

Self-efficacy in relation to self-construals and causal attributions

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

by

Dilek Büyükselçuk

Boğaziçi University

2006

The thesis of Dilek Büyükselçuk
is approved by

Assistant Professor Bilge Ataca, Ph.D. (Committee Chairperson) _____

Associate Professor Ali İ. Tekcan, Ph.D. _____

Assistant Professor Serra Müderrisoğlu, Ph.D. _____

February, 2006

Acknowledgements

It was stimulating and fun for me to be a student again. However, I had very difficult times during the pre-selection, selection phases and in my following years, mostly because of my background and my future expectations. Being such a graduate-to-be student approached with disbelief of some of the professors in the department had been put an additional responsibility to prove my interest, will and enthusiasm all the time over and over again. In addition to my intellectual and emotional satisfaction, seeing that these could be removed with dedication, hard-work and positive attitude, and hearing the appreciations of the most suspicious ones in following years were my additional and indulging takeaways from this journey.

This work could not be realized without constructive criticisms and helpful suggestions of my thesis committee, especially while I was trying to come up with concrete questionnaires. I am grateful to them to invest their time and intellectual effort and to tolerate possibly the longest proposal procedure in the history of Psychology Department.

In addition to take the burden of the most difficult part of this study by providing me a very meaningful and to-the-point thesis title, Ms. Bilge Ataca helped me a lot in every technical detail of this thesis and devoted long hours to provide her feedback even this year was possibly the most difficult year of her life. Her support in reaching an easily comprehensible, error-proof, consistent and smooth thesis report was immeasurable.

Ms. Serra Müderrisoğlu did not only give her time and energy during our lively discussions in various stages of this study, but she passed on her enthusiasm and courage, and showed the importance and appreciated the presentation of critical thinking, energy and openness to, and eagerness for, alternative explanations during

the semester she was my professor. Her lecture gave me the most important thing that helped me a lot, and will always do in my life, in other lectures in my following years in Psychology Department: “FIND THE GAPS AND FILL THEM WITH ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS!”

I could not have a thesis committee I would love to be in it that much without silent but supporting existence of Mr. Ali Tekcan.

A special thank is reserved for Ms. Esra Mungan. In addition to her precious support in every phase of this thesis, her emotional involvement throughout this process motivated me too much. It was really mobilizing to see that she was as excited as me and to know that she would be there whenever I needed her with her inspiration, encouragement, openness to learn, prompt existence, never-ending positive attitude, and answers to even the most absurd/impractical/boring questions of me. I am very lucky that I had the chance to work with her and to feel her confidence in me during my years in Psychology Department.

Without trust, belief and support of my parents Aysel and Besim, this nurturing experience in MA program in general, and this thesis in particular, could be much more difficult. They were always with me in every route I chose for myself. My brothers Burak and Murat assisted me in various technical details.

Sevgi always provided me remote control in every phase; shared the mobilizing motto that helped me a lot to finish this study and introduced me to Özge, the very special person who dedicated her time even at the times she had lots to do and opened-up the doors for me to reach almost all participants from various engineering departments. Ayça did not only listen my complaints patiently, but also was the owner of the brilliant idea to finalize the thesis in a peaceful place. Even though the resulting performance did not meet our expectations, this summer’s

important sharings about the secrets of earth-shaking problems (!) of life, various, and sometimes primitive, activities we drove fun and quality time we spent in general gave the energy to keep me going. Elçin helped me a lot with her positive attitude and always was with me.

In addition to their invaluable friendships, Deniz, Derya, Erdem, Hakan, Sabiha, Yasemin and Zeynep were always in my service by their boosting emotional, technical, practical and sometimes hidden supports when they were most needed. Not only those I mentioned, but all my friends were still my friends even though I neglected them most of the time.

One of the most difficult phases of this study was data collection. This process would be much more hardly completed without the valuable support of all professors of Boğaziçi University who gave permission, and most of the time enforced lightly their students to participate, to apply my questionnaires during their lecture times. I would also like to use this opportunity to thank all participants of that study since they gave up their valuable break times to fill these questionnaires.

Without the support of Mr. Yusuf Bolayırılı, this process would be much harder for me. Being the person who saved his face in BU made me proud of myself. Gülben encouraged me since my initial thoughts, trusted me in accomplishing my intent and provided my first diploma from the start as a sign of her confidence. Mr. Cihangir Erdem helped me to realize what I really missed most. If he did not invest his precious 10-minutes to carry the whiteboard to his room, to find a board marker and to draw some figures and to explain the message he could say in 20 seconds, I could miss the option of starting an MA program in Psychology in my career plans.

Thank you all for your support even in times I put my studies as priority over everything. “Hepiniz iyi ki varsınız!”

Abstract

Self-efficacy in relation to self-construals and causal attributions

By Dilek Büyükselçuk

The aim of the present study was to examine the relationships among self-efficacy beliefs, self-construals and causal attributions by differentiating among relational, individual, and collective self-construals and self-efficacies and among causal attributions for relational, individual, and collective problem domains in success and failure situations. A total of 342 undergraduate senior and graduate students at Boğaziçi University, Turkey filled out questionnaires on self-efficacy, self-construals and causal attributions. Individual self-efficacy was the lowest, relational and collective were the highest self-efficacy types. Inconsistent with the predictions, the findings of the present study indicated that irrespective of the type of self-aspect, all three self-efficacy beliefs were higher for those who were high on each type of self-aspect. Additionally, most of the causal attributions in success and failure situations were consistent with the expectations for high and low self-efficacious individuals, which relates to the possible importance of different attributional styles on self-efficacy levels. However, contrary to expectations, these attributions were not specific to the self-efficacy type. Additional findings pointed out that for all self-aspects and self-efficacy types, self-enhancing attributions were made for failure situations. Overall, results showed that self-enhancement in failure situations can be a basic tendency that exists for every individual, and internal and unstable (effort) attributions may have different meanings that require further examination for individuals in different life stages and from collectivistic cultures.

Özet

Özyeterliliğin değişik benlik kurguları ve atıflarla ilişkileri

Dilek Büyükselçuk

Bu çalışmada farklı benlik kurguları, özyeterlilik inançları ve atıflar arasındaki ilişkiler incelenmiştir. İlişkisel, bireyci ve toplulukçu özyeterlilik tiplerinin ilişkisel, bireyci ve toplulukçu özbenlik kurguları ve başarı ve başarısızlıkla sonuçlanmış değişik problemlerle ilgili atıflar üzerindeki etkileri araştırılmıştır. Değişik bölümlerdeki Boğaziçi Üniversitesi öğrencilerinin üst sınıflarından 342 öğrenci özyeterlilik, benlik kurguları ve atıflar ile ilgili soru formlarını doldurmuşlardır. Bu örnek grubunda bireysel özyeterlilik en düşük, ilişkisel ve toplulukçu özyeterlilik tipleri en yüksek olarak bulunmuştur. Beklentilerin aksine, benlik kurgularından bağımsız olarak, üç tipte ölçülen özyeterlilik inancının da herhangi bir benlik kurgusunda yüksek olan kişilerde yüksek olduğu gözlenmiştir. Ayrıca, başarı ve başarısızlık durumlarındaki atıfların büyük çoğunluğu özyeterlilik inançları yüksek ve düşük olan kişiler için beklenen yöndedir ve farklı atıf biçimlerinin özyeterlilik seviyelerinin belirlenmesindeki olası önemine işaret etmektedir. Ancak, tahminlerin aksine bu atıflar ilgili özyeterlilik inancına özgü çıkmamıştır. Yapılan ek analizler başarısızlık durumlarında bütün benlik kurgularında ve özyeterlilik tiplerindeki kişilerde benlik güçlendirme yanlılığı yönünde temel bir eğilim olabileceğini göstermektedir. Ayrıca bulgular içsel ve değiştirilebilir (çaba) atıflarının toplulukçu kültürlerde ve farklı yaş gruplarındaki bireyler üzerinde farklı anlamları olabileceği ve daha detaylı araştırmalarının gerekliliğine işaret etmektedir.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Sources of Self-Efficacy	2
Self-Efficacy and Attribution Theory	6
The Role of Culture.....	10
The relationship between Self-Efficacy and Self-Enhancement.....	15
The Present Study	18
Hypotheses.....	18
Method	20
Participants.....	20
Instruments.....	20
Self-Efficacy	20
Self-Construal	21
Self-Enhancement	22
Autonomous-Relational Self Scale	22
Procedure	23
The Pilot Study.....	23
The Main Study.....	24
Results.....	25
Descriptive Characteristics of the Variables	25
Results Concerning the Hypotheses.....	32
The Relationship between Self-Construals and Self-Efficacy	32
The Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Self-Enhancement	37

Other Findings.....	46
The Relationship between Attributional Styles and Self-Efficacy	46
The Relationship between Attributional Styles and Self-Construals.....	48
Discussion	50
Non-Exclusive Relationships	51
Attributions for Success and Failure	55
Motivations/Desires/Needs of Individuals.....	57
The Possible Effect of Culture	60
The Life Stage of Individuals.....	63
Methodological Issues.....	65
Limitations and Future Directions	69
Conclusions	72
References	74
Appendices.....	92

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1. Descriptive Characteristics of the Variables	25
Table 2. Oblimin Rotated Factor Loadings of the Self Efficacy Scale	27
Table 3. Oblimin Rotated Factor Loadings of the Ranked RIC Scale	29
Table 4. Inter-correlations among all test variables	33
Table 5. Comparisons of self-construals and self-efficacy	35
Table 6. Comparisons of self-construals and the order of self-efficacy.....	37
Table 7. The relationships between self-efficacy and attributions in success situations	39
Table 8. Comparisons of attributions for problem domains for high and low self-efficacy types in success situations	41
Table 9. The relationship between self-efficacy and attributions in failure situations	43
Table 10. Comparisons of attributions for problem domains for high and low self-efficacy types in failure situations.....	45
Table 11. Order of attributions in different self-efficacy domains	47
Table 12. Order of attributions in different self-aspects	49

Introduction

Individuals who have the same skills may perform differently based on their use of these skills (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Self-efficacy, a social cognitive construct that refers to “people’s judgments of their abilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391) has been shown to be a reliable predictor of task performance (e.g., Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996, 2001; Bandura & Cervone, 1983; Gist, 1989; Lapan, Adams, Turner, & Hinkelman, 2000; Sadri & Robertson, 1993; Shell, Colvin, & Bruning, 1995; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). In other words, people’s beliefs in their capabilities to produce desired effects are more important than what they actually possess (Bandura, 1986) since if they believe they will have no power to produce results, they will not attempt to make things happen (Bandura, 1986, 1997).

Research has documented self-efficacy to be related to performance either directly or indirectly. Self-efficacy affects performance directly by interacting with task effort (Frayne & Latham, 1987; Latham & Frayne, 1989), counterfactual thinking (Sanna, 1997), creativity (Gist, 1989), and complex decision-making (Gist, Stevens, & Bavetta, 1991; Stevens & Gist, 1997; Wood & Bandura, 1989b). It affects performance indirectly by interacting with aspirations and goal commitments (Bandura et al., 1996, 2001; Chung, 2002; Lapan et al., 2000; Pajares, Miller, & Johnson, 1999; Turner & Lapan, 2002), persistence (Eaton & Dembo, 1997; Wood & Bandura, 1989b; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 1997), resilience to adversity (Ausems, Mesters, van Breukelen, & de Vries, 2003; Borman & Overman, 2004; Brody & Flor, 1997; Fasko & Fasko Jr, 1998), vulnerability to stress and depression (Bandura, Pastorelli, Barbaranelli, & Caprara, 1999; Sandler, Tein, Mehta, Wolchik, & Ayers,

2000), internal and external attributions (Oettingen, Little, Lindenberger, & Baltes, 1994; Skinner, Schindler, & Tschechne, 1990), social relationships (Bandura et al., 1996; Clark & Ladd, 2000), interest (Bandura et al., 2001), and selected goal-difficulty (Bandura & Cervone, 1983).

Operations of human agency depend on one's beliefs in one's capability to mobilize the necessary resources in terms of motivation, affective states, and cognitive resources. This, in return, will determine the courses of action needed to meet the given situational demands (Bandura, 1977a, b, 1997; Wood & Bandura, 1989a). In short, self-efficacy creates tendencies to strive or give up and is reciprocally related to motivations, goal settings, achievements and attributions (Bandura, 1986; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Given the central role of self-efficacy in task performance, it is important to investigate the sources of self-efficacy judgments and how these sources influence the development of a person's sense of self-efficacy.

Sources of Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1977b, 1986, 1997, 2001) specifies four major sources of information that people use in developing their sense of self-efficacy beliefs. These sources, from the most to the least influential for a strong sense of self-efficacy, are enactive mastery experiences, vicarious learning experiences, social persuasion, and psychological states. Each of these sources has particular significance in their roles to make a self-efficacy judgment.

Enactive mastery experiences refer to the strengthening of self-efficacy beliefs as a result of task accomplishments. In other words, it simply means "doing", that is, carrying out a behavior and observing oneself while doing so. Successes build a strong sense of self-efficacy (Karl, O'leary-Kelly, & Martocchio, 1993), whereas the effects of occasional failures partly depend on the timing and the total

pattern of experiences in which the failures occur (Bandura, 1977b; Bandura & Jourden, 1991; Schunk & Hanson, 1989). Repeated early failures especially may have the most adverse effect if they cannot be discounted as due to lack of effort or unfavorable circumstances (Försterling, 1985). Failures would be less detrimental if people have already developed a strong sense of self-efficacy with early frequent successes (Brunstein & Gollwitzer, 1996) or even they could strengthen it if they are later overcome by determined effort (Bandura 1986, 1997; Bandura & Jourden, 1991; Försterling, 1985).

Vicarious information is obtained from watching others carry out a desired behavior. Seeing others perform successfully can persuade observers that they can too be capable (or incapable) of carrying out these particular behaviors (Bandura, 1977b, 1997). The model, through successful efforts, conveys to the observing person possible task strategies, a basis for (social) comparison and judgment of their own abilities, and encouragement to believe that through effort, even though there are setbacks, the task can be successfully accomplished.

Being told by others that one can be capable of carrying out a particular behavior, that is verbal persuasion, can also influence judgments of self-efficacy. The objective of verbal persuasion is just to convey to the person faced with the task of utilizing their ability to succeed, but is not to create unrealistically high expectations which may well affect the person negatively if they fail at the task (Bandura, 1977b, 1997).

A person's perception of his/her physiological state (subjective personal influences) may affect self-efficacy because people have the tendency to associate these bodily responses with impaired performance. However, it is not the reaction

per se, but its interpretation that is important for the development of self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1977b, 1997).

In all of these sources, what is important is not the objective observations, but the appraisal processes that change the information's impact on self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977b). In their daily lives, people are not passive actors who are behaving according to the situational demands. Instead, they analyze the situations, plan the necessary courses of action by considering the results the actions are likely to produce, and decide their ability to employ these actions. They then act based on their judgments, analyze the effectiveness of their thoughts, and are changing their reasoning and strategies if necessary (Bandura, 1997; Cervone, 2000). In Triadic Reciprocal Causation Model of self and society (Bandura, 1989, 1997), internal factors in the form of cognitive, affective and biological events, behavior, and environmental events are influencing each other and this bi-directional influence can vary in strength depending on the activities and circumstances. Relationship between the beliefs of self-efficacy and the performance is a complex process of self-appraisal that demands selecting, weighing, and combining information from multiple sources (Bandura, 1977b, 1997, 2001). This process of self-appraisal includes the beliefs about the nature of ability, information or assumptions which link successful performance to internal or external factors, estimations of controllability, feedback received regarding previous efforts, attributions made regarding the outcome of previous experiences, specific task requirements and the degree of interdependence on the efforts of others (Appelbaum & Hare, 1996).

In summary, the work reviewed up until this point has highlighted three aspects of self-efficacy (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Wood & Bandura, 1989b). First, self-efficacy is a detailed judgment of perceived capability for performing a specific

task. In any performance domain, information derived from the individual, the task, and others in the work environment may contribute to this assessment of capability. Second, perceived self-efficacy is not a static personality trait that people “have”, but is a dynamic cognitive appraisal process that people “do” (Cantor, 1990). In short, the efficacy judgment changes over time as new information and experience are acquired (sometimes during actual task performance). Third, efficacy beliefs involve a mobilization component; self-efficacy includes the construction and harmonization of adaptive performances to suit changing circumstances (Bandura, 1997, 2001).

In this dynamic construction process of self-efficacy, two factors are important in the development of a strong sense of self-efficacy: the performance, either directly through personal attainments or indirectly through observation and verbal persuasion, and interpretation of the performance and physiological state (Appelbaum & Hare, 1996; Bandura, 1986, 1997; Furstenberg & Rounds 1995; Wood & Bandura, 1989a), that is, depending on the nature of information available to the person and her/his the interpretation of these information, s/he would experience either positive or negative consequences on her/his self-efficacy. Perceptions and responses of an individual to previous performance ultimately define how that performance affects self-efficacy (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). If an individual performs a behavior by focusing on negative aspects of the performance, or by explaining success to something other than his or her ability, there would be no positive contribution for the development of a resilient sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986). A successful performance enhances self-efficacy only if the person explains it by her/his own ability and not with temporary or external factors or chance. These are all related with the causal attributions people make and would lead us to the relationship between self-efficacy and attribution theory.

Self-Efficacy and Attribution Theory

Attribution Theory predicts that it is the individual's focus on why success or failure occurred that explains specific psychological outcomes such as future expectancies, persistence when faced with difficulty, and affect (Weiner, 1985). Causal attribution process is one of the most important processes involved in strengthening self-efficacy judgments (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). The well-recognized attributional causes (i.e., effort, ability, luck, task difficulty) become cues for subsequent efficacy judgments. However, self-efficacy theory does not propose that attributions have direct influence on behavior (Bandura, 1977b). Instead, the theory claims that efficacy expectations determine engagement. When people believe that a behavior will lead to a specific outcome and that they are capable of performing that behavior, they are more likely to engage in the behavior. In line with the claims of Triadic Reciprocal Causation Model, judgments of efficacy depend, in part, on past level of performance (i.e., successes and failures) and performance is also clearly related with initial self-efficacy beliefs (Brunstein & Gollwitzer, 1996; Courneya & McAuley, 1993; Davis, Fedor, Parsons, & Herold, 2000; Feltz, 1982; Locke, Frederick, Lee, & Bobko, 1984; Mathieu, Martineau, & Tannenbaum, 1993; Nease, Mudgett, & Quinones, 1994; Shea & Howell, 2000; Silver, Mitchell, & Gist, 1995).

Self-efficacy judgments are not only based on the level of past performance, but also on individuals' interpretations of the causes of their previous performance (Silver et al., 1995). Even though Bandura mentions the importance of attributions on self-efficacy development, he does not put forth an elaborated theoretical model. Bandura (1977b) stated "successes are more likely to enhance self-efficacy if performances are perceived as resulting from skills than from fortuitous or special external aids" and "success with minimal effort fosters ability ascriptions that

reinforce a strong sense of self-efficacy. By contrast, analogous successes achieved through high expenditure of effort connote a lesser ability and thus likely to have a weaker effect on perceived self-efficacy” (p. 201). In other words, Bandura proposes that it is better to attribute success to ability rather than to effort or to external factors in order to have a strong sense of self-efficacy. A success achieved without effort implies greater ability than success achieved with effort. Thus, attributions to ability for successful outcomes should have a greater positive effect on perceived self-efficacy than attributions to effort (Sanna & Pusecker, 1994; Schunk, 1983, 1984).

It seems clear that when people explain successes with their own abilities and efforts, they are more likely to take pride with these accomplishments (Bandura, 1986). Similarly, they would respond self-critically to faulty performances if they hold themselves responsible, whereas those that they perceive as due to unusual circumstances, to insufficient capabilities, or to unrealistic demands would create no effect.

However, among internal causes, attributions to lack of effort, rather than lack of ability can make the effects of failure less severe. When people are led to believe that failures are due to lack of effort, an internal, unstable, and controllable attribution, the greatest amount of positive change in self-efficacy, effort and persistence occurs (Försterling, 1985; Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Luzzo & Funk, 1996). Similarly, Anderson (1983) found that when people believed that task performance was determined by variable causes (e.g., effort, task strategies), they were discouraged less by failure than people who believed that the causes were stable (e.g., character dispositions, ability).

There are also various studies to test how initial self-efficacy level affects causal attributions since attributions about the causes of performance differ for high-

and low-efficacious people (Chase, 2001; Nease et al., 1994; Pajares & Schunk, 2001; Silver et al., 1995; Vrugt, Langereis, & Hoogstraten, 1997). Stability of self-efficacy beliefs may derive from highly developed and accessible pre-existing self-schemata on the cognitive processing of efficacy information (Bandura, 1997; Markus, 1977). Experiences that are inconsistent with these self-efficacy beliefs tend to be minimized, discounted, distorted, or forgotten in the memory (Bandura, 1997; Nease et al., 1994). Consistent with this claim, self-efficacious people believe even more highly in their capabilities (both ability and effort) following successes than do people with low-self-efficacy (Silver et al., 1995, Study 2) and low sense of efficacy continues despite repeated performance attainments that show personal capabilities (Nease et al., 1994). Additionally, those with low self-efficacy beliefs in coping with environmental demands concentrate on their deficiencies and perceive potential difficulties as more formidable than they really are (Bandura, 1986). By contrast, those with a strong sense of self-efficacy employ their effort and attention to the demands of the situation and work on obstacles with greater effort (Bandura & Cervone, 1986; Pajares & Schunk, 2001).

Once a strong sense of self-efficacy is established through repeated successes, occasional failures or setbacks are unlikely to undermine belief in one's capabilities (Bandura, 1997; Brunstein & Gollwitzer, 1996; Nease et al., 1994; Wood & Bandura, 1989b). People with high self-efficacy are more likely to explain deficient performances with temporary situational factors, insufficient effort, or poor strategies. Interestingly, when people explain poor performances with unstable, uncontrollable factors, failures could become a factor to increase efficacy since these types of explanations imply that better strategies, different situational factors, or more effort will bring future success.

As a result, it is theoretically clear that attributions of successful past performance to ability or of unsuccessful past performance to lack of effort would create perseverance; an experience that provides assurance of one's capabilities and that allows a person to endure setbacks and failures without loss of confidence (Wood & Bandura, 1989a). This would lead to positive feelings of self-efficacy that are enhanced in the success but are unaffected by the failure (Bandura, 1977b, 1986; Försterling, 1985; Haugen, & Lund, 1998; Ponton, Edmister, Ukeiley, & Seiner, 2001). Additionally, attributions of unsuccessful performance to external factors should prevent the loss of self-efficacy beliefs, even if they do not help to increase them.

However, the results of empirical studies are not definitely conclusive. In success situations, some found that internal attributions were better than external attributions (Haugen & Lund, 1998; Karl et al., 1993; Shell et al., 1995; Silver et al., 1995) and ability attributions (internal, stable) were better than effort attributions (internal, unstable) (Gattuso, Litt, & Fitzgerald, 1992; Schunk, 1983, 1984) in increasing self-efficacy. Additionally, others found that it was better to attribute success to stable factors (Haugen & Lund, 1998; Silver et al., 1995, Study 2) and to controllable factors (Bandura & Wood, 1989). Also, high efficacious people tended to explain their successes more with ability and effort (Silver et al., 1995, Study 2) and with stable factors (Silver et al., 1995, Study 1). In summary, for success situations it seems that there is a convergence on internal attributions but there is only a tendency towards stable attributions as stated by Bandura (1977b).

