

**BAŞKENT UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
MASTER IN
SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY WITH THESIS**

**THE ROLE OF MEANING IN LIFE ON THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN DEATH ANXIETY AND WELL-BEING IN AN
EXISTENTIAL CONTEXT**

BY

SENA TEKÇE

MASTER'S THESIS

THESIS ADVISOR

ASST. PROF. ZUHAL YENİÇERİ KÖKDEMİR

ANKARA – 2022

BAŞKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU

Tarih: 25 / 07 / 2022

Öğrencinin Adı, Soyadı: Sena Tekçe

Öğrencinin Numarası: 21910197

Anabilim Dalı: Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı

Programı: Sosyal Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı

Danışmanın Unvanı/Adı, Soyadı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Zuhal Yeniçeri Kökdemir

Tez Başlığı: The Role of Meaning in Life on The Relationship between Death Anxiety and Well-Being in An Existential Context

Yukarıda başlığı belirtilen Yüksek Lisans/Doktora tez çalışmamın; Giriş, Ana Bölümler ve Sonuç Bölümünden oluşan, toplam 42 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 25 / 07 / 2022 tarihinde şahsım/tez danışmanım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı %10'dur. Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

1. Kaynakça hariç
2. Alıntılar hariç
3. Beş (5) kelimedenden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

“Başkent Üniversitesi Enstitüleri Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Usul ve Esaslarını” inceledim ve bu uygulama esaslarında belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Öğrenci İmzası:

Onay

Tarih: 25 / 07 / 2022

Öğrenci Danışmanı Unvan, Ad, Soyad,

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Zuhal Yeniçeri Kökdemir

To all my loved ones



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Zuhale Yeniceri Kökdemir. She patiently answered my endless questions and did not make me feel alone throughout the process. She supported me not only within the scope of the thesis but also psychologically. She gave me the courage to keep going when I faced difficulties. I feel lucky to have had the opportunity to work with her.

I am grateful to Mualla Yıldız for accepting to be on the jury in my thesis defense and for her valuable feedback and contributions. I would also like to thank Doğan Kökdemir, who has always supported me, during my undergraduate and graduate years. He was responsible for planting the seeds of existential psychology in my mind during my undergraduate years. I would like to thank Elvin Doğutepe, who gave feedback during the thesis writing, for her time with me. I would like to thank Okan Cem Çırakoğlu for not holding back his wisdom since my undergraduate years and for always keeping his door open to me. I would like to thank Mualla Yıldız again for helping me find participants. She made great efforts to reach the appropriate number of participants. I would also like to thank her students for participating in the study. Thanks to Ateizm Derneği for sharing my thesis announcement on their social media and providing me with a great number of participants in a short time. Finally, I would like to thank İlker Dalgıç for his support and wisdom during my difficult times.

I thank Furkan Cantürkoglu. He was with me throughout the process with his endless support. He gave me strength as I struggled to cope with difficulties. I cannot express in words how important he and what he has done for me is. Bahar Balcı and Berkay Çakmak also have a very important place for me. Throughout the process, they offered me their sincere support as friends as well as peer supervision. For this reason, I also thank them. I would also like to thank all my graduate friends. It was very valuable for me that everyone helped each other during the thesis process and created a helpful environment.

My dear family... I would like to thank my family for not only being with me during this process but always supporting me to reach this point in my life. Solmaz Tekçe, Nimet Uçarcan, Gönül Günyolu are my three musketeers. I am so lucky that they raised me and grew up with me. I will always be grateful for their unconditional love. Thank you, Emre Tekçe for making me laugh more than anyone can and being my joy throughout the process.

I would like to thank Cüneyt Tekçe for being my rock and helping me become an independent woman. Thank you all from the bottom of my heart for always believing in me.



ÖZET

TEKÇE, Sena. Varoluşsal Bağlamda Ölüm Kaygısı ve İyilik Hali Arasındaki İlişkide Hayatta Anlamın Rolü. Başkent Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sosyal Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı, 2022.

Ölümün bilinmezliğinin bizde kaygı uyandırdığı ve bu kaygının bizi hayatta anlam bulmaya motive ettiği öne sürülmektedir. Ek olarak, hayatta anlamın varlığı ve yokluğunun iyilik hali üzerindeki etkileri çokça çalışılmıştır. Bu tez, varoluşsal bağlamda hayatta anlam, ölüm kaygısı ve iyilik hali arasındaki bağlantıları anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca, inanç ve iyilik hali arasındaki ilişkinin mekanizmasını anlamak amaçlanmıştır. Literatürde herhangi bir dine inanmayan bireyler hakkında çok az sosyal bilimsel veri bulunmakta ve inancı içeren çalışmalarda herhangi bir dine inanmayan bireyler nadiren yer almaktadır. Bu nedenle önerilen model hem herhangi bir dine inanmayan hem de herhangi bir dine inanan bireyler için test edilmesi planlanmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini 18-67 yaş aralığındaki 395 birey oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın verileri; İnançsızlığın Altı Tipolojisi, Hayatta Anlam Anketi, Templer'in Ölüm Kaygısı Ölçeği, Psikolojik İyilik Hali Ölçeği ve Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Sonuçlar, tüm katılımcılar için hayatta anlam arayışının ölüm kaygısı ve iyilik hali arasındaki ilişkiye aracılık ettiğini göstermiştir. Herhangi bir dine inanan bireyler için hayatta anlamın varlığının ölüm kaygısı ile iyilik hali arasındaki ilişkiye aracılık ettiği, herhangi bir dine inanmayan bireyler için ise hayatta anlam arayışının aracılık ettiği görülmüştür. Genel olarak sonuçlar, hayatta anlamın ölüm kaygısı ve iyilik hali arasındaki ilişkide önemli bir değişken olduğunu göstermiştir. Sonuçlar ilgili literatür ışığında daha ayrıntılı olarak tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: hayatta anlam, öznel ve psikolojik iyilik hali, ölüm kaygısı, inanç

ABSTRACT

TEKÇE, Sena. The Role of Meaning in Life on The Relationship between Death Anxiety and Well-Being in An Existential Context. Başkent University, Institute of Social Sciences, Master in Social Psychology with Thesis, 2022.

It is claimed that the unknown of death arouses anxiety in us and this anxiety motivates us to find meaning in life. In addition, the effects of the presence and absence of meaning in life on well-being have been studied extensively. This thesis aims to understand the connections between meaning in life, death anxiety, and well-being in an existential context. Also, it is aimed to understand the mechanism of the relationship between belief and well-being. There is little social scientific data in the literature on individuals who do not believe in any religion, and they are rarely included in belief studies. For this reason, the proposed model is planned to be tested both for individuals who believe in any religion and for individuals who do not believe in any religion. The sample of the study consists of 395 individuals between the ages of 18-67. The research data was collected through Typology of Six Types of Nonbelief, The Meaning in Life Questionnaire, Templer's Death Anxiety Scale, Psychological Well-Being Scale, and Satisfaction with Life Scale. The results showed that the search for meaning in life mediated the relationship between death anxiety and well-being for all participants. It was seen that the presence of meaning in life mediated the relationship between death anxiety and well-being for individuals who reported that they believed in any religion, while the search for meaning in life was mediated for individuals who reported that they did not believe in any religion. Overall, the results showed that meaning in life was an important variable in the relationship between death anxiety and well-being. The results are discussed in more detail in the light of the relevant literature.

Keywords: meaning in life, subjective and psychological well-being, death anxiety, belief

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	i
ÖZET.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. The Philosophical and Theoretical Origin of Well-Being	1
1.1.1 Subjective well-being.....	2
1.1.1.1 Subjective well-being of individuals who believe and do not believe in any religion.....	5
1.1.2. Psychological well-being.....	7
1.1.2.1. Psychological well-being of individuals who believe and do not believe in any religion.....	8
1.2. Meaning in Life.....	8
1.2.1. Meaning in life and well-being.....	10
1.3. Death Anxiety	11
1.3.1. Meaning in life and death anxiety.....	12
1.3.2. Death anxiety and well-being.....	12
1.3.3. Death anxiety of individuals who believe and do not believe in any religion	13
1.4. The Relevance of the Current Study and the Research Questions	14
2. METHOD.....	17
2.1. Procedure	17
2.2. Materials	17

2.3. Participants.....	19
2.4. Analysis Strategy	21
3. RESULTS.....	22
3.1. Descriptive statistics of study variables	22
3.2. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).....	22
3.3. Correlations for study variables.....	23
3.4. Impact of death anxiety and meaning in life on subjective and psychological well-being.....	24
3.5. Proposed model test (Research question 1).....	25
3.5.1. Model testing for individuals who believe in any religion.....	28
3.5.2. Model testing for individuals who do not believe in any religion	29
3.6. Comparison of individuals who do not believe in any religion according to typologies (Research question 2).....	31
3.6.1. Participants.....	31
3.6.2. Descriptive statistics of study variables.....	34
3.6.3. Comparison of typologies.....	34
4. DISCUSSION	36
4.1. Limitations	41
4.2. Conclusion.....	42
REFERENCES	44
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX 1: INFORMED CONSENT FORM	
APPENDIX 2: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM	
APPENDIX 3: TEMPLER’S DEATH ANXIETY SCALE	
APPENDIX 4: THE MEANING IN LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE	
APPENDIX 5: PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING SCALE	
APPENDIX 6: FACULTIES / DEPARTMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS	
APPENDIX 7: MULTIPLE COMPARISONS FOR TYPOLOGIES	

APPENDIX 8: ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL



LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 385)	20
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Variables	22
Table 3. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis	22
Table 4. Correlations for Study Variables	23
Table 5. The Predictive Effects of Death Anxiety and Meaning in Life on Subjective Well-Being 24	
Table 6. The Predictive Effects of Death Anxiety and Meaning in Life on Psychological Well-Being	25
Table 7. Proposed Model Fit Index Values Before Modification	26
Table 8. Proposed Model Fit Index Values After Modification	26
Table 9. Model Fit Index Values for IBR	28
Table 10. Model Fit Index Values for NonIBR	30
Table 11. Descriptive Statistics of NonIBR	33
Table 12. Descriptive Statistics of the Variables for NonIBR	34
Table 13. Means and Standard Deviations of the Dependent Variables for Each Typology	34

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. The Proposed Model	16
Figure 2. Standardized Parameter Estimates for Proposed Model: Presence of Meaning in Life and Search for Meaning in Life as Mediators of the Relationship between Death Anxiety and Well-Being	27
Figure 3. Standardized Parameter Estimates of the Model Tested for IBR: Presence of Meaning in Life and Search for Meaning in Life as Mediators of the Relationship between Death Anxiety and Well-Being	29
Figure 4. Standardized Parameter Estimates of the Model Tested for NonIBR: Presence of Meaning in Life and Search for Meaning in Life as Mediators of the Relationship between Death Anxiety and Well-Being.....	31



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Philosophical and Theoretical Origin of Well-Being

Although the feeling of happiness is common to many animal species, *Homo sapiens* can understand what the feeling of happiness is about and thus can have some individual authority on the subject (Grinde, 2012). Researchers find the concept of well-being arguable and complicated but still, there is a generally accepted definition. “The concept of well-being refers to optimal psychological functioning and experience.” (Ryan & Deci, 2001). In addition, based on Greek philosophy: hedonia and eudaimonia (Delle Fave et al., 2011; Ryan & Deci, 2001).

