

## SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS THAT AFFECT SELF-ESTEEM IN TWO CULTURALLY DIVERSE CITIES OF A COUNTRY

Mehmet Akif ERSOY<sup>1</sup>, Dilek Yörük ÖZCAN<sup>2</sup>, Mehmet Yücel AGARGÜN<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ege University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry  
35100 Bornova, Izmir, Turkey  
E-mail: akifersoy@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Ege University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry  
Izmir, Turkey

<sup>3</sup> Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry  
Van, Turkey

*Abstract:* The aim of this study was to investigate sociodemographic factors that affect self-esteem in two culturally diverse cities of Turkey. A total of 860 subjects selected by stratified random sampling method were included. Sociodemographic characteristics, self-esteem, depression levels, perceived loneliness, support levels and anxiety levels were investigated. Self-esteem was found to be negatively related to depression. Situational and continuous anxiety levels were found to be positively related to perceived social and family support levels. Only education level was found to have a direct effect on self-esteem. The level of income, family structure, number of siblings and the province of residence were found to have an indirect effect on self-esteem. The self-esteem of inhabitants of the western city of Izmir was higher and determined mainly by education and financial levels.

*Key words:* self-esteem, sociodemographic factors, culture, depression

### INTRODUCTION

The concept of "self" has long been an interesting research topic in psychology. The number of studies about "self" increased three-fold within the last 30 years and that increase was much higher than the increase in the number of studies performed in all aspects of psychology (Tesser, 2000). Self was conceptualized in a western manner that was limited, autonomous and set apart from social context in

many of these studies (Bellah et al., 1985; Markus, Kitayama, 1994; Sampson, 1989). However, some other investigators, including some Turkish authors, conceptualized "self" in different ways (Ho, 1993; Kagitcibasi, 1994; Markus, Kitayama, 1991, 1994; Marsella et al., 1985; Shweder, Bourne, 1984).

As self-esteem is closely related to adaptive development and character functions, it is an extensively studied part of the "self" concept. Self-esteem is directly related to positive affectivity (Brown, Marshall, 2001; Heatherton, Polivy, 1991) and subjective well-being (Diener, Diener, 1995), and inversely related to depression (Tennen, Herzberger, 1987), loneliness

---

Corresponding author: Dr. Mehmet Akif Ersoy

This article was accepted before May 1, 2008, in accordance with previous publishing rules.

(Jones et al., 1981), generalized anxiety (Brockner, 1984) and death anxiety (Greenberg et al., 1997). Moreover, self-esteem is found to be related to self-determination (Deci, Ryan, 1995), effective management skills (Bednar et al., 1989) and development of satisfactory social links (Leary, Baumeister, 2000). Due to these strong relationships between self-esteem and many aspects of personality, many investigators tried to find the determinants of self-esteem and concluded that parents and families were of vital importance in the development of self-esteem. It was proposed that self-esteem of children was influenced by parental style (Lamborn et al., 1991), types of family relations (Jacobvitz, Bush, 1996) and familial structure (Bynum, Durm, 1996; McCormick, Kennedy, 2000).

There is a complex relation between self-esteem and demographic variants. Higher education level (Jordan, Kelly, 1990), masculinity (Kling et al., 1999), greater age (Harter, 1990, 1993) and being employed (Casper, Fishbein, 2002) were found to be related to higher levels of self-esteem. Self-esteem is relatively higher in childhood. It decreases with adolescence, increases thereafter and reaches its highest level at the end of middle-age and then decreases again in the 70s and 80s. In many studies self-esteem was found to be higher in males (Bologini et al., 1996; Brage, Meredith, 1994; Chubb et al., 1997; Kling et al., 1999) and in people with a higher level of education (Jordan, Kelly, 1990; Kingsbury et al., 1981). Being employed is a supportive factor for self-esteem as well (Casper, Fishbein, 2002). Job satisfaction and success are the other important factors in development of self-esteem. Even if a person is not employed, if his or her personal satisfaction is high enough, self-esteem may even be higher

than that of an employed person (Casper, Fishbein, 2002; Torrey et al., 2000). An unsatisfactory or unsuccessful work life may have negative influences on self-esteem (Casper, Fishbein, 2002).

There are cultural differences in "self" concept. Independence and interdependence are the two dimensions that can be used to characterize differences between cultures (Markus, Kitayama, 1991). These two different conceptualizations of "self", independence and interdependence, may coexist in an individual at the same time, but are generally differently supported in different ethno-cultures (Singelis, 1994; Singelis, Brown, 1995). Independent "self"-construal emphasizes successes and characteristics that make the individual "unique". Conversely, interdependent self-construal depends on relationships with others and situational factors in order to organize its behavior. As relationship with others and adaptation are primary sources of self-esteem, situation and others are 'active and continuous' determinants of interdependence (Markus, Kitayama, 1991). There are cultural differences from the aspect of individualism-collectivism. While individualism is prominent in some countries (USA, Canada, Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand), collectivism is more prevalent in others (China, India, Japan, Latin America) (Hofstede, 1984).

