whose fathers have a university degree or a higher degree and the students whose fathers have a primary school degree. Considering mean ranks of the groups, in terms of spiritual well-being, the students whose fathers are illiterate had the highest mean rank (205.17) and the students whose fathers have a university degree or higher had the lowest mean rank (131.34). Again, in

terms of spiritual well-being, the students whose fathers are illiterate had the highest mean rank (205.17), and the mean ranks of students whose fathers have a primary school degree (135.26) are given in the table. By personal identity scores, the students whose fathers have a high school degree had the highest mean rank (162.49) and the students whose mothers have a primary school degree had the lowest mean rank (106.67), by social identity scores, the students whose mothers have a high school degree had the highest mean rank (160.64) and the students whose mothers have a primary school degree had the lowest mean rank (140.22), by collective identity scores, the students whose mothers have a primary school degree had the highest mean rank (171.87) and the students whose mothers have a secondary school degree had the lowest mean rank (137.10), and by identity total scores, the students whose mothers have a high school degree had the highest mean

Table 7. Comparison of paternal educational levels in terms of spiritual well-being and identity scores by Kruskal-Wallis H test.

Paternal educational level		N	Mean rank	Degree of freedom	X2	P	Significant difference
Spiritual well-being	Illiterate	15	205.17	4	13.114	.011	
	Primary school	84	135.26				University graduate or graduate of a higher degree - Illiterate
	Secondary school	81	164.39				Primary school graduate - Illiterate
	High school	70	149.89				
	University and Higher Education	48	131.34				
Personal identity	Illiterate	15	106.67	4	5.429	.246	_*
	Primary school	84	145.42				
	Secondary school	81	148.30				
	High school	70	156.06				
	University and Higher Education	48	162.49				
Social identity	Illiterate	15	147.53	4	3.111	.539	_*
	Primary school	84	140.22				
	Secondary school	81	158.60				
	High school	70	142.89				
	University and Higher Education	48	160.64				
Collective identity	Illiterate	15	171.87	4	2.183	.702	_*
	Primary school	84	152.79				
	Secondary school	81	150.86				
	High school	70	147.69				
	University and Higher Education	48	137.10				
Total identity	Illiterate	15	139.87	4	.766	.943	_*
	Primary school	84	145.03				
	Secondary school	81	154.86				
	High school	70	149.09				
	University and Higher Education	48	151.90				

_* there was no significant difference.

rank (154.86) and the students whose mothers have a university degree or a higher degree had the lowest mean rank (139.87).

Table 8 shows Kruskal-Wallis H test results of the scores related to spiritual well-being and identity types of students with various perceived parental attitudes. According to the analysis results, there was no statistically significant difference between spiritual well-being (X2 = 5.056, p > 0.05), Personal Identity (X2 = 1.490, p > 0.05), Social Identity (X2 = 2.415, p > 0.05), Collective Identity (X2 = .903, p > 0.05) and Identity total (X2 = 2.300, p > 0.05) scores. Considering mean ranks of the groups, in terms of spiritual well-being, the students whose parents have a tolerant attitude had the highest mean rank (156.13) and the students whose parents have a democratic attitude had the lowest mean rank (126.55), and in terms of personal identity, the students whose parents have an authoritative attitude had the highest mean rank (157.69) and the students whose parents have a negligent attitude had the lowest mean rank (143.36), in terms of social identity, the students whose parents have an authoritative attitude had the highest mean rank (161.76) and the students whose parents have a negligent attitude had the lowest mean rank (126.36), in terms of collective identity, the students whose parents have an authoritative attitude had the highest mean rank (157.00) and the students whose parents have a negligent attitude had the lowest mean

Table 8. Comparison of perceived parental attitudes in terms of spiritual well-being and identity scores by Kruskal-Wallis H test.