The roots of the hedonic tradition can be traced to philosophers such as Aristippus, Epicurus, Bentham, and Locke (Bergsma et al., 2008; Rossiter, 2016; Waterman, 2008). Hedonia is a subjective experience of pleasure. The philosopher Kraut (1979) described it as "the belief that one is getting the important things one wants, as well as certain pleasant affects that normally go along with this belief". The philosophers saw the concepts of pain and pleasure as indicators of good and bad. For this reason, philosophers think that people basically want to reduce pain as much as possible and experience more pleasure. Based on this context, not surprisingly, pleasure has been accepted as a reflection of well-being (Diener, 2009; Henderson & Knight, 2012). On the other hand, some philosophers such as Aristotle have begun to emphasize that traits such as inner development, wisdom, and virtue rather than physical pleasure are the traits to be sought (Grinde, 2012). Aristotle emphasizes that eudaimonia is gained by engaging in ‘meaningful’ activities, but activities do not necessarily cause feelings of joy. Hence, eudaimonia is not happiness in the everyday sense of the word. In this context, happiness is a wishable situation evaluated not by our subjective evaluations, but by a certain value system (Diener, 2009; Grinde, 2012). As a result, the literature discusses happiness in a way that includes both hedonic and eudaimonic elements and most contemporary psychologists agree that each approach expresses important aspects of well-being (Henderson & Knight, 2012; Grinde, 2012; Keyes et al., 2002; Waterman, 1993).

The concept of ‘well-being’ has been investigated in psychology, especially since the 1980s, and conditions and qualities that influence well-being have been studied (Myers & Diener, 1995). Two main perspectives examine the concept of well-being and,

although different from each other, relatively overlap: Subjective well-being (hedonism) and psychological well-being (eudaimonism) (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Waterman, 1993). Although both perspectives represent well-being, the two perspectives handle distinct characteristics of well-being. While psychological well-being (PWB) investigates perceived development in the face of life's existential challenges (for example, expanding and improving as an individual, going after meaningful purposes), subjective well-being (SWB) includes more universal assessments of affect and life quality (Keyes et al., 2002).

1.1.1 Subjective well-being

The dominant view on the concept of happiness in the literature is based on subjective well-being (Diener, 2000, 2009).

It includes an emotional component, consisting in the presence of positive emotions and the absence of negative emotions, and a cognitive component, which is a personal judgment on satisfaction with one's life as a whole, or with specific life domains such as work or relationships (Delle Fave et al., 2011; Diener, 2000).

At this point, it can be said that increasing happiness as much as possible is one of the highest human goals (Diener, 2009).

As mentioned above, subjective well-being occurs in the presence of positive emotions and the absence of negative emotions (Diener, 2000). Studies have shown that although long-term levels of subjective well-being are affected by living conditions (Diener et al., 2003), individuals' positive emotion levels tend to be stable over time and they perceive themselves as lightly happy on the positive-negative emotions spectrum (Fiske & Taylor, 2013). In addition, there are studies in which this consistency of subjective well-being over time is associated with personality. For example, in the study conducted by Anglim and Grant (2016) on personality traits and well-being, neuroticism and extroversion were found to be the personality traits that were the most related to subjective well-being. Moreover, it was found that neuroticism had a negative effect on subjective well-being, while extroversion had a positive effect (Costa, & McCrae, 1980). These findings are consistent with the study of DeNeve and Cooper (1998). Despite the results of DeNeve and Cooper (1998), Librán (2006) found that neuroticism explained 44% variance of subjective well-being, while extroversion explained 7.3%. Based on

these findings, Librán recommends that subjective well-being is more associated with emotional stability than extraversion (Librán, 2006).

Based on stability, it is not surprising that there are studies in which subjective well-being is associated with personality, as well as studies in which it is associated with genetics. Bartels and Boomsma (2009) found that subjective well-being was significantly predicted by heritability in the 40-50% range in a study they conducted on a sample of twins and their siblings ($N = 5,024$). The findings of inheritance-based studies may vary depending on the method of the research and the participant group (Nes & Røysamb, 2015). Nevertheless, according to a meta-analysis of heredity studies, the genetic weight on subjective well-being varies between 32-41% (Nes & Røysamb, 2015).

Some studies include the relationships between subjective well-being and demographic variables such as age, race, sexual orientation, education level, and income. In a study conducted in 2013, Sarracino examined whether happiness differs between countries. In the study comparing the poorest and richest countries, the happiness equation (includes social capital and relational goods) is constant for both country types, and social capital is found to be significantly associated with stronger coefficients of subjective well-being in high-income countries than in low-income countries. Another study explored how subjective well-being was related to income, personal concerns, and social assessments based on rural and urban Chinese. When rural and urban Chinese were compared, higher income was found to be associated with subjective well-being for both groups (Han, 2015). A different study, conducted with data collected from China and investigating the relationship between the economy and subjective well-being, found that subjective well-being is more influenced by lasting income shocks (temporary) and unexpected income shocks (expected) (Cai & Park, 2016). In the study, which included about 30 countries, it was found that the desire for high income decreased the development of subjective well-being, even though the countries were high-income (Hovi & Laamanen, 2021). In a study conducted by Arber, Fenn, and Meadows (2014), based on the middle (45-64) and older age (65 and over) groups, it was found that income and subjective financial well-being for the middle age group were independently correlated with health. When it comes to older age, subjective financial well-being was found to be correlated with health; however, income's effects on health was mediated through subjective financial well-being. The studies on income levels and subjective well-being

were mentioned above, but what kind of a relationship exists between the subjective well-being of the sub-sample, the 1% with the highest income, and their income levels? A study involving more than 200,000 participants from 35 countries found that the top 1% income shares were less clearly associated with life satisfaction, but were positively associated with happiness (Brzezinski, 2019).

In developed countries, a more embracing societal climate has emerged in recent decades toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals (Castells, 2010; Hicks & Lee, 2006). In these periods of social transformations related to sexuality and gender roles, some studies include subjective well-being variables in the LGBTQ community (Boertien & Vignoli, 2019; Chen & Van Ours, 2018; Douglass et al., 2017; Froh et al., 2009; Martínez-Marín & Martínez, 2019; Nouvilas-Pallejà et al., 2018; Schilt & Westbrook 2009). For example, the subjective well-being of all same-sex partners has been found to increase over time due to the legalization of same-sex marriage. Additionally, further analysis has shown that same-sex partners who are currently married have higher subjective well-being compared to same-sex partners living together (Boertien & Vignoli, 2019). Moreover, Chen and Van Ours (2018), found that same-sex and different-sex partners had similar levels of subjective well-being. In addition, when the gender differences in subjective well-being of the living and married groups were examined in the study, no difference was found between the different-sex couples. However, in cases of being married versus living together, it was found that marriage had a greater effect on the subjective well-being of male participants than females in same-sex couples. Despite the development of an accepting social climate towards homosexual people in developed countries (Castells, 2010; Hicks & Lee, 2006), most societies still maintain that only close relationships (romantic or sexual relationships) involving members of the opposite sex are acceptable (Schilt & Westbrook 2009). In addition, studies are showing that gay and bisexual individuals have worse mental health and experience higher levels of distress, anxiety, and depression than heterosexual individuals (Fergusson et al., 2005; Meyer, 2013; Ueno, 2005).

Studying the relationship between education level as another demographic variable and subjective well-being is difficult in terms of research since education is also related to other variables that affect happiness such as income and health (Florit & Lladosa, 2007). In a study conducted by Witter, Okun, Stock, and Haring (1984), while researchers were examining the relationship between education and subjective well-

being, they also added participants' age, sex, and race as variables to the study. When other demographic variables are included, there was no statistically significant difference between black and white individuals in terms of the relationship between subjective well-being and education, while women showed a stronger relationship compared to men, and older adults compared to younger adults. As a result of the study, a slightly positive relationship was found between subjective well-being and education in general. In another study, similar to the previous study, it was found that higher education (college degree) had a relatively positive effect on subjective well-being when health and income were assigned as control variables (Yakovlev & Leguizamon, 2012).

Considering age as a variable, is a controversial issue in the literature, similar to education. The reason for the age paradox is that subjective well-being remains stable despite the decrease in health and psychosocial losses with aging (Bond & Corner, 2004; Frijters & Beaton, 2012). In the literature, the relationship between aging and subjective well-being is generally grouped under U-shaped, inverted U-shaped, and linear relationships (Ulloa et al., 2013). Despite the findings involving different relationship aspects, some recent studies show that although subjective well-being remains stable, there are changes in the levels of some sub-dimensions of subjective well-being with aging. For example, in a study conducted by Hansen and Slagsvold (2012), participants showed stability in subjective well-being towards old age, while life satisfaction and negative affect were found to be inversely proportional to older age longitudinally. However, in the horizontal section, positive affect and depression were found to be inversely related to advanced age. In addition, no gender difference was found in the study.

1.1.1.1 Subjective well-being of individuals who believe and do not believe in any religion

Religiosity is another subject that has been studied extensively with subjective well-being. For example, in a study comparing individual religiosity and national religiosity, it was found that individual religiosity and national religiosity were associated with higher subjective well-being, while negative affect levels increased as national religiosity increased. Researchers suggest that the increase in the level of negative affect may be due to the fact that countries that are religious at the national level have policies that restrict individual religious freedom (Tay et al., 2014). On the other hand, people

living in secular countries report the highest happiness scores compared to other countries in international comparisons (Beit-Hallahmi, 2009; Zuckerman, 2008).

In general, studies show a positive relationship between religiosity and subjective well-being, although in some contexts the findings vary (Ellison, 1991; Abdel-Khalek, 2010). For example, there are differences in subjective well-being levels among individuals who define themselves as religious. When we look at the participation of people in religious services in the context of individual religiosity, it is seen that the life satisfaction and positive affect levels of individuals who participate irregularly or not at all are lower than those who regularly attend religious services (Lim, 2015). In studies in the context of age, the positive relationship between subjective well-being and religiosity of older participants was found to be stronger than younger participants (Witter et al., 1985). In addition, according to another study conducted more recently, it is seen that Kuwaiti adolescents, young adults, and middle-aged participants do not differ in terms of relationship direction and strength. When gender differences are examined, it was found that religious men have higher subjective well-being than religious women. The researcher suggests that the gender difference may be due to the fact that women are subject to more freedom restrictions than men (Abdel-Khalek, 2012). People's commitment to their religious identity also differs in the level of their relationship with subjective well-being. While higher scores for religious status (high commitment vs uncertain individuals) were positively associated with life satisfaction, no such relationship was found for individuals with low scores (Villani et al., 2019). In addition to studies with individuals who reported that they believe in any religion (IBR), some individuals reported that they do not believe in any religion (nonIBR) at the other end of the belief spectrum. But there has been relatively little sustained social scientific research on the nonbeliever/secular group particularly, in belief studies. Therefore, little empirical facts are known about the nonIBR (Fenn, 2001). Although they do not have as many populations as IBR in the world, they are more numerous today than ever before, and it is estimated that there are between 500 million and 750 million people worldwide who do not believe in God (Zuckerman, 2007). When we include agnostic and atheist individuals into the equation, a curvilinear relationship emerges between life satisfaction and belief. That is, individuals with high certainty of belief (confidently religious and atheists) were found to have higher life satisfaction than individuals with low certainty (unsure religious and agnostics). Researchers suggest that this variation in findings may

be due to assured ethos, not belief (Galen & Kloet, 2011). These findings are in line with the research findings recently conducted by Pöhls, Schlösser, and Fetchenhauer (2020).

1.1.2. Psychological well-being

It has been mentioned before that the concept of 'eudaimonia' does not simply mean happiness (Waterman, 1993). Ryff (1989a), proposed 'successful aging' as a response to the concept of 'eudaimonia'. The main feature that distinguishes eudaimonia (psychological well-being) from hedonia (subjective well-being) is that it focuses on the psychological functioning of the person (Ryff, 1989a; Waterman, 1993). She developed this proposition to eliminate some deficiencies in the positive psychology literature. Before the concept of successful aging, the literature focused more on the concept of disease rather than the well-being of the person. Secondly, psychological well-being was lacking in terms of theoretically presenting a holistic perspective and sub-dimensions that make up the individual's well-being. In addition to filling these gaps in the literature, the concept of psychological well-being considers the development of the person as a never-ending process and evaluates well-being from a dynamic perspective (Ryff, 1989a). Ryff proposed 6 sub-dimensions of psychological well-being. The model's sub-dimensions are; autonomy, self-acceptance, purpose in life, personal growth, environmental mastery, and positive relationships with others (Ryff, 1989b).