Many aspects of self are influenced by cultural background. It was shown in many studies that self-esteem was related to some characteristics that were determined by the culture (Greenberg et al., 1992; Markus, Kitayama, 1991; Solomon et al., 1991). Factors that contributed to self-esteem in various cultures or ethnic groups were evaluated (Hoge, McCarthy, 1984; Luk, Bond, 1992; Tashakkori, 1993) and different groups (Dukes, Martinez, 1994;

Verkuyten, 1993) were compared according to levels of self-esteem. The motivation for developing positive perception of self is universal (Greenwald, 1980; James, 1981; Steele, 1988), but the characteristics of positive self-esteem vary between cultures. The source of self-esteem of an individual whose self-construal is independent of others, is being unique; expression of self and asserting the self. The source of self-esteem for one with interdependent self-construal is associated with belonging to a group, being in harmony with others, having a place among others and behaving in accordance with others. The relationship between self in relation to others and self-esteem is a relatively rarely studied topic.

Turkey has a great diversity in cultural and economic structure. There are great cultural and economic differences between the western and eastern parts of the country. To the best of our knowledge there is no study comparing two culturally diverse provinces; one from the western and one from the eastern part of the country. In this study, we aimed at investigating the effects of general sociodemographic data on self-esteem and whether there is a difference between living in a province that is more likely to be collectivist and one more likely to be individualist. For this purpose, subjects were recruited from western and eastern cities of the country.

The most controversial aspect or methodological problem of intercultural studies is inability to determine the source of cultural differences. This is because culture is a 'bundle' of many variants and any of these variants may be responsible for the observed differences (Kagitcibasi, 1994; Poortinga et al., 1987; Whiting, 1976). We tried to eliminate this methodological problem by including most related sociodemographic and psychological variants.

## METHOD

### *Sampling*

The study included subjects who were born and living for at least five years in Izmir or Van and who were older than 18. The subjects were selected with stratified random sampling method; 360 of them were from Van and 500 of them were from Izmir (860 participants in total); 405 of them were females (47.1%) and the remainder were males (455 subjects, 52.9%). Mean age of the participants was 31.44 (SD = 9.41) years for females and 32.15 (SD = 11.27) years for males. Sociodemographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1.

### *Data Collection Instruments*

*Sociodemographic Characteristics Information Form:* This form was developed by the investigators and consisted of questions about basic sociodemographic characteristics like age, gender, marital status, social status, family structure, number of siblings, province of residence, occupation, educational status, level of income and social insurance.

*Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (CSEI):* This inventory was developed by Coopersmith (1986) in order to evaluate people's personal judgments of their own self-esteem. There are three characteristics of definition of self-esteem according to this inventory (Tufan, 1987): self-esteem is a general judgment of self-evaluation; this estimation has a relative continuity; and it may show variations in consistency with age, gender and social roles of the subject. There are 25 items that are answered as "like me" and "not like me" and total points vary between 0-100. High points

indicate high levels of self-esteem. The validity and reliability of the Turkish version of the scale was demonstrated by Tufan and Turan (1987).

*UCLA Loneliness Scale:* UCLA Loneliness Scale was developed by Russell et al. (1978) in order to measure the level of loneliness that was perceived by the participants. A validity and reliability study of the Turkish version was performed by Demir (1989). It is a quadruple Likert-type scale that is made up of 20 items (half of them are coded in a positive direction and half of them are coded in a negative direction) that include feelings and thoughts about social relations. Total points of the scale vary between 20 and 80 and higher points indicate high levels of loneliness.

*Beck Depression Inventory (BDI):* BDI is a self-reporting scale developed by Beck et al. (1961) that includes 21 items designed to measure depressive affection in people. These items are evaluated between 0 and 3 points according to the severity of depression. Higher points indicate more severe symptoms. Studies that were performed with the Turkish version of the scale showed that it was valid and reliable (Hisli, 1988; Hisli, 1989).

*Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS):* This scale evaluates the adequacy of social support from three different sources: family, intimate relationships and friends. It includes 12 items that are evaluated according to a Likert-type grading with seven intervals. There are three subscales each including four items and each of them evaluates the social support of family, intimate relationships and friends. Total points obtained from subscales reflect the level of perceived social support. The validity and reliability of the Turkish version was shown by Eker and Akar (1995a, 1995b).

*Perceived Social Support from Family Scale (PSS-FA):* This scale includes 20 items to be answered with any of three choices (yes, maybe, no) and total points vary between 0 and 40 (Sorias, 1988). Higher points indicate that the level of perceived family support is adequate.