Perceived parental attitudes		N	Mean rank	Degree of freedom	X2	p	Significant Difference
Spiritual well-being	Authoritative	65	152.62	3	5.056	.168	_*
	Democratic	51	126.55				
	Negligent	11	134.41				
	Tolerant	171	156.13				
Personal identity	Authoritative	65	157.69	3	1.490	.685	_*
	Democratic	51	156.32				
	Negligent	11	143.36				
	Tolerant	171	144.75				
Social identity	Authoritative	65	161.76	3	2.415	.491	_*
	Democratic	51	150.68				
	Negligent	11	126.36				
	Tolerant	171	145.98				
Collective identity	Authoritative	65	157.00	3	.903	.825	_*
	Democratic	51	142.59				
	Negligent	11	142.27				
	Tolerant	171	149.18				
Total identity	Authoritative	65	161.85	3	2.300	.513	_*
	Democratic	51	151.99				
	Negligent	11	131.09				
	Tolerant	171	145.25				

_* there was no significant difference.

rank (142.27), and in terms of identity total scores, the students whose parents have an authoritative attitude had the highest mean rank (161.85) and the students whose parents have a negligent attitude had the lowest mean rank (131.09).

Table 9 shows the results of Spearman rho correlation coefficient performed between spiritual well-being scores and identity types scores of the university students. The results of the analysis indicate that there are statistically significant positive correlations between identity subscales, except for social identity, and identity total scores. The highest correlation was identified between collective identity and identity total scores (0.786), whereas the lowest correlation was between personal identity and social identity (0.221). There were moderate correlations between personal identity and spiritual well-being (0.424), between collective identity and spiritual well-being (0.376), personal identity (0.445) and social identity (0.312), and there were high correlations with identity total scores (0.786).

Table 9. Investigation of the relationship between spiritual well-being and identity scores by Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Spiritual well-being	-				
2. Personal identity	.424**	-			
3. Social identity	-.091	.221**	-		
4. Collective identity	.376**	.445**	.312**	-	
5. Total identity	.327**	.750**	.652**	.786**	-
Mean	117.5738	42.1477	20.6208	29.0705	91.8389
S	15.96006	6.73638	5.26923	5.74296	13.48553

**P < .05.

DISCUSSION

Based on the results of the study, spiritual well-being levels of the students significantly differed by gender. Similar results were reported in the literature (Hamurcu, 2011; Hendricks-Ferguson, 2006; Kardas, 2017; Ozden, 2019; Toprak, 2018). In contrast to the results obtained in this study, Gomez and Fisher (2003), Gursu and Ay (2018), Kizilirmak (2015), Sirin (2019), concluded that gender does not lead to any significant difference in the level of spiritual well-being. Furthermore, indirectly, Holder et al. (2016) concluded that gender strongly predicts spirituality.

The results of the present study indicated that female spiritual well-being mean scores were higher than male spiritual well-being mean scores. There are studies in the literature which support this result (Hamurcu, 2011; Hendricks-Ferguson, 2006; Kardas, 2017; Ozden, 2019). Other than these, Toprak (2018) noted that gender leads to a difference in favor of males in phenomological dimension of spirituality. The reason for females having higher spiritual well-being scores may be that particularly women's perspective on spiritual life satisfaction, which is reached by judgment, appears to be more connected to emotions and that women's showing and manifesting their emotions is more acceptable in Turkish society, that men have duties and liabilities to fulfill social expectations in many points and particularly in Turkey men are expected to meet many household needs and that this is a never-ending duty of life and that spiritual satisfaction, which can also be reflected from the continuity of that duty, cannot be directed to the positive side (Gulacti et al., 2017).

Based on the results of the study, personal identity subdimension levels of the students significantly differed by gender. Females had higher mean scores of personal identity than males. Similar results were reported in the literature. For example, Aslan (2013); Aygun (2004); Lapsley et al. (1990), reported that women have higher personal and social identity scores than men, Gulbahce (2007) suggested that women see themselves more positive than men in identity terms, and Aslan and Donmez (2013) and Razmjoo (2010) established that women have significantly higher mean scores of personal identity than men. There are also studies which reported higher mean scores of identity for men than for women (Hatipoglu, 1996; Ozbay et al., 1991; Ozguroglu, 1991; Sezer, 2010). In that case, the results did not differ primarily based on gender, in other words, different results were obtained, which may be ascribed to cultural structures as well as cultural expectations and varying degrees of support and value given to individuals' identity development processes.

As a result of the current study, no significant difference was found between other subdimensions and identity total score and the gender variable. This result is in good agreement with previous results reported in the literature (Aslan, 2013; Balkaya and Ceyhan, 2007; Koker, 1997; Oflazoglu, 2000; Suslu, 2002; Yesilkilic et al., 2018). In contrast, there're also studies which demonstrated significant differences shown by the gender variable in identity development (Morsunbul, 2005). Previous reports in the literature suggest that people with a high level of spiritual well-being have a healthier lifestyle, are happier and lead a more fulfilling life. Stavrova et al. (2013) noted that spiritual well-being positively affects and improves mental health. Individuals trying to develop their gender role during adolescence also try to complete their identity development, watch people around them and see them as a role model. At the end of that process, success means self-acceptance and a positive self, and failure means not accepting oneself and developing a negative identity (Yesilkilic et al., 2018).