There are studies on whether psychological well-being differs with variables such as age, gender, and culture (Kitayama & Markus, 2000; Koo, 2021; McLeod & Owens, 2004; Ryff, 1989a). It is seen that environmental mastery and autonomy increase with age and this difference is more pronounced between young adult and middle age groups. Surprisingly, purpose in life and personal growth scores decrease as we move from middle age to the elderly group. There was no age difference in self-acceptance and positive relationship with others. When we look at the gender differences, women from all age groups got higher scores than men in positive relationships with others. At the same time, personal growth scores tend to be higher than men's (Keyes & Ryff, 1999). In addition, cross-cultural studies have shown that high independence predicts higher well-being in the United States, while high interdependence predicts higher well-being in Japan (Kitayama et al., 2010).

1.1.2.1. Psychological well-being of individuals who believe and do not believe in any religion

There are studies on religion and mental health and findings showing a positive relationship between religiosity and psychological well-being (Leondari & Gialamas, 2009). Despite these findings, the issue remains controversial (Schumaker, 1992). For example, some studies have suggested that religiosity is positively associated with positive mental health outcomes (Levin & Taylor, 1998), while others have found no such association (Musick, 2000; Atchley, 1997). When we evaluate religiosity in the context of mental health, depression can be given as another example. Some studies report that religiosity is associated with reduced levels of depression (Petts & Jolliff, 2008), and still, others suggest that religiosity has no significant effect on depression (O'Connell & Skevington, 2005; Sherkat & Reed, 1992). It is suggested that these differences in findings may be due to the differentiation of measurement tools in the studies or other variables included in the studies except religiosity and well-being (Petersen & Roy, 1985).

As mentioned earlier, relatively little sustained social scientific research has been conducted on nonIBR, particularly in belief studies, and little is known about the empirical facts about nonIBR (Fenn, 2001). Despite the limitations of the findings, there are results that atheist individuals' identification with their identity is positively associated with psychological well-being, and atheists and agnostics tend to have worse outcomes than those with or without religious affiliation in the dimensions of psychological well-being (Doane & Elliott, 2015; Hayward et al., 2016).

1.2. Meaning in Life

One of the most important features that distinguish humans from other animals is their self-awareness. For example, a deer has no thoughts of the past or the future. For a deer, life is a daily sensory purchase between finding food and not being hunted. As Homo sapiens, we can separate ourselves from the things around us and perceive ourselves as objects, thanks to the 'I' that comes with awareness. Only humans know that life is finite because of our perception of time that comes with this awareness. Thus, it was inevitable for people to have some existential anxieties (Becker, 1971).

Throughout history, philosophers, starting with Descartes, Kant, and Hegel, have tried to ask questions about existential issues and answer these questions from their perspectives. Some thinkers, especially in the 20th century, were influenced by these philosophers, built ideas on their views, and put forward new ideas in terms of existentialism. Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Camus, Jaspers, Beauvoir, and more have tried to understand and explain what it means to be human, our communication with the world around us, and how humans can find meaning in a finite life (Bakewell, 2017).

One of the main features of existential philosophy is its focus on the individual, and the existential questions listed above are valid for all individuals (Barrett, 1962). In addition, the concept of 'Being' is important for existential philosophy to center the individual. In this context, Being is not emphasized as a general existence such as the existence of people, flowers, books, as the ancient Greek philosopher, Aristotle suggested. According to Heidegger, the term 'Being' is based on the existence of humans. For this reason, he used the concept of 'Dasein', which defines a human-specific Being. Heidegger emphasizes that we need to separate ourselves from the existence of other beings in order to get closer to the concept of Being (Kaufmann, 1959). Another reason for making this distinction is that homo sapiens is aware of its own existence and has the consciousness to question its existence compared to other beings (Mulhall, 2005). With this contribution of Heidegger to existential philosophy, philosophy ceased to be a subject discussed among a certain group and opened the doors of a philosophical view that concerns every human being (Kaufmann, 1960).

Existential psychotherapist Yalom (1980), one of the pioneers of those who integrated existential philosophy into psychology, defined four basic existential anxieties that he claims to be affected throughout the individual's life: death, freedom, existential isolation, and meaninglessness. Additionally, although people may not be aware that they are experiencing the listed existential concerns, he has argued that all people are affected by these concerns, even if they are not aware of them (Yalom, 1980).

"Why am I here?", "If there is death at the end, why am I living?", "What is my life purpose?". These questions are among the fundamental existential questions of human life (Längle, 2007; Yeniçeri, 2013). Therefore, people try to make sense of the 'things' that surround them and find personal meaning in them (Bandura, 2001). Although

these philosophical questions of human existence are fundamental, when it comes to the meaning in life, there are various definitions rather than a single definition in the literature (Martela & Steger, 2016; Steger et al., 2006). According to Yalom (1980), the meaning in life is the sense of coherence perceived in one's life. In addition, Viktor Frankl (1984), emphasizes that the meaning of the person who says his/her life is meaningful provides a framework for an individual's life, that his/her meaning is positively related to some concepts, he/she perceives one or more of these concepts as a goal, and when he/she achieves his/her goal, a person experiences feelings such as significance and a sense of integration. According to the Hierarchy of Needs developed by Maslow, people must meet certain needs in order to lead a happy life. At the top of the pyramid is the human need for self-actualization, and self-actualization is necessary to understand our meaning in life (Ventegodt et al., 2003). Similar to Maslow, Baumeister emphasizes that some needs must be met to achieve a sense of meaning. These needs are; value, purpose, efficacy, and self-worth (Baumeister, 2005).

1.2.1. Meaning in life and well-being

Viktor Frankl, the founder of Logotherapy, says that when it comes to the meaning in life, it cannot be 'given' by the therapist like a prescription and that the individual must 'find' her/his meaning (Frankl, 1967; Yalom, 1980). In addition, he offers three ways in which we can find the meaning in life based on Logotherapy: 1. by being in action or developing work, 2. by meeting someone or experiencing something, 3. by our attitude towards the inevitable difficulties of life (Frankl, 1984). Since some of his life was spent in the concentration camp, it is not surprising that he suggested our attitude to suffering as a third way of finding meaning in life, and also states that this path is not necessary to find our meaning (Frankl, 1984). In addition to being able to discover our meaning in the face of suffering, there is also pain associated with our inability to discover our meaning (Yalom, 1980). Yalom (1980), suggested that the lack of existential meaning in people's lives may be related to various psychological problems such as depression. There are findings in the literature to support this suggestion. For example, having a low score for meaning in life was found to be associated with negative mental health outcomes such as depression (Hedayati & Khazaei, 2014), anxiety (Shiah et al., 2015), and substance abuse (Coleman et al., 1986). On the other hand, the presence of meaning in life indicates positive mental outcomes. It was found that the participants with higher meaning in life

scores also had better psychological health (Kleftaras & Psarra, 2012). In another study with similar findings, it was found that there is a strong relationship between meaning in life and subjective, psychological well-being, which are two sub-dimensions of well-being (Krok, 2018).

So why should our life be meaningful and why do we suffer when it is meaningless? These questions will be explored in the next section.

1.3. Death Anxiety

Death is the end of life. Although we have this knowledge as a fact, philosophically, what does death mean to us as living beings? For Heidegger, death is not Dasein's self-actualization but one of its possibilities. That is, Dasein is not born to die, but contains the potential of death the moment it begins to live (Mulhall, 2005).

Although fear comes to mind as the first emotion to be felt towards death, it actually makes us feel anxious. According to Kierkegaard, fear is felt towards something. Fear has a target. On the other hand, anxiety is felt towards an unknown rather than a target. Death is an unknown to us, and non-existence is anxiety-inducing (Stone, 2017). Because we cannot experience non-existence, we cannot even imagine. The person who imagines himself/herself dead has a Dasein in his/her head that watches the body lying on the ground, even when he/she thinks of himself/herself as motionless on the ground (Freud, 2014). So Dasein continues to exist. For this reason, non-existence is unknown to us. And nothingness makes us feel anxious. (Stone, 2017).

There are death anxiety studies that include variables such as age, gender, and personality. In the literature, it is seen that death anxiety scores decrease with age (Chopik, 2017). For example, participants in their 20s showed higher death anxiety scores, while females had higher death anxiety scores than males when compared by gender. In addition, the study found that death anxiety scores decreased for both groups as age increased, while an increase in death anxiety scores was found again only for females in their 50s (Russac et al., 2007). In general, it is thought that the decrease in death anxiety with age is related to the increase in the psychosocial maturity of individuals (Rasmussen & Brems, 1996). In addition, although females showed higher scores in terms of death anxiety, when they thought about their own death, female participants reported that they enjoyed being alive more than males (Da Silva & Schork, 1985). When we look

at it in the context of personality traits, it is seen that neuroticism has a strong relationship with death anxiety (Frazier & Foss-Goodman, 1989). At the same time, in another study, it was found that women with high helping personality trait scores had high death anxiety scores, while male participants with high aggression and resilience scores had low death anxiety scores (Thorson, 1977).

1.3.1. Meaning in life and death anxiety

In existentialism, death is evaluated from the perspective of life. According to Heidegger, when individuals realize that their existence will continue until death, this situation pushes the individual to realize the meaning of their being. Considering the fact that we have a limited time, the desire to find meaning in life and to live a meaningful life awakens in individuals (Baumeister, 2005; Frankl, 1967; Steger & Frazier, 2005). The wish to leave a mark on the world is valid for every human being, from the most civilized to the most primitive (Flynn, 2006; Kaufmann, 1959). Awareness of mortality can make one feel anxious. The thought of the possibility of living a meaningless life following this awareness can lead to feelings such as hopelessness and fear (Kastenbaum, 2000). For this reason, Viktor Frankl (1984), argues that finding the meaning of life against this finitude is the most important motivation of human beings.

When we look at death anxiety and meaning in life studies, it is seen that there are findings to support these suggestions. For instance, participants who reported a low search for meaning in life also reported low death anxiety scores (Lyke, 2013). In another study conducted with elderly individuals, a statistically significant relationship was found between meaning in life and death anxiety (Zhang et al., 2019). This finding is also consistent with the findings of the study conducted by Rappaport et al. (1993), and it was also seen that the direction of the relationship was negative. It was observed that when the mortality of the participants who had no meaning in life was primed, their death anxiety increased. The same manipulation did not affect the death anxiety levels of the participants who had meaning in life (Routledge & Juhl, 2010). Based on these findings, it can be argued that people who have a clear meaning in life may have low death anxiety.

1.3.2. Death anxiety and well-being

It is suggested that when the awareness of death is increased, there will be a decrease in the well-being of individuals. Some studies support this proposition (Juhl &

Routledge, 2016). There is evidence that acute death awareness causes anxiety and undermines well-being for participants with low self-esteem scores (one of the psychological buffers) (Routledge et al., 2010). In addition, a comparison study involving Catholics and Protestants found a negative relationship between life satisfaction and death anxiety in both groups (Cohen et al., 2005). Consistent with this study, it was found that elderly individuals with lower death anxiety scores reported higher life satisfaction (Given & Range, 1990).