There is also inconsistency in research that involves failure situations. Some studies found that attributing failures to lack of effort was better in increasing self-efficacy than attributions to lack of ability (Anderson, 1983; Pajares & Schunk,

2001; Wood & Bandura, 1989b). Another study showed that attribution of failures to lack of effort was better than attributions to external factors (Luzzo & Funk, 1996). Additionally, a review by Försterling (1985) documented that attributions to lack of effort was better than lack of ability task difficulty and bad luck. Also, those people with high efficacy tended to attribute failure more to lack of effort (Bandura & Cervone, 1986; Chase, 2001; Pajares & Schunk, 2001; Vrugt et al., 1997), less to lack of ability and task difficulty (Silver et al., 1995, Study 2), more to lack of internal factors of ability and effort (Silver et al., 1995, Study 2), and more to external factors (Nease et al., 1994). Consistent with theoretical claims, most findings supported the claim that attributing failures to lack of effort is better in increasing self-efficacy or at least maintaining it. However, as documented above, there are also studies that found internal (both ability and effort) or external attributions to be better. At this point, the role of the culture in explaining these inconclusive findings in the literature will be dwelled upon.

The Role of Culture

In terms of the role of culture, perceived absence of negative features rather than the existence of positive features may be more important for Easterners since this provides an opportunity for the elimination of those negative aspects, which could be harmful for group harmony and interconnectedness (Kitayama & Karasawa, 1995; as cited in Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunnit, 1997). For example, Americans desire success feedback and as a result, show more initiative in the workplace, whereas Japanese desire failure feedback (Bailey, Chen, & Dou, 1997).

Most of the literature on the role of culture in self shares the view that there are two types of self (e.g., Heine & Lehman, 1999; Kitayama et al., 1997; Sedikides,

Gaertner, & Toguchi, 2003). The Western cultures, especially the European American middle-class promote the independent self. The self is autonomous and independent; it is separate and distinct from other individuals and from the social context. The self discovers and identifies with positively valued internal attributes; it expresses them publicly and maintains and enhances self-esteem (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). On the other hand, many Asian cultures promote interdependent self-construals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In these cultural systems, fundamental connectedness with specific others is important. As a result, meanings and practices that emphasize connectedness to and harmony within the group are constructed. While trying to merge with the group, the self has to adjust himself/herself continuously according to the requirements of the social relationships.

Even though the two-dimensional conception of the self has been used extensively (e.g., Heine & Lehman, 1999; Kitayama et al., 1997; Sedikides et al., 2003), recent literature distinguishes among the three aspects of the self (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Y. Kashima, Yamaguchi, Kim, Choi, Gelfand, & Yuki, 1995). The first is the “individualistic self” which is similar to Markus and Kitayama’s (1991) independent self-construal. The second is the “relational self” which has to do with the quality of the relationship between the individual and the other significant individuals (see, for example, Cross & Madson, 1997). The third is the “collective self” which is derived from one’s membership in groups or social categories and has to do with group affiliation, adherence to in-group norms, and emphasis on roles and status defined by collectives (Y. Kashima et al., 1995).

The self-efficacy construct was used in cross-cultural studies with samples from the UK, and the USA (Sadri, 1996), India (Randhawa & Gupta, 2000), and Asian Americans and non-Americans in the USA (Eaton & Dembo, 1997). Research

showed differences in the strength of the relationship between self-efficacy and performance (Eaton & Dembo, 1997; Jung, Ehrlich, De Noble, & Baik, 2001). For example, although Asian Americans had lower-levels of self-efficacy beliefs, they outperformed their non-Asian counterparts on the task (Eaton & Dembo, 1997).

However, even though “self” sounds a little bit more appropriate for individualistic social systems, individuals in collectivistic societies could not manage their group life through collective effort and would be overwhelmed easily by adversities without a resilient sense of self (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2001; Sadri & Robertson, 1993). Self-efficacy helps to explain why people perform poorly in a specific domain and it is an integrating mechanism between different concepts such as goal setting and self-management of behavior (Sadri & Robertson, 1993). A belief in one’s abilities to produce desired effects enhances accomplishments in all cultures. The way efficacy beliefs are developed, the purposes they are employed for, and the way in which they are best-exercised in particular cultural environments will be affected by cultural values and practices. Individualistic people will be more efficacious and productive when they can manage things by themselves, whereas collectivistic people will be more efficacious and productive when they manage things together.

A strong sense of efficacy is important for successful functioning in daily lives regardless of whether it is achieved individually or by group members working together (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2001; Sadri & Robertson, 1993). Members of a group have to perform their roles and coordinate activities with a high sense of efficacy in order to be able to put their resources together and work together successfully. An efficacious collectivity can be achieved only with members who

approach problems without any doubts about their ability to succeed and with perseverance in the face of difficulties.

Although a few cross-cultural studies have examined the influence of culture on self-efficacy, their findings are far from being conclusive for various reasons. Perceived personal efficacy contributes to the productive functioning of both collectivistic and individualistic people (Earley, 1993, 1994). In Earley's (1994) study, managers from Hong Kong, China, and the United States were given information specific to their own performance potential and actions in the individual-focused training condition. In the group-focused training condition, information was specific to their group's performance potential and actions. Even though both types of training were effective in increasing self-efficacy beliefs than no training condition, cultural heritage affected the ways in which efficacy beliefs were more easily developed, the purposes to which they were put, and the arrangements through which they were best exercised. In individualistic cultures those who were provided with an individual-focused training felt more efficacious and performed better than those who were provided with a group-focused training, whereas in collectivistic cultures those who were provided with a group-focused training judged themselves more efficacious and worked more productively than those from who were provided with an individual-focused training. Self-efficacy of a collectivist is mostly based on information s/he gets about a work group, whereas an individualist's self-efficacy derives from self-referenced cues.

Jung et al. (2001) studied the relationship between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions. They tested entrepreneurial self-efficacy for people from different cultural backgrounds in predicting entrepreneurial behavior. Although there was a positive relationship between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and

entrepreneurial intentions and actions for the American undergraduate and graduate students, and Korean undergraduates, this relationship did not hold for Korean graduate students, managers and the American managers. The role of culture was not measured in that study and there are always collectivists in individualistic cultures and individualists in collectivistic cultures. It is probable that these people whom the investigated relationship does not hold may have different cultural orientations. Regardless of its cultural orientation, if one's psychological orientation is congruent with the structure of the social system, s/he achieves the greatest personal efficacy and productivity (Earley, 1994). Both at the societal and individual level of analysis, a strong perceived efficacy enhance high group effort and performance accomplishments.

In the literature, the only study that investigated the relationships among self construal, causal attributional patterns and self-efficacy found that individuals who were high on independent self-construal exhibited higher self-efficacy when compared to those individuals who were high on interdependent self-construals as measured by Singelis' (1994) Self-Construal Scale (Uchida, 2004).

These studies are too few in number to reach a confident conclusion about the role of culture in self-efficacy. Also, there are some weaknesses in these studies. For example, the effect of culture is assumed, but not measured (Jung et al., 2001). Even though construals were taken in to consideration (Uchida, 2004), attributions and self-efficacy were not differentiated for different self aspects. In other words, the possible and proposed effect of culture on attributional styles or self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2001; Sadri & Robertson, 1993) was not taken into consideration. Even though there is the acceptance of the importance of causal attributions for the formation and development of self-efficacy (e.g., Appelbaum &

Hare, 1996; Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Wood & Bandura, 1989b), the effect of attributions on the level of self-efficacy is not considered in any of this research. Hence, further support is needed to study the effect of culture. This support might be obtained from another literature. The suggested attributional style of individuals with strong sense of self-efficacy (Bandura 1977a, 1986; Försterling, 1985) is very similar to the concept of self-enhancement. That is, people's tendency to explain their own successes with internal and relatively stable attributes such as ability or talent, while reducing the effect of their failure by attributing it either to some external factors (like blaming others, luck, or task difficulty) or to some internal but modifiable factors such as lack of effort (Kitayama et al., 1997), it would be helpful to look at this literature to see the effect of culture.

The relationship between Self-Efficacy and Self-Enhancement

In this literature, there is the belief that self-enhancement is more applicable to people from individualistic cultures, and self-effacement, people's tendency to explain one's successes in terms of effort or luck and one's failures in terms of lack of abilities and talents, is more applicable to people from collectivistic cultures (e.g., Heine & Lehman, 1999; Kitayama et al., 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). However, the literature on self-enhancement shows quite mixed and divergent results. Some studies were the exact replica of the definition, that is, people tried to enhance or at least maintain their self-esteem either by attributing success to internal and the failure to external factors (Fry & Ghosh, 1980, Caucasian sample; Lee & Seligman, 1997, White-American sample; Santamaria & Furst, 1994) or by attributing both success (ability and effort) and failure (lack of effort) to internal factors (Anderson, 1999; Chinese sample; Bong, 2004, Korean sample; Chandler, Shama, Wolf, & Planchard, 1981, Yugoslavia, India, South Africa and the United

States samples; Fry & Ghosh, 1980, Asian sample; Si, Rethorst, & Willimczik, 1995, Chinese sample; Yan & Gaier, 1994, The United States, Japan, China, Korea and Southeast Asia samples). Some others found more internal attributions for failure than for success (Chandler et al., 1981, Japanese sample) and internal attributions to ability in failure situations and more external attributions in success situations (Anderson, 1999, Chinese sample).

From the literature reviewed so far, it is not possible to reach a clear conclusion that self-enhancement is employed more in individualistic cultures and self-effacement is employed more in collectivistic cultures. However, this does not mean that cultural systems have no effect on psychological processes of self-enhancement. For example, a collective constructionist theory of the self of Kitayama et al. (1997) mainly proposes that many psychological processes including self-enhancement and self-effacement, or self-criticism could not be separated from the situations and social acts that are collectively defined and subjectively experienced in a given cultural context. In other words, cultural system and psychological processes mutually and continuously construe each other. A psychological process could be accepted as natural, familiar and ordinary if and only if that process fits well with the cultural context in which the act occurs. If this is the case, then the social context in the West should provide relatively more self-enhancing opportunities, whereas the situations in Asian countries should have relatively more self-effacing ones. Additionally, self-enhancing situations in the West and self-effacing situations in the East should be seen as a source for self-esteem. Kitayama et al. (1997) found exactly this relationship in their two studies.

Recent research has shown that living in a culture with specific everyday practices and situations could automatically foster certain types of psychological

processes. All cultures may engage in self-enhancement but for those attributes that are relevant for the cultural context (Kurman, 2001; Sedikides et al., 2003). In other words, even though there could be a universal human motive of self-enhancement with different psychological processes, this motive could be shaped by the social restrictions on self-development (Kurman, 2001; Sedikides et al., 2003). In short, if the situational information does not require modesty (Tice, Butler, Muraven, & Stillwell, 1995), provides an opportunity to self-enhance (e.g., Kurman, 2001), or is self-threatening (e.g., Dunning, 1995; Heine & Lehman, 1999; Hong, Chiu, Dweck, Lin, & Wan, 1999), people will engage in self-enhancement, that is, they will explain their own successes with internal and relatively stable attributes such as ability or talent, while reducing the effect of their failure by attributing it either to some external factors such as blaming others, luck or task difficulty, or to some internal but modifiable (unstable and controllable) factors, such as lack of effort (Kitayama et al., 1997).

This point in self-enhancement literature supports Bandura's (1986, 1997, 2001) previously outlined cultural views on self-efficacy. If people are self-enhancing in culturally relevant domains and if this is the desired/suggested attributional style to increase self-efficacy, then self-efficacy should be really high in culturally shaped, self-relevant domains. To be more specific, individualistic self should be more efficacious and productive when one can manage things by herself/himself and when one is working for the purposes to enhance or to maintain the quality of her/his own life (Individual self-efficacy). The relational self should be more efficacious and productive when one manages relations with specific other(s) and when s/he is working for the purposes to enhance or to maintain the quality of her/his relationships (Relational self-efficacy). The collective self should

be more efficacious and productive when s/he can manage things together with other people in her/his group and when s/he is working for the purposes to enhance or to maintain the group norms (Collective self-efficacy).

The Present Study

The purpose of this study is to test the relationships among self-efficacy, self-construals and causal attributions. Many studies have demonstrated that self-efficacy influences performance in diverse settings; however, the relationships among self-efficacy, self-construals and causal attributions have not been examined together in the same study.

The present study contributes to the previous body of research in three ways. The main contribution is the examination of the relationships among these three constructs on culturally relevant domains. Additionally, in the self-efficacy literature, even though there are a few studies (Earley 1993, 1994; Jung et al., 2001) that test the role of culture and a study that employs the two-dimensional self (Uchida, 2004), this study is the first that employs self-construal with the recent three dimensional conception of the self (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Y. Kashima et al., 1995). Finally, both self-efficacy and causal attributions are studied on culturally shaped, self-relevant domains.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis I: Self-efficacy will be higher in self-relevant areas.

- a. Individual, relational, collective self-efficacy will be higher for those high in individual, relational, collective self-aspect, respectively, compared to those low in individual, relational, collective self-aspect, respectively.

Hypothesis II: Individuals who are high in self-efficacy will employ self-enhancement in self-relevant areas.

- a. Individuals who are high in individual, relational, collective self-efficacy will attribute successes in individual, relational, collective problem areas, respectively, to internal and stable factors (ability) more than those who are low in individual, relational, collective self-efficacy, respectively.
- b. Individuals who are high in individual, relational, collective self-efficacy will attribute failures in individual, relational, collective problem areas, respectively, to internal and unstable (effort) or external factors (other people, destiny, or task) more than those who are low in individual, relational, collective self-efficacy, respectively.

Method

Participants

Since the most influential way of developing a strong sense of self-efficacy is enactive mastery (Bandura, 1997), participants were expected to have chances to be involved in various personal experiences in different domains of life. Hence, they were selected from students among upper classes. Participants in this study were 342 fourth year (257 students), graduate (81 students) and doctorate (4 students) Boğaziçi University students (223 women and 119 men). The age range was between 20 and 34 with a mean of 23.29 and a standard deviation of 1.95.

Instruments

There are three constructs of major interest in this study (see Appendix B, C, D, E for Turkish versions, and L, M, N, O for English versions): Self-efficacy, self-construal, and self-enhancement.

Self-Efficacy

The instrument for self-efficacy that includes three types of self-efficacy, namely individual, relational, and collective self-efficacy, was created in Turkish by the researcher. Since efficacy beliefs should be measured in terms of specific judgments of capability that may vary across a dimension depending on the particular domain of functioning being explored (Bandura 1977b, 1986, 1997), various statements that could be suitable for each aspect of self, namely, individual, relational, and collective self-efficacy were developed. Sample statements are: “*I believe I can succeed in the most challenging tasks with the support of those who are closest to me*”, “*I believe I can carry out my duties for my group in a regular and orderly manner*”, “*I believe I can perform well in order to achieve my personal goals even in difficult circumstances*”. A total of 28 statements asked self-efficacy beliefs.

Then, 3 independent judges analyzed the items and categorized those under three subscales. Inter-rater reliability was 100%. Statements representing each self-efficacy type were separated from each other in the questionnaire. For each statement, participants indicated whether they could do the tasks (*Yes/ No*) and if they could, how certain they are (%) as suggested by Bandura (1977b, 1986, 1997).

Self-Construal

The measurement of self-construal was inspired by Kashima and Hardie's (2000) Relational, Individual, and Collective Self-Aspects (RIC) scale. The original scale consists of 10 statements each of which is followed by three response items corresponding to the relational, individual, and collective aspects of the self. Each response item has to be rated separately on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*not like me, not true of me*) to 7 (*like me, true of me*). Kashima and Hardie (2000) reported Cronbach's alpha of .81, .72 and, .78 for the relational, individual, and collective subscales of RIC for their Australian samples. Similar reliability scores of .81, .74, and .88 for the RIC subscales respectively were obtained in Turkish sample by Fişek (2003; as cited in Gerçek, 2004). However, in the original scale, in some questions family was treated as part of the collective, still in some others no reference was given for the family. Collective self aspect in Kashima and Hardie's (2000) scale is derived from one's membership in groups or social categories and it has to do with group affiliation, adherence to in-group norms, and emphasis on roles and status defined by collectives. On the other hand, relational dimension has to do with the quality of the relationship between the individual and other significant individuals (see for example Cross & Madson, 1997). Turkish family concept, especially in the modern urban culture has been in transition and it is a combination of individual and group (family) loyalties (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996). The conceptualization of the relational

self aspect in the original scale was more relevant for the relationships between spouses/partners or between best friends. As a result, family was added as a new dimension. The modified version consisted of a total of 10 items with 38 responses for relational (10 responses), individual (10 responses), collective (10 responses) and family (8 responses) self aspects were evaluated in the pilot study. Following the pilot study, a new section was also added in order to differentiate among the responses and obtain hard core self aspects. Participants were asked to indicate the most and the least representative responses among the four responses for each of the 10 items by putting a plus and a minus sign beside their original responses. Ranked self-construal scale scores were calculated by adding 1 to the option that was selected as the most representative option in each of the 10 items and subtracting 1 from the option that was selected as least representative option in each of the 10 items. Hence, the scores for ranked self-construal scale ranged from 0 to 8.

Self-Enhancement

Participants were asked to think about their successes and failures in individual, relational, and collective domains. Self-enhancement was measured by causal attributions in success/failure situations. The attributional causes of effort, ability, luck/destiny, task difficulty and the role of other people were evaluated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) for each of the success/failure situation consisting of individual, relational, collective domains for a total of 30 statements.

Autonomous-Relational Self Scale

In order to test the validity of the self aspects scale, Autonomous-Relational Self Scale (ARSS) of Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (personal communication, May 18, 2005) was used. Kağıtçıbaşı (1996) proposed that in addition to agency and relatedness

dimensions mostly investigated in social psychology literature, conceptualization of the self should also include a new dimension combining two basic human needs of agency and relatedness and her concept of the “autonomous relational self” is a synthesis of these two basic needs and it is mostly seen in the urban, educated and high SES parts of collectivist cultures. The ARSS scale consists of 27 items for Autonomy, Relatedness and Autonomous Relational subscales (9 for each dimension). It was expected that the autonomy dimension should correlate positively with the individual self aspect; the relatedness dimension should correlate positively with the collective, family and relational self aspects; and the autonomous relational dimension should correlate positively with the relational and family dimensions. Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (personal communication, May 18, 2005) reported Cronbach’s alpha of .76, .72 and .80 for the autonomy, relatedness and autonomous-relational subscales of ARSS for Turkish sample.

Procedure

The Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted with 115 participants to test the reliability, comprehensibility and the general flow of the questionnaires. Self Efficacy, modified RIC scale, Self Enhancement scale and Self-Constraint scale (SCS; Singelis, 1994) were employed in the pilot study. After the pilot study, due to its low explanation power (Appendix J) it was decided to eliminate this scale and use ARSS scale of Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (personal communication, May 18, 2005). Additionally, one more section for the self-construal measurement was added in order to differentiate the self construals better. To be more specific, it was decided to ask the participants to rank the relational, individual and collective aspects of scale items of modified RIC scale.

The Main Study

The participants filled out the questionnaires in groups in classes. Since the self-efficacy measure involved questions about different aspects of self, the grouped structure of the RIC scale (Kashima & Hardie, 2000), would affect the responses for the former. Also, descriptions in the self-enhancement measure gave some clues about self-aspects, but not as much as the RIC scale (Kashima & Hardie, 2000). As a result, the order of the measures was self-efficacy, self-enhancement scale, and RIC scale. Since the ARSS scale was added for control purposes, it was placed at the very end, before the demographics questions. Two sets of each questionnaire with different orderings of the questions in each scale were used to eliminate the order effect. As a result, total of 16 sets were used in the main study. The instructions were given by the researcher and participants were assured about the anonymity and the confidentiality of their responses. Only nicknames were written on the questionnaires. A written consent was also taken from the participants. They were also asked to write their e-mail addresses on these consent forms. To ensure anonymity, all of the participants received a summary report of their performances on the measures in a single e-mail that included their nicknames.

Results

Descriptive Characteristics of the Variables

The means, standard deviations, ranges of possible and actual scores for the scales used and their Cronbach's alphas are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive Characteristics of the Variables

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Possible Range of Scores			Actual Range of Scores			Cronbach's Alpha
RIC_collective	4.25	1.21	.00	-	8.00	.38	-	7.25	.87
RIC_family	5.52	.99	.00	-	8.00	1.75	-	7.13	.87
RIC_individual	7.02	.77	.00	-	8.00	2.71	-	8.00	.77
RIC_relational	6.42	.73	.00	-	8.00	1.33	-	7.83	.73
SEF_col	68.50	18.34	.00	-	100.00	11.00	-	100.00	.88
SEF_ind	64.14	18.76	.00	-	100.00	8.75	-	100.00	.80
SEF_rel	70.53	19.18	.00	-	100.00	4.00	-	100.00	.78
CS-effort	4.81	1.32	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
CS-ability	4.58	1.31	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
CS-external	4.81	1.34	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
CF-effort	3.61	1.73	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
CF-ability	2.63	1.47	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
CF-external	4.88	1.24	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
IS-effort	5.73	1.16	1.00	-	7.00	2.00	-	7.00	
IS-ability	4.98	1.27	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
IS-external	4.12	1.48	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
IF-effort	4.24	1.86	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
IF-ability	2.92	1.55	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
IF-external	4.61	1.36	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
RS-effort	5.00	1.37	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
RS-ability	4.73	1.34	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
RS-external	4.46	1.44	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
RF-effort	3.90	1.77	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
RF-ability	2.88	1.53	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	
RF-external	4.77	1.32	1.00	-	7.00	1.00	-	7.00	

Note. RIC = Ranked Relational Individual Collective Scale, SEF = Self Efficacy scale, CS = Collective Success of Self Enhancement, CF = Collective Failure of Self Enhancement, IS = Individual Success of Self Enhancement, IF = Individual Failure of Self Enhancement, RS = Relational Success of Self Enhancement, RF = Relational Failure of Self Enhancement.

For data reduction purposes, exploratory principal axis factor analysis followed by oblimin rotation was conducted for self-efficacy, the modified version of RIC scale, ranked RIC scale and the ARSS scales. Items not loading highly (greater

than .40) on either factor or loading approximately equally on two or more factors (i.e., not having a clear factor structure) were dropped. Oblimin rotation was chosen because the possible factors underlying each scale were theoretically correlational in nature.

Factor solutions that were consistent with the theoretical framework were not obtained for the ARSS scale (Appendix H) and the modified version of RIC scale with relational, family, individual and collective subscales before ranking (Appendix I). As a result, ARSS was not used, and only the ranked RIC scale was used in further analyses.

A three factor solution was imposed a priori on the 28 items of the self-efficacy scale according to the theoretical framework (Table 2). After the examination of the item content, the first factor was named as collective self-efficacy (SEF_col) as proposed initially. The second factor was named as individual self-efficacy (SEF_ind) and the third factor was named as relational self-efficacy (SEF_rel). After removing inappropriate items, a total of 22 items (10 items for the Collective, 7 items for the Individual, and 5 items for the Relational subscales of self-efficacy scale) were obtained for the final list. Collective, individual and relational self-efficacy scores were calculated by taking the mean of the relevant items: Items 1, 3, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 23, 25 and 27 for collective self-efficacy variable, items 5, 8, 11, 16, 19, 21 and 24 for individual self-efficacy variable, and items 4, 7, 9, 22 and 28 for relational self-efficacy variable.

A four factor solution was forced on the 38 items of the ranked RIC scale (Table 3). The resulting factors were consistent with the theoretical subscales. After removing the problematic items, a total of 29 items (8 for the Family, 7 for the Individual, 6 for the Relational, and 8 for the Collective subscales of the ranked RIC

scale) were kept for the final analysis. Collective, family, individual and relational self aspects were calculated by taking the mean of all relevant items: Items 1b, 2c, 3a, 5b, 7c, 8b, 9d and 10b for the RIC_family variable, items 2d, 3d, 4a, 5d, 8c, 9b and 10c for the RIC_individual variable, items 2b, 5a, 7a, 8d, 9c and 10a for the RIC_relational variable, and items 1d, 2a, 3c, 4c, 5c, 7d, 8a and 9a for the RIC_collective variable.