Based on the results of the current study, no significant difference was found between spiritual well-being levels of the students and the year of study variable. The studies reported in the literature have primarily addressed the "age" variable together with the year of study variable. As a result of the literature search conducted to search for results similar to those of the current study, given that the year of study increases with increasing age, findings similar to or different from the results of the current study were identified. For example Karagulle (2018), Koker (1997) and Suslu (2002), reported that there's no significant difference between the age variable and the sense of identity. Another study by Kizilirmak (2015) did not find any difference between the educational level and spiritual well-being. There're also studies that found significant differences between age and identity orientation (Bas, 2013). All these results may be construed as that individuals showing spiritual well-being are raised in Turkish society without placing emphasis on either gender. There was no significant difference between spiritual well-being scores of female and male university student in the current study, which may suggest a positive result in terms of the level of well-being.

A significant difference was established between the students' collective identity subdimension and the variable of year of study at the end of the study. Mean scores of 1st year students were higher than 3rd year students. No significant difference was found between other subdimensions and identity total score and the year of study variable. There was no reported finding related to these results in the literature. The reason for this result on collective identity may be that particularly first year students may tend to internalize all elements of and specific to class culture and that the students increasingly tend to adopt individuality, rather than the fact that such traits become alike according to their interpretations as the year of study and age increase.

As a result of the current study, no significant difference

was found between the students' spiritual well-being levels and the field of study variable. In the literature, the results of Koker's study (1997) support this finding; however, Hamurcu's study (2011) reported results in contrast to this finding.

Also in the current study, no significant difference was found between the students' identity scores and the field of study variable. This result is in good agreement with the results of Koker (1997). These results may be construed as that individuals with similar spiritual well-being scores and identity scores are raised regardless of their field of study without placing emphasis on either gender in Turkish higher education process. There was no significant difference between spiritual well-being scores of female and male university student in the current study, which may suggest a positive result in terms of the level of well-being. This may also apply for the process identity development.

No significant difference was found between spiritual well-being levels of the students and maternal educational level variable. Similarly, Hamurcu's study (2011) demonstrated that there's no significant difference between maternal educational level and self-acceptance well-being.

Furthermore, no significant difference was found between identity scores of the students and maternal educational level variable. Aslan (2014) reported that parental educational level does not provide significant predictions on identity development of adolescents, which supports the results of our study. Many studies suggested that democratic attitude toward the children increases with increasing level of parental education and that authoritative and oppressive attitudes are adopted as the parental educational level decreases (Ari et al., 1995; Mizrakci, 1994; Ozyurek and Poyraz, 2005; Sendogdu, 2000; Yalkin, 1994). It is a fact that a high level of democratic attitude maintained in a family means that the family has a high level of love and tolerance. In an authoritative and oppressive family setting, tolerance and love are replaced by oppression and fear. For children, it is rather problematic to live in such a family setting because they will not feel themselves valuable and will struggle to develop a successful identity in such a setting. If mothers have a high level of education, they can provide a high-quality environment to their children. A mother with a high level of education means a mother who supports her child more, respects him/her, makes realistic evaluations and can be a role model with the quality time spent together (Yilmaz Bolat, 2011). This is rather critical in a child's developing a positive identity.

There was a significant difference between spiritual well-being levels of the students and paternal educational level variable. This result of our study is in good agreement with Hamurcu's (2011) finding but contrasts with Aslan's study (2014) results.

The students whose fathers are illiterate had higher

spiritual well-being mean scores than the students whose fathers have a university degree or a higher degree The students whose fathers are illiterate had higher spiritual well-being scores than the students whose fathers have a university degree or a higher degree or a primary school degree. The results of the study suggest that paternal educational level predicts spiritual well-being levels but fails to predict identity development.

No significant difference was found between spiritual well-being levels of the students and perceived parental attitude variable.