*State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI):* this was developed by Spielberger (1970) in order to evaluate the levels of situational and generalized anxiety separately. It is a self-evaluation scale that is made up of 40 items under two different subscales. In the Situational Anxiety Scale, the subject expresses his or her feelings in a certain situation and in certain circumstances by considering the thoughts about the given condition. In the Generalized Anxiety Scale, the tendency of someone towards anxiety is evaluated and the general feeling of the subject is investigated. The validity and reliability of the Turkish form were shown by Oner and LeCompte (1985).

*Statistical Analysis:* Statistical analysis was performed with SPSS (SPSS, 2004) version 13.0 software. As sample size was adequate and distribution of variables was normal, all comparisons were performed with parametric tests. Chi-square test was employed for categorical data; Pearson correlation, Student's t-test and UNIANOVA were used for interval data. The level for statistical significance was considered as  $p < .05$ .

## RESULTS

Before investigating the difference between provinces from the point of view of self-esteem, we evaluated whether socio-demographic and psychological factors that might be related to self-esteem differed in respect of provinces. Characteristics of the participants like age, gender, marital status, education level, income

level, family structure, social status, number of siblings, occupation, and having social insurance were presented in Table 1 for both provinces separately. It was demonstrated that the two provinces differed from each other for most sociodemographic data. Comparison of participants from

both provinces for psychological variables was presented in Table 2. It could be observed that participants from Izmir and Van were different in self-esteem, level of loneliness, depression level, perceived level of social support, situational and continuous anxiety levels.

Table 1. Comparison of participants from Izmir and Van according to sociodemographic data

	Izmir (n = 500)	Van (n = 360)	Total (n = 860)	Statistics
Age (Mean)	34.87 (sd = 10.87)	27.56 (sd = 8.06)	31.81 (sd = 10.43; min-max=18-80)	t = 10.80 *** (df = 858)
<i>Gender</i>				
Female (f)	278 (55.6%)	127 (35.3%)	405 (47.1%)	$\chi^2 = 34.69$ *** (df = 1)
Male (f)	222 (44.4%)	233 (64.7%)	455 (52.9%)	
<i>Marital status</i>				
Married (f)	291 (58.2%)	173 (48.1%)	464 (54.0%)	$\chi^2 = 24.83$ *** (df = 2)
Single (f)	180 (36.0%)	182 (50.6%)	362 (42.1%)	
Widow (f)	29 (5.8%)	5 (1.4%)	34 (4.0%)	
<i>Educational level</i>				
Primary school (f)	41 (8.2%)	53 (14.7%)	94 (10.9%)	$\chi^2 = 45.00$ *** (df = 4)
High school (f)	221 (44.2%)	208 (57.8%)	429 (49.9%)	
College (f)	45 (9%)	33 (9.2%)	78 (9.1%)	
University (f)	161 (32.2%)	52 (14.4%)	213 (24.8%)	
Academics (f)	32 (6.4%)	14 (3.9%)	46 (5.3%)	
<i>Income levels</i>				
None (f)	2 (0.4%)	51 (14.2%)	53 (6.2%)	$\chi^2 = 151.56$ *** (df = 3)
Low (f)	100 (20.0%)	157 (43.6%)	257 (29.9%)	
Medium (f)	333 (66.6%)	136 (37.8%)	469 (54.5%)	
High (f)	65 (13.0%)	16 (4.4%)	81 (9.4%)	
<i>Family structure</i>				
Basic (f)	449 (89.8%)	246 (68.3%)	695 (80.8%)	$\chi^2 = 62.71$ *** (df = 2)
Large (f)	42 (8.4%)	99 (27.5%)	141 (16.4%)	
Other (f)	9 (1.8%)	15 (4.2%)	24 (2.8%)	

Table continues

Table 1 (continued)

	Izmir (n = 500)	Van (n = 360)	Total (n = 860)	Statistics
<i>Social status</i>				
With family (f)	419 (83.8%)	301 (83.6%)	720 (83.7%)	$\chi^2 = .005$ (df = 1; p = 1.00)
Alone (f)	81 (16.2%)	59 (16.4%)	140 (16.3%)	
<i>Number of siblings</i>				
0-2	351 (70.2%)	61 (16.9%)	412 (47.9%)	$\chi^2 = 298.79$ *** (df = 2)
3-5	127 (25.4%)	134 (37.2%)	261 (30.3%)	
≥ 6	22 (4.4%)	165 (45.8%)	187 (21.7%)	
<i>Work status</i>				
Unemployed	50 (10.0%)	9 (2.5%)	59 (6.9%)	$\chi^2 = 18.43$ *** (df = 1)
Working	450 (90.0%)	351 (97.5%)	801 (93.1%)	
<i>Social insurance</i>				
Yes	455 (91.0%)	241 (66.9%)	696 (80.9%)	$\chi^2 = 78.48$ *** (df = 1)
No	45 (9.0%)	119 (33.1%)	164 (19.1%)	