Table 2

Oblimin Rotated Factor Loadings of the Self Efficacy Scale

		Factor		
		1	2	3
12. I believe I can achieve my goals by working together with my group	C	.82	-.19	.15
27. I believe I can overcome problems by working together with my group.	C	.80	-.20	.10
14. I believe I can use my special skills and talents in order to achieve the goals of my group.	C	.75	.08	-.02
15. I believe I can succeed in the most challenging tasks with the support of my group.	C	.73	-.16	.23
3. I believe I can work hard to achieve the challenging goals of my group even though they do not seem easy to achieve.	C	.73	.17	-.15
1. I believe I can fulfill the requirements necessary to achieve the goals of my group even in very difficult circumstances.	C	.71	.20	-.07
10. I believe I can carry out my duties for my group in a neat and orderly manner.	C	.60	.23	-.11
17. I believe I can determine my priorities in a way that will not destroy the solidarity of my group.	C	.55	.06	.09
23. I believe I can persist in my job in the face of obstacles if I feel the support of my group.	C	.49	-.11	.27
25. I believe I can easily adapt to the situations where people work together.	C	.46	.13	.14
13. I believe I can work hard to achieve the challenging goals of those who are closest to me;even though they do not seem easy to achieve.	R	.30	.06	.24
11. I believe I can overcome problems on my own.	I	.04	.75	-.14

Table 2 (continued)

		Factor		
		1	2	3
24. I believe I can succeed in the most challenging tasks on my own.	I	.06	.72	-.11
19. I believe I can achieve my goals on my own.	I	-.01	.71	-.13
5. I believe I can find fast and practical solutions in the face of obstacles without getting into panic..	I	-.08	.64	.11
8. I believe I can perform well in order to achieve my personal goals even in very difficult circumstances.	I	.03	.60	.13
16. I believe I can persist in my job in the face of obstacles.	I	.10	.59	.21
2. I believe I can find fast and practical solutions without getting into panic in situations threatening the harmony of my relationship with those who are closest to me.	R	-.03	.54	.30
21. I believe I can use my special skills and talents under any circumstances.	I	.12	.51	.20
26. I believe I can set challenging goals for myself and work hard to achieve them even though they do not seem easy to achieve.	I	.21	.38	.08
20. I believe I can use my special skills and talents to maintain my close relationships.	R	.13	.33	.28
6. I believe I can carry out my in a neat and orderly manner.	I	.29	.31	-.05
9. I believe I can overcome problems by working together with those who are closest to me.	R	.12	-.07	.75
4. I believe I can succeed in the most challenging tasks with the support of those who are closest to me.	R	.00	.10	.72
7. I believe I can persist in my job in the face of obstacles if I feel the support of those who are closest to me.	R	.13	.08	.67
28. I believe I can achieve my goals by working together with those who are closest to me.	R	.23	-.08	.49
22. I believe I can persist in maintaining my close relationships in a good way even in very difficult circumstances.	R	-.02	.22	.43
18. I believe I can determine my priorities in a way that will not destroy my relationships with those who are closest to me.	R	.10	.24	.32
Eigenvalues		10.02	3.13	1.67
Variances explained		34.03	9.49	4.28

Note. C = Proposed Collective Item of Self Efficacy Scale, I = Proposed Individual Item of Self Efficacy Scale, R = Proposed Relational Item of Self Efficacy Scale.

Table 3

Oblimin Rotated Factor Loadings of the Ranked RIC Scale

		Factor			
		1	2	3	4
5.b. The thing I care about most is my relationship with my family	F	.89	-.06	-.12	.00
2.c. What makes me most content is doing something for my family	F	.83	-.08	-.09	.04
9.d. The most important thing in life is being in good relationships with my family.	F	.80	-.01	.02	-.09
3.a. The way to be a honorable person is being devoted to my family	F	.72	.07	-.01	-.02
8.b. I would teach my children to be loyal to their family	F	.67	.06	.03	.05
10.b. When I have to make an important personal decision I talk to my mother, father and siblings	F	.59	.02	-.05	.01
1.b. What makes me proud of is the fact that one of the family members was praised in the newspaper due to something s/he has done	F	.54	.01	.18	-.02
7.c. I regard myself as a good child or parent	F	.50	.09	.09	.01
5.d. The thing I care about most is my relationship with myself	I	-.08	.72	-.01	.03
2.d. What makes me most content is doing something for myself	I	-.01	.60	.03	-.15
10.c. When I have to make an important personal decision I ask myself what I really want to do most	I	.03	.57	-.19	.04
3.d. The way to be a honorable person is being honest towards myself	I	.04	.57	-.02	.19
9.b. The most important thing in life is being consistent and honest towards myself.	I	.09	.56	-.12	.06
8.c. I would teach my children to get to know themselves and improve themselves	I	-.08	.49	.07	-.05
4.a. When I attend a concert/ theater/cinema, I have a good time if I like the event	I	.15	.43	-.00	-.22
7.b. I regard myself as an individual who knows of her/his wishes	I	.10	.40	-.05	-.02
1.c. What makes me proud of is the fact that I was praised in the newspaper due to the something I have done	I	.07	.31	.21	-.18
6.a. To define a person as a good employer of a company, that person should feel personal responsibility for the task assigned	I	-.03	.31	.08	.03
5.a. The thing I care about most is my relationship with the person whom I care very much	R	-.02	-.07	.68	-.01
2.b. What makes me most content is doing something for the people whom I care about	R	-.07	-.02	.67	.02
10.a. When I have to make an important personal decision I talk with my partner or my best friend	R	.03	-.11	.52	-.04

Table 3 (continued)

		Factor			
		1	2	3	4
9.c. The most important thing in life is being in good relationships with the people whom I care about	R	.12	-.04	.52	.01
7.a. I regard myself as a good spouse and friend	R	-.03	.15	.52	-.06
8.d. I would teach my children to care about their friends and be sensitive to them.	R	-.05	.04	.43	.16
3.b. The way to be a honorable person is being devoted to the people with whom I have close relationship	R	.20	.12	.27	.09
1.a. What makes me proud of is the fact that my best friend was praised in the newspaper due to something s/he has done.	R	.06	.03	.23	.17
6.b. To define a person as a good employer of a company, that person should get on well with his colleagues and be in cooperation with them.	R	.16	-.00	.17	.10
4.b. When I attend a concert/ theater/cinema, I enjoy it if my company(partner, friend, guest) also enjoys the event	R	.06	-.12	.15	.09
5.c. The thing I care about most is my relationship with my group	C	-.10	-.07	-.03	.82
2.a. What makes me most content is doing something for my group	C	-.13	-.02	.08	.79
9.a. The most important thing in life is working for the benefits of the group which I belong to (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhoods, neighbors etc.)	C	.11	.00	-.11	.74
3.c. The way to be a honorable person is being loyal to the groups which I belong to	C	.02	.01	-.02	.71
1.d. What makes me proud of is the fact that my group was praised in the newspaper due to something they have done	C	-.13	-.02	-.01	.66
8.a. I would teach my children to be loyal to the group which they belong to	C	.17	.06	-.02	.62
7.d. I regard myself as a good member of my group	C	.05	.04	.09	.57
4.c. When I attend a concert/ theater/cinema, being there with my group is enough to feel good even if I don't like the event much	C	-.01	-.09	.08	.47
10.d. When I have to make an important personal decision I talk to my relatives	C	.07	.05	.03	.28
6.c. To define a person as a good employer of a company, that person should work for the benefits of the company which s/he works for.	C	.24	-.02	.06	.27
Eigenvalues		6.37	4.68	2.49	2.39
Variances explained		15.35	10.82	4.91	4.79

Note. C = Proposed Collective Item of Ranked RIC Scale, F = Proposed Family Item of Ranked RIC Scale, I = Proposed Individual Item of Ranked RIC Scale, R = Proposed Relational Item of Ranked RIC Scale.

In the self enhancement measure, three external choices (external others, task difficulty and destiny/luck) were provided for external attributions. In terms of hypotheses, there is no difference among these three attributional causes. As a result, the maximum score of these three causes were recoded as “general external” in the analyses. Ability attributions were analyzed as “internal/stable” attributions and effort attributions were analyzed as “internal/unstable” attributions.

Results Concerning the Hypotheses

All of the analyses were non-parametric due to two basic reasons. First of all, the self-construal scale was re-evaluated by participants based on the most and the least representative items in each set of 10 statements. Hence, the scale was converted into a kind of ranking scale. Secondly, each causal attribution in the self-enhancement measure was assessed by a single statement that was responded on a 7-point scale that indicated degree of agreement. This means that it is actually a subjective and unquantifiable method of measurement. Since the available range for answers were very limited, and the scale is not actually an interval scale, assumptions of normal distribution may be at risk. As a result, non-parametric tests were used. The inter-correlations among all the variables calculated in terms of Spearman's rho are presented in Table 4.

The Relationship between Self-Construals and Self-Efficacy

Hypothesis I predicted that self-efficacy will be higher in self-relevant areas. More specifically, individual, collective, relational self-efficacies was expected to be higher for individuals who were high in individual, collective, relational self-aspects, respectively, compared to those who were low in individual, collective, relational self-aspects, respectively.

In order to test this hypothesis, first, the relationship between self-construals and self-efficacy was examined by Spearman's rho correlations. As seen in Table 4, except for the relationship between relational self aspect and individual self-efficacy, all self efficacies were positively correlated with all self-aspects. Secondly, the participants were divided into three groups as low, medium, and high in terms of his/her collective, individual, and relational self-aspect scores. Those who were in

Table 4

Inter-correlations among all test variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. SEF_collective	-											
2. SEF_individual	.67 **	-										
3. SEF_relational	.71 **	.58 **	-									
4. RIC_collective	.43 **	.23 **	.23 **	-								
5. RIC_family	.26 **	.15 **	.27 **	.32 **	-							
6. RIC_individual	.14 *	.19 **	.13 *	-.21 **	.09	-						
7. RIC_relational	.15 **	.07	.28 **	.30 **	.22 **	-.07	-					
8. CS_effort	.14 *	.19 **	.18 **	.11	.11	.10	-.02	-				
9. CS_ability	.30 **	.31 **	.34 **	.13 *	.18 **	.15 *	.05	.40 **	-			
10. CS_external	-.12	-.16 **	-.11	-.01	-.04	-.12	.01	.00	.03	-		
11. CF_effort	.04	-.05	-.02	.03	-.07	-.09	-.08	.18 **	-.05	.05	-	
12. CF_ability	-.16 **	-.14 *	-.17 **	-.11	-.13 *	-.19 **	-.10	.01	-.22 **	.17 **	.47 **	-
13. CF_external	-.12 *	-.07	-.11	-.11	-.08	.01	.02	.05	.03	.17 **	-.04	.02
14. IS_effort	-.06	-.03	.01	-.06	-.08	.14 *	.08	.18 **	.17 **	.12 *	.08	-.05
15. IS_ability	.13 *	.28 **	.20 **	-.07	.10	.20 **	.08	.13 *	.35 **	-.04	-.13 *	-.21 **
16. IS_external	-.09	-.16 **	-.13 *	-.03	.06	-.14 *	.05	.07	-.12 *	.23 **	.07	.29 **
17. IF_effort	-.09	-.12 **	-.10	-.02	-.15 **	-.15 *	-.07	-.05	-.06	.23 **	.35 **	.25 **
18. IF_ability	-.19 **	-.17 **	-.19 **	-.05	-.14 *	-.25 **	-.11	-.08	-.11	.21 **	.25 **	.48 **
19. IF_external	-.02	-.04	-.07	-.05	-.04	.02	-.00	.08	.06	.19 **	-.02	.04
20. RS_effort	.06	.08	.12 *	.09	.08	.06	.01	.28 **	.12 *	.11	.20 **	-.04
21. RS_ability	.24 **	.28 **	.31 **	.07	.10	.17 **	.14 *	.17 **	.35 **	.00	.02	-.17 **
22. RS_external	-.00	-.05	-.12 *	.03	.04	-.04	-.07	-.02	-.05	.37 **	.11	.16 **
23. RF_effort	-.02	-.09	-.09	.03	-.09	-.13 *	-.08	.10	.02	.16 **	.44 **	.26 **
24. RF_ability	-.11	-.16 **	-.20 **	-.06	-.14 *	-.17 **	-.14 *	-.04	-.18 **	.20 **	.33 **	.60 **
25. RF_external	-.07	-.12 *	.01	-.14 *	-.10	-.02	.07	.08	.05	.23 **	.04	.10

Note. * Spearman's Rho < .05 (2-tailed) ** Spearman's Rho < .01 (2-tailed)

Table 4

Inter-correlations among all test variables (continued)

	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1. SEF_collective													
2. SEF_individual													
3. SEF_relational													
4. RIC_collective													
5. RIC_family													
6. RIC_individual													
7. RIC_relational													
8. CS_effort													
9. CS_ability													
10. CS_external													
11. CF_effort													
12. CF_ability													
13. CF_external	-												
14. IS_effort	.19 **	-											
15. IS_ability	.22 **	.41 **	-										
16. IS_external	.20 **	-.018	-.04	-									
17. IF_effort	.10	.23 **	-.02	.06	-								
18. IF_ability	.02	-.04	.19 **	.16 **	.52 **	-							
19. IF_external	.47 **	.08	.10	.35 **	-.01	.06	-						
20. RS_effort	.16 **	.38 **	.19 **	.07	.16 **	-.03	.11	-					
21. RS_ability	.03	.22 **	.34 **	-.07	-.09	-.13 *	.05	.42 **	-				
22. RS_external	.18 **	-.05	-.05	.37 **	.15 *	.14 *	.23 **	.02	-.08	-			
23. RF_effort	-.00	.11	-.07	.14 *	.46 **	.28 **	.06	.17 **	-.09	.19 **	-		
24. RF_ability	.01	-.14 *	-.25 **	.25 **	.31 **	.44 **	.14 *	.03	-.28 **	.20 **	.42 **	-	
25. RF_external	.48 **	.20 **	.14 *	.27 **	.15 **	.06	.44 **	.22 **	.14 *	.22 **	.04	.12 *	-

Note. * Spearman's Rho < .05 (2-tailed) ** Spearman's Rho < .01 (2-tailed)

the upper quartile were recoded as the “high” group, and those who were in the bottom quartile were recoded as the “low” group. For the collective self-aspect category the cut-off points for the low (bottom quartile) and the high (top/upper quartile) groups were 3.50 and 5.13, respectively. For the individual self-aspect category the cut-off points for the low and the high groups were 6.71 and 7.57, respectively. For the relational self-aspect category the cut-off points for the low and the high groups were 6.00 and 6.83, respectively. A Mann-Whitney U test was used to analyze the predictions of the hypothesis that self efficacy varies depending on the self-construal. This test assesses whether there is a statistically significant difference between the ranks of self-efficacy in high and low conditions of self-aspect when there are different participants in each condition. As seen in Table 5, all self-efficacies were higher for those who were high in individual, collective, and relational self aspects. In other words, irrespective of their construals, self-efficacy in all 3 domains was higher for those who were higher in each one of the self aspects compared to those who were low in that aspect.

Table 5

Comparisons of self-construals and self-efficacy

	SEF col*	Sig. (2-tailed)	SEF ind*	Sig. (2-tailed)	SEF rel*	Sig. (2-tailed)
RIC_Collective	46.05	.00	20.98	.00	26.34	.00
RIC_Individual	27.86	.00	24.50	.00	17.17	.01
RIC_Relational	25.34	.00	19.37	.03	38.40	.00

* Test method: Mann-Whitney U (Mean Rank Differences in self-efficacies were given in the table as the difference between the ranks of people who were high and low in relevant self aspects. Positive scores indicated that the self-efficacy ranks of people who were high on the specific self-aspect were higher than those who were low on that self-aspect.)

Thirdly, even though self efficacy was found not to be related to self-relevant domains, it is possible that a specific type of self efficacy would be the highest in the self-relevant domain. More specifically, collective self-efficacy would be the highest type of self-efficacy for those who were high in collective self

construal. In order to test this alternative, Friedman's test for repeated measures was used. Friedman's test is the non-parametric equivalent of the repeated measures ANOVA and it involves the ranks of scores instead of the scores themselves. Since post-hoc analyses are not possible in non-parametric tests, all paired comparisons were done by Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test. This test assesses whether there is a statistically significant difference between the ranks of two conditions (namely, between individual and relational self-efficacy, collective and relational self-efficacy, and collective and relational self-efficacy) when there are the same participants in both conditions. As can be seen in Table 6, there seemed to be significant differences between collective, individual and relational self efficacies of people with different self-aspects. However, the differences were not in the expected directions. Irrespective of self aspects, individual self-efficacy was the lowest self-efficacy category for all participants with the exception of those who are low in collective self-aspect, whose collective self-efficacy was as low as their individual self-efficacy. Additionally, relational self-efficacy was either the highest or as equally high as collective self-efficacy regardless of self-aspects.

In conclusion, the hypothesis was not supported in the sense that irrespective of the type of self aspect, all three self-efficacy beliefs were higher for those who were high on each self aspect. In addition, individual self-efficacy was the lowest, and either relational or relational and collective self-efficacies equally were the highest self-efficacy category.

Table 6

Comparisons of self-construals and the order of self-efficacy

	Friedman's Chi-square	SEF_col- SEF_ind ⁺	SEF_col- SEF_rel ⁺	SEF_ind- SEF_rel ⁺	Order of Self-efficacy
Total	73.64***	16,824.00**	-6,793.00**	-20,675.00**	Ind<Col<Rel
RIC_Collective_low	22.30***	732.00	-1,090.00**	-1,385.00**	Ind=Col<Rel
RIC_Collective_high	19.67***	1,638.00**	393.00	-1,342.00**	Ind<Col=Rel
RIC_Individual_low	34.36***	1,169.00**	-515.00	-1,618.00**	Ind<Col=Rel
RIC_Individual_high	22.08***	1,416.00**	-1,019.00*	-1,855.00**	Ind<Col<Rel
RIC_Relational_low	16.80***	1,281.00**	-108.00	-1,434.00**	Ind<Col=Rel
RIC_Relational_high	48.54***	2,697.00**	-1,533.00**	-3,492.00**	Ind<Col<Rel

⁺ Test method: Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. (Sum of Ranks Differences in self-efficacies in each domain were given in the table as the difference between the scores indicated above the columns. Positive scores indicated that the self-efficacy ranks of the former domain were higher than the self-efficacy ranks of the latter.)

* $p < .05$ (2-tailed)

** $p < .01$ (2-tailed)

*** $p < .001$ (2-tailed)

The Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Self-Enhancement

Hypothesis II predicted that those who are high in various types of self-efficacy would employ self-enhancement in self-relevant areas. This hypothesis has two parts: one for success situations, and the other for failure situations. The success part of this hypothesis predicted that those who are high in individual, relational, collective self-efficacy would attribute successes to internal and stable factors (ability) more than those who are low in individual, relational, collective self-efficacy, respectively, in respective problem areas. Those who are low in each domain would be expected to explain their successes with external attributions.

In order to test this hypothesis, first, the relationship between self-efficacy and self-enhancement was examined by Spearman's rho correlations. As seen in Table 4, all self efficacies were positively correlated with all ability attributions in success situations. Additionally, individual and relational self-efficacies were negatively correlated with external attributions in individual success situations and

relational self-efficacy was negatively correlated with external attributions in relational success situations.

Secondly, the participants were divided into three groups as low, medium and high in terms of his/her collective, individual, and relational self-efficacy scores. Those who were in the upper quartile were recoded as the “high” group, and those who were in the bottom quartile were recoded as the “low” group. For the collective self-efficacy category the cut-off points for the low (bottom quartile) and the high (top/upper quartile) groups were 58.00 and 82.00, respectively. For the individual self-efficacy category the cut-off points for the low and the high groups were 52.50 and 78.75, respectively. For the relational self-efficacy category the cut-off points for the low and the high groups were 60.00 and 84.00, respectively. A Mann-Whitney U test was used to analyze the predictions of the hypothesis that self-enhancement varies depending on the self-efficacy type. It assesses whether there is a statistically significant difference between the ranks of self-enhancement in high and low conditions of self-efficacy when there are different participants in each condition. As seen in Table 7, except for collective self-efficacy and ability attributions in individual success situations, all ability attributions were higher for those who were high in individual, collective, and relational self efficacy. In other words, irrespective of their efficacy types, ability attributions for all 3 problem domains were higher for those who were higher in each of the self efficacy types compared to those who were lower in that efficacy type, except for the ability attributions in individual success situations of collective self-efficacy people. Additionally, all effort attributions for the collective problem domain were higher for those who were high in each self-efficacy type. There was also a trend in making external attributions. While high and low individuals in collective self-efficacy did

not differ with regard to their external attributions, individuals who were lower in individual self-efficacy explained their successes in individual and collective problem domains more with external attributions compared to those who were higher in individual and relational self-efficacies. Those who were lower in relational self-efficacy explained their successes in relational and individual problem domains more with external attributions than those who were higher in relational self-efficacy.

Table 7

The relationships between self-efficacy and attributions in success situations

	Mean Rank Differences in Self-enhancement (High SEF_col-Low SEF_col) ⁺	Mean Rank Differences in Self-enhancement (High SEF_ind-Low SEF_ind) ⁺	Mean Rank Differences in Self-enhancement (High SEF_rel-Low SEF_rel) ⁺
CS-effort	15.13*	17.02**	20.52**
CS-ability	34.81***	27.02***	37.05***
CS-external	-11.34	-21.00***	-12.68
IS-effort	-5.65	-2.24	1.38
IS-ability	11.48	27.60***	20.24**
IS-external	-9.81	-17.48**	-16.21*
RS-effort	6.85	9.64	13.16
RS-ability	24.67***	31.00***	35.00***
RS-external	-4.29	-10.48	-14.89*

⁺ Test method: Mann-Whitney U (Mean Rank Differences in self-enhancement categories were given in the table as the difference between high and low self efficacious people. Positive scores indicated that the self-enhancement ranks of people who were high on the specific self-efficacy domain was higher than those who were low on that domain.)

* p < .05 (2-tailed)

** p < .01 (2-tailed)

***p < .001 (2-tailed)

Thirdly, even though self enhancement was not related to self-efficacy domains, it is possible that a specific type of self enhancement would be the highest in the specific self-efficacy domains. More specifically, ability attributions for collective success situations compared to individual and relational success situations would be the highest for those who were high in collective self efficacy; external attributions in collective success situations compared to individual and relational success situations would be the highest for those who were low in collective self efficacy. (The same should also be true for individual and relational self efficacies).

In order to test this alternative, Friedman's test for repeated measures was used. As can be seen in Table 8, there were several significant differences among attributions in collective, individual, and relational success situations of people with different self-efficacy types and levels. However, for ability explanations, no significant differences were obtained among problem domains for those who were high in collective and relational self-efficacies. Ability explanations of individuals with high individual self-efficacy levels in individual success situations were higher than their ability attributions in collective success situations. Irrespective of the efficacy types and levels, effort explanations in individual success situations was the highest, and except for those who were low in relational self-efficacy, no significant difference was obtained between effort explanations for relational and collective success situations. Additionally, external explanations for collective success situations were the highest for all self-efficacy types and levels with the exception of those with high individual self-efficacy. External explanations for individual success situations were the lowest for those who were high in any type of self-efficacy. In short, even though there are significant differences among attributions for collective, individual, and relational success situations of people with different self-efficacy types and levels, these differences were not in the expected direction in the sense that they were not specific to each self-efficacy domain.

In summary, individuals who were high, compared to those who were low in any type of self-efficacy explained their successes mostly with ability attributions. Additionally, individuals who were low in individual and relational self-efficacies explained their successes with external attributions. In summary, the success part of Hypothesis II was supported partially in the sense that attribution styles of people

who were high and low in each self-efficacy domain were in the expected direction, but these attribution styles were not specific to each self-efficacy domain.