No significant difference was found between identity scores of the students and perceived parental attitude variable. The family is the first socialization environment of a child. The family prepares a child to the social environments in the outside world by providing balanced and appropriate behavioral models to the child (Cetinkaya, 2019). Hence, the child lays the foundation of his/her social relationships in the future (Sanli and Ozturk, 2015). A sincere relationship that includes acceptance in the family supports a child's feelings of independence and also helps him/her develop a positive identity (Gander and Gardiner, 2001). Parental attitudes are highly effective on identity development of individuals (Cagdas, 2015) so it is important that parents maintain positive (democratic, supportive) attitudes for their children to develop a positive identity. Authoritative parental attitude means obedience and strict discipline. Loose attitude, unlimited freedom, negligent attitude mean leaving a child uncontrolled and deprived of love and attention. However, democratic attitude is considered a guiding attitude that supports individuality (Cetinkaya, 2018; Gander and Gardiner, 2001). As from infancy, children develop their self and identity under the influence of attitudes and behaviors of their families. Parental attitudes have positive and negative effects on an individual's entire life. Previous studies in the literature (Kose and Kolburan, 2019) indicate that children's self-respect and empathy development are related to parental attitudes (democratic attitude/positive effect; authoritative attitude/negative effect), whereas Aslan (2014) and Karagulle (2018) suggest that individuals with authoritative parents, individuals with negligent parents and individuals with democratic parents have a significantly high level of personal identity, social identity and collective identity, respectively.

In the current study, when the correlation between spiritual well-being scores and identity types was examined, there were correlations between identity total score and its subdimensions but there was no such correlation with social identity. Such correlation may exist between the scale and its subdimensions. The key concern is whether there is any correlation between personal identity and spiritual well-being. The results of the current study showed that there's a high positive correlation between identity total scores and spiritual

well-being scores. In other words, the identity total score increases with increasing spiritual well-being score. Similarly, a positive correlation was established between spiritual well-being and personal and collective identities, whereas there was no correlation between spiritual well-being and social identity. Based on this result of the study, it can be concluded that in western societies, there is a significantly positive relationship between individuals' identity development and well-being (Josselson, 1994; Meeus et al., 1999; Nurmi et al., 1997). Moreover, it has been reported that collective identity predicts positive well-being in adolescents and mothers and is a predictor of adolescent spiritual well-being (Dimitrova et al., 2014). Other than these results, it is suggested that there is no significant relationship between personal well-being and self-esteem (Saygin, 2008).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the results of this study, which investigated university students' identity types and spiritual well-being levels in terms of a range of variables, indicate that students' identity types significantly vary by gender and year of study variables. The students' spiritual well-being levels significantly changed by gender, year of study, field of study and parental education level. There was a low positive correlation between identity types scores and spiritual well-being scores.

RECOMMENDATIONS

More comprehensive work investigating the relationship between spiritual well-being and identity development needs to be done for study results to be more generalizable. Hence the number of studies reported in the literature about the subject will increase and scientific work will be placed on more solid grounds. As a result of the literature search, a limited number of studies investigating the correlation between identity and spiritual well-being were found, which suggests the need for such studies.

The importance of this study lies in the fact that it has demonstrated once more that democratic parental attitude is required for a child to develop a healthy identity. Therefore, it is recommended that parents undergo parental training and receive professional support to turn unhealthy parental attitudes into democratic attitudes.

Limitation

This study, at only one university in Turkey, was conducted on 298 students. Therefore, it cannot be generalized to the whole universe. This is seen as a limitation.

REFERENCES

Acar, H. (**2014**). A consideration on the relationship between spiritual well-being and piety Cumhuriyet Theology Journal, 18(2): 391-412. https://doi.org/10.18505/cuifd.254730.

Adams, T. B., Bezner, J. R., Drabbs, M. E., Zambarano, R. J., and Steinhardt, M. A. (**2000**). Conceptualization and measurement of the spiritual and psychological dimensions of wellness in a college population. Journal of American College Health, 48(4): 165-173. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480009595692.

Alaca, E. (**2017a**). Tarih egitimine giris. [Introduction to History Education]. Pegem Academy. https://doi.org/10.14527/9786052410684.

Alaca, E. (**2017b**). The discourse on Turkish identity in historical films: The case of 'Kara Murat'. European Journal of Education Studies, 3(11): 418-433. http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1066180.

Alperen, A. (**2008**). Search for identity and Islam in Turkey. Cukurova University Journal of Faculty of Divinity, 8(2): 59-80.