1.3.3. Death anxiety of individuals who believe and do not believe in any religion

According to Yalom (1980), individuals spend their energy in many areas of life to overcome the horror of death. Religions and ideologies are just a few of our efforts to reach the transcendence of death. Belief, which is mentioned as one of these efforts, has been researched from the perspective of existential psychology. It is claimed that death anxiety lies at the center of religious belief. A person believes in supernatural immortality and is thought of as an effort to overcome death and reach eternal happiness (Becker, 1973; Vail III & Soenke, 2018). It is important whether people's belief motivations are intrinsic or extrinsic. While intrinsically motivated individuals internalize religion, extrinsically motivated individuals define themselves as religious because of the benefits of being religious such as security and solace, sociability, and status in the community (Allport & Ross, 1967). So, religion seems to protect against death anxiety, but only if the motivation for belief is intrinsic and not extrinsic (Clements, 1998). Based on this information, it was planned to collect the data of IBR from the Faculty of Theology.

According to Beck (2004), religiosity can be used as a defense mechanism against our existential anxieties. In the study by Bylski and Westman (1991), it was found that existential concerns were related to defense mechanisms, but religiosity was not related to these two variables. In addition, John Battista and Richard Almond (1973), suggested that having a religious belief may be associated with meaning in life. For example, when the religious beliefs of the participants were primed, it was seen that the belief had a positive effect on the meaning and purpose (Petersen & Roy, 1985). In addition, the relationship between belief and well-being was explained above. Having religious beliefs may not directly contribute to one's well-being. Since having religious beliefs can provide a sense of meaning, it is thought that it may indirectly affect the well-being of people in

a positive way (Petersen & Roy, 1985). Studies of the mechanisms explaining the effect of religion on well-being are not comprehensive (Jackson & Bergeman, 2011). However, there are few studies in the literature. For example, meaning in life has been found to play a mediating role in the relationship between daily religious activity and well-being (Steger & Frazier, 2005).

Although religious belief is suggested as a coping mechanism for existential concerns, not every individual defines himself/herself as a member of religious belief, but the fact that an individual who does not believe in any religion does not mean that there are no coping mechanisms against existential anxieties (Vail III et al., 2019). Studies have shown that nonIBR have strong values, views, and beliefs (Zuckerman, 2009). As a result of the research of Sedlar et al. (2018), it was found that atheists experience less spiritual difficulties than theist individuals, but they experience a similar level of ultimate meaning difficulties. Within the presented findings and propositions, it can be said that IBR and nonIBR can cope with existential anxieties, regardless of whether they are IBR or not if they feel meaningful in life.

1.4. The Relevance of the Current Study and the Research Questions

Death anxiety, meaning in life, and well-being are variables studied by many researchers. Although variables are studied in the form of binary combinations, there is hardly any research that studies these variables together and offers a more holistic perspective from an existential point of view. Also, there are findings in the literature that the relationship between belief and well-being is positive, but the literature is weak in terms of studies on the mechanisms explaining this relationship. In addition, there is very little research presenting data on nonIBR, and they are not included in studies that involve belief. Therefore, this thesis aims to examine the role of meaning in life in the relationship between death anxiety and well-being; to understand the positive effect of belief on well-being for this examine the role of meaning in life in the relationship between death anxiety and well-being of IBR; and to compare IBR and nonIBR by testing the model for nonIBR as well and lastly to obtain findings about nonIBR. The research questions and hypotheses are as follows:

Research Question 1: What is the role of meaning in life (presence of meaning in life and search for meaning in life) on the relationship between death anxiety and well-being (SWB and PWB)?

Proposed Model: The mediating effects of meaning in life (presence of meaning in life and search for meaning in life) on the relationship between death anxiety and well-being (SWB and PWB).

Hypothesis 1: Death anxiety is expected to negatively predict subjective (Hypothesis 1a) and psychological well-being (Hypothesis 1b).


Hypothesis 2: It is expected that the search for meaning in life predicts subjective (Hypothesis 2a) and psychological (Hypothesis 2b) well-being negatively. The presence of meaning in life is expected to predict subjective (Hypothesis 2c) and psychological (Hypothesis 2d) well-being positively.

Hypothesis 3: Death anxiety is expected to positively predict the search for meaning in life (Hypothesis 3a) and negatively presence of meaning in life (Hypothesis 3b).

Hypothesis 4: In addition to the expected direct effect of death anxiety on well-being (SWB and PWB), death anxiety is expected to predict well-being (SWB and PWB) through the presence of meaning in life (Hypothesis 4a) and the search for meaning in life (Hypothesis 4b).

After the proposed model is tested for all participants, the same model will be tested separately for IBR and nonIBR. Exploratory analysis will be made for the mediator roles and direct relationships tested for the groups.

Figure 1. *The Proposed Model*



Research Question 2: Do nonIBR differ among themselves in terms of well-being, death anxiety, and meaning in life levels?

In general, this study aims to examine whether meaning in life mediates the relationship between death anxiety and well-being and to test the proposed model for IBR and nonIBR. In addition, it is aimed to provide information to the literature about nonIBR.

2. METHOD

2.1. Procedure

After obtaining the necessary ethical approval from Başkent University, the scales were delivered to nonIBR online via Qualtrics, and to IBR (students of Theology Faculty) by hand. In addition, the study was announced on Twitter to reach nonIBR.

Participants first encountered a consent form page that included necessary information about the study, that they could leave the study at any time and that their privacy would be protected, and they filled out the consent form anonymously. Participants who accepted participation filled the demographic form in the next step. At this stage, information such as gender and age were obtained from the participants. In addition, the participants were asked “Do you believe in any religion?” by asking the question, the nonIBR and IBR were separated at this stage, and nonIBR were divided into categories by presenting the Typology of Six Types of Nonbelief scale. IBR were asked about their belief levels between 1 (I'm not religious at all) and 7 (I am very religious). After the form, the Meaning in Life Questionnaire, the Templer Death Anxiety Scale, the Psychological Well-Being Scale, and the Satisfaction with Life Scale were randomly assigned and presented to the participants. After this stage, the data collection process was completed.

2.2. Materials

Consent Form: The consent form contained general information about the study. Then, a statement was made that the participants would attend anonymously, and their privacy would be protected. Also, it was stated that those who want to learn about the study can reach the researcher and the researcher's e-mail address was given. Finally, it was stated that the study was on a voluntary basis and the participant did not have to complete the study if they wished.

Demographic Information Form: Participants were asked about their gender and age. In addition, they were asked whether they studied at the university and, if they did, the department they studied. This part has been added to exclude IBR who are not from the Faculty of Theology. Then, the participants were asked if they believed in any religion.

Participants whose answer was no were directed to a typology scale that divided nonIBR into 6 groups (Intellectual Atheist/Agnostic, Activist Atheist/Agnostic, Seeker-Agnostic, Anti-theist, Non-Theist, and Ritual Atheist/Agnostic) (Silver, 2013). Respondents whose answers were yes were asked how religious they would describe themselves. The answers range from 1 (I'm not religious at all) to 7 (I am very religious).

Typology of Six Types of Nonbelief: There is no detailed study in the literature regarding the definition and classification of nonIBR (Silver et al., 2014). For this reason, Silver (2013), gathered information from the participants through interviews and categorized nonIBR according to the common answers. As a result of this categorization, nonIBR were grouped under 6 different typologies. The 6 typologies are named Intellectual Atheist/Agnostic, Activist Atheist/Agnostic, Seeker-Agnostic, Anti-theist, Non-Theist, and Ritual Atheist/Agnostic.

The Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ): MLQ was developed by Steger et al. (2006). The scale consists of 2 subscales containing 10 items in total and is a 7-Likert type. The first is the Presence of Meaning in Life and the second is the Search for Meaning in Life. The first subscale measures how meaningful the person subjectively perceives his/her life, while the second subscale measures the person's attitude towards finding meaning in life. The internal consistency coefficients in the original study were .86 for the 1st subscale and .88 for the 2nd subscale. In a study involving the Turkish adaptation of the Meaning in Life Scale, the internal consistency coefficients were found to be .86 for the Presence of Meaning in Life subscale and .87 for the Searching for Meaning in Life subscale (Dursun, 2012). In this study, the reliability of the scale was found to be .82.

Templer's Death Anxiety Scale (DAS): The scale was developed by Templer in 1970. It contains 15 items in total and was originally created to be answered as true/false. Templer (1970) reported the reliability coefficient of the scale as (Kuder Richardson Formula₂₀) = .76, product-moment correlation coefficient = .83. High scores on the scale indicate high death anxiety and low scores indicate low death anxiety. Ertufan (2000), in his study named 'Bir grup tıp öğrencisi üzerinde ölüm kaygısı ve korkusu ölçeklerinin geçerlik güvenirlik çalışması', converted the scale from true/false 2-point Likert type to 7-Likert type and found the Cronbach alpha value of the Turkish version of the scale as .74 (as cited in Ertufan, 2008). In this study, the reliability of the scale was found to be .81.

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS): The SWLS was developed by Diener et al. (1985), in order to measure individuals' level of life satisfaction. It consists of 5 items rated on 7-point Likert-type scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scores indicate higher levels of life satisfaction. Cronbach's alpha value was .87 and the two-month test re-test reliability was found as .82. Durak et al. (2011) adapted SWLS to Turkish and Cronbach's alpha was found to be .81 in a Turkish sample. In this study, the reliability of the scale was found to be .87.

Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWS): The Psychological Well-Being Scale was developed by Ryff (1989a). The original scale consists of 84 items and 6 dimensions (autonomy, self-acceptance, purpose in life, personal growth, environmental mastery, and positive relationships with others). Each dimension consists of 14 items. Confidence intervals for each subscale, Cronbach alpha value for autonomy .83, Cronbach alpha value for environmental mastery .86, Cronbach alpha value for personal growth .85, Cronbach alpha value for positive relations with others .88, Cronbach alpha value for purpose in life was .88, and Cronbach's alpha value for self-acceptance was reported as .91. Higher scores represent higher levels of psychological well-being. Ryff and Keyes (1995) created a short 18-item form by choosing 3 items for each component. The scale was translated into Turkish by İmamoğlu (2004) in her study titled 'Self-construal correlates of well-being' and the Cronbach alpha value of the scale was found to be .79 (as cited in Yeniceri, 2013). In this study, the reliability of the scale was found to be .68.

2.3. Participants

The recommended minimum number of participants for any SEM model is 200 (Weston & Gore, 2006; Kline, 2005). The proposed SEM model is planned to be tested for both IBR and nonIBR groups. Therefore, 200 participants were targeted for each group, and it was aimed to reach 400 participants in total. Data were collected from students of the Theology Faculty to form IBR. 270 questionnaires were hand-delivered to the participants, despite the possibility of leaving the questionnaire unfinished or missing data. 70 of the 270 questionnaires were excluded from the data set because the participants filled in incomplete or left missing data. As a result, 200 IBR were reached. NonIBR were reached online via Qualtrics. The study link went viral on Twitter and reached 574 people. 163 people were excluded from the data set because they did not fill

out the scales measuring the main variables of the study. 20 people were excluded because they filled out the online scale, although they were IBR and were not from the Faculty of Theology. As a result, 391 nonIBR were reached. A total of 591 (Female = 217, Male = 363, Non-Binary = 5, Those who do not specify = 6) IBR and nonIBR were reached. The mean age of the participants was 29.65 (SD = 9.82; range from 18 to 67).

For the analysis of research question 1, 200 people were randomly selected from 391 nonIBR to distribute IBR and nonIBR equally. As a result of the univariate outlier analysis, 14 participants outside the z score range of -3.29, and 3.29 were excluded (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). As a result of the multivariate outlier analysis, 1 participant was excluded from the data set because they did not meet the Mahalanobis distance criterion at $p < .001$ (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The average age of 191 IBR was 21.79 (SD = 3.46; range from 19 to 50). The belief level (answers range from 1 = I'm not religious at all to 7 = I am very religious) of the IBR was 5.88 (SD = 1.08). The average age of 194 nonIBR was 33.67 (SD = 9.12; range from 18 to 67). The mean age of 385 participants is 27.76 (SD = 9.11; range from 18 to 67). Table 1 shows the demographic information of 385 participants. Also, the departments/faculties of the participants can be seen in APPENDIX 6.