Table 8

Comparisons of attributions for problem domains for high and low self-efficacy types in success situations

<u>Ability Comparisons</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	RS_ability - CS_ability ⁺	IS_ability - CS_ability ⁺	RS_ability - IS_ability ⁺	Order of problem domains
Total	25.46***	2,527.00	6,104.00**	-4,133.00**	Col=Rel<Ind
SEF_Col_low	16.54***	227.00	935.00**	-646.00**	Col=Rel<Ind
SEF_Col_high	4.08	-23.00	181.00	-162.00	No difference
SEF_Ind_low	5.69	47.00	355.00	-404.00	No difference
SEF_Ind_high	10.84***	242.00	515.00**	-262.00	Col<Ind
SEF_Rel_low	10.57**	67.00	653.00**	-613.00**	Col=Rel<Ind
SEF_Rel_high	5.16	186.00	265.00	-42.00	No difference
<u>Effort Comparisons</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	RS_effort - CS_effort ⁺	IS_effort - CS_effort ⁺	RS_effort - IS_effort ⁺	Order of problem domains
Total	107.10***	3,464.00*	13,371.00***	-11,281.00***	Col<Rel<Ind
SEF_Col_low	35.51***	231.00	1,005.00***	-795.00***	Col=Rel<Ind
SEF_Col_high	8.77**	-15.00	427.00**	-531.00**	Col=Rel<Ind
SEF_Ind_low	33.24***	242.00	1,004.00**	-737.00**	Col=Rel<Ind
SEF_Ind_high	14.64***	19.00	546.00***	-644.00***	Col=Rel<Ind
SEF_Rel_low	44.34***	407.00*	1,219.00***	-903.00***	Col<Rel<Ind
SEF_Rel_high	25.17***	253.00	934.00***	-900.00***	Col=Rel<Ind
<u>External Comparisons</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	RS_external - CS_external ⁺	IS_external - CS_external ⁺	RS_external - IS_external ⁺	Order of problem domains
Total	54.44***	-7,335.00***	-12,542.00***	6,194.00***	Ind<Rel<Col
SEF_Col_low	16.51***	-594.00***	-996.00***	317.00	Ind=Rel<Col
SEF_Col_high	6.17*	-308.00	-584.00***	348.00	Ind<Col
SEF_Ind_low	21.85***	-830.00***	-981.00***	170.00	Ind=Rel<Col
SEF_Ind_high	6.57*	-224.00	-730.00***	543.00*	Ind<Rel=Col
SEF_Rel_low	13.67**	-383.00*	-900.00***	435.00*	Ind<Rel<Col
SEF_Rel_high	8.90**	-492.00	-781.00***	358.00	Ind<Col

⁺ Test method: Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. (Sum of Ranks Differences in self-enhancement categories were given in the table as the difference between the scores indicated above the columns. Positive scores indicated that the self-enhancement ranks of former attribution style were higher than that of the latter.)

* p < .05 (2tailed)

** p < .01 (2-tailed)

*** p < .001 (2-tailed)

Total alpha > .05 (computed by Bon Ferroni procedure)

The second part of Hypothesis II predicted that those who are high in individual, relational, collective self-efficacy would attribute failures to either internal and unstable factors (lack of effort) or external factors (external others, task difficulty, or destiny/luck) more than those who are low in individual, relational, collective self-efficacy, respectively, respective problem areas. Those who were low in each domain would be expected to explain their failures with lack of ability.

In order to test this hypothesis, first, the relationship between self-efficacy and self-enhancement was examined by Spearman's rho correlations. As seen in Table 4, only collective self-efficacy with external attributions and individual self-efficacy with effort attribution were correlated, but not in the expected direction in failure situations. Ability attributions in all failure situations were negatively correlated with any self-efficacy type other than the one between relational failure situations and collective self-efficacy.

Secondly, the participants were divided into three groups as low, medium and high as described in success situations. A Mann-Whitney U test was used to analyze the predictions of the hypothesis that self enhancement varies depending on the self-efficacy type. As seen in Table 9, collective self efficacy and external attributions in collective failure situations were related, but in the unexpected direction. In other words, it was expected that those who were higher in collective self-efficacy would make external attributions in failure situations, but it was the low self-efficacy people who would do external attributions. Additionally, those who were low in collective self-efficacy explained their failures in collective and individual domains with ability attributions compared to those who were higher in collective self-efficacy. Participants who were low in individual self-efficacy explained their failures in individual and relational domains with ability attributions

more than those who were higher in individual self-efficacy. Those who were lower in relational self-efficacy explained their failures in collective, individual and relational domains with ability attributions more than those who were higher in relational self-efficacy. In summary, the expected relationship between self-efficacy and enhancement was partially supported for low self-efficacy people in each domain in that they were using lack of ability explanations in other problem areas also.

Table 9

The relationship between self-efficacy and attributions in failure situations

	Mean Rank Differences in Self-enhancement (High SEF_col-Low SEF_col) ⁺	Mean Rank Differences in Self-enhancement (High SEF_ind-Low SEF_ind) ⁺	Mean Rank Differences in Self-enhancement (High SEF_rel-Low SEF_rel) ⁺
CF-effort	3.36	-3.92	-2.77
CF-ability	-16.95**	-10.56	-19.85**
CF-external	-15.77*	-6.94	-14.77*
IF-effort	-9.91	-13.06	-7.64
IF-ability	-19.99**	-16.48*	-20.15**
IF-external	-3.27	-3.64	-14.17*
RF-effort	-2.07	-6.84	-8.40
RF-ability	-10.71	-17.10**	-21.64**
RF-external	-5.61	-13.18	1.30

⁺ Test method: Mann-Whitney U (Mean Rank Differences in self-enhancement categories were given in the table as the difference between high and low self efficacious people. Positive scores indicated that the self-enhancement ranks of people who were high on the specific self-efficacy domain were higher than those who were low on that domain.)

* p < .05 (2-tailed)

** p < .01 (2-tailed)

Thirdly, even though self enhancement was not specific to self-efficacy domains, it is possible that a specific type of self enhancement would be the highest in the specific self-efficacy domain. More specifically, effort and external attributions in collective failure situations compared to individual and relational failure situations would be the highest for those who were high in collective self efficacy; ability attributions in collective failure situations compared to individual and relational failure situations would be the highest for those who are low in collective self efficacy. (The same should also be true for individual and relational

self-efficacies). In order to test this alternative, Friedman's test for repeated measures was used. As can be seen in Table 10, regardless of the type and level of self-efficacy, there was no significant difference among the ability and external attributions for individual, relational, collective problem areas. Additionally, even though there were some significant relationships in effort attributions, these differences were not in the expected direction in the sense that they were not relevant to self-efficacy domains.

In summary, individuals who were low compared to those who were high in any type of self-efficacy attributed failures mostly to ability. Additionally, there was no difference in the attributional styles of people who were high in any type of self-efficacy. As a result, the failure part of Hypothesis II was supported partially in the sense that people who were low in each self-efficacy domain mostly made ability attributions, but these explanation styles were not specific to the each self-efficacy domain and did not hold for those who were high in any type of self-efficacy.

Table 10

Comparisons of attributions for problem domains for high and low self-efficacy types in failure situations

<u>Ability Comparisons</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	IF Ability - CF Ability ⁺	RF Ability - IF Ability ⁺	RF Ability - CF Ability ⁺	Order of problem domains
Total	9.67**	3,997.00**	-648.00	3,028.00**	Col<Rel=Ind
SEF_Col_low	2.16	279.00	-31.00	168.00	No diff.
SEF_Col_high	3.28	71.00	248.00	351.00	No diff.
SEF_Ind_low	3.93	319.00	-38.00	208.00	No diff.
SEF_Ind_high	0.5	70.00	-77.00	68.00	No diff.
SEF_Rel_low	2.85	290.00	47.00	286.00	No diff.
SEF_Rel_high	1.81	191.00	-45.00	222.00	No diff.
<u>Effort Comparisons</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	IF Effort - CF Effort ⁺	RF Effort - IF Effort ⁺	RF Effort - CF Effort ⁺	Order of problem domains
Total	36.68***	7,701.00**	-4,495.00**	3,328.00**	Col<Rel<Ind
SEF_Col_low	10.54**	675.00**	-221.00	435.00*	Col<Rel=Ind
SEF_Col_high	1.90	148.00	38.00	155.00	No diff.
SEF_Ind_low	8.16*	492.00*	-413.00*	110.00	Col=Rel<Ind
SEF_Ind_high	4.11	245.00	-186.00	10.00	No diff.
SEF_Rel_low	6.31*	556.00**	-175.00	414.00*	Col<Rel=Ind
SEF_Rel_high	8.16**	421.00*	-278.00	196.00	Col<Ind
<u>External Comparisons</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	IF External - CF External ⁺	RF External - IF External ⁺	RF External - CF External ⁺	Order of problem domains
Total	7.96*	-3,936.00**	2,189.00	-1,716.00	Ind<Col
SEF_Col_low	5.30	-412.00	93.00	-255.00	No diff.
SEF_Col_high	.20	76.00	42.00	96.00	No diff.
SEF_Ind_low	3.42	-331.00	230.00	-69.00	No diff.
SEF_Ind_high	3.29	-224.00	-25.00	-292.00	No diff.
SEF_Rel_low	4.01	-187.00	-126.00	-323.00	No diff.
SEF_Rel_high	4.78	-241.00	402.00*	116.00	No diff.

⁺ Test method: Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. (Sum of Ranks Differences in self-enhancement categories were given in the table as the difference between the scores indicated above the columns. Positive scores indicated that the self-enhancement ranks of former attribution style were higher than that of the latter.)

* p < .05 (2-tailed)

** p < .01 (2-tailed)

** p < .001 (2-tailed)

Total alpha > .05 (computed by Bon Ferroni procedure)

Other Findings

The Relationship between Attributional Styles and Self-Efficacy

The relationship between self-efficacy and self-enhancement is of special interest in this study. Even though there were differences in attributions in success and failure situations between individuals who were high and low in self-efficacy, it is not possible to conclude that low self-efficacy people do not self-enhance, or do self efface. The aim of this section is to examine the attribution styles of people with different self-efficacy levels in different domains for success and failure situations.

Participants were divided as high, medium, and low based on their self-efficacy scores, as discussed previously. Friedman's test for repeated measures was used to see whether there was a difference among ability, effort and external attributions. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was used to see the relevant pairs that caused the difference in attributions.

As can be seen in Table 11, both low and high self-efficacious people explained their failures in self enhancing ways, by attributing them either to external factors or to lack of effort. The difference between high and low self-efficacious people derives from their attributional styles in success situations. While high self efficacious people used external factors the least in their success explanations, low self efficacious people used ability attributions the least. Two inconsistencies between the theoretical expectations and the findings of this study emerged. First, ability attributions would have been expected to be rated the highest in success situations for high self-efficacious people (Försterling, 1985), however, effort were rated as high as, if not higher than ability in success situations by high self-efficacious people. Second, contrary to the expectation of lack of effort explanations

for failures (Försterling, 1985), all individuals other than those who were low in individual self-efficacy stated external explanations the most.

Table 11

Order of attributions in different self-efficacy domains

<u>Explanations for Success Situations in Collective Domain</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Collective	7.27	-3,249.00	3,202.00	-80.00	No diff.
SEF_Col_low	23.66***	-650.00***	1,050.00***	291.00	Ab<Ef=Ex
SEF_Col_high	8.59**	-3.00	-559.00**	-553.00*	Ex<Ab=Ef
<u>Explanations for Success Situations in Individual Domain</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Individual	185.74***	-11,731.00***	-13,658.00***	-22,774.00***	Ex<Ab<Ef
SEF_Ind_low	40.21***	-1,078.00***	105.00	-1,068.00***	Ab=Ex<Ef
SEF_Ind_high	58.90***	-395.00**	-1,421.00***	-1,616.00***	Ex<Ab<Ef
<u>Explanations for Success Situations in Relational Domain</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Relational	16.94***	-4,449.00***	-4,045.00*	-7,699.00***	Ex<Ab<Ef
SEF_Rel_low	12.06***	-790.00***	656.00**	26.00	Ab<Ef=Ex
SEF_Rel_high	76.47***	132.00	-1,425.00***	-1,105.00***	Ex<Ab=Ef
<u>Explanations for Failure Situations in Collective Domain</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Collective	237.63***	-12,578.00***	30,204.00***	17,998.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
SEF_Col_low	58.90***	-442.00**	1,965.00***	1,592.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
SEF_Col_high	55.94***	-967.00***	1,757.00***	870.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
<u>Explanations for Failure Situations in Individual Domain</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Individual	175.01***	-16,269.00***	24,367.00***	5,233.00**	Ab<Ef<Ex
SEF_Ind_low	37.50***	-945.00***	1,460.00***	254.00	Ab<Ef=Ex
SEF_Ind_high	52.92***	-1,109.00***	1,912.00***	730.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
<u>Explanations for Failure Situations in Relational Domain</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Relational	181.10***	-14,099.00***	26,513.00***	11,826.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
SEF_Rel_low	24.03***	-720.00***	1,370.00***	641.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
SEF_Rel_high	69.44***	-1,144.00***	2,528.00***	1,454.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex

⁺ Test method: Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. (Sum of Ranks Differences in self-enhancement categories were given in the table as the difference between the scores indicated above the columns. Positive scores indicated that the self-enhancement ranks of former attribution style were higher than that of the latter.)

* p < .05 (2-tailed)

** p < .01 (2-tailed)

***p < .001 (2-tailed)

The Relationship between Attributional Styles and Self-Construals

The relationship between self-construals and self-enhancement is also important and requires further investigation. The aim of this section is to examine the attributional styles of individuals with different self-construals in different domains for success and failures situations.

Participants were divided as high, medium and low based on their self aspect scores, as discussed previously. Friedman's test for repeated measures was used to see whether there was a difference between ability, effort and external attributions. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was used to see the relevant pairs that were causing the difference in attributions.

As can be seen in Table 12, both individuals who were high and low in self aspects explained their failures in self enhancing ways, by attributing them mostly to external factors. While individuals who were high in the individual self aspect used external factors the least in their success explanations, individuals who were low in individual self aspect used ability attributions the least. Individuals who were high and low in relational and collective self aspects did not use any of the explanations more than the other.

Table 12

Order of attributions in different self-aspects

<u>Explanations for Success Situations in Collective Self-aspect</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Collective	7.27	-3,249.00**	3,202.00	-80.00	Ab<Ef
RIC_Col_low	9.32*	-273.00	694.00***	388.00*	Ab<Ef<Ex
RIC_Col_high	3.68	-293.00	276.00	-49.00	No diff.
<u>Explanations for Success Situations in Individual Self-aspect</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Individual	185.74***	11,731.00***	-13,658.00***	-22,774.00***	Ex<Ab<Ef
RIC_Ind_low	24.93***	-824.00***	29.00	-667.00***	Ab=Ex<Ef
RIC_Ind_high	68.23***	-735.00***	-1,863.00***	-2,577.00***	Ex<Ab<Ef
<u>Explanations for Success Situations in Relational Self-aspect</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Relational	16.94***	-4,449.00***	-4,045.00*	-7,699.00***	Ex<Ab<Ef
RIC_Rel_low	3.61	-481.00*	191.00	-248.00	No diff.
RIC_Rel_high	8.02	47.00	-1,133.00	-913.00	No diff.
<u>Explanations for Failure Situations in Collective Self-aspect</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Collective	237.63***	12,578.00***	30,204.00***	17,998.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
RIC_Col_low	61.42***	-785.00***	2,342.00***	1,488.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
RIC_Col_high	59.81***	-937.00***	1,706.00***	875.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
<u>Explanations for Failure Situations in Individual Self-aspect</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Individual	175.01***	16,269.00***	24,367.00***	5,233.00**	Ab<Ef<Ex
RIC_Ind_low	31.52***	-912.00***	1,078.00***	-41.00	Ab<Ex=Ef
RIC_Ind_high	62.05***	-1,286.00***	2,599.00***	896.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
<u>Explanations for Failure Situations in Relational Self-aspect</u>					
	Friedman's Chi-square	Ability - Effort ⁺	General External - Ability ⁺	General External - Effort ⁺	Order
Total Relational	181.10***	14,099.00***	26,513.00***	11,826.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex
RIC_Rel_low	36.36***	-1,052.00***	1,867.00***	585.00**	Ab<Ef<Ex
RIC_Rel_high	84.67***	-1,736.00***	3,475.00***	1,920.00***	Ab<Ef<Ex

⁺ Test method: Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. (Sum of Ranks Differences in self-enhancement categories were given in the table as the difference between the scores indicated above the columns. Positive scores indicated that the self-enhancement ranks of former attribution style were higher than that of the latter.)

* p < .05 (2-tailed)

** p < .01 (2-tailed)

***p < .001 (2-tailed)

Discussion

The major aim of this study was to examine self-efficacy in relation to self-construals and causal attributions. The first aim was to show the effect of self-construals on different self-efficacy domains. The findings indicated that irrespective of the type of self-construal; all three self-efficacy beliefs were higher for those who were high on each type of self aspect. It was also found that individual self-efficacy was the lowest, and relational and collective self-efficacies were the highest. The second aim of this study was to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and self-enhancement in self relevant domains. Participants who were high in various types of self-efficacy were expected to employ self-enhancement in self-relevant problem situations. Since self-enhancing attributional styles were different for success and failure situations, this prediction had two parts. Success part was partially supported in the sense that attributional styles of people who were high and low in each self-efficacy domain were in the expected direction, but these attributional styles were not specific to the self-efficacy domain. Failure part also received partial support because those who were low in each self-efficacy domain attributed their failures mostly to ability, however, these explanations were not specific to the problem areas that were relevant to the self-efficacy type. Additional findings pointed out that for all self-aspects and self-efficacy types, self-enhancing attributions were made for failure. For success, while all types of high self-efficacious individuals were self-enhancing, low self-efficacious individuals were self-effacing. However, only individuals with high individual self-aspect enhanced in success situations.

The present study is the first that investigated the relationships among self-efficacy, self-construals and self-enhancement in self relevant domains. While some

of the predictions were supported, several alternative explanations can be put forth for the lack of predicted relationships among the constructs, which relate to a) the reason(s) for obtaining non-exclusive relationships between self-efficacy types and self-aspects, and efficacy types and attributional styles in individual, relational, collective problem areas, b) unexpected causal explanations in success and failure situations, and c) methodological issues.

Non-Exclusive Relationships

The core prediction of this study was that self would have an effect on efficacy types and, via its effect on causal explanations, on self-enhancement strategies. The findings indicated that each self-efficacy type was higher for those who were higher in any of the self-aspect. Irrespective of the type of self-aspect, individuals who were higher compared to those who were lower in any type of self-efficacy explained their successes mostly with ability attributions. Additionally, individuals who were low in individual and relational self-efficacies explained their successes away with external attributions. In summary, success attributions of people who were high and low in each self-efficacy domain were in the expected direction, but these attribution styles were not specific to the self-efficacy type. Failure attributions of people who were low in each self-efficacy domain was in the expected direction, but these attribution styles were not specific to the self-efficacy type and did not hold for those who were high in each type of self-efficacy.

These results pointed out to non-exclusive relationships among the variables. This might be due to several factors. First, it might concern the generalizability of self-efficacy beliefs. Although self-efficacy beliefs are related to the perceived beliefs of performing a specific task at a specific level, adaptive functioning requires the transfer of efficacy beliefs across activities or settings

(Bandura, 1977a, 1986, 1997). If this is the case, self-efficacy domains have to be related to each other. The findings of the present study showed that self-efficacy beliefs were correlated positively with each other. In other words, individuals who were high in one self-efficacy type were also high in other self-efficacy types.

This transfer of mastery experiences, however, is not just the articulation of arbitrary self-beliefs, but involves different processes that can produce some generality in personal efficacy (Bandura, 1997). These processes through which self-efficacy is expected to be generalized to other domains are a) common use of similar sub-skills in different classes of activities, b) co-development of skills in dissimilar domains that are acquired together because of socially structured competencies, c) self-regulatory skills that enable individuals' selecting and orchestrating their sub-skills to improve their performance in a variety of activities, d) mastery oriented treatments, feedbacks, orientations to enable individuals to exercise control over diverse threats, e) highlighting commonalities to structure cognitive models accordingly, and f) powerful mastery experiences indicating one's capacity to effect personal changes (Bandura, 1997). Some factors varying from self-esteem (e.g., Davis et al., 2000; Seery, Blascovich, Weisbuch, & Vick, 2004; Tice, 1991), to anxiety (Alden, 1987; Eysenck, 1978, as cited in Hurst, 1994; Luszczynska, Gutierrez-Dona, Schwarzer, 2005; Pyszczynski, Greenberg, Solomon, Arndt, & Schimel, 2004), locus of control (Johnson, Stone, Altmaier, & Berdahl, 1998), self-regulation (Crocker & Park, 2004), having means-ends relationships (Skinner, 1996), secure attachment (Crocker & Nuer, 2004), self-threat (Campbell & Sedikides, 1999), depression (Luszczynska et al., 2005) may influence the need for and the interpretation of mastery experiences directly, in addition to their possible effects on the generalization mechanisms of self-efficacy. Three of these factors require further

elaboration because of their well-established effects on self-efficacy and/or causal explanations (e.g. Appelbaum & Hare, 1996; Bandura, 1997; Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

One such factor is self-esteem which can be defined as an individual's evaluation of her/his self-worth across a wide variety of situations (AbuSabha & Achterberg, 1997; Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Luszczynska et al., 2005) and has significant relations with general self-efficacy (Campbell & Fairey, 1985; Davis et al., 2000; Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2002). Positive self-esteem is associated with beneficial outcomes like better adjustments, perception of control, motivation to succeed, and academic achievements (Crocker & Park, 2004; Crocker, Sommers, Luhtanen, 2002; Mann, Hosman, Schaalma, & deVries, 2004; Taylor & Brown, 1998) which may cause an increase in enactive mastery experiences in various domains, thus leading to a more generalized self-efficacy. The level and stability of self-esteem is also associated with the approaches to outcomes (Seery et al., 2004), general self-efficacy (Davis et al., 2000; Judge et al., 2002; Luszczynska et al., 2005), and differences in self-enhancing strategies (Davis et al., 2000; Hirschy, 1999; Tennen & Herzberger, 1987; Tice, 1991). Positive self-esteem can increase the possibility of various enactive mastery experiences in various domains; it can interact with the mechanisms necessary for efficacy beliefs to be generalized and can also create tendencies for certain attributional styles over others, and hence, be a reason for self-unspecific, non-exclusive results among the variables of interest in the study.

Another such factor may be perceived locus of control (Appelbaum & Hare, 1996; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Individuals with internal locus of control (LOC) feel that they are in control of their environment, can produce the outcomes they desire, and can take more responsibility for their actions compared to those with external

LOC (Gist, 1987; Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Luzzo & Funk, 1996; Schmitz & Skinner, 1993). Given the significant correlations between self-efficacy and LOC (Johnson et al., 1998; Judge et al., 2002), internal LOC can affect self-efficacy either directly because people would take more responsibility for their actions and would engage in various activities more easily (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Luzzo & Funk, 1996; Martocchio & Dulebohn, 1994), or indirectly because people with internal LOC would need less enactive mastery experiences to develop a strong sense of efficacy (Appelbaum & Hare, 1996; Gist, 1987). Perceived LOC may have also affected attributions in this study since individuals with internal and external LOC have different attributional tendencies in explaining their behaviors (Luzzo & Funk, 1996).