Ari, M., Bayhan, P., and Artan, I. (**1995**). Farkli ana-baba tutumlarinin 4–11 yas grubu cocuklarinda gorulen problem durumlarina etkisinin arastirilmasi, [Investigation of the effect of different parental attitudes on problem situations observed in children aged 4-11]. 10. Ya-Pa Pre-school Education and Dissemination Seminar. Ya-Pa Publishing, 23-38.

Askin, M. (**2007**). Identity and dressed identity. Ataturk University Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences, 10(2): 213-220.

Aslan, A. (**2014**). The effects of the family, religion and media in the identity formation of secondary education students in Carsamba. [Unpublished master's thesis]. On Dokuz Mayis University.

Aslan, S. (**2013**). The identity orientations, social comparisons, attachements to friends and group integration levels among young people who are affiliated and non-affiliated with social groups. [Unpublished doctoral disertation]. Ankara University.

Aslan, S., and **Donmez**, A. (**2013**). The identity orientations, social comparisons, attachments to friends and group integration levels among young people. Mülkiye Dergisi [Journal of Mulkiye], 37(3): 141-173.

Aygun, Z. K. (**2004**). Self, identity, and emotional well-being among Turkish university students. The Journal of Psychology, 138 (5), 457-478. https://doi.org/10.3200/JRLP.138.5.457-480.

Balkaya, A., and **Ceyhan**, E. (**2007**). Investigating the levels of sense of identity acquisition of high school students in terms of some variables. Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences, 7(1): 433-446.

Bas, O. (**2016**) Relationship between negative or positive attitudes with social identity on social media. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Istanbul University.

Bekelman, D. B., Dy, S. M., Becker, D. M., Wittstein, I. S., Hendricks, D. E., Yamashita, T. E., and Gottlieb, S. H. (**2007**). Spiritual well-being and depression in patients with heart failure. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 22(4): 470-477. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-006-0044-9

Bilgin, N. (**1999**). Kollektif kimlik [Collective identity]. (2nd Ed.). System Publishing.

Bilgin, N. (**2003**). Sosyal psikoloji sozlugu [Social psychology dictionary]. Baglam Publising.

Bilgin, N. (**2007**). Kimligin insası [Building of identity]. Asina Book.

Brown, J. D.(**1998**). The self. McGrow-Hill.

Budak, S. (**2009**). Psikoloji sozlugu [Psychology dictionary]. Science and Art Publications.

Cagdas, A. (**2015**). Anne baba cocuk iletisimi. [Parent-child communication] (2nd Ed)bEducating Book Publishing.

Cetinkaya, B. (**2018**). Saglikli aile saglikli cocuk, cocuk ruh sagligi. [Healthy family, healthy child, child mental health]. (6th Ed.). Pegem Academy. https://doi.org/10.14527/9786053186663.

Cetinkaya, B. (**2019**). Cocugun kisilik gelisiminde anne baba rolu. [Parents' role in the child's personal development]. Pegem Academy. https://doi.org/10.14527/9786056991660.

Cheek, J. M., and **Briggs**, S. R. (**1982**). Self-consciousness and aspects of identity. Journal of Research in Personality, 16: 401-408. https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(82)90001-0.

Corey, G. (**2013**). Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy. Cengage Learning.

Coskun, H. (**2004**). A study of the validity and reliability of the identity questionnaire in a Turkish sample. Turkish Psychology Articles, 7(14): 49-60

Dimitrova, R., Chasiotis, A., Bender, M., and van de Vijver Fons. J. R. (**2014**). Collective identity and well-being of Bulgarian Roma adolescents and their mothers. Journal of Youth Adolescence, 43: 375–386. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0043-1.

Eksi, H., and **Kardas**, S. (**2017**). Spiritual well-being: Scale development and validation. Spiritual Psychology and Counseling, 2: 73–88. http://dx.doi.org/10.12738/spc.2017.1.0022.

Ellison, C. W. (**1983**). Spiritual well-being: Conceptualization and measurement. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 11: 330–340. https://doi.org/10.1177/009164718301100406.

Emmons, R. A. (**1999**). The psychology of ultimate concerns: Motivation and spirituality in personality. Guilford Press.

Erikson, E. H. (**1968**). Identity youth and crisis. W.W. Norton & Company.