Table 1. *Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 385)*

Variables	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	
			M	SD
Sex				
Female	169	43.9	24.36	7.56
Male	209	54.3	30.52	9.25
Non-Binary	3	.8	23.67	1.16
Those who do not specify	4	1	31.50	17.06
Last Degree of Graduation				
Middle school and below	0	0		
High school	210	54.5	22.21	4.41
University	112	29.1	33.69	9.07
Master/ Doctorate	63	16.4	35.81	8.28
Belief / Disbelief				
IBR	191	49.6	21.79	3.47
NonIBR	194	50.4	33.67	9.12

2.4. Analysis Strategy

All analyses were performed in Jamovi, Version of 1.6.3, IBM SPSS Statistics for Microsoft, Versions 24.0. and IBM AMOS 26.0. First of all, descriptive analyses and correlation analyses were conducted. Then hierarchical regression analysis was carried out. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed for the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ). To test the main hypotheses regarding death anxiety, well-being, and meaning in life, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis with the maximum likelihood method and 5000 bootstrapping re-samples was performed by IBM AMOS 26.0. The proposed model was tested by performing exploratory analysis for IBR and nonIBR groups. Descriptive statistics analysis was performed again for nonIBR. For the second research question, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive statistics of study variables

Table 2 summarizes descriptive statistics of all scales. Distributions of all variables were evaluated with skewness and kurtosis values and histograms (min. skewness = -.48, max. skewness = 1.34, min. kurtosis = -1.06, max. kurtosis = 1.33). According to these values and histograms, distributions appeared to be normal (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics of the Variables*

Variables	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Skewness	Kurtosis
Death Anxiety	3.77	1.00	1.20	6.67	-.02	-.26
Search for Meaning in Life	4.03	1.70	1	7	-.14	-1.06
Presence of Meaning in Life	5.01	1.42	1.60	7	-.48	-.68
SWB	4.02	1.38	1	7	-.34	-.69
PWB	5.06	.58	3.56	6.50	-.03	-.48
Age	27.77	9.12	18	67	1.34	1.33

Notes. SWB = Subjective Well-Being, PWB = Psychological Well-Being

3.2. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

A confirmatory factor analysis via Jamovi, Version of 1.6.3 was conducted to test the construct validity of The Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ) before further analyses. Accordingly, the model demonstrated a good model-data fit (Table 3). Also, the factor loadings of each item (standard estimates) ranged between .64 and .91.

Table 3. *Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis*

	Chi-square	df	p	CFI	TLI	SRMR	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% CI	
								Lower	Upper
Model	106	34	< .001	.967	.956	.056	.074	.059	.091

3.3. Correlations for study variables

Before correlation analysis, curve estimation was performed for all relationships in the model (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). All relationships except death anxiety and presence of meaning in life, death anxiety and subjective well-being, search for meaning in life and subjective well-being were found to be sufficiently linear to be tested.

The correlations between the scores of the participants from the variables included in the research were evaluated by considering the Pearson correlation coefficients. The findings regarding the correlations are given in Table 4. According to the results of the analysis, death anxiety was negatively and significantly associated with PWB ($r = -.27$, $p < .001$), but no significant relationship was found with SWB. While a positive relationship was found between SWB and the presence of meaning in life ($r = .47$, $p < .001$), no significant relationship was found with the search for meaning in life. While a positive relationship was found between PWB and the presence of meaning in life ($r = .36$, $p < .001$), a negative relationship was found with the search for meaning in life ($r = -.21$, $p < .001$). In addition, there was a positive relationship between death anxiety and the search for meaning in life ($r = .34$, $p < .001$), but no statistically significant relationship was found with the presence of meaning in life.

Table 4. *Correlations for Study Variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Belief Level	1						
2. Presence of Meaning in Life	.33***	1					
3. Search for Meaning in Life	-.09	.08	1				
4. SWB	.28***	.48***	-.09	1			
5. PWB	.14	.36***	-.21***	.40***	1		
6. Death Anxiety	-.05	-.03	.34***	-.08	-.27***	1	
7. Age	.13	-.22***	-.30***	-.07	.02	-.16**	1

Notes. SWB = Subjective Well-Being, PWB = Psychological Well-Being, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

3.4. Impact of death anxiety and meaning in life on subjective and psychological well-being

Two separate hierarchical regression analyzes were conducted for 385 participants to see whether death anxiety and meaning in life components improved the prediction of subjective and psychological well-being. In the first model, there was only the relationship between death anxiety and subjective well-being, while the presence of meaning in life and the search for meaning in life variables were added in the second model.

Results showed that at the end of step two, death anxiety had no significant effect on subjective well-being. However, the presence of meaning in life appeared to be a significant positive predictor of subjective well-being ($\beta = .49, p < .001$), and the search for meaning appeared to be a significant negative predictor of subjective well-being ($\beta = -.12, p < .01$). Together those variables explained 24 % of the variance in subjective well-being and adding components of meaning in life significantly improved the regression model ($\Delta R^2 = .24, F(2, 381) = 60.78, p < .001$) (see Table 5).

Table 5. *The Predictive Effects of Death Anxiety and Meaning in Life on Subjective Well-Being*

Model	B	<i>B</i>	T	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² Change
Step 1				.08	.01	.00	.01
Death Anxiety	-.10	-.08	-1.490				
Step 2				.50	.25	.24	.24***
Death Anxiety	-.03	-.02	-.488				
Search for Meaning in Life	-.10	-.12	-2.475**				
Presence of Meaning in Life	.47	.49	10.933***				

Notes. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Another hierarchical regression analysis was performed for psychological well-being. Results showed that at the end of step two, death anxiety had a negative significant effect on psychological well-being ($\beta = -.20, p < .001$). In addition, the presence of meaning in life appeared to be a significant positive predictor of psychological well-being ($\beta = .37, p < .001$), and the search for meaning appeared to be a significant negative predictor of psychological well-being ($\beta = -.17, p < .001$). Together those variables explained 22 % of the variance in psychological well-being and adding components of

meaning in life significantly improved the regression model ($\Delta R^2 = .15$, $F(2, 381) = 36.72$, $p < .001$) (see Table 6).

Table 6. *The Predictive Effects of Death Anxiety and Meaning in Life on Psychological Well-Being*

Model	B	β	T	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² Change
Step 1				.27	.07	.07	.07***
Death Anxiety	-.16	-.27	-5.432***				
Step 2				.47	.22	.22	.15***
Death Anxiety	-.12	-.20	-4.147***				
Search for Meaning in Life	-.06	-.17	-3.576***				
Presence of Meaning in Life	.15	.37	8.098***				

Notes. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

To summarize, hypothesis 1b was supported as a result of the negative and significant relationship between death anxiety and psychological well-being. On the other hand, as no relationship was found between death anxiety and subjective well-being, the null hypothesis for hypothesis 1a could not be rejected. As a result of the negative and significant relationships between the search for meaning in life and subjective and psychological well-being, hypothesis 2a and hypothesis 2b were supported (respectively). In addition, as a result of the positive and significant relationships between the presence of meaning in life and subjective and psychological well-being, hypothesis 2c and hypothesis 2d were supported (respectively).

3.5. Proposed model test (Research question 1)

In order to test the proposed model of the study, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis with the maximum likelihood method and 5000 bias-corrected bootstrapping re-samples was performed by IBM AMOS 26.0. In a simulation study, Stephenson and Holbert (2003) stated that path analysis with observed variables was more conservative than that with latent variables but suggested that both results were equally valid. As a result of this proposition, SEM path analysis was performed with the observed variables.

Modification indices indicated letting the error variances to correlate between psychological well-being and subjective well-being. The proposed modification was made because subjective and psychological well-being were proposed as two divergent

but also partially overlapping paradigms of well-being and considering the relationship between the two variables ($r = .40$).

Table 7. *Proposed Model Fit Index Values Before Modification*

	Chi-square	df	p	CFI	AGFI	GFI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% CI	
								Lower	Upper
Model	29.52	2	< .001	.898	.783	.971	.189	.133	.252

After the modification, the latest version of the model provided a good fit with the data. The fit indices before and after the modification are shown in Table 7. and Table 8.


Table 8. *Proposed Model Fit Index Values After Modification*

	Chi-square	df	p	CFI	AGFI	GFI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% CI	
								Lower	Upper
Model	3.61	1	> .05	.990	.944	.996	.082	0	.181

According to the results of the analysis, while there was a negative and direct relationship between death anxiety and psychological well-being ($\beta = -.20$, boot $SE = .06$, 95% $C.I.$ $[-.305, -.088]$, $p < .001$), no significant relationship was found between subjective well-being. Similar to the findings of the hierarchical regression analysis, while hypothesis 1b was supported, the null hypothesis could not be rejected for hypothesis 1a. Death anxiety predicted the search for meaning in life positively and significantly ($\beta = .34$, boot $SE = .05$, 95% $C.I.$ $[.240, .424]$, $p < .001$), but no significant direct relationship was found between death anxiety and the presence of meaning in life. While hypothesis 3a was supported, the null hypothesis for hypothesis 3b could not be rejected. It was found that the search for meaning in life predicted both subjective ($\beta = -.12$, boot $SE = .05$, 95% $C.I.$ $[-.203, -.025]$, $p < .01$) and psychological ($\beta = -.17$, boot $SE = .05$, 95% $C.I.$ $[-.269, -.074]$, $p < .001$) well-being negatively and significantly. Again, similar to hierarchical regression, hypotheses 2a, and 2b were supported (respectively). Also, it was found that the presence of meaning in life predicted both subjective ($\beta =$

.49, boot $SE = .04$, 95% $C.I. [.400, .566]$, $p < .001$) and psychological ($\beta = .37$, boot $SE = .04$, 95% $C.I. [.281, .446]$, $p < .001$) well-being positively and significantly. Similar to hierarchical regression, hypotheses 2c, and 2d were supported (respectively). The standardized parameter estimates of the proposed model are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2. *Standardized Parameter Estimates for Proposed Model: Presence of Meaning in Life and Search for Meaning in Life as Mediators of the Relationship between Death Anxiety and Well-Being*



Notes. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

IBM AMOS 26.0 does not perform specific mediator testing for mediator variables. The Sobel test was conducted to see whether the presence of meaning in life and the search for meaning in life play a mediator role in the relationship between death anxiety and well-being (Baron & Kenny, 1986). According to the results of the analysis, the search for meaning in life mediates the relationship between death anxiety and both subjective ($p < .01$) and psychological ($p < .01$) well-being. On the other hand, it was seen that the presence of meaning in life did not mediate the relationship between death anxiety and well-being. While hypothesis 4b was supported, the null hypothesis for hypothesis 4a could not be rejected.