Lastly, orientations of individuals may create general tendencies that can cause differences in cognitive and behavioral perceptions of individuals. Whether it is causality orientations, namely, autonomy and control orientations (Deci & Ryan, 1987), or achievement orientation (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1994; Harackiewicz & Elliot, 1993), these two explanations and various others (see Austin & Vancouver, 1996, for a review) have at least one thing in common that could have an important implication for the present study: Their emphasis on the effects of goals on behavior (Deci & Ryan, 1987; Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1994; Grieve, Whelan, Kottke, & Meyers, 1994; Harackiewicz & Elliot, 1993; Mathieu et al., 1993). Once activated either directly (Bandura & Jourden, 1991; Grant & Dweck, 2003) or indirectly (Bargh, Gollwitzer, Lee-Chai, Barndollar, & Trötschel, 2001), mastery goals provide standards to individuals to compare their current or anticipated outcomes (Austin & Vancouver, 1996) and produce persistent task performance even in the face of obstacles or in the presence of more attractive alternatives (Bandura &

Cervone, 1986; Pajares & Schunk, 2001; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 1997). By increasing the number of and the possibility to succeed in mastery experiences and regulating the behavior by setting internal representations of desired outcomes (Austin & Vancouver, 1996), goals can also lead to generalized self-efficacy. Additionally, having mastery oriented goals may create certain tendencies in causal explanations, namely, effort explanations both for success and failure situations (Bandura & Jourden, 1991) that may lead to non-exclusive findings.

Attributions for Success and Failure

Theoretically, the most desirable attributional style in order to increase, or at least, to maintain self-efficacy beliefs was proposed to be internal, stable (ability) attributions in success situations, and internal, unstable (effort) attributions in failure situations (Försterling, 1985). Consistent with the theoretical claims, it was proposed that individuals who were higher compared to those lower in individual, relational, collective self-efficacy would employ self-enhancing strategies in respective problem areas (both for success and failure situations). It was also expected that individuals who were lower compared to those higher in individual, relational, collective self-efficacy would explain their successes with external or effort attributions and failures with ability attributions in respective problem areas. The success attributions received support from the data in the sense that even though self-specificity of attributions did not hold, the explanations were in the expected directions, both for individuals with low and high self-efficacy levels. However, failure attributions received support only for those individuals with lower self-efficacy. Low- and high-self-efficacious people both explained their failures in self enhancing ways, by attributing them either to external factors or to lack of effort. The difference between high and low self-efficacious people derived from their attributional styles in success

situations. While high self efficacious people used external factors the least in their success attributions, low self efficacious people used ability attributions the least.

Two inconsistencies between the theoretical expectations and the findings of this study were emerged. First, ability attributions would have been expected to be rated the highest in success situations for high self-efficacious people, however, effort explanations were rated as high, if not higher than ability explanations in success situations. Second, contrary to the expectation of lack of effort explanations, individuals stated external explanations the most as the reason for their failures.

Lastly, individuals who were high and low in each self aspect explained their failures in self enhancing ways, by attributing them either to external factors or to lack of effort. While individuals who were high in the individual self aspect used external factors the least in their success explanations, individuals who were low in individual self aspect used ability attributions the least. Individuals who were high and low in relational and collective self aspects did not use any of the explanations more than the other. Various other studies also demonstrated that effort attributions were as important as, if not more than ability attributions in success situations (Anderson, 1983; Anderson, 1999; Bandura & Jourdan, 1991; Gernigon, Fleurance, & Reine, 2000; Si et al., 1995; Weiner, 1985; Wood & Bandura, 1989b). Depending on the various factors, external attributions can also be as adaptive as effort attributions in failure situations (Campbell & Fairey, 1985; Chaplain, 2000; Nease et al., 1994; Silver et al., 1995). As a result, both the literature and the findings of the present study provide partial support for the “theoretically-ideal” model. The existence of inconsistent findings suggests that some uncontrolled moderators and/or mechanisms could have influenced the findings, namely, a) Motivations, desires, and

needs of individuals (including cognitive models/self-schemata of individuals), b) the culture/environment individuals were grown-up, and c) the life stage of individuals.

Motivations/Desires/Needs of Individuals

Some recent studies (e.g. Duval & Silvia, 2002; Kunda, 1990; Sedikides, 1993; Sedikides & Strube, 1997; etc.) have suggested that individuals do not only strive for positive self-images, but also want accurate knowledge/conclusions about themselves. This brings two sets of motives; those that are necessary to arrive at an accurate conclusion, whatever it may be (accuracy motives of Kunda, 1990, the attribution system of Duval & Silvia, 2002, or tactical self-enhancement of Sedikides & Strube, 1997) and those that are required to arrive at a particular, directional conclusion (directional motives of Kunda, 1990; the Self-to-Standard Comparison System, SSCS, of Duval & Silvia, 2002, or candid self-enhancement of Sedikides & Strube, 1997). For ease of explanation, proposed models will be explained by using Kunda's terminology, but all three models, Motivated Reasoning (Kunda, 1990), Dual Systems Theory (Duval & Silvia, 2002), and the SCENT (Self Concept ENhancing Tactician) Model (Sedikides & Strube, 1997), emphasize similar things.

Accuracy motives require more deep and careful cognitive processing, more cognitive effort on issue-relevant reasoning with different information and by complex rules (Kunda, 1990). As a result, even if it may result in some negative consequences for the short-term well-being of the individual, in the long-run, accuracy motives would lead to less cognitive biases (Kunda, 1990), accurate understanding (Duval & Silvia, 2002), and positivity of the self in the long-run (Sedikides & Strube, 1997).

On the other hand, most of the time people also have motives to reach certain goals, mostly coming from their self-schemata (Kunda, 1990). While they

are motivated to reach those goals, they also want to be rational and to construct a justification of their desired goals that would persuade a dispassionate observer. Hence, individuals search their memories for those facts that could support the desired conclusion and they would go with their desired goals even if some or most of the facts that they have found are illusory or without realizing that they could reach another set if they have different directional goals (Kunda, 1990). Use of directional motives would lead to more cognitive biases, but it is quick, less time-consuming, easy and requires less cognitive effort (Kunda, 1990), less self-standard discrepancy (Duval & Silvia, 2002), and more positive self image in the short-run (Sedikides & Strube, 1997).

If the accuracy motives are independent from directional motives (Kunda, 1990; Duval & Silvia, 2002) rather than being subordinate to them (Sedikides, 1993), there should be some conditions that endorse accuracy motives over directional motives. High self-focus (Duval & Silvia, 2002; Silvia & Duval, 2001; Silvia & Gendolla, 2001), belief in malleability of trait(s) (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Bandura, 1986; Dunning, 1995; Duval & Silvia, 2002; Hong et al., 1999; Uchida, 2004; Vrugt et al., 1997), self-relevance of traits to self-definition (Brunstein & Gollwitzer, 1996; Campbell & Fairey, 1985; Crocker & Wolfe, 2001), identifiability (Choi & Nisbett, 1998; Lee, Hallahan, & Herzog, 1996; Sedikides, Herbst, Hardin, & Dardis, 2002, Experiment 3) and deeper processing of information because of high-level identification with the task (Taylor & Gollwitzer, 1995; Freitas, Salovey, Liberman, 2001) either directly or in combination would endorse accuracy motives.

When the self is under threat (Brunstein & Gollwitzer, 1996; Campbell & Sedikides, 1999; Campbell & Fairey, 1985; Crocker & Wolfe, 2001; Follette & Jacobson, 1987; Kunda, 1987; Seery et al., 2004) and the situational factors provide

an opportunity to self-enhance (Kurman, 2001; Sedikides et al., 2003), individuals can magnify the use of directional motives. On the other hand, when the situation requires modesty (Tice et al., 1995), or the situation is not very self-threatening and it provides an opportunity for long-term improvement of the self (Heine & Lehman, 1995, 1999; Kitayama et al., 1997), individuals can magnify the use of accuracy motives.

In summary, these two systems may occasionally conflict from one individual to another, one situation to another and from time to time. For high self-efficacious individuals, these need systems should be in harmony when the self is the cause for success because they have pre-existing self-schemata of their ability to reach certain goals (Bandura, 1997; Miserandino, 1998; Nease et al., 1994). Attributing success to self can fulfill both needs since both the self-standard discrepancy could be reduced (directional motives) and s/he could get the accurate knowledge about the situation (accuracy motives). However, in case of failure, the needs of two systems should be in conflict. Since high self-efficacious people do have cognitive capabilities to gather and analyze the required and relevant information (Bandura & Wood, 1989), and they believe they have the ability to reach the goals they set for themselves (to reduce self-standard discrepancy in this case) (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Nease et al., 1994), directional motives may be subordinate to accuracy motives, leading to no self-enhancement in failure situations at the inter-individual level (when compared to those individuals who have low self-efficacy). However, at the intra-individual level, directional motives of self-standard congruency may overcome the accuracy motives, resulting with external explanations.

Since people with low self-efficacy have pre-existing self-schemata of inability to reach certain goals (Bandura, 1997; Miserandino, 1998; Nease et al., 1994) and they lack capacities/intentions to reach/gather accurate knowledge (Wood & Bandura, 1989b), their motivational systems should be in harmony in success situations when they explain their successes with external attributions since this explanation would be compatible with their directional motives. Their motivational systems should also be in harmony in failure situations and make ability attributions more than those individuals who have high self-efficacy to reach their directional motives (of less self-standard discrepancy). Since they may not have the capacity to process relevant information (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Wood & Bandura, 1989b), however, their accuracy motives may never be completely fulfilled, thus, leading to self-enhancing explanations in failure situations at the intra-individual level.

The Possible Effect of Culture

Social-cognitive theory of Bandura (1977a, b, 1986, 1989, 1997) does not process individuals in isolation. Behavior is determined by the interactions of the person, her/his environment and all cognitive and emotional processes specific to that person. Accordingly, the influence of normative culture on individuals, more specifically, what individuals bring to the experimental situation with their past experiences, socialization processes, roles, or locations in the social structure should also be taken into consideration in order to understand human behavior (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 2003; Ryff, 1987).

Turkey is defined as a collectivistic culture (Hofstede, 1980; as cited in Triandis, 1994) even though individualistic aspects prevail in highly educated upper classes in urban contexts. The culture harbors both individualistic and collectivistic tendencies (Göregenli, 1997). Collectivist cultures promote conjoint models of self

which emphasize the feelings of relatedness, self-discipline, modesty, connectedness, and sympathy (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 2003). On the other hand, individualistic cultures promote disjoint models of the self with the main emphasis on the feelings of self-esteem, independence, autonomy, achievement, competitiveness, efficacy, and power. Individualistic values, ideals, and socialization practices lead to personal characteristics that are different from the personal characteristics following socialization in collectivistic cultures (Heine & Lehman, 1999; Kitayama et al., 1997; Ryff, 1987) even though they have the same construals (Bhzwuk & Brislin, 1992; as cited in Yamada & Singelis, 1999; Brockner & Chen, 1996; Uchida, 2004). In individualistic cultures, it is easier, and even mandatory, to express one's goals, desires, intentions, and abilities in dealing with the environment (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). However, emphasizing one's ability may be harmful for harmony and relatedness with the group in collectivist cultures. In these cultural systems, the self has to adjust herself/himself continuously according to the requirements of social relationships. Thus, instead of in-born, stable characteristics, effort explanations in success situations could be more adaptive since they may not harm harmony by creating large discrepancies between group members (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) and they lead to perseverance (Bandura, 1986, 1997).

Additionally, Kağıtçıbaşı's (1996) concept of "autonomous-relational self" is a synthesis of two basic human needs of agency and relatedness and is typical in urban and educated parts of collectivistic cultures. The development of felt security in childhood and mutually caring relationships in adulthood with necessary spaces for the execution of two basic needs would lead to emotional interdependence (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996), or secure attachments as defined by Crocker & Nuer (2004), and less anxiety (Crocker & Nuer, 2004). These individuals may not require continuous

proofs of their self-worth, thus not looking for the signs of their abilities (Crocker & Nuer, 2004), but they may be in search for the signs of opportunities that might improve their relationships with the environment. These opportunities and improvements can be more easily reached through continuous effort (Bandura, 1986, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 2003). Thus, considerable effect of socialization in a collectivistic culture may bring modesty and culturally adaptive attributional styles, resulting in mostly effort explanations in success situations for people with high self-efficacy.

This cultural view may also help in explaining the findings of no enhancement in success situations of individuals with relational and collective self-aspects. Self-efficacy theory as Bandura (1977a, b, 1986, 1997) puts it, mainly concentrates on agents-means relations (Skinner, 1996). Self-efficacy and attributions for successes and failures, as measured in this study, were related with an agent who had beliefs about his/her ability to do something (either alone, or with the help and the existence of, or for the relevant others) with varying difficulty levels or were the explanations given for the actions of this agent. Without this belief, individuals could not perform the behavior even if they knew the behavior(s) to reach certain outcomes.

Individuals with high individual self aspect did self-enhance in success situations, however, those with relational and collective self-aspects did not. It may be possible that individuals with relational and collective self-aspects may self-enhance by other mechanisms or by using other explanations to reach desired outcomes or refrain from the undesired outcomes (e.g. through successful cooperation and harmony with the specific other or the group) (Heine & Lehman,

1999; Kitayama et al., 1997), the side more related with the means-ends relationships of the self.

In other words, the individual aspects of the self may still be related with the “traditional” agent definition that derives its sources of all agentic actions from the individual intentions or individual internal states such as motives or preferences (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 2003). However, relational and collective aspects of the self may be better explained with Inden’s (1990; as cited in Markus & Kitayama, 2003) agency definition that emphasizes the idea that there are likely to be different understandings of the nature and the source of actions other than individual intentions. Since both the relational and collective self-aspects may have different goals, namely, high quality relationships with significant others (see, for example, Cross & Madson, 1997) and successful membership in groups or social categories (Y. Kashima et al., 1995), respectively, the choices provided in this study may have been lacking some dimensions necessary to enhance in success situations. Additionally, modesty requirements for relational and collective aspects and supposedly more emotional interdependence and/or secure relationships might have led to less/no desire for the verification of self-worth, namely, less or no self-enhancement. This study contributes to the literature since it is the first study that shows the effect of culture on self-enhancement patterns of individuals.

The Life Stage of Individuals

In addition to cultural/social understanding, a perspective on human behavior also requires information about the connections of roles that individuals have and the way these roles are patterned by the social meanings of age (Caspi, 1987). The role of age graded standards in self-assessment should also be investigated in order to understand the attributional patterns of individuals.

Participation in increasingly diverse and complex social roles necessitates certain social and psychological transitions (Caspi, 1987; Jung et al., 2001; Lang & Heckhausen, 2001; Schulz & Heckhausen, 1996). If this approach is true, one can expect certain changes related with the change in life-stages. This study is the first study in Turkey highlighting the possible effects of life stage on attributions.

When children work at a new task (related with a skill/knowledge that they do not know at the beginning) and succeed, they become to believe that they are becoming competent in acquiring the knowledge and skills, and hence, develop a sense of efficacy for continued success (Schunk, 1983, 1984). Ability attributions for them in that stage ought to prove these self-perceptions. However, adaptive functioning requires generalization of perceived efficacy since the development and exercise of capabilities would be limited if there was no transfer of these beliefs across different activities (Bandura, 1997). Ability attributions may be more beneficial to develop highly specific self-beliefs in earlier phases of life, but a strong sense of control may be more adaptive when the organism is rapidly growing since it may provide motivation to engage in various tasks and perseverance in the case of obstacles (Schulz & Heckhausen, 1996). Having a sense of control over their malleable resources may provide an opportunity for future growth potentials for young adults (Bandura & Jourden, 1991; Bandura & Wood, 1989; Lang & Heckhausen, 2001; Silver et al., 1995, Study 2; Schulz & Heckhausen, 1996). As people become older, on the other hand, they again may benefit more from ability attributions since they lose interest/power in excellence experiences (Courneya & McAuley, 1993; Lang & Heckhausen, 2001). One possible reason for high effort attributions in success situations could be the life stage of the participants of the

present study since they were all young adults. In other words, effort attributions may be more adaptive for them at that life stage.

Methodological Issues

Finally, there are also some methodological issues that may have some effects on the findings of the present study. One such issue is related with the content of questions in the study. Even though items of the self-efficacy scale were specific to different domains (namely, individual, collective, and relational domains) and were related to the beliefs in performing specific tasks/skills that were required to complete tasks and reach certain outcomes, they were not related to “a specific task”, but to a group of tasks. This type of questioning may be more helpful in defining a range to which a belief has generalized (Bandura, 1997). It may be a possible cause for non-exclusive findings since all items in individual, collective and relational domains emphasized the belief for the execution of similar skills either by alone or with the help or for the well-being of others. The present study is the first attempting to investigate self-efficacy in culturally relevant domains. Further studies with more specific task definitions are required to see whether the insignificant results was due to the non-existence of culture-specific self-efficacy contrary to Bandura’s (1997, 2001) claims or due to the content of questions in this study.

The self-enhancement scale used in this study may also be problematic. Even though it is more adaptive to attribute failure to lack of effort instead of lack of ability, if a failure is due to uncontrollable factors, the more adaptive response could be external attributions (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Gernigon et al., 2000; Janoff-Bulman & Brickman, 1982; as cited in Miserandino, 1998). Additionally, as tasks become more difficult, a combination of ability and effort gains importance for success explanations (Wood & Bandura, 1989b) since ability attributions for difficult

tasks alone would have the cost of loss of credibility (Shell et al., 1995). Effort attribution could be as effective as, if not more than ability attributions for tasks with moderate level of difficulty (Bandura & Cervone, 1986; Bandura & Jourden, 1991; Gernigon et al., 2000; Pajares & Schunk, 2001; Wood & Bandura, 1989b). In the present study, individuals reported reasons for their successes/failures for the problems they faced recently. Participants who were high in any self-efficacy type explained their successes by their efforts and their failures with external factors. While this finding might simply be a support for the adaptiveness of effort attributions in success and external attributions in failure situations, it could also be a result of the evaluation method of this study since the word “problem” may imply something with moderate difficulty at least, and it can be something controllable as well as uncontrollable.

Additionally, participants gave explanations for their successes and failures they have faced recently. This way of questioning may cause a rounding effect especially for those individuals who have high self-efficacy since they have the ability/capacity to process different information (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Wood & Bandura, 1989b). To be more specific, they might remember number of relevant situations with different reasons, resulting insignificant results in their failure explanations at the inter-individual level. Further studies with problem specific evaluations could be of help to clarify this issue.

The attributional typology may also have some problems (Russell, 1982; Russell, McAuley, & Tarico, 1987; Silvia & Duval, 2001). The categorization of causal attributions by the researcher into causal dimensions can be risky since the participant and the researcher may not agree on the locus and stability of attributions (Russell, 1982; Russell et al., 1987), thereby invalidating the findings. Effort

explanations (choice a in each question) were put on as internal and unstable explanations and ability attributions as internal and stable attributions. As a result, within this study, effort explanations were treated as if they were internal and unstable explanations, but it may also be possible that participants, at least some of them, may perceive this choice as a more stable trait. Ability and task difficulty explanations can also be two sides of the same coin since ability of a person can define the difficulty level of a task (Silvia & Duval, 2001). The implication of this claim on the present study is that high ability attributions of individuals with high self-efficacy and high external attributions of individuals with low self-efficacy in success situations can both be accurate knowledge instead of directional motives of reducing self-standard discrepancy. In other words, this finding could just be a fact rather than being a bias of individuals. Thus, further studies with both general (as the one in this questionnaire) and specific (e.g. Russell et al., 1987) measures could help to differentiate the attributional styles better.

This study provides at least three scales (self-efficacy, self-enhancement and ranked version of RIC scale) with clear scientific reliabilities. The ranked version of RIC scale may especially provide an efficient tool due to its clear factor structure, high reliability coefficients and considerably higher explanation power over the previously used two dimensional scales. Further use and improvement of these scales are necessary to prove their reliabilities and validities in different research settings.

Another methodological problem, that is common to almost all social psychological research, is time-free but situation specific measures (Caspi, 1987). All the questions/items in the scales asked how people would change/changed their behaviors under different conditions, as well as their beliefs and explanations of their

behaviors under different conditions. Even though most of the questions (if not all) were about general situations, cognitive models that were highlighted, either due to the questioning or due to the moment-specific issues, might have had an effect on the answers (e.g., Freitas et al., 2001; Nease et al., 1994; Taylor & Gollwitzer, 1995; Tice et al., 1995). Since all of the scales were administered on the same day one after another, no or little difference was expected due to different cognitive models, but there is always a possibility of obtaining results that may have temporary psychological significance to the individual (Caspi, 1987).

The data for this study was gathered via self-administered questionnaires anonymously. A discussion about the numerous advantages of anonymity is beyond the scope of this study. However, since identifiability decreases the likelihood of self-enhancement (Choi & Nisbett, 1998; Lee et al., 1996; Sedikides et al., 2002, Experiment 3), self-enhancing attributional patterns by all individuals in failure situations regardless of efficacy and construal types and levels can also be an artifact created by the anonymous nature of questioning.

Since all participants in this study were young adults aged between 20-34 years, cohort effect may also be in place. Unexpected effort attributions in success situations could be specific to that age group, or specific to all individuals grown up in collectivistic cultures, or specific to young adults grown up in collectivistic cultures. Further studies with individuals from different age groups and life stages are required to clarify this issue.

Limitations and Future Directions

The present study is especially important because of its two findings. It is obvious that individuals with low and high self-efficacy levels have different attributional styles, both at the intra- and inter-individual levels. The attributional evenhandedness of low self-efficacy people (Tennen & Herzberger, 1987), that is explaining both successes and failures with the same reason (use of ability and lack of ability explanations as the least mentioned reason) at the intra-individual level seemed to affect them negatively. Additionally, their self-effacing patterns at the inter-individual level, that is the use of external explanations for their successes and lack of ability for their failures, could be a factor for their low levels of self-efficacy. Attributional retraining of these individuals could be of help to increase their self-efficacy (Försterling, 1985; Luzzo & Funk, 1996), thus may lead to positive changes due to the various benefits associated with high levels of self-efficacy (e.g. persistence, self-regulation, achievement, mental health, etc.).

Some theoretical models (Motivated Reasoning of Kunda, 1990, Dual Systems Theory of Duval & Silvia, 2002, and the SCENT Model of Sedikides & Strube, 1997) seem to provide sound explanations for some of the findings of this study. Further research is required to find out whether these two systems do really exist and operate as described in this study. Additionally, various mediating factors like high self-focus (Duval & Silvia, 2002; Silvia & Duval, 2001; Silvia & Gendolla, 2001), belief in malleability of trait(s) (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Bandura, 1986; Dunning, 1995; Duval & Silvia, 2002; Hong et al., 1999; Uchida, 2004; Vrugt et al., 1997), self-relevance of traits to self-definition (Brunstein & Gollwitzer, 1996; Campbell & Fairey, 1985; Crocker & Wolfe, 2001), identifiability (Choi & Nisbett, 1998; Lee et al., 1996; Sedikides et al., 2002, Experiment 3) and the like seem to

have influences on the use of the systems described in the models. Further studies should also pay attention to these factors.

The hypotheses formulated for the present study were based on the arguments of various researchers, but mainly they were shaped by the claims of Bandura (1977a, b, 1986, 1997, 2001) and they were not supported as he claimed them to be. In particular, the findings yielded a lack of variation between self-construal and self-efficacy types. Further studies with more specific task definitions are required to see whether non significant results were due to the non-existence of culture-specific self-efficacy contrary to the claims of Bandura (1997, 2001) or due to the content of questions in this study.

This study indicated possible effects of culture on attributional patterns of individuals, or their tendencies of not to self-enhance at the intra-individual level in success situations and provided two plausible explanations for this finding. Further studies by more diverse samples are required to see whether these findings are valid for individuals with different ages, SES, sociological and cultural backgrounds. Such a study would also clarify the issues about the possible cohort effect on findings.

No gender effect was found in this study. While this can be a sound fact by itself, it can also be an artifact created by the restricted sample of Boğaziçi University since the female students may not be a representative sample of the Turkish society due to the fact they are among the most successful students in Turkey, or by the cohort effect discussed previously. Studies with diverse samples can also clarify these issues.