\*\*\* p &lt; .000

Table 2. Comparison of participants from Izmir and Van according to self-esteem and other psychological variants related to self-esteem

	Izmir (n = 500)	Van (n = 360)	Total (n = 860)	Statistics
Self-esteem	71.92	61.48	67.55 (sd = 17.23)	t = 9.182**
Loneliness	52.15	49.09	50.87 (sd = 7.76)	t = 5.813**
Depression	9.52	15.41	11.99 (sd = 8.83)	t = -10.228**
Social support	58.66	54.66	56.99 (sd = 16.20)	t = 3.600**
Family support	24.10	24.53	24.28 (sd = 5.29)	t = -1.173 (p = 0.241)
Situational anxiety	37.72	42.80	39.85 (sd = 10.89)	t = -6.935**
Continuous anxiety	44.13	46.09	44.95 (sd = 8.75)	t = -3.249**

\*\* p &lt; .001

The results of the analyses that evaluated the relationship between sociodemographic characteristics and self-esteem are presented in Tables 3 and 4. When the relationship between self-esteem and other psychological factors was investigated, it

could be seen that the levels of depression and situational and continuous anxiety, perceived level of social and family support were correlated with self-esteem (Table 5).

Table 3. Relations between self-esteem and demographic factors

<i>Age</i>		
≤ 21 (n = 164)	61.32 (sd = 18.31)	F = 11.24 (df = 4) ***
≥ 22; ≤ 27 (n = 169)	65.21 (sd = 16.58)	
≥ 28; ≤ 32 (n = 173)	68.34 (sd = 16.47)	
≥ 33; ≤ 39 (n = 186)	72.51 (sd = 15.81)	
≥ 40 (n = 168)	69.69 (sd = 17.07)	
<i>Gender</i>		
Female (n = 405)	68.55 (sd = 17.90)	t = 1.61 (df = 858) p = .106
Male (n = 455)	66.65 (sd = 16.59)	
<i>Marital status</i>		
Married (n = 464)	68.86 (sd = 17.16)	F = 5.50 (df = 2) **
Single (n = 362)	65.41 (sd = 17.40)	
Widowed (n = 34)	72.35 (sd = 13.63)	
<i>Education</i>		
Primary school (n = 94)	59.11 (sd = 19.37)	F = 23.10 (df = 4) ***
High school (n = 429)	64.59 (sd = 16.85)	
College (n = 78)	73.21 (sd = 14.00)	
University (n = 213)	72.32 (sd = 14.91)	
Academicals (n = 46)	80.70 (sd = 15.39)	
<i>Income level</i>		
None	59.85 (sd = 19.29)	F = 49.082 (df = 3) ***
Low	59.54 (sd = 18.15)	
Medium	70.58 (sd = 14.48)	
High	80.47 (sd = 14.06)	
<i>Family structure</i>		
Basic (n = 695)	69.38 (sd = 16.29)	F = 22.94 (df = 2) ***
Large (n = 141)	60.74 (sd = 17.45)	
Other (n = 24)	54.50 (sd = 25.84)	
<i>Social status</i>		
With family (n = 720)	67.83 (sd = 16.83)	t = 1.087 (df = 858) p = .277
alone (n = 140)	66.10 (sd = 19.19)	

Table continues

Table 3 (continued)

<i>Number of siblings</i>		
0-2 (n = 412)	70.82 (sd = 15.70)	F = 22.60 (df = 2) ***
3-5 (n = 261)	67.18 (sd = 17.28)	
≥ 6 (n = 187)	60.87 (sd = 18.45)	
<i>Work status</i>		
Not working (n = 59)	72.85 (sd = 14.30)	t = 2.45 (df = 858) *
Working (n = 801)	67.16 (sd = 17.37)	
<i>Social insurance</i>		
Yes (n = 696)	70.27 (sd = 16.04)	t = 10.08 (df = 858) ***
No (n = 164)	56.00 (sd = 17.39)	

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001

Table 4. The effect of marital status on self-esteem in males and females

Males N = 455	Married	234	68.761	F = 6.512 (df = 2) **
	Single	210	63.857	
	Widow	11	75.273	
Females N = 405	Married	230	68.965	F = .498 (df = 2) p = .608
	Single	152	67.566	
	Widow	23	70.957	

\*\* p < .01

Table 5. Relations between self-esteem and loneliness, depression, social support, family support, situational anxiety and continuous anxiety