3.5.1. Model testing for individuals who believe in any religion


No hypotheses were made before the proposed model was tested for IBR. For this reason, the analysis is exploratory. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis with the maximum likelihood method and 5000 bias-corrected bootstrapping re-samples was performed by IBM AMOS 26.0. The fit indices for IBR are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. *Model Fit Index Values for IBR*

	Chi-square	df	<i>p</i>	CFI	AGFI	GFI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% CI	
								Lower	Upper
Model	6.24	1	< .01	.960	.809	.987	.166	.062	.301

According to the results of the analysis, while death anxiety negatively predicted psychological well-being ($\beta = -.18$, boot $SE = .07$, 95% *C.I.* [-.316, -.036], $p < .05$), no relationship was found between subjective well-being and death anxiety. While death anxiety predicted the search for meaning in life positively and significantly ($\beta = .18$, boot $SE = .07$, 95% *C.I.* [.039, .314], $p < .05$), death anxiety predicted the presence of meaning in life negatively and significantly ($\beta = -.20$, boot $SE = .07$, 95% *C.I.* [-.340, -.047], $p < .01$). The relationships between the search for meaning in life and well-being were found to be non-significant for the IBR. On the other hand, it is seen that the presence of meaning in life predicts both subjective ($\beta = .48$, boot $SE = .07$, 95% *C.I.* [.327, .606], $p < .001$) and psychological ($\beta = .42$, boot $SE = .06$, 95% *C.I.* [.289, .531], $p < .001$) well-being positively and significantly. Standardized parameter estimates of the model tested for IBR are shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. *Standardized Parameter Estimates of the Model Tested for IBR: Presence of Meaning in Life and Search for Meaning in Life as Mediators of the Relationship between Death Anxiety and Well-Being*



Notes. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

IBM AMOS 26.0 does not perform specific mediator testing for mediator variables. The Sobel test was conducted to see whether the presence of meaning in life and the search for meaning in life play a mediator role in the relationship between death anxiety and well-being (Baron & Kenny, 1986). According to the results of the analysis, the presence of meaning in life mediates the relationship between death anxiety and both subjective ($p < .05$) and psychological ($p < .05$) well-being. On the other hand, it was seen that the search for meaning in life did not mediate the relationship between death anxiety and well-being for IBR.

3.5.2. Model testing for individuals who do not believe in any religion


No hypotheses were made before the proposed model was tested for nonIBR. For this reason, the analysis is exploratory. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis with the maximum likelihood method and 5000 bias-corrected bootstrapping re-samples was performed by IBM AMOS 26.0. The fit indices for nonIBR are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. *Model Fit Index Values for NonIBR*

	Chi-square	df	<i>P</i>	CFI	AGFI	GFI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% CI	
								Lower	Upper
Model	1.51	1	> .05	.996	.953	.997	.052	.000	.207

According to the results of the analysis, no significant direct relationships were found between death anxiety and both subjective and psychological well-being. For nonIBR, there was a direct relationship between death anxiety and the search for meaning in life ($\beta = .41$, boot $SE = .07$, 95% *C.I.* [.260, .525], $p < .001$), but no relationship was found between death anxiety and the presence of meaning in life. It was found that the search for meaning in life significantly and negatively predicted both subjective ($\beta = -.19$, boot $SE = .07$, 95% *C.I.* [-.330, -.043], $p < .05$), and psychological ($\beta = -.22$, boot $SE = .07$, 95% *C.I.* [-.352, -.066], $p < .01$), well-being. At the same time, the presence of meaning in life predicted both subjective ($\beta = .37$, boot $SE = .07$, 95% *C.I.* [.230, .497], $p < .001$) and psychological ($\beta = .38$, boot $SE = .06$, 95% *C.I.* [.258, .489], $p < .001$) well-being positively and significantly. Standardized parameter estimates of the model tested for nonIBR are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4. *Standardized Parameter Estimates of the Model Tested for NonIBR: Presence of Meaning in Life and Search for Meaning in Life as Mediators of the Relationship between Death Anxiety and Well-Being*



Notes. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

IBM AMOS 26.0 does not perform specific mediator testing for mediator variables. The Sobel test was conducted to see whether the presence of meaning in life and the search for meaning in life play a mediator role in the relationship between death anxiety and well-being (Baron & Kenny, 1986). According to the results of the analysis, the search for meaning in life mediates the relationship between death anxiety and both subjective ($p < .05$) and psychological ($p < .01$) well-being. On the other hand, it was seen that the presence of meaning in life did not mediate the relationship between death anxiety and well-being for nonIBR.

3.6. Comparison of individuals who do not believe in any religion according to typologies (Research question 2)

3.6.1. Participants

In the last question of the study, nonIBR were tested whether they differed in meaning in life (search for meaning in life and presence of meaning in life), death anxiety, and well-being (subjective well-being and psychological well-being) levels. As a result of the data collected online via Qualtrics and the elimination of missing data, 391 nonIBR

were reached. There is no detailed study in the literature regarding the definition and classification of nonIBR (Silver et al., 2014). For this reason, Silver (2013), gathered information from the participants through interviews and categorized nonIBR according to the common answers. As a result of this categorization, nonIBR were grouped under 6 different typologies. The 6 typologies are named Intellectual Atheist/Agnostic, Activist Atheist/Agnostic, Seeker-Agnostic, Anti-theist, Non-Theist, and Ritual Atheist/Agnostic. Therefore, the Typology of Six Types of Nonbelief scale was used to categorize nonIBR. The average age of 391 people (Female = 88, Male = 295, Non-Binary = 5, Those who do not specify = 3) is 33.67 (SD = 9.59; range from 18 to 67). The descriptive statistics of the participants for each of the 6 typologies are shown in Table 11.



Table 11. *Descriptive Statistics of NonIBR*

Typology	N				Age				Last Degree of Graduation			
	Female	Male	Non-Binary	Not Specified	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Middle	High School	University	Master/Doctorate
									School and Below			
Intellectual Atheist / Agnostic (IAA)	22	100	1	1	18	67	35.02	9.32	0	14	69	41
Activist Atheist / Agnostic (AAA)	12	43	1	1	18	67	34.70	9.84	0	10	34	13
Seeker-Agnostic (SA)	12	29	1	1	18	57	27.58	7.49	0	7	26	10
Anti-Theist	16	57	1	0	19	62	35.69	10.15	1	10	38	25
Non-Theist	14	50	0	0	18	60	32.77	9.30	1	6	42	15
Ritual Atheist/Agnostic (RAA)	12	16	1	0	22	56	31.72	8.58	0	1	14	14

3.6.2. Descriptive statistics of study variables

Table 12 summarizes descriptive statistics of all scales. Distributions of all variables were evaluated with skewness and kurtosis values and histograms (min. skewness = -.34, max. skewness = .76, min. kurtosis = -1.09, max. kurtosis = .28). According to these values and histograms, distributions appeared to be normal (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013)

Table 12. *Descriptive Statistics of the Variables for NonIBR*

Variables	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Skewness	Kurtosis
Death Anxiety	3.54	.97	1.20	6.20	.13	-.19
Search for Meaning in Life	3.56	1.63	1	7	.08	-1.09
Presence of Meaning in Life	4.35	1.42	1	7	-.13	-.85
SWB	3.70	1.39	1	7	-.21	-.94
PWB	5.10	.61	3.22	6.72	-.34	-.14
Age	33.67	9.59	18	67	.76	.28

Notes. SWB = Subjective Well-Being, PWB = Psychological Well-Being.

3.6.3. Comparison of typologies

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to compare the effects of each typology on the search for meaning in life, the presence of meaning in life, subjective well-being, psychological well-being, and death anxiety. Table 13 shows the means and standard deviations of the dependent variables for each typology.

Table 13. *Means and Standard Deviations of the Dependent Variables for Each Typology*

Typology	Death Anxiety		SFM		POM		PWB		SWB	
	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M
Intellectual Atheist/Agnostic	.91	3.36	1.60	3.36	1.51	4.49	.54	5.23	1.40	3.84
Activist Atheist/Agnostic	.77	3.47	1.69	3.52	1.39	4.57	.64	5.10	1.47	3.48
Seeker-Agnostic	1.15	4.09	1.42	4.27	1.33	3.93	.63	4.80	1.39	3.64
Anti-Theist	.88	3.51	1.61	3.58	1.39	4.39	.58	5.05	1.35	3.30
Non-Theist	1.01	3.45	1.57	3.27	1.42	4.10	.63	5.15	1.28	3.97
Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	.94	3.85	1.62	4.53	1.24	4.35	.64	5.02	1.38	4.06

According to research findings, there was a significant effect of typology, $F(25, 1416) = 3.09, p < .001$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .821$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. Furthermore, it was found that typology had a significant effect on the search for meaning in life ($F(5, 385) = 4.87; p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .06$), death anxiety ($F(5, 385) = 4.67; p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .06$), psychological well-being ($F(5, 385) = 3.67; p < .01$; partial $\eta^2 = .05$), and subjective well-being ($F(5, 385) = 2.70; p < .05$; partial $\eta^2 = .03$), and no significant effect was found on the presence of meaning in life variable.

Post hoc group comparisons were made with the Bonferroni test. According to the analysis results, Seeker-Agnostics showed significantly higher death anxiety scores than Intellectual Atheists/Agnostics ($p < .001$), Activist Atheists/Agnostics ($p < .05$), Anti-Theists ($p < .05$), and Non-Theists ($p < .01$). While there was no difference between the groups in the variable of the presence of meaning in life, a difference was found in the levels of search for meaning in life. Seeker-Agnostics showed higher levels of search for meaning in life scores than Intellectual Atheists/Agnostics ($p < .05$), and Non-theists ($p < .05$). In addition, Ritual Atheist/Agnostics showed higher levels of search for meaning in life scores than Intellectual Atheists/Agnostics ($p < .01$), Anti-Theists ($p < .05$), and Non-Theists ($p < .01$). When all groups were compared, no significant difference was found between groups in subjective well-being. In addition, a significant difference was found in terms of psychological well-being. It was seen that the psychological well-being of Intellectual Atheists/Agnostics ($p < .001$) and Non-theists ($p < .05$) were higher than Seeker-Agnostics. All group comparisons can be seen in APPENDIX 7.

4. DISCUSSION

While death anxiety and well-being have been examined together, as have well-being and meaning in life, the relationship between the three concepts simultaneously has not been tested. Therefore, this study is aimed to understand the connections of meaning in life with death anxiety and well-being. There are findings in the literature that the relationship between death anxiety and well-being is negative (Cohen et al., 2005; Given & Range, 1990; Routledge et al., 2010). At the same time, existentialism argues that death anxiety awakens people's awareness of their limited life and motivates people to find meaning in life (Baumeister, 2005; Frankl, 1967; Steger & Frazier, 2005). There are findings in the literature that the presence of meaning in life positively predicts well-being and the search for meaning in life negatively predicts well-being. (Coleman et al., 1986; Hedayati & Khazaei, 2014; Kleftaras & Psarra, 2012; Krok, 2018; Shiah et al., 2015). Based on these findings, it was aimed to examine the mediating role of meaning in life in the relationship between death anxiety and well-being. At the same time, there are findings that having religious beliefs positively affects the well-being of individuals (Leondari & Gialamas, 2009; Levin & Taylor, 1998). However, the literature on the mechanisms explaining this relationship is weak. Having religious belief is thought of as one's belief in supernatural immortality and an effort to overcome death and attain eternal happiness, and it is suggested that belief can provide a sense of meaning in life (Becker, 1973; Petersen & Roy, 1985; Vail III & Soenke, 2018). For this reason, it is also aimed to examine the mediating role of meaning in life in the relationship between death anxiety and the well-being of IBR. On the other hand, the fact that individuals do not have religious beliefs does not indicate that they are vulnerable to existential concerns (Vail III et al., 2019). Studies have shown that nonIBR have strong values, views, and beliefs (Zuckerman, 2009). Also, nonIBR were rarely included in research involving religious belief (Fenn, 2001). For this reason, meaning in life as a mediator role was also tested for nonIBR. It was thought that this would provide an opportunity to compare IBR and nonIBR. Finally, the literature is weak in terms of social scientific data on nonIBR (Fenn, 2001). At the same time, there is no detailed study in the literature regarding the definition and classification of nonIBR (Silver et al., 2014). For this reason, the Typology of Six Types of Nonbelief scale, which divides nonIBR into six categories, was used to classify nonIBR (Silver, 2013). In order to provide the literature with social scientific data on

nonIBR, 6 non-religious groups were compared in terms of meaning in life, well-being, and death anxiety.