As it was discussed in detail previously, the self-enhancement scale used in this study had several limitations. Further studies with event/problem specific

evaluations, with both general and specific measures and with well-defined definition of the coverage of the term “problem” in the questions are necessary to clarify these issues.

Conclusions

This study examined the relationships among different types of self-construals, self-efficacies, and causal attributions in relevant problem domains and it highlighted some important points. First, findings of this study shed light on some important research questions regarding the possible causes of success/ failure outcomes and their relationship with different types and levels of self-efficacy and self-aspects. Individuals made more external and effort attributions in failure situations regardless of the type and level of self-efficacy and self-aspect. More specifically, they self-enhanced in case of threat to self, indicating the possibility of a general human motive in failure situations. Additionally, even though the present study provided no support for the relationship between self-efficacy types and the use of self-enhancement strategies in relevant domains, differences in the attributional styles of high and low self-efficacious individuals points out a tool to increase self-efficacy levels. Low self-efficacious compared to high self-efficacious individuals attributed their successes mostly to external factors and their failure mostly to lack of ability. High self-efficacious individuals compared to low self-efficacious individuals made mostly ability attributions for their successes, however, used all causal attributions evenly in case of failure. It might be of help to use attributional retraining to change the attributional styles of low self-efficacious individuals in order to inc their self-efficacy.

Success explanations of individuals with different self-aspects were also important in the sense that they indicated a partial support of the differential effect of culture on behavior (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 2003). The fact that only individuals with high individual self-aspect used self-enhancing explanations in success situations and those individuals with high collective and relational self-

aspects did not, when considered in combination with the general use of self-enhancing styles in failure situations pointed out the possibility of other sources for self-enhancement and highlighted a need for more differentiated, specific measures in success situations for those with relational and collective self-aspects.

Inconsistent with the theoretical claims, effort explanations were as frequent as ability attributions in success situations and were not the most frequent in failure situations. This might possibly be a methodological artifact, however, it could also have some theoretical implications to be examined further in future studies.

References

- AbuSabha, R., & Achterberg, C. (1997). Review of self-efficacy and locus of control for nutrition- and health-related behavior. *Journal of American Dietetic Association, 10*, 1122-1132.
- Alden, L. (1987). Attributional responses of anxious individuals to different patterns of social feedback: Nothing succeeds like improvement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 100-106.
- Anderson, C. A. (1983). Motivational and performance deficits in interpersonal settings: The effect of attributional style. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 1136-1147.
- Anderson, C. A. (1999). Attributional style, depression, and loneliness: A cross-cultural comparison of American and Chinese students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 482-499.
- Appelbaum, S. H., & Hare, A. (1996). Self-efficacy as a mediator of goal setting and performance: Some human resource applications. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 11*, 33-52
- Ausems, M., Mesters, I., van Breukelen, G., & de Vries, H. (2003). Do Dutch 11- 12-year olds who never smoke, smoke experimentally or smoke regularly have different demographic backgrounds and perception of smoking. *European Journal of Public Health, 13*, 160-167.
- Austin, J. T., & Vancouver, J. B. (1996). Goal constructs in psychology: Structure, process, and content. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*, 338-375.
- Bailey, J. R., Chen, C. C., Dou, S. (1997). Conceptions of self and performance-related feedback in the U.S., Japan and China. *Journal of International Business Studies, 28*, 605-625.

- Bandura, A. (1977a). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 125-139.
- Bandura, A. (1977b). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, 44, 1175- 1184.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1-26.
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G.V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. *Child Development*, 67, 1206-1222.
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G.V., & Pastorelli, C. (2001). Self-efficacy beliefs as shapers of children's aspirations and career trajectories. *Child Development*, 72, 187-206.
- Bandura, A., & Cervone, D. (1983). Self-evaluative and self-efficacy mechanisms governing the motivational effects of goal systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 1017-1028.
- Bandura, A., & Cervone, D. (1986). Differential engagement of self-reactive influences in cognitive motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 38, 92-113.
- Bandura, A., & Jourden, F. J. (1991). Self-regulatory mechanisms governing the

- impact of social comparison on complex decision-making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 941-951.
- Bandura, A., Pastorelli, C., Barbaranelli, C., & Caprara, G.V. (1999). Self-efficacy pathways to childhood depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 258-269.
- Bandura, A., & Wood, R. (1989). Effect of perceived controllability and performance standards on self-regulation of complex decision-making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 805-814.
- Bargh, J. A., Gollwitzer, P. M., Lee-Chai, A., Barndollar, K., & Trötschel, R. (2001). The automated will: Nonconscious activation and pursuit of behavioral goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 1014-1027.
- Bong, M. (2004). Academic motivation in self-efficacy, task value, achievement goal orientations, and attributional beliefs. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97, 287-297.
- Borman, G. D., & Overman, L. T. (2004). Academic resilience in mathematics among poor and minority students. *The Elementary School Journal*, 104, 177-196.
- Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this “we”? Levels of collective identity and self representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 83-93.
- Brockner, J., & Chen, Y. (1996). The moderating roles of self-esteem and self-construal in reaction to a threat to the self: Evidence from the People’s Republic of China and the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 603-615.
- Brody, G. H., & Flor, D. L. (1997). Maternal psychological functioning, family

- processes, and child adjustment in rural, single parent, African-American families. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 1000-1011.
- Brunstein, J. C., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (1996). Effects of failure on subsequent performance: The importance of self-defining goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 395-407.
- Campbell, W. K., & Fairey, P. J. (1985). Effects of self-esteem, hypothetical explanations, and verbalization of expectancies on future performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 1097-1111.
- Campbell, W. K., & Sedikides, C. (1999). Self-threat magnifies the self-serving bias: A meta-analytic integration. *Review of General Psychology*, 3, 23-43.
- Cantor, N. (1990). From thought to behavior: "Having" and "doing" in the study of personality and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 45, 735-750.
- Caspi, A. (1987). Personality in the life course. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1203-1213.
- Cervone, D. (2000). Thinking about self-efficacy. *Behavior Modification*, 24, 30-56.
- Chandler, T. A., Shama, D. D., Wolf, F. M., & Planchard, S. K. (1981). Multiattributational causality. A five cross-national samples study. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 12, 207-221.
- Chaplain, R. P. (2000). Differences in the social and psychological perceptions of young males and females at school. *Educational Studies*, 26, 177-190.
- Chase, M. A. (2001). Children's self-efficacy, motivational intentions, and attributions in physical education & sport. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 72, 47-54.

- Choi, I., & Nisbett, R. E. (1998). Situational salience and cultural differences in the correspondence bias and actor-observer bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 949-960.
- Chung, Y. B. (2002). Career decision-making self-efficacy and career commitment: Gender and ethnic differences among college graduates. *Journal of Career Development*, 28, 277-284.
- Clark, K. E., & Ladd, G. W. (2000). Connectedness and autonomy support in parent-child relationships: links to children's socioemotional orientation and peer relationships. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 485-498.
- Courneya, K. S., & McAuley, E. (1993). Efficacy, attributional, and affective responses of older adults following an acute bout of exercise. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 8, 729-742.
- Crocker, J., & Nuer, N. (2004). Do people need self-esteem? Comment on Pyszczynski et al. (2004). *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 469-472.
- Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2004). The costly pursuit of self-esteem. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 392-414.
- Crocker, J., Sommers, S. R., & Luhtanen, R. K. (2002). Hopes dashed and dreams fulfilled: Contingencies of self-worth and admissions to graduate school. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1275-1286.
- Crocker, J., & Wolfe, C. T. (2001). Contingencies of self-worth. *Psychological Review*, 108, 593-623.
- Cross, S. E. & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122, 5-37.
- Davis, W. D., Fedor, D. B., Parsons, C. K., & Herold, D. M. (2000). The development of self-efficacy during aviation training. *Journal of*

Organizational Behavior, 21, 857-871.

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1024-1037.
- Dunning, D. (1995). Trait importance and modifiability as factors influencing self-assessment and self-enhancement motives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 1297-1306.
- Duval, T. S., & Silvia, P. J. (2002). Self-awareness, probability of improvement, and the self-serving bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 49-61.
- Earley, P. C. (1993). East meets West meets Mideast: Further explorations of collectivistic and individualistic work groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 319-348.
- Earley, P. C. (1994). Cultural effects of training on self-efficacy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 89-117.
- Eaton, M. J., & Dembo, M. H. (1997). Differences in the motivational beliefs of Asian American and Non-Asian students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 433-440.
- Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1994). Goal setting, achievement orientation, and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 968-980.
- Fasko, S. N., & Fasko Jr, D. (1998). A systems approach to self-efficacy and achievement in rural schools. *Education*, 119, 292-299.
- Feltz, D. L. (1982). Path analysis of the causal elements in Bandura's theory of self-efficacy and an anxiety-based model of avoidance behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 764-781.
- Follette, V. M., & Jacobson, N. S. (1987). Importance of attributions as a predictor of

- how people cope with failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1205-1211.
- Försterling, F. (1985). Attributional retraining: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, 495-512.
- Frayne, C. A., & Latham, C. A. (1987). Application of social-learning theory to employee self-management of attendance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 387-392.
- Freitas, A. L., Salovey, P., & Liberman, N. (2001). Abstract and concrete self-evaluative goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 410-424.
- Fry, P. S., & Ghosh, R. (1980). Attributions of success and failure. Comparison of cultural differences between Asian and Caucasian children. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 11, 343-363.
- Furstenberg, A. L., & Rounds, K. A. (1995). Self-efficacy as a target for social work intervention. *Families in Society*, 76, 587-595.
- Gattuso, S. M., Litt, M. D., & Fitzgerald, T. E. (1992). Coping with gastrointestinal endoscopy: Self-efficacy enhancement and coping style. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 60, 133-139.
- Gerçek, B. (2004). *Does self-enhancement exist in differently construed selves? A test of the current debate between the Process and the Content View. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey.*
- Gernigon, C., Fleurance, P., & Reine, B. (2000). Effects of uncontrollability and failure on the development of learned helplessness in perceptual-motor tasks. *Research Quarterly*, 71, 44-54.
- Gist, M. E. (1987). Self-efficacy: Implications for organizational behavior and human resource management. *Academy of Management. The Academy of*

Management Review, 12, 472-485.

Gist, M. E. (1989). The influence of training method on self-efficacy and idea generation among managers. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 787-805.

Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review*, 17, 183-211.

Gist, M. E., Stevens, C. K., & Bavetta, A. G. (1991). Effects of self-efficacy and post-training intervention on the acquisition and maintenance of complex interpersonal skills. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 837-861.

Göregenli, M. (1997). Individualist-collectivist tendencies in a Turkish sample. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28, 789-794.

Grant, H., & Dweck, C. S. (2003). Clarifying achievement goals and their impact. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 541-553.

Grieve, F. G., Whelan, J. P., Kottke, R., & Meyers, A. W. (1994). Manipulating adults' achievement goals in a sport task: Effects on cognitive, affective and behavioral variables. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 17, 227-238.

Harackiewicz, J. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1993). Achievement goals and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 904-915.

Haugen, R., & Lund, T. (1998). Attributional style and its relation to other personality dispositions. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, 537-549.

Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1995). Cultural variation in unrealistic optimism: Does the West feel more invulnerable than the East? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 595-607.

Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1999). Culture, self-discrepancies, and self-

- satisfaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 915-925.
- Hirschy, A. J. (1999). *Individual differences in attributional style: The mediating influence of self-efficacy, self-esteem, and sex role identity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University.
- Hong, Y., Chiu, C., Dweck, C. S., Lin, D. M. S., & Wan, W. (1999). Implicit theories, attributions, and coping: A meaning system approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 588-599.
- Hurst, J. R. (1994). *The effects of performance feedback and psychological factors on intrinsic motivation for exercise activity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.
- Johnson, B. D., Stone, G. L., Altmaier, E. M., & Berdahl, L. D. (1998). The relationship of demographic factors, locus of control and self-efficacy to successful nursing home adjustment. *The Gerontologist*, 38, 209-216.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 693-710.
- Jung, D. I., Ehrlich, S. B., De Noble, A. F., Baik, K. B. (2001). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and its relationship to entrepreneurial action: A comparative study between the US and Korea. *Management International*, 6, 41-53.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996). The autonomous-relational self: A new synthesis. *European Psychologist*, 1, 180-186.
- Karl, K. A., O'leary-Kelly, A. M., & Martocchio, J. J. (1993). The impact of feedback and self-efficacy on performance in training. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 379-394.

- Kashima, E. S., & Hardie, E. A. (2000). The development and validation of the Relational, Individual, and Collective Self-Aspects (RIC) scale. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 19-48.
- Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S. C., Gelfand, M. J., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender, and the self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 925-937.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunnit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1245-1267.
- Kunda, Z. (1987). Motivated inference: Self-serving generation and evaluation of causal theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 636-647.
- Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 480-498.
- Kurman, J. (2001). Self-enhancement: Is it restricted to individualistic cultures? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1705-1716.
- Lang, F. R., & Heckhausen, J. (2001). Perceived control over development subjective well-being: Differential benefits across adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 509-523.
- Lapan, R. T., Adams, A., Turner, S., & Hinkelman, J. M. (2000). Seventh graders' vocational interest and efficacy expectation patterns. *Journal of Career Development*, 26, 215-229.
- Latham, G. P., & Frayne, C. A. (1989). Self-management training for increasing job attendance: A follow-up and a replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74,

411-416.

- Lee, F., Hallahan, M., & Herzog, T. (1996). Explaining real-life events: How culture and domain shape attributions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 732-741.
- Lee, Y., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1997). Are Americans more optimistic than the Chinese? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 32-40.
- Locke, E. A., Frederick, E., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1984). Effect of self-efficacy, goals, and task strategies on task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 241-251.
- Luszczynska, A., Gutierrez-Doma, B., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). General self-efficacy in various domains of human functioning: Evidence from five countries. *International Journal of Psychology*, 40, 80-89.
- Luzzo, D. A., & Funk, D. P. (1996). Attributional retraining increases career decision-making self-efficacy. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 44, 378-386.
- Mann, M., Hosman, C. M. H., Schaalma, H. P., & deVries, N. K. (2004). Self-esteem in a broad-spectrum approach for mental health promotion. *Health Education Research*, 19, 357-372.
- Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 63-78.
- 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. (2003). Models of agency: Sociocultural diversity in the construction of action. In J. Berman & V. Murphy-Berman (Eds.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol.49. Cross-cultural differences in*

perspectives on the self (pp. 1-57). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Martocchio, J. J., & Dulebohn, J. (1994). Performance feedback effects in training:

The role of perceived controllability. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 357-373.

Mathieu, J. E., Martineau, J. W., & Tannenbaum, S. I. (1993). Individual and

situational influences on the development of self-efficacy. *Personnel*

Psychology, 46, 125-147.

Miserandino, M. (1998). Attributional retraining as a method of improving athletic

performance. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 21, 286-297.

Nease, A. A., Mudgett, B. O., & Quinones, M. A. (1994). Relationships among

feedback sign, self-efficacy, and acceptance of performance feedback. *Journal*

of Applied Psychology, 84, 806-814.

Oettingen, G., Little, T. D., Lindenberger, U., & Baltes, P. B. (1994). Causality,

agency, and control beliefs in East versus West Berlin children: A natural

experiment on the role of context. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 66, 579-595.

Pajares, F., Miller, M. D., & Johnson, M. J. (1999). Gender differences in writing

self-beliefs of elementary school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*,

91, 50-61.

Pajares, F., Schunk, D. H. (2001). Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-

concept, and school achievement. In R. Riding & S. Rayner (Eds.), *Perception*

(pp. 239-266). London, Ablex Publishing

Ponton, M. K., Edmister, J. H., Ukeiley, L. S., & Seiner, J. M. (2001). Understanding

the role of self-efficacy in engineering education. *Journal of Engineering*

Education, 90, 247-251.

Poyrazlı, S., Arbona, C., Nora, A., McPherson, R., Pisecco, S. (2002). Relation

between assertiveness, academic self-efficacy, and psychosocial adjustment among international graduate students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43, 632-642.

Pyszczynski, T., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Arndt, J., & Schimel, J. (2004). Why do people need self-esteem? A theoretical and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 435-468.

Randhawa, B. S., Gupta, A. (2000). Cross-national gender differences in mathematics achievement, attitude and self-efficacy within a common intrinsic structure. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 16, 51-74.

Russell, D. W. (1982). The Causal Dimension Scale: A measure of how individuals perceive causes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 1137-1145.

Russell, D. W., McAuley, E., & Tarico, V. (1987). Measuring causal attributions for success and failure: A comparison of methodologies for assessing causal dimensions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1248-1257.

Ryff, C. D. (1987). The place of personality and social structure research in social psychology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1192-1202.

Sadri, G. (1996). A study of agentic self-efficacy and agentic competence across Britain and the USA. *The Journal of Management Development*, 15, 51-61.

Sadri, G., & Robertson, I. T. (1993). Self-efficacy and work-related behavior: A review and meta-analysis. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 42, 139-152.

Sandler, I. N., Tein, J., Mehta, P., Wolchik, S., & Ayers, T. (2000). Coping efficacy and psychological problems of children of divorce. *Child Development*, 71, 1099-1118.

Sanna, L. J. (1997). Self-efficacy and counterfactual thinking: Up a creek with and

- without a paddle. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 654-666.
- Sanna, L. J., & Pusecker, P. A. (1994). Self-efficacy, valence of self-evaluation, and performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 82-92.
- Santamaria, V. L., & Furst, D. M. (1994). Distance runners' causal attributions for most successful and least successful races. *Journal of sport behavior*, 17, 43-52.
- Schmitz, B., & Skinner, E. (1993). Perceived control, effort, and academic performance: Interindividual, intraindividual, and multivariate time-series analyses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 1010-1028.
- Schulz, R., & Heckhausen, J. (1996). A life span model of successful aging. *American Psychologist*, 51, 702-714.
- Schunk, D. H. (1983). Ability versus effort attributional feedback: Differential effects on self-efficacy and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 848-856.
- Schunk, D. H. (1984). Sequential attributional feedback and children's achievement behaviors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 1159-1169.
- Schunk, D. H., & Hanson, A. R. (1989). Influence of peer-model attributes on children's beliefs and learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 431-434.
- Sedikides, C. (1993). Assessment, enhancement, and verification determinants of the self-evaluation process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 317-338.
- Sedikides, C., Gaertner, L., & Toguchi, Y. (2003). Pancultural self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 60-79.

- Sedikides, C., Herbst, K. C., Hardin, D. P., & Dardis, G. J. (2002). Accountability as a deterrent to self-enhancement: The search for mechanisms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 592-605.
- Sedikides, C., & Strube, M. J. (1997). Self-evaluation: To thine own self be good, to thine own self be sure, to thine own self be true, and to thine own self be better. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 29, 209-275.
- Seery, M. D., Blascovich, J., Weisbuch, M., & Vick, S. B. (2004). The relationship between self-esteem level, self-esteem stability, and cardiovascular reactions to performance feedback. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 133-145.
- Shea, C. M., & Howell, J. M. (2000). Efficacy-performance spirals: An empirical test. *Journal of Management*, 26, 791-812.
- Shell, D. F., Colvin, C., & Bruning, R. H. (1995). Self-efficacy, attribution, and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement: Grade-level and achievement-level differences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 386-398.
- Si, G., Rethorst, S. & Willimczik, K. (1995). Causal attribution perception in sports achievement. A cross-cultural study on attributional concepts in Germany and China. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 26, 537-553.
- Silver, W. S., Mitchell, T. R., & Gist, M. E. (1995). Responses to successful and unsuccessful performance: The moderating effect of self-efficacy on the relationship between performance and attributions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 62, 286-299.
- Silvia, P. J., & Duval, T. S. (2001). Predicting the interpersonal targets of self-serving attributions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 333-340.

- Silvia, P. J., & Gendolla, G. H. E. (2001). On introspection and self-perception: Does self-focused attention enable accurate self-knowledge? *Review of General Psychology, 5*, 241-269.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 580-591.
- Skinner, E. A. (1996). A guide to constructs of control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 549-570.
- Skinner, E. A., Schindler, A., & Tschechne, M. (1990). Self-other differences in children's perceptions about the causes of important events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 144-155.
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*, 240-261.
- Stevens, C. K., & Gist, M. E. (1997). Effects of self-efficacy and goal-orientation training on negotiation skill maintenance: What are the mechanisms? *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 955- 978.
- Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1998). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*, 193-210.
- Taylor, S. E., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (1995). Effects of mindset on positive illusions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 213-226.
- 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.
- Tice, D. M. (1991). Esteem protection or enhancement? Self-handicapping motives and attributions differ by trait self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 711-725.

- Tice, D. M., Butler, J. L., Muraven, M. B., & Stillwell, A. M. (1995). When modesty prevails: Differential favorability of self-presentation to friends and strangers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 1120-1138.
- Triandis, H.C. (1994). *Culture and Social Behavior*. (1st ed). New York. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Turner, S., & Lapan, R. T. (2002). Career self-efficacy and perceptions of parent support in adolescent career development. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 51, 44-55.
- Uchida, H. (2004). *Effects of self-construals on university students' causal attributions, self-efficacy beliefs, and self-handicapping behavior*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.
- Vrugt, A. J., Langereis, M. P., Hoogstraten, J. (1997). Academic self-efficacy and malleability of relevant capabilities as predictors of exam performance. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 66, 61-72.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92, 548-573.
- Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989a). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 361-384.
- Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989b). Impact of conceptions of ability on self-regulatory mechanisms and complex decision-making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 407-415.
- Yamada, A., & Singelis, T. M. (1999). Biculturalism and self-construal. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23, 697-709.
- Yan, W. & Gaier, E. L. (1994). Causal attributions for college success and failure. An Asian-American comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25,

146-158.

Zimmerman B. J. & Kitsantas, A. (1997). Developmental phases in self-regulation: shifting from process goals to outcome goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 29-36.

Appendices

APPENDIX A: Onay Formu

Bu araştırma bir yüksek lisans tez çalışmasının bir parçası olarak yapılmaktadır. Bu anket sizin genel tutum ve davranışlarınız ile ilgili farklı bölümlerden oluşmakta ve her bölümün başında soruları nasıl cevaplandıracağınız anlatılmaktadır. Bu anketteki soruların doğru cevapları yoktur. Önemli olan sizin gerçek düşüncelerinizi öğrenmektir. Lütfen soruları eksiksiz olarak doldurmaya dikkat ediniz.

Toplam süresi en fazla 20 dakika olan bu çalışmaya katılmak isterseniz formu imzalayınız. Çalışma süresince herhangi bir noktada katılmaktan vazgeçebilirsiniz.

Vereceğiniz cevaplar araştırmacı dışında kimse tarafından görülmeyecektir. Ayrıca cevapların kime ait olduğunun anlaşılmaması için isminizi yazmanız gerekmemektedir. Bu araştırma için vereceğiniz tüm bilgiler isimsiz olarak ve diğer katılımcıların bilgileriyle birleştirilerek ortalamalar şeklinde değerlendirilecektir. Kişisel bilgileriniz hiçbir amaçla kullanılmayacaktır.

Tez çalışması bittiğinde araştırmanın sonuçlarını içeren özet bir rapor e-mail adresinize gönderilecektir. Eğer herhangi bir sorunuz olursa bana e-mail adresim aracılığıyla (dilek_thesis@yahoo.com) başvurun.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu deneye gönüllü olarak katılmaya karar verdim.