	Loneliness	Depression	Social support	Family support	Situational anxiety	Continuous anxiety
Self-esteem	.01	-.603**	.426**	.338**	-.518**	-.465**
Loneliness		-.027	-.049	-.109**	.111**	.017
Depression			-.417**	-.250**	.530**	-.016
Social support				.494**	-.354**	.040
Family support					-.288**	.010
Situational anxiety						.021

\*\* p < .01



Participants from Izmir and Van differed from each other not only in self-esteem, but also in other demographic (age, marital status, education and financial levels, family structure, living alone or with family, number of siblings, having an occupation, having social insurance) and psychological (depression, social support, situational and generalized anxiety levels) factors that were found to be significantly related to self-esteem as well. It might be suggested that nearly all investigated variables are possibly in a cause-result relationship with

each other. Lower levels of self-esteem in participants from Van might be explained solely by higher levels of depression among them. Thus, sociodemographic data that were categorical and considered as constant factors as well as psychological data were regarded as co-variants and their effects on self-esteem were analyzed (UNIANOVA).

As presented in Table 6 provinces lost their importance in relation to self-esteem when perceived level of loneliness, level of depression, perceived social and family

Table 6. Investigation of the effects of sociodemographic and psychological factors on self-esteem with variance analysis

Source	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	8.537	.000	.606
Intercept	230.081	.000	.240
Loneliness	0.147	.702	.000
Depression	68.529	.000	.086
Social support	10.161	.001	.014
Family support	12.535	.000	.017
Situational anxiety	16.966	.000	.023
Continuous anxiety	16.385	.000	.022
Age	.059	.808	.000
Province	.243	.622	.000
Income level	1.875	.132	.008
Education level	3.619	.006	.019
Family structure	.147	.863	.000
Number of siblings	.301	.740	.001
Province * income * education	2.766	.027	.015
Province * number of siblings	3.450	.032	.009
Province * income * number of siblings	5.791	.003	.016
Province * education * number of siblings	2.273	.027	.021
Province * education * family structure * number of siblings	3.761	.024	.010

support, situational and generalized anxiety levels and age were regarded as covariants and province, income and education level, family structure and number of siblings were regarded as constant factors and all of them were included in the analysis. The model that was made up of all of these factors explained self-esteem at a level of .606 (Partial Eta Squared). That the variance of dependent variant was equal between groups was shown by Levene's test.

When the "Eta" values presented in Table 6 were investigated, it was determined that the level of depression, the levels of situational and generalized anxiety, education level, perceived family and social support

respectively were the sociodemographic and psychological factors with most effect on self-esteem. The province of residence alone was not found to have an effect on self-esteem. But it was found to have effect after interference with the level of education and income; the number of siblings; the level of income and the number of siblings; the level of education and the number of siblings; the level of education, family structure and the number of siblings together.

The effects of sociodemographic and psychological factors on self-esteem were evaluated in Izmir and Van separately (Table 7). When the effects of sociodemographic factors on self-esteem were evalu-

Table 7. Separate and combined effects of sociodemographic and psychological factors on self-esteem in Izmir and Van

Characteristics	Izmir	Van	Total
Age	F = 3.588**	F = 3.127*	F = 11.24***
Gender	t = .99	t = -1.18	t = 1.61
Marital status	F = 1.094	F = 1.224	F = 5.50**
Education level	F = 17.092***	F = 7.156***	F = 23.10***
Income level	F = 30.475***	F = 6.938***	F = 49.082***
Family structure	F = 3.118*	F = 9.873***	F = 22.94***
Social status	t = -.66	t = 2.148*	t = 1.087
Number of siblings	F = 1.298	F = .901	F = 22.60***
Work status	t = 1.074	t = .775	t = 2.45 *
Social insurance	t = 6.357***	t = 4.922***	t = 10.08***
Loneliness	R = -.076	R = -.026	R = .010
Depression	R = -.543(**)	R = -.575(**)	R = -.603**
Social support	R = .383(**)	R = .437(**)	R = .426**
Family support	R = .304(**)	R = .431(**)	R = .338**
Situational anxiety	R = -.502(**)	R = -.469(**)	R = -.518**
Continuous anxiety	R = -.413(**)	R = -.498(**)	R = -.465**

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001

ated in both provinces separately, education and income were found to have an effect in Izmir and family structure was found to have an effect in Van. Social status also had an effect on self-esteem among inhabitants of Van, but this effect was not significant when the total sample was taken into the consideration. When psychological factors were considered, perceived social and family support was found to have more effect among inhabitants of Van, but the difference was not significant.