Since the correlation and hierarchical regression findings show similar results with the direct effect findings of the Structural Equation Model Analysis, the discussion of the results will be discussed over the findings of the Structural Equation Model in order to avoid repetition.

In the proposed model tested with all participants, death anxiety predicted psychological well-being negatively, similar to correlation relationships and hierarchical regression findings, but no significant relationship was found between death anxiety and subjective well-being. Contrary to the literature, the reason why there was no significant relationship with subjective well-being may have been due to the fact that the scales were not filled honestly, as in other studies in which self-report scales were used, and the lack of sufficient skills regarding introspection even if the aim was to fill them honestly. On the other hand, as death anxiety increases, the decrease in psychological well-being is consistent with the findings in the literature (Routledge et al., 2010). Anxiety caused by the unknown of death can be interpreted as a decrease in people's mental health.

Similar to the correlations, in the model tested for all participants, the direct relationship between death anxiety and the search for meaning in life was positive and significant, while no significant relationship was found between death anxiety and the presence of meaning in life. The reason why there was no relationship between the presence of meaning in life and death anxiety may be due to the fact that the scores of the search for meaning in life in the model tested for everyone were generally high for participants. The reason for this may be that the participants in the model tested only for nonIBR affected the presence of meaning in life score in general. While there was a relationship between death anxiety and the presence of meaning in life for IBR, no such relationship was found for nonIBR. At the same time, the majority of IBR are females. It is supported by the findings that females show higher death anxiety levels than males (Russac et al., 2007). At the same time, the average age of participants is generally low. The fact that the majority of the participants were young adults may also have affected the results. For example, the literature shows that young adults show both higher death anxiety scores and lower presence of meaning in life scores in life than older age groups (Chopik, 2017; Russac, et al., 2007; Steger et al., 2009). Although the belief levels of the

participants were high in the model tested only for IBR, the fact that there was a relationship between death anxiety and the search for meaning in life also supports this proposition. Another possible explanation for this finding may be that death is a phenomenon often attributed to the future. The search for meaning can also be thought of as a situation with potential future consequences, whereas the evaluation of the presence of meaning takes place in the present. For this reason, the future-oriented side of the meaning in life may be more closely related to death anxiety as it does not exist at the moment (Lyke, 2013). As a result, finding a positive relationship between the search for meaning in life and death anxiety is compatible with the literature findings (Lyke, 2013). People's lack of meaning in life may have left them vulnerable to death anxiety.

While no significant correlation was found between the search for meaning in life and subjective well-being, significant direct effects are observed between the two variables in hierarchical regression and SEM analysis findings. In the curve estimation analysis, it was found that the relationship between subjective well-being and the search for meaning in life was not linear. Thus, such a result is not surprising. However, regression analysis shows us that the amount of increase in the search for meaning in life shows a significant decrease in the amount of subjective well-being. As a result, it was found that the search for meaning in life negatively predicted subjective and psychological well-being. These findings are compatible with the literature (Hedayati & Khazaei, 2014; Krok, 2018; Shiah et al., 2015). The person's search for meaning may have left the person vulnerable to death anxiety, which is one of the existential anxieties. Thus, both subjective and psychological well-being may be adversely affected. At the same time, the presence of meaning in life predicted subjective and psychological well-being positively and significantly. These findings are also compatible with the literature (Kleftaras & Psarra, 2012; Krok, 2018). The fact that people have meaning in life against death anxiety may have positively affected their well-being.

When we look at the indirect effects of death anxiety on well-being, it is seen that death anxiety predicts both subjective and psychological well-being through the search for meaning in life while there is no direct relationship between death anxiety and subjective well-being. On the other hand, when it comes to the presence of meaning in life, it does not seem to mediate the relationship between death anxiety and well-being. Yalom (1980), argues that people are affected by existential concerns whether they are

aware of it or not. The hypothesized relationship could have been found had the study not been conducted using the paper-and-pencil method alone and had also included experimental manipulation. For example, in TMT studies, it has been found that individuals who are reminded of death acutely cling to their view of life more (Greenberg et al., 1990). The fact that some of the effect sizes are small may also be related to the fact that people are not very aware of existential concepts. Experimental manipulation before the questionnaires can make people's cognitions about existential concepts more accessible and help to obtain more specific results by increasing the effect sizes. In short, raising awareness of death in the participants may affect the results.

In the model tested for IBR, the relationship between death anxiety and psychological well-being was negative and significant, but no relationship was found with subjective well-being. This relationship was also found to be non-significant in the model tested for all participants. As explained above, the use of self-report scales may be the reason for not finding a significant relationship. A negative direct relationship between death anxiety and psychological well-being is consistent with the literature (Routledge et al., 2010). Anxiety caused by the unknown of death can be interpreted as a decrease in people's mental health.

Significant and positive relationships were found between the presence of meaning in life and well-being (SWB and PWB). On the other hand, no significant relationship was found between the search for meaning in life and well-being. When IBR were asked to indicate their belief levels between 1 (I'm not religious at all) and 7 (I am very religious), IBR stated an average of 5.88 belief levels. These results are not surprising given the high level of belief of the participants. Since the beliefs of participants provide them with a sense of meaning in life, their well-being may not be associated with the search for meaning in life. At the same time, when we look at the indirect relationships, an indirect relationship was found between death anxiety and well-being only through the presence of meaning in life. This result presents a consistent perspective with the absence of a significant relationship between the search for meaning in life and well-being (SWB and PWB). As the literature suggests, the positive effect of belief on well-being may be mediated by the presence of meaning in life (Petersen & Roy, 1985). The belief of IBR who are sure of their view of life may be protecting them because it provides a sense of meaning against existential anxieties.

In the model tested for nonIBR, no significant direct relationships were found between death anxiety and well-being. The fact that direct relationships are non-significant may be due to the fact that the study is based on self-reporting. Yalom (1980), argues that everyone experiences existential anxieties consciously or unconsciously. Manipulating death anxiety, which is one of the existential concerns, can help us to obtain more specific results by revealing the cognitions of people. A positive and significant relationship was found between the presence of meaning in life and well-being (SWB and PWB). Negative and significant relationships were found with the search for meaning in life. These relationships are compatible with the literature (Hedayati & Khazaei, 2014; Kleftras & Psarra, 2012; Krok, 2018; Shiah et al., 2015).

While there was no significant direct relationship between death anxiety and the presence of meaning in life, a significant and positive relationship was found with the search for meaning in life. When the indirect relationships are examined, it is seen that only the search for meaning in life mediates the relationship between death anxiety and well-being (SWB and PWB). These results seem plausible in themselves. If people do not feel meaningful in life, not seeing a relationship between death anxiety and the presence of meaning in life, and only an indirect relationship with the search for meaning in life can indicate that nonIBR are in search of meaning in life. This does not mean that nonIBR generally seek meaning in life and are devoid of any meaning. While IBR consist of individuals who are close to intrinsic religiosity and internalize their view of life, nonIBR consist of 6 different categories. When typologies are examined, they include participants who are not sure about their life view, such as Seeker Agnostics. This is also a limitation of the study. Against the group of IBR who are sure of their beliefs, the group of nonIBR who are sure of their views on life should have taken place. For this reason, based on these results, it cannot be said that nonIBR are in search of meaning in general. Because the literature shows that nonIBR also have strong life views, ideas, and beliefs (Zuckerman, 2009).

When the typologies are examined, it is seen that the Seeker-Agnostics show higher scores in terms of death anxiety and search for meaning in life scores than certain typologies. They also showed significantly lower scores in terms of psychological well-being. These results are not surprising given the definition of typology. In the definition, there are statements such as "Arkadaşlarım din ve Tanrı (ilah) üzerine görüşlerinden emin

olabilirler ama ben o kadar emin değilim." As the name suggests, these people seem to be in search of meaning. For this reason, it seems logical that death anxiety scores are high and psychological well-being is low. Although there was no difference between typologies in terms of the presence of meaning in life, Intellectual Atheists/Agnostics, Activist Atheists/Agnostics, Anti-Theists, and Non-Theists showed significantly lower death anxiety scores than Seeker-Agnostics. The reason for this may be related to the fact that these typologies contain more confident life views in terms of definitions. For example, in the definition of Activist Atheists/Agnostics, there are statements such as "Toplunun iyileştirilmesi gerekiyor ve eylemcilik bunu sağlamanın iyi bir yolu." It can be concluded that this group is more purposeful. Individuals in this typology seem more confident in their view of life when looking at the definitions. For this reason, they may have shown lower death anxiety scores. In terms of psychological well-being, the Seeker-Agnostics show lower scores than the Intellectual Atheists/Agnostics and Non-theists. In addition, the fact that Seeker Agnostics show a higher search for meaning in life scores compared to Intellectual Atheists/Agnostics, and Non-Theists, together with higher death anxiety scores, provides a plausible framework in itself. In summary, Seeker-Agnostics can be interpreted as being vulnerable to death anxiety due to their search for meaning in life, and their mental health negatively affected by it.

Surprisingly, the Ritual Atheist/Agnostics showed a higher search for meaning in life scores than the Intellectual Atheists/Agnostics, Anti-Theists, and Non-Theists. People in this group openly state that they do not have a religious belief. At the same time, they see religious and secular symbols as a means of connecting with the past and people. Openly rejecting belief may not necessarily imply having a firm view of life.

4.1. Limitations

Gender distribution seems balanced when all participants are considered. But the gender distributions within the group are not equal. While most of the IBR are made up of females, most of the nonIBR are made up of males. In addition, while the age distribution is balanced for nonIBR, most of the IBR are in the emerging adulthood age range. These conditions may have affected the results. At the same time, there is a difference between the average age of individuals who believe in any religion and those who do not believe in any religion. The average age of individuals who believe in any

religion was 21.79, while the average age of individuals who did not believe in any religion was 33.67. As mentioned above, the results of the subcomponents of meaning in life may be affected by the age of the people. Future studies can carry out the research process by controlling the age difference.

The second limitation of the study is the sample size. Analysis was conducted with a reasonable number of participants for the proposed model. However, sample sizes remained small for model testing while testing the same model for IBR and nonIBR. Considering the criteria of a minimum of 200 people for any SEM analysis, the sample size is partially small for analysis (Weston & Gore, 2006; Kline, 2005).

The third limitation of the study is that the method is based on self-report. Results may have been influenced by poor insight or social desirability. Existential psychology is an approach that has strong philosophical foundations and discusses the basic motivations of human beings, it can be useful to test it with implicit methods in order to better understand people. However, important results have also been obtained with self-reporting.

The last limitation of the study is the collection of data from the more heterogeneously dispersed nonIBR versus IBR close to intrinsic religiosity. The specificity of IBR and the more heterogeneous distribution of nonIBR reduce the generalizability of the results. Future studies should either compare a specific nonIBR group that is confident in their view of life and confident IBR or compare a heterogeneously dispersed nonIBR group with a heterogeneously dispersed IBR group.

4.2. Conclusion

When we look at the results in general, it was found that death anxiety and well-being were mediated by the search for meaning in life. On a group basis, it is seen that the presence of meaning in life for IBR and the search for meaning in life for nonIBR mediate the relationship between death anxiety and well-being. Studies show that religious activities, practices, and scientific view of life are not related to death anxiety (Sawyer et al., 2021; Templer & Dotson, 1970). The important thing here may be that we are sure of our meaning in life rather than our life perspective. Although individuals are religious, a relationship has emerged between death anxiety and the search for meaning in life. At the same time, the presence of meaning in life predicted the well-being of

nonIBR positively and significantly. This study presents a general view of people rather than separating them. Being sure of that view, rather than what our view of life is, seems to protect us against death anxiety and positively influence our well-being.