Araştırmacı: Dilek BÜYÜKSELÇUK

Katılımcı

Adı Soyadı:

e-mail adresi:

Öğrenci No:

Tarih:

İmza:

APPENDIX B: BENLİK YETERLİLİĞİ ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen aşağıdaki maddelerde anlatılan davranışları yapıp yapamayacağınıza olan inancınızı Evet (E) veya Hayır (H) seçeneklerinden birisini işaretleyerek belirtin. Eğer **EVET** işaretlediyseniz, bu davranışı yapabileceğinizden ne kadar emin olduğunuzu 10 ile 100 arasında bir seçeneği işaretleyerek belirtiniz. Aşağıdaki sorularda grup kelimesi ile anlatılmak istenen içindeki bütün bireyleri tanımasak bile kendimizi ait hissettiğimiz topluluklardır. (Akrabalar, takım, mahalle, klüp, okul dernekleri gibi...). “En yakınlarımla” sözcükleri ile anlatılmak istenen ise en yakın arkadaş, eş, sevgili, ya da kendinizi çok yakın hissettiğiniz aile bireyleridir.

Örnek I:

1. Yeterince çalışırsam başarılı olabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
--	---	----------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

Örnek II:

1. Yeterince çalışırsam başarılı olabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
--	----------	---	----	----	----	-----------	----	----	----	----	----	-----

Şimdi soruları cevaplamaya başlayabilirsiniz.

	E/ H		<u>EVET ise, Ne kadar eminsiniz? (%)</u>										
1. Çok zor koşullarda bile, grubumun hedeflerine ulaşmak için gerekli şeyleri yapabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
2. En yakınlarımla uyumlu bir ilişki sürdürmemi tehdit eden durumlar karşısında paniğe kapılmadan hızlı ve uygulanabilir çözümler yaratabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
3. Başarılması kolay görünmese de, grubumun zorlayıcı hedeflerine ulaşmak için çalışabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
4. Zorlayıcı işlerin altından en yakınlarımla desteği ile kolayca kalkabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
5. Engeller karşısında paniğe kapılmadan hızlı ve uygulanabilir çözümler yaratabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
6. Sorumluluğum altındaki işleri düzenli ve düzgün bir şekilde yapabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
7. Arkamda en yakınlarımla desteğini hissettiğim takdirde engeller karşısında kararlı davranarak işimi sürdürebileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	

	E/ H		<u>EVET ise, Ne kadar eminsiniz? (%)</u>											
8. Çok zor koşullarda bile, kişisel hedeflerime ulaşmak için gerekli performansı sergileyebileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
9. Olumsuzlukların üstesinden en yakınlarımla beraber çalışarak gelebileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
10. Grubum için yapılması gereken işleri düzenli ve düzgün bir şekilde yürütebileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
11. Olumsuzlukların üstesinden tek başıma gelebileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
12. Gerçekleştirmek istediğim şeyleri grubumla birlikte yaparak başarabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
13. Başarılması kolay görünmese de, en yakınlarımla zorlayıcı isteklerini gerçekleştirmek için çalışabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
14. Özel yetenek ve becerilerimi grubumun hedeflerine ulaşmak için kullanabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
15. Zorlayıcı işlerin altından grubumun desteği ile kolayca kalkabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
16. Engeller karşısında kararlı davranarak işimi sürdürebileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
17. Önceliklerimi grup içi işbirliğini bozmayacak şekilde belirleyebileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
18. Önceliklerimi en yakınlarımla olan ilişkilerimi bozmayacak şekilde belirleyebileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
19. Gerçekleştirmek istediğim şeyleri tek başıma başarabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
20. Özel yetenek ve becerilerimi yakın ilişkilerimi sürdürebilmek için kullanabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
21. Özel yetenek ve becerilerimi her koşulda kullanabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		

	E/ H		<u>EVET ise, Ne kadar eminsiniz? (%)</u>											
22. Çok zor koşullarda bile yakın ilişkilerimi sağlıklı sürdürebilmek için uğraşabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
23. Arkamda grubumun desteğini hissedersen engeller karşısında kararlı davranarak işimi sürdürebileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
24. Zorlayıcı işlerin altından tek başıma kolayca kalkabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
25. İnsanların hep beraber birşeyler yaptıkları ortamlara kolaylıkla uyum sağlayabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
26. Başarılması kolay görünmese de, kendime zor hedefler koyup onlara ulaşmak için çalışabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
27. Olumsuzlukların üstesinden grubumla beraber çalışarak gelebileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		
28. Gerçekleştirmek istediğim şeyleri en yakınlarımla birlikte yaparak başarabileceğime inanıyorum.	E	H	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100		

APPENDIX C: ATIF DEĞERLENDİRME ÖLÇEĞİ

1. İçindeki bütün bireyleri tanımasak bile kendimizi bazı gruplara ait hissederiz (Akrabalar, takım, mahalle, klüp, okul dernekleri gibi...). Şimdi lütfen böyle gruplarla yaşadığınız ve grubun iyiliği/sağlığı için **olumlu** sonuçlanan geçmişteki problemleri düşünün. Bu problemlerin **olumlu** dönüşme sürecini düşündüğünüzde aşağıdakilerin herbiri sizin için ne kadar geçerlidir?

- a. Genelde problemler ben çabaladığım zaman olumlu çözümlenmiş, çabalamadığımda ise çözümlenmemiştir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- b. Problemlerin olumlu çözümlenmesi benim gruplarla ilişkilerde genelde becerikli olmamın sonucudur.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- c. Genelde problemler grubun diğer üyeleri çabaladığı zaman olumlu çözümlenmiş, çabalamadığında ise çözümlenmemiştir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- d. Bu problemlerin zaten olumlu çözümleneceği varmış.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- e. Genelde olumlu çözümlenmiş problemler çözümü kolay problemler oluyor.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

2. Hayatın içinde kişisel olarak bazı mücadeleler veriyoruz. Şimdi lütfen yaşadığınız ve çözüldüğünde kendi geleceğiniz açısından **olumsuz** sonuçlanan geçmişteki problemleri düşünün. Bu problemlerin **olumsuz** dönüşme sürecini düşündüğünüzde aşağıdakilerden herbiri sizin için ne kadar geçerlidir?

- a. Problemlerin olumsuz sonuçlanması bir çok kez benim yeterince çabalamamam yüzündendir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- b. Problemlerin olumsuz sonuçlanması benim beceriksizliğim yüzündendir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- c. Problemlerin olumsuz sonuçlanması diğer insanların pek bir şey yapmamasıyla ilgilidir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- d. Bu problemlerin zaten olumsuz çözümleneceği varmış.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- e. Genelde olumsuz sonuçlanmış problemler çözümü zor problemler oluyor.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

3. Zaman zaman her türlü ilişkide problemler yaşanabilir. Lütfen eşinizle/sevdiğinizle veya en yakın arkadaşınızla yaşadığınız ve ilişkinizin geleceği açısından **olumlu** sonuçlanan geçmişteki problemleri düşünün. Bu problemlerin **olumlu** dönüşme sürecini düşündüğünüzde aşağıdakilerin herbiri sizin için ne kadar geçerlidir?

- a. Genelde problemler ben çabaladığım zaman olumlu çözümlenmiş, çabalamadığımda ise çözümlenmemiştir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- b. Problemlerin olumlu çözümlenmesi benim ikili ilişkilerde genelde becerikli olmamın sonucudur.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- c. Genelde problemler karşı taraf çabaladığı zaman olumlu çözümlenmiş, çabalamadığında ise çözümlenmemiştir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- d. Bu problemlerin zaten olumlu çözümleneceği varmış.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- e. Genelde olumlu çözümlenmiş problemler çözümü kolay problemler oluyor.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

4. İçindeki bütün bireyleri tanımasak bile kendimizi bazı gruplara ait hissederiz (Akrabalar, takım, mahalle, klüp, okul dernekleri gibi...). Şimdi lütfen böyle gruplarla yaşadığınız ve grubun iyiliği/sağlığı için **olumsuz** sonuçlanan geçmişteki problemleri düşünün. Bu problemlerin **olumsuz** dönüşme sürecini düşündüğünüzde aşağıdakilerden herbiri sizin için ne kadar geçerlidir?

- a. Problemlerin olumsuz sonuçlanması bir çok kez benim yeterince çabalamam yüzündendir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- b. Problemlerin olumsuz sonuçlanması benim gruplarla ilişkilerdeki beceriksizliğim yüzündendir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- c. Problemlerin olumsuz sonuçlanması grubun diğer üyelerinin pek bir şey yapmamasıyla ilgilidir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- d. Bu problemlerin zaten olumsuz çözümleneceği varmış.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- e. Genelde olumsuz sonuçlanmış problemler çözümü zor problemler oluyor.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

5. Hayatın içinde kişisel olarak bazı mücadeleler veriyoruz. Şimdi lütfen yaşadığınız ve çözüldüğünde kendi geleceğiniz açısından **olumlu** sonuçlanan geçmişteki problemleri düşünün. Bu problemlerin **olumlu** dönüşme sürecini düşündüğünüzde aşağıdakilerin herbiri sizin için ne kadar geçerlidir?

- a. Genelde problemler ben çabaladığım zaman olumlu çözümlenmiş, çabalamadığımda ise çözümlenmemiştir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- b. Problemlerin olumlu çözümlenmesi benim genelde becerikli olmamın sonucudur.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- c. Genelde problemler başkaları benim için çabaladığında olumlu çözümlenmiş, çabalamadığı zamanlardaysa çözümlenmemiştir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- d. Bu problemlerin zaten olumlu çözümleneceği varmış.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- e. Genelde olumlu çözümlenmiş problemler çözümü kolay problemler oluyor.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

6. Zaman zaman her türlü ilişkide problemler yaşanabilir. Lütfen eşinizle/sevdiğinizle veya en yakın arkadaşınızla yaşadığınız ve ilişkinizin geleceği açısından **olumsuz** sonuçlanan geçmişteki problemleri düşünün. Bu problemlerin **olumsuz** dönüşme sürecini düşündüğünüzde aşağıdakilerden herbiri sizin için ne kadar geçerlidir?

- a. Problemlerin olumsuz sonuçlanması bir çok kez benim yeterince çabalamam yüzündendir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- b. Problemlerin olumsuz sonuçlanması benim ikili ilişkilerdeki beceriksizliğim yüzündendir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- c. Problemlerin olumsuz sonuçlanması karşı tarafın pek bir şey yapmamasıyla ilgilidir.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- d. Bu problemlerin zaten olumsuz çözümleneceği varmış.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

- e. Genelde olumsuz sonuçlanmış problemler çözümü zor problemler oluyor.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Kesinlikle katılıyorum**

APPENDIX D: İLİŞKİSEL, BİREYCI, AİLESEL VE TOPLULUKÇUK BENLİK ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen aşağıdaki 10 maddenin her bir seçeneğini sizi ne kadar doğru tarif ettiği, size ne kadar uygun olduğu açısından değerlendiriniz. Değerlendirmenizi aşağıdaki ölçeğe göre, **her seçeneğin yanındaki çizgiye** 1’den 7’ye kadar bir rakam yazarak yapınız. Sorularda “**AKRABALAR**” kelimesi ile kastedilen anne, baba, kardeş, eş ve çocuklar dışında kalan ve kanbağı ile bağlı olduğunuz kişilerdir. Lütfen cevaplarınızı verirken bu açıklamayı da dikkate alınız.

Beni hiç tarif etmiyor								Beni tam tarif ediyor
Bana hiç uymuyor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bana tam uyuyor

Örnek:

- Başkalarının benimle aynı fikirde olmadığı ortamlarda
 - _____ grubum (mesela akrabalar, okul, klüp, mahalle, komşular, vb.) benimle aynı fikirdeyse düşüncelerimi söylerim.
 - _____ annem, babam ve kardeşlerim benimle aynı fikirdeyse düşüncelerimi söylerim.
 - _____ başkalarının ne düşündüğünün benim için önemi yoktur, kendi düşüncelerimi söylerim.
 - _____ birlikte olduğum kişi/ eşim veya en yakın arkadaşım benimle aynı fikirdeyse düşüncelerimi söylerim.

Şimdi soruları kendi düşüncelerinize göre cevaplamaya başlayabilirsiniz.

- Beni gururlandıracak şey
 - _____ en yakın arkadaşımın yaptığı bir işten dolayı gazetede övülmesidir.
 - _____ aile bireylerinden birinin yaptığı bir işten dolayı gazetede övülmesidir.
 - _____ yaptığım bir işten dolayı benim gazetede övülmemdir.
 - _____ grubumun (mesela akrabalar, okul, klüp, mahalle, komşular, vb.) yaptığı bir işten dolayı gazetede övülmesidir.
- Beni en çok memnun eden şey:
 - _____ grubum (mesela akrabalar, okul, klüp, mahalle, komşular, vb.) için bir şeyler yapmaktır.
 - _____ önemsedığım kimseler için bir şeyler yapmaktır.
 - _____ ailem için bir şeyler yapmaktır.
 - _____ kendim için bir şeyler yapmaktır.
- Bence onurlu bir insan olmanın yolu
 - _____ aileme bağlı olmaktır.
 - _____ yakın ilişkim olan insanlara bağlı olmaktır.
 - _____ ait olduğum gruplara (mesela akrabalar, okul, klüp, mahalle, komşular, vb.) sadık olmaktır.
 - _____ kendime karşı dürüst olmaktır.
- Bir kültürel etkinliğe (konser/tiyatro/sinema gibi) gittiğimde,
 - _____ ben hoşlandıysam iyi vakit geçiririm.
 - _____ bana eşlik eden insanlar (eş, arkadaş, konuk) keyif alırsa ben de keyif alırım.
 - _____ etkinlikten çok keyif almasam bile, grubumla beraber orada olmak zaten kendi başına keyif vericidir.

Beni hiç tarif etmiyor**Beni tam tarif ediyor****Bana hiç uymuyor****1****2****3****4****5****6****7****Bana tam uyuyor**

5. En önemsedığım şey:

- ☐ a. çok değer verdiğim/bana en yakın olan insanla olan ilişkimdir.
- ☐ b. ailemle olan ilişkimdir.
- ☐ c. grubumla (mesela akrabalar, okul, klüp, mahalle, komşular, vb.) olan ilişkimdir.
- ☐ d. kendimle olan ilişkimdir.

6. Bir kişiyi bir işyerinin iyi bir çalışanı olarak tanımlamam için o kişi,

- ☐ a. kendisine verilen işle ilgili kişisel sorumluluk duymalıdır.
- ☐ b. çalışma arkadaşlarıyla iyi anlaşmalı ve işbirliği yapmalıdır.
- ☐ c. içinde bulunduğu kurumun iyiliği için çalışmalıdır.

7. Kendimi

- ☐ a. iyi bir eş veya arkadaş olarak görürüm.
- ☐ b. ne istediğini bilen bir birey olarak görürüm.
- ☐ c. iyi bir evlat veya ebeveyn (ana-baba) olarak görürüm.
- ☐ d. grubumun (mesela akrabalar, okul, klüp, mahalle, komşular, vb.) iyi bir üyesi olarak görürüm.

8. Çocuklarıma

- ☐ a. ait olduğu gruba (mesela akrabalar, okul, klüp, mahalle, komşular, vb.) sadık olmayı öğretirdim.
- ☐ b. ailesine sadık olmayı öğretirdim.
- ☐ c. kendilerini tanımalarını ve kendilerini geliştirmelerini öğretirdim.
- ☐ d. arkadaşlarını önemsemeyi ve onlara karşı duyarlı olmayı öğretirdim.

9. Bence hayatta en önemli şey,

- ☐ a. ait olduğum grubun (mesela akrabalar, okul, klüp, mahalle, komşular, vb.) iyiliği için çalışmaktır.
- ☐ b. tutarlı ve kendime karşı dürüst olmaktır.
- ☐ c. önem verdiğim insanlarla iyi ilişkiler içinde olmaktır.
- ☐ d. ailemle iyi ilişkiler içinde olmaktır.

10. Önemli bir kişisel karar almak durumunda kaldığımda,

- ☐ a. birlikte olduğum kişi/ eşim veya en yakın arkadaşım ile konuşurum.
- ☐ b. annem, babam ve kardeşlerimle konuşurum.
- ☐ c. kendime gerçekten en çok ne yapmak istediğimi sorarım.
- ☐ d. akrabalarım ile konuşurum.

APPENDIX E: İLİŞKİSEL, BİREYÇİ, AİLESEL VE TOPLULUKÇUK BENLİK
ÖLÇEĞİ – AĞIRLIKLANDIRMA ÖLÇEĞİ

Şimdi lütfen 6 ve 7. sayfalardaki 10 soruya geri dönün. Az önce cevapladığınız 10 sorunun seçenekleri arasında

sizi **EN DOĞRU** tarif ettiğini, size **EN UYGUN** olduğunu düşündüğünüz **tek bir seçeneğin** yanına **(+)**,

EN AZ DOĞRU tarif ettiğini, size **EN AZ UYGUN** olduğunu düşündüğünüz **tek bir seçeneğin** yanına **(-)**

işaretleri koyarak yeni bir değerlendirme yapınız. Bu değerlendirmeyi **10 soru için ayrı ayrı** yapmanız gerekmektedir.

Örnek:

1. Başkalarının benimle aynı fikirde olmadığı ortamlarda

- _____ a. grubum (mesela akrabalar, okul, klüp, mahalle, komşular, vb.) benimle aynı fikirdeyse düşüncelerimi söylerim.
- _____ b. annem, babam ve kardeşlerim benimle aynı fikirdeyse düşüncelerimi söylerim.
- _____ c. başkalarının ne düşündüğünün benim için önemi yoktur, kendi düşüncelerimi söylerim.
- _____ d. birlikte olduğum kişi/ eşim veya en yakın arkadaşım benimle aynı fikirdeyse düşüncelerimi söylerim.

Şimdi lütfen 6 ve 7. sayfalara geri dönünüz.

APPENDIX F: BAĞIMSIZ İLİŞKİSEL BENLİK ÖLÇEĞİ

"Bu ankette kişilerin kendileri ve ilişkileri hakkında cümleler var. Bunların her birinin yanına o durum ile ilgili ne düşündüğünüzü belirten numarayı yazınız. Aşağıdaki cümlelerle ilgili görüşlerinizi, kendinize çok yakın hissettiğiniz kişi veya kişilerle olan ilişkinizi düşünerek belirtin."

Düşüncelerime/ bana çok aykırı	Düşüncelerime/ bana biraz aykırı	Kararsızım	Düşüncelerime/ bana biraz uygun	Düşüncelerime/ bana çok uygun
1	2	3	4	5

- ___ 1. Kararlarımı yakınlarımın isteklerine göre kolayca değiştirebilirim.
- ___ 2. Bir kimse hem yakınlarına bağlı olabilir, hem de fikirleri ayrı olduğunda fikrine saygı duyulmasını isteyebilir.
- ___ 3. Özel hayatımı, çok yakınım olan birisiyle bile paylaşmam.
- ___ 4. Birisiyle yakın bir arkadaşlık kurduğumda, genellikle o kişiyle çok özdeşleşirim.
- ___ 5. Yakınlarımla aramdaki bağ, kendimi huzur ve güven içinde hissetmemi sağlıyor.
- ___ 6. Genellikle kendime çok yakın hissettiğim kişilerin isteklerine uymaya çalışırım.
- ___ 7. Yakın arkadaşlarımla kim olduğumu bilmek, benim için gurur kaynağıdır.
- ___ 8. Yakınlarım, hayatımda en ön sıradadır.
- ___ 9. Özerk olabilmek için yakın ilişki kurmamak gerekir.
- ___ 10. Kendimi tanımlarken, yakın ilişkilerimin payı önemsizdir.
- ___ 11. Yakınlarımla hakkımda ne düşündüğü benim için önemli değildir.
- ___ 12. Benimle ilgili bir konuda çok yakın hissettiğim kişilerin aldığı kararlar, benim için geçerlidir.
- ___ 13. Bir kimse kendini hem yakınlarına bağlı, hem de özgür hissedebilir.
- ___ 14. Kendime çok yakın hissettiğim kimseler sık sık aklıma gelir.
- ___ 15. Genelde yakın ilişkilerim, kendimle ilgili duygularıyla bağlantılı değildir.
- ___ 16. Kararlarımı alırken yakınlarıma danışırım.
- ___ 17. Bir kişiye çok yakın olmak, özgür olmayı engeller.
- ___ 18. Genellikle yakın ilişkilerim, kimliğimin önemli bir parçasıdır.
- ___ 19. Kişiliğimin oluşmasında yakınlarımla etkisi büyüktür.
- ___ 20. Yakınlarımla düşüncelerine önem vermek, kendi düşüncelerimi gözardı etmek anlamına gelir.
- ___ 21. Eğer birisi bana yakın olan bir kişiyi incitirse, kendimi kişisel olarak incinmiş hissederim.
- ___ 22. Benimle ilgili bir konuda, çok yakın hissettiğim kişilerin fikirleri beni etkiler.
- ___ 23. İnsan çok yakınlarının fikirlerine karşı çıkabilmelidir.
- ___ 24. Kendimi düşündüğümde, yakın arkadaşlarımla veya ailemi de düşünürüm.
- ___ 25. Genelde kendimle ilgili şeyleri kendime saklarım.
- ___ 26. Çok yakın ilişkiler içindeki kişi, kendi kararlarını veremez.
- ___ 27. Beni anlamak için, yakın arkadaşlarımla anlamak gerekir.
- ___ 28. Hayatımı kendimi çok yakın hissettiğim kişilerin düşüncelerine göre yönlendiririm.
- ___ 29. Kendimi yakınlarımdan bağımsız hissederim.
- ___ 30. Yakın olduğum biri önemli bir başarı elde ettiğinde, büyük gurur duyarım.
- ___ 31. Planlar yaparken yakınların önerileri dikkate alınsa bile, son karar kişiye ait olmalıdır.
- ___ 32. Yakınlarımla olan ilişkimde mesafeli olmak isterim.
- ___ 33. Kendimi birine çok yakın hissettiğimde, o kişiyi benliğimin önemli bir parçası gibi hissederim.
- ___ 34. Çok yakın hissettiğim bir kişinin bile hayatıma karışmasından hoşlanmam.
- ___ 35. Hem yakın ilişkileri olmak, hem de özerk olmak önemlidir.
- ___ 36. Yakın ilişkilerim benim kim olduğumu yansıtır.
- ___ 37. Kararlarımda yakınlarımla etkisi çok azdır.
- ___ 38. Kendimi çok yakın hissettiğim insanların desteğine ihtiyaç duyarım.