Festinger, L. (**2007**). A theory of social comparison process. Stapel D. A. ve Blanton, H. (Eds.). In Social Comparison Theories Key Readings. Psychology Pres, 29-44.

Gander, M. J., and **Gardiner**, H. W. (**2001**). Child and adolescent development. Imge Bookstore.

Giddens, A. (**1991**). Modernity and self identity. Stanford University Press.

Gomez, R., and **Fisher**, J. W. (**2003**). Domains of spiritual well-being and development and validation of the spiritual well-being questionnaire. Personality and Individual Differences, 35(8): 1975–1991. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00045-x.

Gorp, J. V. (**2005**). Youth, identity and consumption: A research model. Draft Paper, 7th ESA Conference.

Gulacti, F. (**2009**). The effects of group guidance program based on social skill training on the levels of students? social skill, subjective and psychological well-being. [Unpublished doctoral disertation]. Ataturk University.

Gulacti, F., Gur, R., and Ciftci, Z. (**2017**). Ogretmen adaylarının ozgecilik ve yasam doyumu duzeylerinin incelenmesi. [Examining the level of altruism and life satisfaction of teacher candidates]. In Ozcan Demirel, Serkan Dincer (Ed.), Education in a Globalize World. Pegem Academy, 473-484. https://doi.org/10.14527/9786053188407.31.

Gulbahce, A. (**2007**). An analysis of self image and social comparison of the students who have different career maturity levels. [Unpublished doctoral disertation]. Ataturk University.

Gursu, O., and **Ay**, Y. (**2018**). Religion, spiritual well-being and aging. The Journal of International Social Research, 11(61): 1176-1190. http://dx.doi.org/10.17719/jisr.2018.3007.

Hamurcu, H. (**2011**). Psychological needs on regression of adolescents' competence beliefs and psychological well-being. [Unpublished doctoral disertation]. Selcuk University.

Hatipoglu, Z. T. (**1996**). Ergenlik cagindaki ogrencilerin benlik tasarim duzeyleri ile algilanan anne davranislari arasindaki iliskinin incelenmesi. [Examining the relationship between self-design levels and perceived maternal behavior on the adolescent students]. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Marmara University.

Hawks, S. R., Hull, M., Thalman, R. L., and Richins, P. M. (**1995**). Review of spiritual health: Definition, role, and intervention strategies in health promotion. American Journal of Health Promotion, 9: 371-378. https://doi.org/10.4278/0890-1171-9.5.371.

Hendricks-Ferguson, V. (**2006**). Relationships of age and gender to hope and spiritual well-being among adolescents with cancer. Journal of Pediatric Oncology Nursing, 23: 189-199. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043454206289757.

Holder, M. D., Coleman, B., Krupa, T., and Krupa, E. (**2016**). Well-being's relation to religiosity and spirituality in children and adolescents in Zambia. Journal of Happiness Studies, 17(3): 1235-1253. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-015-9640-x.

Ingersoll, R. E. (**1994**). Spirituality, religion, and counseling: Dimensions and relationships. Counseling and Values, 38(2): 98-111. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-007X.1994.tb00827.x.

Josselson, R. (**1994**). The theory of identity development and the question of intervention: An introduction. Archer, S. L. (Ed.), In: Interventions for adolescent identity development, 12–25, Sage.

Karagulle, I. (**2018**). College students in interpersonal dependency, identity orientations and depression. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Nisantası University.

Karasar, N. (**2015**). Bilimsel arastırma yöntemi. [Scientific research method]. Nobel.

Kardas, S. (**2017**). The predictive role of virtual identity and spiritual well being on the narcissistic tendency of university students. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Marmara University.

Kizilirmak, O. (**2015**). The investigation of meaning in life of the young adults according to spirituality and personality traits. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University.

Koker, S. (**1997**). Kimlik duygusunun kazanilmasi acisindan ergenlerin, genc yetiskinlerin ve yetiskinlerin karsilastirilmasi. [Comparison of adolescents, young adults and adults in terms of obtain a sense of identity]. [Unpublished doctoral disertation]., Ankara University.

Kose, D. and **Kolburan**, Ş. G. (**2019**). The relationship between parental attitudes and self-esteem and empathy development in children. International Social Sciences Studies Journal, 5(47), 5835-5843. http://dx.doi.org/10.26449/sssj.1821.