#### DISCUSSION

When the relationship between self-esteem and demographic factors was evaluated, it was demonstrated that self-esteem increased with age until 40 years. This finding was consistent with the literature, which stated that self-esteem reached its peak by the end of middle-age. In this study we did not find any difference between males and females with respect to self-esteem. As previous studies concluded that self-esteem was higher in males, our finding was in conflict with the literature. Cultural differences would suggest various criteria of self-evaluation for males and females, and different social responsibilities imply that males and females obtain self-esteem from different sources (Schwalbe, Staples, 1991). However, as the social roles of males and females in Turkey are still determined by more conservative models when compared with Western countries, this discrepancy may explain findings in this study. Despite higher level of self-esteem in married people versus singles, it was interesting to see that the self-esteem level of divorced people was higher than married ones or singles. Marital status had no effect on self-esteem among females, but it was

found to have an effect in males (Table 4). This result was consistent with the information that self-esteem had different sources in males and females. Self-esteem increased with the levels of education, income and possession of social insurance, as was expected. The levels of education and income were in positive correlation with self-esteem, but it was interesting to see that self-esteem levels of non-working participants were higher in our study. But all non-working participants were women and all of them had social insurance cover. Non-working participants constituted only 6.86% of the sample. Due to this smaller portion, our sample was not suitable for evaluating the effect of having a job on self-esteem. Family structure and number of siblings had an effect on self-esteem in association with province and education (Table 3, Table 6).

When Izmir and Van provinces were evaluated separately, the levels of education and income had a positive effect on self-esteem in both of them, but these effects were more prominent in Izmir (Table 7). This difference might be due to a relatively higher importance of the levels of education and income in Izmir as a consequence of economic characteristics. First analysis revealed that the number of siblings was inversely related to self-esteem, but this relation lost its significance following the variance analysis with other controlled variants. Perceived level of social support probably decreased with the sharing of spiritual resources of the family with other siblings ( $F = 7.646$ ;  $SD = 2$ ;  $p < .001$ ). On the other hand, as the number of siblings is higher in families with lower levels of education and income, this variant may have an effect on the decrease in self-esteem through the levels of education and income as well.

Self-esteem was found to be related to depression level, perceived social support, perceived family support and situational and generalized anxiety levels as shown in Table 5. Self-esteem decreases with the increases in depression levels and situational and generalized anxiety levels. The relation between self-esteem and perceived social support and perceived family support was found to be parallel, as was expected.

The effect on self-esteem of living in Izmir or Van was a subject of interest in our study. At the beginning, living in Izmir was related to higher levels of self-esteem, but variance analysis revealed that this effect was a consequence of other factors that were indirectly influenced by the place of residence. This finding showed that the economic, cultural and educational circumstances of the province were more important than the geographical location.

A major limitation of this study was that the participants were not evaluated objectively in the perspective of individualism or collectivism. However, this limitation did not reduce its importance, as it was the first study that investigated the effect on self-esteem of living in the western or eastern part of Turkey.

Received May 22, 2007

## REFERENCES

- BECK, A., WARD, C., MENDELSON, M., MOCK, J., ERBAUGH, J., 1961, An inventory for measuring for depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 4, 561-571.
- BEDNAR, R.L., WELLS, M.G., PETERSON, S.R., 1989, *Self-esteem: Paradoxes and innovations in clinical theory and practice*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- BELLAH, R.N., MADSEN, R., SULLIVAN, W.M., SWIDLER, A., TIPTON, S., 1985, *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- BOLOGNINI, M., PLANCHEREL, B., BETSCHART, W., HALFON O., 1996, Self-esteem and mental health in early adolescence: Development and gender differences. *Journal of Adolescence*, 19, 233-245.
- BRAGE, D., MEREDITH, W., 1994, A causal model of adolescent depression. *The Journal of Psychology*, 128, 455-468.
- BROCKNER, J., 1984, Low self-esteem and behavioral plasticity: Some implications of personality and social psychology. In: L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (pp. 237-271). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- BROWN, J.D., MARSHALL, M.A., 2001, Self-esteem and emotion: Some thoughts about feeling. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 575-584.
- BYNUM, M.K., DURM, M.W., 1996, Children of divorce and its effect on their self-esteem. *Psychological Reports*, 79, 447-450.
- CASPER, E.S., FISHBEIN, S., 2002, Job satisfaction and job success as moderators of the self-esteem of people with mental illnesses. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 26, 33-43.
- CHUBB, N.H., FERTMAN, C.I., ROSS, J.L., 1997, Adolescent self-esteem and locus of control: A longitudinal study of gender and age differences. *Adolescence*, 32, 113-129.
- COOPERSMITH, S., 1986, *Self-Esteem Inventories*. Palo Alto California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- DECI, E.L., RYAN, R.M., 1995, Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In: M.H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem* (pp. 31-49). New York: Plenum.
- DEMİR, A., 1989, UCLA Yalnızlık Ölçeğinin Geçerlik ve Güvenirligi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 7, 14-18.
- DIENER, E., DIENER, M., 1995, Cross-cultural correlates of life-satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- DUKES, R.L., MARTINEZ, R., 1994, The impact of ethnogender on self-esteem among adolescents. *Adolescence*, 29, 105-115.
- EKER, D., ARKAR, H., 1995a, Perceived social support: Psychometric properties of the MSPSS in normal and pathological groups in a developing country. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 30, 121-126.
- EKER, D., ARKAR, H., 1995b, Çok boyutlu Algılanan Sosyal Destek Ölçeği'nin faktör yapısı, geçerlik ve güvenirligi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 34, 45-55.
- GREENBERG, J., SOLOMON, S., PYSZCZYNSKI, T., 1997, Terror management theory of self-esteem and cultural worldviews: Empirical assess-