APPENDIX G: DEMOGRAFİ SORULARI

- a. Cinsiyetiniz ☐ K
☐ E
- b. Yaşınız _____
- c. Bölümünüz _____
- d. Kaç yıldır Boğaziçi Üniversitesi'ndesiniz? _____
- e. Kaçınıcı sınıf öğrencisisiniz? _____
- f. Lütfen lisenizin türünü işaretleyiniz.
- ☐ Meslek Lisesi
- ☐ Anadolu Meslek Lisesi
- ☐ Devlet Lisesi
- ☐ Anadolu Lisesi
- ☐ Kolej
- ☐ Diğer (Lütfen Belirtiniz) _____
- g. Hayatınızın büyük bir bölümünü nerede geçirdiniz?
- ☐ Köy
- ☐ Kasaba
- ☐ İlçe
- ☐ Şehir
- ☐ Büyükşehir
- h. Kaç yıldır İstanbul'da yaşıyorsunuz? _____

APPENDIX H: OBLIMIN ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS OF THE AUTONOMOUS RELATIONAL SELF SCALE

		Factor		
		1	2	3
17. Being very close to a person prevents one from being free.	AR	.61	.01	.15
3. I don't share my personal life even with the person who is very close to me.	R	.60	.02	-.01
25. In general, I don't share the things about myself with others.	R	.59	.01	-.06
32. I would like to keep the distance in my relationship with the people who are close to me.	R	.56	-.07	-.05
9. One should not have any close relationship to be autonomous.	AR	.54	-.02	.27
26. The people who have very close relationships cannot make their own decisions.	AR	.52	.07	.26
34. I don't like the fact that even a person whom I feel very close interferes with my life.	A	-.48	.09	.37
11. What the people who are close to me think about me is not important for me.	R	.45	-.14	.04
20. To attach importance to the opinions of the people who are close to me means that you disregard your own opinions.	AR	.39	-.03	.34
29. I feel independent of the people who are close to me.	A	-.37	.16	.24
22. The opinions of the people whom I feel very close about a subject related with me influence me.	A	.01	.62	.01
1. I can change my decisions easily in accordance with the wishes of the people who are close to me.	A	.17	.59	.23
6. In general, I try to behave in accordance with the wishes of those whom I feel very close to myself.	A	.18	.59	.12
19. The roles of the people who are close to me on my identity are very important.	R	-.04	-.55	.03
16. I consult the people who are close to me while taking my decisions.	A	-.14	.54	-.10
5. The relations with the people who are close to me enables me to feel secure and peaceful.	R	.13	-.52	.19
8. Those who are close to me are the most important for me.	R	.03	-.51	.06
12. The decisions of the people whom I feel very close about a subject related with me are valid for me.	A	.06	.45	.27
14. The people whom I feel very close to myself often come to my mind.	R	.09	-.41	.14
38. I need the support of the people whom I feel very close.	R	.14	-.39	.07
37. The effects of the people who are close to me on my decisions are inconsiderable.	A	-.29	.33	.19
31. The last decision should be given by the person himself, even though the suggestions of the people who are close to him are taken into consideration while plans are being made.	AR	-.04	-.06	.64
2. A person can both be devoted to the people who are close to him and want them to respect his ideas, when they don't agree with each other.	AR	.15	-.06	.55
35. Both having close relationships and being autonomous are important.	AR	-.08	-.05	.51
28. I lead my life in accordance with the opinions of those whom I feel very close.	A	.17	.34	.44
13. A person can feel both devoted to the people who are close to him and free.	AR	.26	-.17	.42
23. One should oppose to the opinions of the people who are very close to himself.	AR	-.00	.05	.26
Eigenvalues		4.92	3.87	1.83
Variances explained		15.73	11.94	4.25

Note. AR = Proposed Autonomous Relational Item of Autonomous-Relational Self Scale, R = Proposed Relatedness Item of Autonomous-Relational Self Scale, A = Proposed Autonomy Item of Autonomous-Relational Self Scale.

APPENDIX I: OBLIMIN ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS OF THE MODIFIED RIC SCALE

		Factor			
		1	2	3	4
3.a. The way to be a honorable person is being devoted to my family	F	.80	-.17	-.19	-.07
8.b. I would teach my children to be loyal to their family	F	.63	-.25	.01	-.02
5.b. The thing I care about most is my relationship with my family	F	.57	-.17	.23	-.04
9.d. The most important thing in life is being in good relationships with my family.	F	.57	-.13	.14	-.10
2.c. What makes me most content is doing something for my family	F	.54	-.17	.12	-.20
3.b. The way to be a honorable person is being devoted to the people with whom I have close relationship	R	.50	-.21	-.16	-.17
3.d. The way to be a honorable person is being honest towards myself	I	.45	-.04	.13	.05
10.b. When I have to make an important personal decision I talk to my mother, father and siblings	F	.36	-.03	.24	-.00
2.d. What makes me most content is doing something for myself	I	.36	.27	.28	-.08
4.a. When I attend a concert/ theater/cinema, I have a good time if I like the event	I	.34	.30	.10	-.25
5.c. The thing I care about most is my relationship with my group	C	.04	-.81	.05	.04
2.a. What makes me most content is doing something for my group	C	.02	-.70	.02	-.17
9.a. The most important thing in life is working for the benefits of the group which I belong to (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhoods, neighbors etc.)	C	.20	-.68	.03	.05
3.c. The way to be a honorable person is being loyal to the groups which I belong to	C	.28	-.67	-.11	-.06
8.a. I would teach my children to be loyal to the group which they belong to	C	.30	-.63	-.00	.05
1.d. What makes me proud of is the fact that my group was praised in the newspaper due to something they have done	C	-.10	-.49	-.06	-.35
7.d. I regard myself as a good member of my group	C	-.01	-.49	.41	.05
4.c. When I attend a concert/ theater/cinema, being there with my group is enough to feel good even if I don't like the event much	C	.00	-.45	.02	-.10
8.d. I would teach my children to care about their friends and be sensitive to them.	R	-.10	-.31	.28	-.15
10.d. When I have to make an important personal decision I talk to my relatives	C	.12	-.30	.07	.08

		Factor			
		1	2	3	4
4.b. When I attend a concert/ theater/cinema, I enjoy it if my company(partner, friend, guest) also enjoys the event	R	.09	-.18	.02	-.15
7.a. I regard myself as a good spouse and friend	R	-.10	-.01	.57	-.14
7.c. I regard myself as a good child or parent	F	.13	-.06	.56	-.03
6.a. To define a person as a good employer of a company, that person should feel personal responsibility for the task assigned	I	.01	.00	.47	-.09
7.b. I regard myself as an individual who knows of her/his wishes	I	.14	.02	.46	.13
6.b. To define a person as a good employer of a company, that person should get on well with his colleagues and be in cooperation with them.	R	-.04	-.22	.44	-.03
10.c. When I have to make an important personal decision I ask myself what I really want to do most	I	.26	.16	.43	.18
6.c. To define a person as a good employer of a company, that person should work for the benefits of the company which s/he works for.	C	-.02	-.33	.42	.00
5.d. The thing I care about most is my relationship with myself	I	.24	.12	.41	-.01
9.b. The most important thing in life is being consistent and honest towards myself.	I	.35	.09	.36	.05
5.a. The thing I care about most is my relationship with the person whom I care very much	R	.03	-.17	.35	-.27
10.a. When I have to make an important personal decision I talk with my partner or my best friend	R	-.05	-.03	.30	-.21
8.c. I would teach my children to get to know themselves and improve themselves	I	.18	.11	.22	-.04
1.b. What makes me proud of is the fact that one of the family members was praised in the newspaper due to something s/he has done	F	.29	.09	-.06	-.77
1.a. What makes me proud of is the fact that my best friend was praised in the newspaper due to something s/he has done.	R	-.02	-.10	-.02	-.66
1.c. What makes me proud of is the fact that I was praised in the newspaper due to the something I have done	I	.16	.27	.14	-.46
2.b. What makes me most content is doing something for the people whom I care about	R	-.10	-.22	.31	-.38
9.c. The most important thing in life is being in good relationships with the people whom I care about	R	.22	-.19	.20	-.22
Eigenvalues		8.95	3.61	2.08	1.93
Variances explained		22.07	7.97	3.94	3.63

Note. C = Proposed Collective Item of Ranked RIC Scale, F = Proposed Family Item of Ranked RIC Scale, I = Proposed Individual Item of Ranked RIC Scale, R = Proposed Relational Item of Ranked RIC Scale.

APPENDIX J: OBLIMIN ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS OF THE SINGELIS' SCS SCALE

		Factor	
		1	2
2. I feel comfortable using someone's first name soon after I meet them, even when they are much older than I am..	I	.55	.10
27. My personal identity independent of others, is very important to me.	I	.53	-.07
13. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met.	I	.51	.10
25. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.	I	.44	.12
7. I think it is important to me to act as an independent person.	I	.44	-.23
5. I do what I want without thinking about others' thoughts.	I	.44	-.24
20. I act the same way no matter who I am with.	I	.43	.04
9. I'd rather say "No" directly, than risk being misunderstood.	I	.38	-.11
30. I confirm others' wishes even if I want to do other things.	C	-.37	.37
18. Speaking up during a class (or a meeting) is not a problem for me.	I	.36	.06
15. I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.	I	.33	.11
22. I value being in good health above everything.	I	.31	.24
29. I am the same person at home (or at work) that I am at school.	I	.31	.01
24. I try to do the best for myself without paying attention possible effects of my accomplishments on other people.	I	.30	.05
3. Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument..	C	-.27	.24
1. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.	I	.21	.05
10. Having a lively imagination is important to me.	I	.18	.06
28. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.	C	.18	.16
11. I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education/career plans	C	.01	.52
26. It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.	C	.28	.52
23. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I'M not happy with the group.	C	-.12	.47
14. I feel good when I make cooperation with others.	C	.14	.42
4. I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.	C	.31	.40
17. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.	C	-.09	.37
6. I respect people who are modest about themselves.	C	.00	.36
21. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.	C	-.08	.34
8. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.	C	.10	.33
12. I feel my fate is closely related with the fates of other people around me.	C	.03	.27
19. I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor (or boss).	C	.20	.25
16. If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.	C	.09	.25
Eigenvalues		3.74	2.98
Variances explained		9.83	7.30

Note. I = Proposed Independence Item of SCS Scale, C = Proposed Interdependence Item of SCS Scale.

APPENDIX K: Consent Form

This study is being conducted as part of a master thesis project. This questionnaire consists of different parts related with your general attitudes and behaviors. Each part has its own instructions about how to answer the questions. There are no correct answers, it is very important that you respond honestly and completely.

The total duration of the study is about 20 minutes. Please sign this form if you want to join this study. You can give up anytime you want to do so during the study.

Be assured that your responses will be kept confidential and will be processed only by the researcher. Please do not write your name on the main questionnaires to assure your confidentiality. All the answers you would give will be processed cumulatively together with the responses of other participants. Your personal data will not be used for any purpose.

When the study completely finished you would receive a summary report about the results. If you have any questions, you can contact me through my e-mail. (dilek_thesis@yahoo.com)

I have read all the information above and have decided to participate by my own will.

Researcher: Dilek BÜYÜKSELÇUK

Participant

Name, Surname:

e-mail:

Student Number:

Date:

Signature:

APPENDIX L: SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

Please state your belief about whether you would perform the behavior described below by circling the Yes (Y) or No (N) option. If you circle YES, you should also state how sure you are about your belief about performing that behavior by circling one of the options among 10-100. The word “group” in the questions below refers to the communities about which we think that we belong to, even though we don’t know all the people in it. (Relatives, neighborhood, school clubs etc.) The phrase “those closest to me” refers to the best friend, spouse, lover or the family members to whom you feel very close.

Example I:

2. I believe I can be successful if I study hard enough	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

Example II:

2. I believe I can be successful if I study hard enough	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

Now you can begin answering the questions.

	Y/ N		IF YES, how sure are you? (%)										
1. I believe I can fulfill the requirements necessary to achieve the goals of my group even in very difficult circumstances.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
2. I believe I can find fast and practical solutions without getting into panic in situations threatening the harmony of my relationship with those who are closest to me.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
3. I believe I can work hard to achieve the challenging goals of my group even though they do not seem easy to achieve.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
4. I believe I can succeed in the most challenging tasks with the support of those who are closest to me.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
5. I believe I can find fast and practical solutions in the face of obstacles without getting into panic.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
6. I believe I can carry out my duties in a neat and orderly manner.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
7. I believe I can persist in my job in the face of obstacles if I feel the support of those who are closest to me.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
8. I believe I can perform well in order to achieve my personal goals even in very difficult circumstances.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
9. I believe I can overcome problems by working together with those who are closest to me.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	

	Y/ N		IF YES, how sure are you? (%)										
10. I believe I can carry out my duties for my group in a neat and orderly manner.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
11. I believe I can overcome the problems on my own.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
12. I believe I can achieve my goals by working together with my group.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
13. I believe I can work hard to achieve the challenging goals of those who are closest to me even though they do not seem easy to achieve.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
14. I believe I can use my special skills and talents in order to reach the goals of my group.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
15. I believe I can succeed in the most challenging tasks with the support of my group.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
16. I believe I can persist in my job in the face of obstacles.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
17. I believe I can determine my priorities in a way that will not destroy the solidarity of my group.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
18. I believe I can determine my priorities in a way that won't ruin my relationships with those closest to me.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
19. I believe I can achieve my goals on my own.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
20. I believe I can use my special skills and competencies to keep going my close relationships.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
21. I believe I can use my special skills and talents under any circumstances.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
22. I believe I can persist in maintaining my close relationships in a good way even in very difficult circumstances.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
23. I believe I can keep persist in my job in the face of obstacles if I feel the support of my group.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
24. I believe I can succeed in the most challenging tasks on my own.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
25. I believe I can easily adapt to the situations where people work together.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
26. I believe I can set challenging goals for myself and work hard to achieve them even though they do not seem easy to achieve.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
27. I believe I can overcome problems by working together with my group.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
28. I believe I can achieve my goals by working together with those who are closest to me.	Y	N	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	

APPENDIX M: SELF-ENHANCEMENT SCALE

1. We feel that we belong to some groups, even if we do not know all the members. (e.g., relatives, team, neighborhood, club and school clubs, etc.) Now, please think about the problems that you had in some of these groups that were resolved positively for the benefit of the group. When you consider the process of resolving them positively, how valid is each statement for you?
 - a. In general, the problems were resolved when I tried hard, but were not resolved, when I did not try hard.
I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree
 - b. The fact that the problems were resolved was a result of my general ability to have good relationships with groups.
I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree
 - c. In general, the problems were resolved for the benefit of the group when the other members of the group tried hard, but were not resolved when others did not try hard.
I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree
 - d. These problems were meant to be resolved.
I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree
 - e. In general, the problems that are resolved are the ones to be resolved easily.
I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree
2. We have some individual struggles in life. Now, please think about the problems that you had in the past that resulted in a way that affected your future negatively. When you consider the process of these problems resulting in negative consequences for your future, how valid is each statement for you?
 - a. The fact that the problems resulted in negative consequences was mostly due to the fact that I did not try hard enough.
I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree
 - b. The fact that the problems resulted in negative consequences was due to my inability.
I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree
 - c. The fact that the problems resulted in negative consequences was due to the fact that other people did not do much at all.
I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree
 - d. These problems were meant to result in negative consequences.
I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree
 - e. In general, the problems that result in negative consequences are the most difficult ones to resolve.
I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

3. Sometimes there are problems in every relationship. Now please think about the problems that you had with your spouse/lover or best friend in the past that resolved positively for the future of your relationship. When you consider the process of resolving them positively, how valid is each statement for you?

- a. In general, the problems were resolved when I tried hard, but were not resolved, when I did not try hard.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- b. The fact that the problems were resolved was a result of my general ability in close relationships.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- c. In general, the problems were resolved for the benefit of the group when the other members of the group tried hard, but were not resolved when others did not try hard.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- d. These problems were meant to be resolved.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- e. In general, the problems that are resolved are the ones to be resolved easily.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

4. We feel that we belong to some groups, even if we do not know all the members. (e.g. relatives, team, neighborhood, club and school clubs, etc.) Now, please think about the problems that you had in some of these groups in the past that resulted in a way affected the well-being of the group negatively. When you consider the process of these problems resulting in negative consequences, how valid is each statement for you?

- a. The fact that the problems resulted in negative consequences was mostly due to the fact that I did not try hard enough.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- b. The fact that the problems resulted in negative consequences was due to my inability in relationships with groups.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- c. The fact that the problems resulted in negative consequences was due to the fact that other people did not do much at all.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- d. These problems were meant to result in negative consequences.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- e. In general, the problems that result in negative consequences are the most difficult ones to resolve.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

5. We have some individual struggles in life. Now, please think about the problems that you had in the past that were resolved positively for your future. When you consider the process of resolving them positively, how valid is each statement for you?

- a. In general, the problems were resolved when I tried hard, but were not resolved, when I did not try hard.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- b. The fact that the problems were resolved was a result of my general ability.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- c. In general, the problems were resolved for the benefit of the group when the other members of the group tried hard, but were not resolved when others did not try hard.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- d. These problems were meant to be resolved.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- e. In general, the problems that are resolved are the ones to be resolved easily.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

6. Sometimes there are problems in every relationship. Now please think about the problems that you had with your spouse/lover or best friend in the past and that resulted in a way that affected the future of your relationship negatively. When you consider the process of these problems resulting in negative consequences, how valid is each statement for you?

- a. The fact that the problems resulted in negative consequences was mostly due to the fact that I did not try hard enough.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- b. The fact that the problems resulted in negative consequences was due to my inability in close relationships.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- c. The fact that the problems resulted in negative consequences was due to the fact that other people did not do much at all.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- d. These problems were meant to result in negative consequences.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

- e. In general, the problems that result in negative consequences are the most difficult ones to resolve.

I strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I strongly agree

APPENDIX N: RELATIONAL, INDIVIDUAL, AND COLLECTIVE SELF-ASPECTS SCALE

Please evaluate how much the 10 items below describe you and how suitable they are for you. (how much they refer to you) Please write a number from 1 to 7 on the line at the left side of the each statement. The word “relatives” in the questions refer to the people whom you’re related by blood except for mother, father, siblings, spouse and children. Please take this explanation into consideration while answering the questions.

Does not describe me at all									It exactly describes me
Not true of me at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		Very true of me

Example:

1. When others do not agree with me

- _____ a. I state my opinions if my group (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhood, neighbors etc.) agrees with me
- _____ b. I state my opinions if my parents and siblings agree with me
- _____ c. I state my opinions regardless of what the others think
- _____ d. I state my opinions if the person with whom I date/ my spouse or my best friend agrees with me

Now you can start to answer the questions below in a way that reflects your opinions.

1. What makes me proud of is

- _____ a. the fact that my best friend was praised in the newspaper due to something s/he has done.
- _____ b. the fact that one of the family members was praised in the newspaper due to something s/he has done
- _____ c. the fact that I was praised in the newspaper due to the something I have done
- _____ d. the fact that my group (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhood, neighbors etc.) was praised in the newspaper due to something they have done

2. What makes me most content is

- _____ a. doing something for my group (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhood, neighbors etc.)
- _____ b. doing something for the people whom I care about
- _____ c. doing something for my family
- _____ d. doing something for myself

3. The way to be a honorable person is

- _____ a. being devoted to my family
- _____ b. being devoted to the people with whom I have close relationship
- _____ c. being loyal to the groups (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhood, neighbors etc.) which I belong to
- _____ d. being honest towards myself

4. When I attend a concert/ theater/cinema

- _____ a. I have a good time if I like the event
- _____ b. I enjoy it if my company(partner, friend, guest) also enjoys the event
- _____ c. being there with my group is enough to feel good even if I don’t like the event much

Does not describe me at all**It exactly describes me****Not true of me at all****1****2****3****4****5****6****7****Very true of me**

5. The thing I care about most is

- _____ a. my relationship with the person whom I care very much/ who is the closest to me.
- _____ b. my relationship with my family
- _____ c. my relationship with my group (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhood, neighbors etc.)
- _____ d. my relationship with myself

6. To define a person as a good employer of a company, that person

- _____ a. should feel personal responsibility for the task assigned
- _____ b. should get on well with his colleagues and be in cooperation with them.
- _____ c. should work for the benefits of the company which s/he works for.

7. I regard myself as

- _____ a. a good spouse and friend
- _____ b. an individual who knows of her/his wishes
- _____ c. a good child or parent
- _____ d. a good member of my group (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhood, neighbors etc.)

8. I would teach my children

- _____ a. to be loyal to the group which they belong to (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhood, neighbors etc.)
- _____ b. to be loyal to their family
- _____ c. to get to know themselves and improve themselves
- _____ d. to care about their friends and be sensitive to them.

9. The most important thing in life is

- _____ a. working for the benefits of the group which I belong to (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhoods, neighbors etc.)
- _____ b. being consistent and honest towards myself.
- _____ c. being in good relationships with the people whom I care about
- _____ d. being in good relationships with my family.

10. When I have to make an important personal decision

- _____ a. I talk with my partner or my best friend
- _____ b. I talk to my mother, father and siblings
- _____ c. I ask myself what I really want to do most
- _____ d. I talk to my relatives

APPENDIX O: RELATIONAL, INDIVIDUAL, AND COLLECTIVE SELF-
ASPECTS SCALE – RANKING SCALE

Now please look at the 10 questions on the page 6 and 7. Look at the options of the questions and make a new evaluation by putting

the mark “+” next to the one option that describes you BEST and that suits you MOST.

the mark “- ” next to the one option that describes you LEAST and that suits you LEAST

You should make this evaluation for each of the 10 question separately.

Example

1. When others do not agree with me

- _____ a. I state my opinions if my group (for example relatives, school, club, neighborhood, neighbors etc.) agrees with me
- _____ b. I state my opinions if my parents and siblings agree with me
- _____ c. I state my opinions regardless of what the others think
- _____ d. I state my opinions if the person with whom I date/ my spouse or my best friend agrees with me

Now please go back to pages 6 and 7.

APPENDIX P: AUTUNOMOUS RELATIONAL SELF SCALE

“This questionnaire includes the statements about people and their relationships. Please state your opinions about the statements below by taking into consideration your relationships with whom you feel very close to yourself”

It doesn't suit me / to my thoughts at all	It doesn't suit me/ to my thoughts	Not sure	It suits me/ to my thoughts	It suits me/ to my thoughts a lot
1	2	3	4	5

- ___ 1. I can change my decisions easily in accordance with the wishes of the people who are close to me
- ___ 2. A person can both be devoted to the people who are close to him and want them to respect his ideas, when they don't agree with each other.
- ___ 3. I don't share my personal life even with the person who is very close to me
- ___ 4. When I become a close friend with someone, I usually identify myself with that person.
- ___ 5. The relations with the people who are close to me enables me to feel secure and peaceful.
- ___ 6. In general, I try to behave in accordance with the wishes of those whom I feel very close to myself.
- ___ 7. To know who is my close friend makes me proud.
- ___ 8. Those who are close to me are the most important for me.
- ___ 9. One should not have any close relationship to be autonomous.
- ___ 10. The role of my close relationships is unimportant while describing myself.
- ___ 11. What the people who are close to me think about me is not important for me.
- ___ 12. The decisions of the people whom I feel very close about a subject related with me are valid for me.
- ___ 13. A person can feel both devoted to the people who are close to him and free.
- ___ 14. The people whom I feel very close to myself often come to my mind.
- ___ 15. In general, my close relationships are not related to my emotions about myself.
- ___ 16. I consult the people who are close to me while taking my decisions.
- ___ 17. Being very close to a person prevents one from being free.
- ___ 18. In general, my close relationships are the important part of my identity.
- ___ 19. The roles of the people who are close to me on my identity are very important.
- ___ 20. To attach importance to the opinions of the people who are close to me means that you disregard your own opinions.
- ___ 21. If somebody hurts the person whom I am close, I feel personally hurt too.
- ___ 22. The opinions of the people whom I feel very close about a subject related with me influence me.
- ___ 23. One should oppose to the opinions of the people who are very close to himself.
- ___ 24. When I think of myself, I also think of my close friends or my family.
- ___ 25. In general, I don't share the things about myself with others.
- ___ 26. The people who have very close relationships cannot make their own decisions.
- ___ 27. It is necessary to understand my close friends in order to understand me.
- ___ 28. I lead my life in accordance with the opinions of those whom I feel very close
- ___ 29. I feel independent of the people who are close to me.
- ___ 30. When a person whom I am close has an achievement, I am proud of him.
- ___ 31. The last decision should be given by the person himself, even though the suggestions of the people who are close to him are taken into consideration while plans are being made.
- ___ 32. I would like to keep the distance in my relationship with the people who are close to me.
- ___ 33. When I feel very close to somebody, I feel as if that person were a part of my identity.
- ___ 34. I don't like the fact that even a person whom I feel very close interferes with my life.
- ___ 35. Both having close relationships and being autonomous are important.
- ___ 36. My close relationships reflect who I am.
- ___ 37. The effects of the people who are close to me on my decisions are inconsiderable.
- ___ 38. I need the support of the people whom I feel very close.

APPENDIX R: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Gender ☐ F

☐ M

a. Age _____

b. Department _____

c. How long have you been a student at the Bogazici University? _____

d. What is your class in your department? _____

e. Please mark the type of the high school from which you graduated

☐ Vocational High School

☐ Anadolu Vocational High School

☐ High School

☐ Anadolu High School

☐ College

☐ Other (Please specify) _____

f. Where did you live in the most of your life?

☐ Village

☐ Small Town

☐ Town

☐ City

☐ Metropolis

g. How long have you been living in Istanbul? _____