Lapsley, D. K., Rice, K. G., and FitzGerald, D. P. (**1990**). Adolescent attachment, identity, and adjustment to college: Implications for the continuity of adaptation hypothesis. Journal of Counseling and Development, 68(5): 561-565. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1990.tb01411.x.

Marcia, J. E. (**1980**). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), Handbook of adolescent psychology, 159–187. Wiley.

Marcia, J. E. (**1996**). Development and validation of ego-identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3(5): 551-558. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023281.

Mead, G. H. (**1970**). Self as social object. Stone G. P. and Farbennan H. A. (Eds.). In Social Psychology Through Symbolic Interaction, Ginn-Blaisdell, 383-386.

Meeus, W., Iedema, J., Helsen, M., and Vollebergh, W. (**1999**). Patterns of adolescent development: Review of literature and longitudinal analysis. Developmental Review, 19: 419–461. https://doi.org/10.1006/drev.1999.0483.

Miquelon, P., and **Vallerant**, R. J. (**2006**). Goal motives, well-being, and physical health: Happiness and self-realization as psychological resources under challenge. Motivemot, 30: 259-272. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-006-9043-8.

Mizrakci, S. (**1994**). Annelerin cocuk yetistirme tutumlarina etki eden faktorler: demografik ozellikleri, kendi yetistirilis tarzlari, cocuk gelisimine iliskin bilgi duzeyleri ve cocugun mizacina iliskin algilari. [Factors affecting mothers' parenting attitudes: demographic characteristics, self-upbringing styles, level of knowledge about child development and perceptions of the child's temperament]. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ege University.

Moberg, D. O., and **Brusek**, P. M. (**1978**). Spiritual well-being: A neglected subject in quality of life research. Social Indicators Research, 5: 303–323. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00352936.

Morsunbul, U. (**2005**). Ergenlikte kimlik statulerinin bağlanma stilleri, cinsiyet ve egitim duzeyi acisindan incelenmesi. [Examination of adolescence identity statuses in terms of attachment styles, gender and education level]. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara University.

Nurmi, J. E., Berzonsky, M. D., Tammi, K., and Kinney, A. (**1997**). Identity processing orientation, cognitive and behavioural strategies, and well-being. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 21: 555–570. https://doi.org/10.1080/016502597384785.

Oflazoglu A. F. (**2000**). Yetistirme yurdunda yasayan ergenlerde kimlik

statulerinin incelenmesi. [Examination of identity status in adolescents living in orphanages]. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ege University.

Ozbay, H., Sahin, N., and Hincal, G. (**1991**). Ergenlikte benlik imajı: ogrenci ergenler arasında karsilastirmali bir calisma. [Self-image in adolescence: a comparative study among student adolescents]. Turk Psikiyatri Dergisi [Turkish Journal of Psychiatry], 2(2): 82-95.

Ozden, Y. (**2019**). Evaluation of the relationship between spiritual well-being and level of happiness at teachers who are employee at different kinds of schools. [Unpublished master's thesis].İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University.

Ozdil, M. (**2017**). Social integration in the context of individual and collective identities. Journal of Süleyman Demirel University Institute of Social Sciences, 3(28): 383-400.

Ozen, Y., and Gulacti, F. (**2010**). Self-concept and its development: Need for a concious self-concept. Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty, 12(2): 21-37.

Ozguroglu, M. (**1991**). Adolesans doneminde benlik imaji. [Self-image in adolescence]. [Unpublished Specialization in Medicine]. İstanbul University.

Ozyurek, A., and Poyraz, H. (**2005**). Okuloncesi 5–6 yas cocuklarin problem davranislari ve ebeveynlerin disiplin yontemlerinin incelenmesi, [Examination of problem behaviors and parents' discipline methods of 5-6 year old pre-school children]. National Education, 166: 83–97.

Paloutzian, R. F., and Ellison, C.(**1982**). Spiritual well-being scale. Measures of Religiosty, 382-385.

Razmjoo, S. A. (**2010**). Language and identity in the Iranian context: The impact of identity aspects on EFL learner's achievement. The Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 2(2): 99-121. http://doi.10.22099/JTLS.2012.410.

Ryff, C. D. (**1995**). Psychological well-being in adult life. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4: 99–104. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10772395.

Sanli, D., and Ozturk, C. (**2015**). Contraceptive methods, pregnancy and breastfeeding after organ transplantation. Dokuz Eylul University E-Journal of Nursing Faculty, 8(4): 240-246.