- ments and cultural refinements. In: M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 61-139). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- GREENBERG, J., SOLOMON, S., PYSZCZYNSKI, T., ROSENBLATT, A., BURLING, J., LYON, D., SIMON, L., PINEL, E., 1992, Why do people need self-esteem? Converging evidence that self-esteem serves an anxiety-buffering function. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 913-922.
- GREENWALD, A.G., 1980, The totalitarian ego: Fabrication and revision of personal history. *American Psychologist*, 35, 603-618.
- HARTER, S., 1990, Causes, correlates and the functional role of global self-worth: A life span perspective. In: R. Sternberg, J. Kolligan (Eds.), *Competence considered*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- HARTER, S., 1993, Causes and consequences of low self-esteem in children and adolescents. In: R.F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard* (pp. 87-116). New York: Plenum.
- HEATHERTON, T.F., POLIVY, J., 1991, Development and validation of a scale for measuring state self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 891-895.
- HISLI, N., 1988, Beck Depresyon Envanteri'nin geçerliği üzerine bir çalışma. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 6, 118-126.
- HISLI, N., 1989, Beck Depresyon Envanteri'nin üniversite öğrencileri için geçerliği ve güvenilirliği. *Psikoloji Dergisi*, 6, 3-13.
- HO, D.Y.F., 1993, Toward an Asian social psychology: Relational orientation. In: U. Kim, J.W. Berry (Eds.), *Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context* (pp. 240-259). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- HOFSTEDE, G., 1984, The cultural relativity of the quality of life concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 389-398.
- HOGUE, D.R., McCARTHY, J.D., 1984, Influence of individual and group identity salience in the global self-esteem of youth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 403-414.
- JACOBVITZ, D.B., BUSH, N.F., 1996, Reconstructions of family relationships: Parent-child alliances, personal distress, and self-esteem. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 732-743.
- JAMES, W., 1981, *The principles of psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- JONES, W.H., FREEMON, J.E., GOSWICK, R.A., 1981, The persistence of loneliness: Self and other determinants. *Journal of Personality*, 49, 27-48.
- JORDAN, L.K., KELLY, K.R., 1990, Effects of academic achievement and gender on academic and social self-concept: A replication study. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69, 173-77.
- KAGITCIBASI, C., 1994, A critical appraisal of individualism-collectivism: Toward a new formulation. In: U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theoretical and methodological issues* (pp. 52-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- KINSBURY, G.G., MARUYAMA, G., RUBIN, R.A., 1981, Self-esteem and educational achievement: Independent constructs with a common cause. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 962-975.
- KLING, K., HYDE, J.S., SHOWERS, C.J., BUSWELL, B.N., 1999, Gender differences in self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 470-500.
- LAMBORN, S.D., MOUNTS, N.S., STEINBERG, L., BORNBUSCH, S.M., 1991, Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 62, 1049-1065.
- LEARY, M.R., BAUMEISTER, R.F., 2000, The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. In: M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 2-62). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- LUK, C.L., BOND, M.H., 1992, Explaining Chinese self-esteem in terms of the self-concept. *Psychologia*, 35, 147-154.
- MARKUS, H.R., KITAYAMA, S., 1991, Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- MARKUS, H.R., KITAYAMA, S., 1994, A collective fear of the collective: Implications for selves and theories of selves. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5, 568-579.
- MARSELLA, A., DeVOS, G., HSU, F.L.K., 1985, *Culture and the self*. London: Tavistock.
- MCCORMICK, C.B., KENNEDY, J.H., 2000, Father-child separation, retrospective and current views of attachment relationship with father, and self-esteem in late adolescence. *Psychological Reports*, 86, 827-834.
- ÖNER, N., LeCOMPTE, A., 1985, Durumluk-Süreklilik Kaygı Envanteri El Kitabı, İkinci Baskı, İstanbul: Bogaziçi Üniversitesi Matbaası.
- POORTINGA, Y.H., VAN DE VIJVER, F.J.R., JOE, R.C., VAN DE KOPPEL, J.M.H., 1987, Peeling the onion called culture: A synopsis. In: C. Kagitcibasi (Ed.), *Growth and progress in crosscultural psychology* (pp. 22-34). The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- RUSSELL, D., PEPLAU, L.A., FERGUSON, M.L., 1978, Developing a measure of loneliness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 42, 290-294.
- SAMPSON, E.E., 1989, The challenge of social change for psychology: Globalization and psycholo-

- gy's theory of the person. *American Psychologist*, 44, 914-921.
- SCHWALBE, M.L., STAPLES, C.L., 1991, Gender differences in sources of self-esteem. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54, 158-168.
- SHWEDER, R.A., BOURNE, E.J., 1984, Does the concept of person vary cross-culturally? In: R.A. Shweder, R.A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 158-199). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- SINGELIS, T.M., 1994, The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 580-591.
- SINGELIS, T.M., BROWN, W.J., 1995, Culture, self, and collectivist communication: Linking culture to individual behavior. *Human Communication Research*, 21, 354-389.
- SOLOMON, S., GREENBERG, J., PYSZCZYNSKI, T., 1991, A terror management theory of social behavior: The psychological functions of self-esteem and cultural worldviews. In: L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 24, pp. 93-159). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- SORIAS, O., 1988, Sosyal destegin degerlendirilmesi, II: Toplumdan seçilmiş bir örneklemede sosyal agin yapisal özellikleri ile algılanan destek. *Seminer Psikoloji Dergisi*, 6, 23-33.
- SPIELBERGER, C.D., GORSUCH, R.L., LUSHENE, R.E., 1970, *Manual for State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, ABD: California Consulting Psychologists Press.
- SPSS Inc., 2004, *SPSS for Windows, version 13.0*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.
- STEELE, C., 1988, The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. In: L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 21, pp. 181-227). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- TASHAKKORI, A., 1993, Gender, ethnicity, and the structure of self-esteem: An attitude theory approach. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133, 479-488.
- TENNEN, H., HERZBERGER, S., 1987, Depression, self-esteem, and the absence of self-protective attributional biases. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 72-80.
- TESSER, A., 2000, On the confluence of self-esteem maintenance mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 290-299.
- TORREY, W.C., MUESER, K.T., McHUGO, G.H., DRAKE, R.E., 2000, Self-esteem as an outcome measure in studies of vocational rehabilitation for adults with severe mental illness. *Psychiatric Services*, 51, 229-233.
- TUFAN, B., 1987, Coopersmith Benlik Saygisi Envanteri Üzerine Geçerlik ve Güvenirlilik Çalışması. 13. Ulusal Psikiyatri ve Nörolojik Bilimler Kongresi, 14-18 Eylül, İstanbul.
- TUFAN, B., TURAN, N., 1987, Coopersmith Benlik Saygisi Ölçeği üzerinde geçerlik, güvenilirlik çalışması. 23. Ulusal Psikiyatri Kongresi Bildirileri, İstanbul.
- VERKUYTEN, M., 1993, Self-esteem among ethnic minorities and three principles of self-esteem formation: Turkish children in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Psychology*, 28, 307-321.
- WHITING, B.B., 1976, The problem of the packaged variable. In: K.F. Riegel, J.A. Meacham (Eds.), *The developing individual in a changing world* (Vol. 1, pp. 303-309). Chicago: Aldine.

## SOCIODEMOGRAFICKÉ FAKTORY OVPLYVŇUJÚCE SEBAHODNOTENIE V DVOCH KULTÚRNE ODLIŠNÝCH MESTÁCH KRAJINY

M. A. Ersoy, D. Y. Özcan, M. Y. Ağargün

*Súhrn:* Cieľom výskumu boli sociodemografické faktory ovplyvňujúce sebahodnotenie v dvoch kultúrne odlišných tureckých mestách. Výskumný výber pozostával z 860 jednotlivcov vybraných pomocou metódy stratifikovaného náhodného výberu. Skúmali sa sociodemografické charakteristiky, sebahodnotenie, úroveň depresie, vnímaná samota, úrovne sociálnej opory a úrovne anxiety. Zistili sme, že sebahodnotenie sa negatívne spájalo s depresiou. Úrovne anxiety ako stavu i črty sa pozitívne spájali s úrovňami vnímanej sociálnej a rodinnej opory. Jediný priamy vplyv na sebahodnotenie malo vzdelanie. Úroveň príjmov, rodinná štruktúra, počet súrodencov a miesto bydliska mali na sebahodnotenie nepriamy vplyv. Sebahodnotenie obyvateľov západotureckého mesta Izmir bolo vyššie a určujúcim faktorom boli najmä vzdelanie a finančná úroveň.