Saygin, Y. (**2008**). Investigating social support, self-esteem and subjective well-being levels of university students. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Selcuk University.

Schwartz, S. J. (**2001**). The evolution of Eriksonian and neoEriksonian identity theory and research: A review and integration. Identity, 1, 7-58. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532706XSCHWARTZ.

Sendogdu, M. C. (**2000**). Anaokuluna devam eden 5–6 yaş cocuklarinin anne babalarini algilamalari ile anne babalarin kendi tutumlarini algilamalari arasındaki iliski. [The relationship between to perceive their parents with their parents' perception of their own attitudes of 5-6 years old children continuing kindergarten]. [Unpublished master's thesis].Gazi University.

Sezer, O. (**2010**). The relationship between adolescents' self perception, parental attitudes, and some other variables Journal of Yuzuncu Yil University Faculty of Education, 7(1): 1-19.

Simsek, S. (**2002**) The question of identity and its conflict dimensions. Uludag University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences, 3(3): 29-39.

Sirin, T. (**2019**). The relationship between spiritual well-being and marriage satisfaction of married couples. Ekev Academy Journal, 77: 389-410. http://dx.doi.org/10.17753/Ekev1088

Sozen, E. (**2019**). Kimlik-demir kafesten plastige [identitiy- from iron cage to plastic]. Profile Book.

Stanard, R. P., Sandhu, D. S., and Painter, L. C. (**2000**). Assessment of spirituality in counseling. Journal of Counseling and Development, 78(2): 204-210. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2000.tb02579.x.

Stavrova, O., Fetchenhauer, D., and Schlösser, T. (**2013**). Why are religious people happy? The effect of the social norm of religiosity across countries. Social Science Research, 42(1): 90-105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.07.002.

Suslu, D. P. (**2002**). Calisan ve ögrenci ergenlerde kimlik duygusu kazaniminin arastirilmasi. [Researching the obtaining of a sense of identity in working and student adolescents]. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara University.

Tajfel, H. (**1982**). Social psychology of intergroup relations. Annual Review of Psychology, 33: 1-39. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.000245.

Tajfel, H., and Turner, J. C. (**1986**). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worschel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), Psychology of intergroup relations. Nelson-Hall.

Toprak, Y. (**2018**). The relationship between spirituality, life goals and well-being. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gaziosmanpasa University.

Topuz, C. (**2013**). The relationship of altruism with subjective and psychological well-being among university students. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Fatih University.

Tural, S. K. (**1988**). Kulturel kimlik uzerine dusunceler. [Thoughts on cultural identity]. Kultur ve Turizm Bakanligi Yayinlari [Ministry of Cultur and Tourism].

Turan, N., and Ozkan, B. (**2019**). Self-alienation after traumatic terror experiences. Current Approaches in Psychiatry, 11(4): 496-505. https:// doi.org/ 10.18863/pgy.512403.

Turner, J. C. (**1975**). Social comparison and social identity: some prospects for intergroup behaviour. European Journal of Social Psychology, 5(1): 1-34. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420050102.

Ugurluoglu, D., and Erdem, R. (**2019**). The impact of individuals' spiritual well-being who go through a trauma on posttraumatıc growth. Dokuz Eylul University The Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences, 21(3): 833-858. http://dx.doi.org/10.16953/deusosbil.507731.

Ulug, F. (**1999**). Egitimde grup surecleri. [Group processes in education]. TODAİE Yayinlari.

Verkuyten, M. (**2005**). Social identity. In Verkuyten M. (Ed.), The Social Psychology of Ethnic Identity, Psychology Press, 39-90. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203338704.

Yalkin, S. (**1994**). Parental expectancies of developmental time-tables, child-rearing attitudes and actual child development. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Bogazici University.

Yazici, F. (**2016**). Identity attitudes scale: A scale development study. Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education, 5(4): 41–54. https://doi.org/10.30703/cije.321414.

Yesilkilic, B., Cakir, M. A., and Dutar, S. (**2018**). Analyzing the effects of parental attitudes on the identity status of adolescents in terms of some variables. International Journal of Science and Education, 1(1): 68-77.

Yilmaz Bolat, E. (**2011**). A study on the effect of parent education on child rearing behaviours and way of behaving of parents who have five and six years old children. [Unpublished doctoral disertation]. Ankara University.