REFERENCES

- Abdel-Khalek, A. M. (2010). Quality of life, subjective well-being, and religiosity in Muslim college students. *Quality of life research*, 19(8), 1133-1143. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-010-9676-7>
- Abdel-Khalek, A. M. (2012). Subjective well-being and religiosity: A cross-sectional study with adolescents, young and middle-age adults. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15(1), 39-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2010.551324>
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0021212>
- Anglim, J., & Grant, S. (2016). Predicting psychological and subjective well-being from personality: Incremental prediction from 30 facets over the Big 5. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 17(1), 59-80. DOI 10.1007/s10902-014-9583-7
- Arber, S., Fenn, K., & Meadows, R. (2014). Subjective financial well-being, income and health inequalities in mid and later life in Britain. *Social Science & Medicine*, 100, 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.10.016>
- Atchley, R. C. (1997). The subjective importance of being religious and its effect on health and morale 14 years later. *Journal of Aging studies*, 11(2), 131-141. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0890-4065\(97\)90017-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0890-4065(97)90017-7)
- Bakewell, S. (2017). *Varoluşçular kahvesi: Özgürlük, varoluş ve kayısı kokteylleri jean-paul sartre, simone de beauvoir, albert camus, martin heidegger, karl Jaspers, edmund husserl, maurice merleau-ponty ve diğerleri eşliğinde* (2nd ed.). Turkey: Domingo.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1>
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173- 1182.

<https://sites.hofstra.edu/jeffrey-froh/wp-content/uploads/sites/86/2019/11/Baron-and-Kenny-1986.pdf>

- Barrett, W. (1962). *Irrational man: A study in existential philosophy*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Bartels, M., & Boomsma, D. I. (2009). Born to be happy? The etiology of subjective well-being. *Behavior Genetics*, 39(6), 605-615. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-009-9294-8>
- Battista, J., & Almond, R. (1973). The development of meaning in life. *Psychiatry*, 36(4), 409-427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1973.11023774>
- Baumeister, R. F. (2005). *The cultural animal: Human nature, meaning, and social life*. Oxford University Press.
- Beck, R. (2004). The Function of Religious Belief: Defensive Versus Existential Religion. *Journal of Psychology & Christianity*, 23(3). <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.548.1204&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Becker, E. (1971). *Birth and death of meaning: An interdisciplinary perspective of the problem of man* (2nd ed.). The Free Press.
- Becker, E. (1973). *The denial of death*. New York: The Free Press.
- Beit-Hallahmi, B. (2009). Morality and immorality among the irreligious. *Atheism and secularity*, 1, 113.
- Bergsma, A., Poot, G., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2008). Happiness in the garden of Epicurus. *Journal of happiness studies*, 9(3), 397-423. DOI 10.1007/s10902-006-9036-z
- Boertien, D., & Vignoli, D. (2019). Legalizing same-sex marriage matters for the subjective well-being of individuals in same-sex unions. *Demography*, 56(6), 2109-2121. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-019-00822-1>
- Bond, J., & Corner, L. (2004). *Quality of life and older people*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

- Brzezinski, M. (2019). Top incomes and subjective well-being. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 73, 60-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2019.05.003>
- Bylski, N. C., & Westman, A. S. (1991). Relationships among defense style, existential anxiety, and religiosity. *Psychological reports*, 68(3_suppl), 1389-1390. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1991.68.3c.1389>
- Cai, S., & Park, A. (2016). Permanent income and subjective well-being. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 130, 298-319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2016.07.016>
- Castells, M. (2010). *The Power of Identity*, 2nd ed., *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, (Blackwell: Cambridge, MA, 2004).
- Chen, S., & Van Ours, J. C. (2018). Subjective well-being and partnership dynamics: Are same-sex relationships different?. *Demography*, 55(6), 2299-2320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0725-0>
- Chopik, W. J. (2017). Death across the lifespan: Age differences in death-related thoughts and anxiety. *Death studies*, 41(2), 69-77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481187.2016.1206997>
- Clements, R. (1998). Intrinsic religious motivation and attitudes toward death among the elderly. *Current Psychology*, 17(2), 237-248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-998-1009-4>
- Cohen, A. B., Pierce Jr, J. D., Chambers, J., Meade, R., Gorvine, B. J., & Koenig, H. G. (2005). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity, belief in the afterlife, death anxiety, and life satisfaction in young Catholics and Protestants. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39(3), 307-324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2004.02.005>
- Coleman, S. B., Kaplan, J. D., & Downing, R. W. (1986). Life cycle and loss—The spiritual vacuum of heroin addiction. *Family Process*, 25(1), 5-23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1986.00005.x>

- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(4), 668–678. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.4.668>
- Da Silva, A., & Schork, M. A. (1985). Gender differences in attitudes to death among a group of public health students. *OMEGA-Journal of Death and Dying*, 15(1), 77-84. <https://doi.org/10.2190/UAEX-6EPM-K3E0-8XYE>
- Delle Fave, A., Massimini, F., Bassi, M. (2011). Hedonism and Eudaimonism in Positive Psychology. In: Psychological Selection and Optimal Experience Across Cultures. *Cross-Cultural Advancements in Positive Psychology*, vol 2. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9876-4_1
- DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 197. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.197>
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American psychologist*, 55(1), 34. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.34>
- Diener, E. (2009). Subjective well-being. In E. Diener (Ed.), *The science of well-being: The collected works of Ed Diener* (Vol. 37, pp. 11-58). New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2350-6_2
- Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of personality assessment*, 49(1), 71-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual review of psychology*, 54(1), 403-425. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145056>
- Doane, M. J., & Elliott, M. (2015). Perceptions of discrimination among atheists: Consequences for atheist identification, psychological and physical well-being. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 7(2), 130. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rel0000015>

- Douglass, R. P., Conlin, S. E., Duffy, R. D., & Allan, B. A. (2017). Examining moderators of discrimination and subjective well-being among LGB individuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 64(1), 1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cou0000187>
- Durak, M., Senol-Durak, E., & Gencoz, T. (2010). Psychometric properties of the satisfaction with life scale among Turkish university students, correctional officers, and elderly adults. *Social indicators research*, 99(3), 413-429. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9589-4>
- Dursun, P. (2012). *The role of meaning in life, optimism, hope, and coping styles in subjective well-being*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Ellison, C. G. (1991). Religious involvement and subjective well-being. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 80-99. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2136801>
- Ertufan, H. (2008). *Hekimlik uygulamalarında ölümle sık karşılaşmanın ölüm kaygısı üzerine etkisi*. Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G. & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175-191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Fenn, R. K. (2001). *Beyond idols: The shape of a secular society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L. J., Ridder, E. M., & Beautrais, A. L. (2005). Sexual orientation and mental health in a birth cohort of young adults. *Psychological medicine*, 35(7), 971-981. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291704004222>
- Fiske, S. T. & Taylor, S. E. (2013). *From social cognition to affect*. In *Social cognition: From brains to culture* (2nd ed.) (p. 341-369). London: Sage.
- Florit, E. F., & Lladosa, L. E. V. (2007). Evaluation of the effects of education on job satisfaction: Independent single-equation vs. structural equation models. *International Advances in Economic Research*, 13(2), 157-170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11294-007-9081-3>

- Flynn, T. (2006). *A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frankl, V. E. (1967). Logotherapy and existentialism. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice*, 4(3), 138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087982>
- Frankl, V. E. (1984). *Man's search for meaning*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Frazier, P. H., & Foss-Goodman, D. (1989). Death anxiety and personality: Are they truly related?. *OMEGA-Journal of death and dying*, 19(3), 265-274. <https://doi.org/10.2190/141T-Q32F-LPPD-EY3W>
- Freud, S. (2014). *Bir yanılsamanın geleceği*. Türkiye: Tutku Yayınevi.
- Froh, J. J., Yurkewicz, C., & Kashdan, T. B. (2009). Gratitude and subjective well-being in early adolescence: Examining gender differences. *Journal of adolescence*, 32(3), 633-650. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.06.006>
- Frijters, P., & Beaton, T. (2012). The mystery of the U-shaped relationship between happiness and age. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 82(2-3), 525-542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2012.03.008>
- Galen, L. W., & Kloet, J. D. (2011). Mental well-being in the religious and the non-religious: Evidence for a curvilinear relationship. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 14(7), 673-689. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2010.510829>
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Rosenblatt, A., Veeder, M., Kirkland, S., & Lyon, D. (1990). Evidence for terror management theory II: The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 58(2), 308. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.2.308>
- Given, J. E., & Range, L. M. (1990). Life satisfaction and death anxiety in elderly nursing home and public housing residents. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 9(2), 224-229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/073346489000900208>
- Grinde, B. (2012). *The biology of happiness*. Springer Science & Business Media.

- Han, C. (2015). Explaining the subjective well-being of urban and rural Chinese: Income, personal concerns, and societal evaluations. *Social science research*, 49, 179-190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.08.006>
- Hansen, T., & Slagsvold, B. (2012). The age and subjective well-being paradox revisited: A multidimensional perspective. *Norsk Epidemiologi*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.5324/nje.v22i2.1565>
- Hayward, R. D., Krause, N., Ironson, G., Hill, P. C., & Emmons, R. (2016). Health and well-being among the non-religious: Atheists, agnostics, and no preference compared with religious group members. *Journal of religion and health*, 55(3), 1024-1037. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-015-0179-2>
- Hedayati, M. M., & Khazaei, M. M. (2014). An investigation of the relationship between depression, meaning in life and adult hope. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 114, 598-601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.753>
- Henderson, L. W., & Knight, T. (2012). Integrating the hedonic and eudaimonic perspectives to more comprehensively understand well-being and pathways to wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 2(3), 196-221. doi: 10.5502/ijw.v2i3.3.
- Hicks, G. R., & Lee, T. T. (2006). Public attitudes toward gays and lesbians: Trends and predictors. *Journal of homosexuality*, 51(2), 57-77. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v51n02_04
- Hovi, M., & Laamanen, J. P. (2021). Income, aspirations and subjective well-being: International evidence. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 185, 287-302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2021.02.030>
- Jackson, B. R., & Bergeman, C. S. (2011). How does religiosity enhance well-being? The role of perceived control. *Psychology of religion and spirituality*, 3(2), 149. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021597>
- Juhl, J., & Routledge, C. (2016). Putting the terror in terror management theory: Evidence that the awareness of death does cause anxiety and undermine psychological well-

- being. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25(2), 99-103.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721415625218>
- Kastenbaum, R. (2000). *The psychology of death*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Kaufmann, W. (1959). Existentialism and death. *Chicago Review*, 13(2), 75-93.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/25293517>
- Kaufmann, W. (1960). *Existentialism from dostoevsky to sartre*. New York: Meridian Books.
- Keyes, C. L. M., & Ryff, C. D. (1999). Psychological well-being in midlife. In *Life in the middle* (pp. 161-180). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012757230-7/50028-6>
- Keyes, C. L., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: the empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 82(6), 1007. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.1007>
- Kitayama, S., Karasawa, M., Curhan, K. B., Ryff, C. D., & Markus, H. R. (2010). Independence and interdependence predict health and wellbeing: Divergent patterns in the United States and Japan. *Frontiers in psychology*, 1, 163. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2010.00163>
- Kitayama, S., & Markus, H. R. (2000). The pursuit of happiness and the realization of sympathy: Cultural patterns of self, social relations, and well-being. *Culture and subjective well-being*, 1, 113-161.
- Kleftaras, G., & Psarra, E. (2012). Meaning in life, psychological well-being and depressive symptomatology: A comparative study. *Psychology*, 3(04), 337. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/psych.2012.34048>
- Kline, T. (2005). *Psychological testing: A practical approach to design and evaluation*. U.S.A: Sage Publications.

- Koo, K. K. (2021). Am I Welcome Here? Campus Climate and Psychological Well-Being Among Students of Color. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 58(2), 196-213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2020.1853557>
- Kraut, R. (1979). Two conceptions of happiness. *The philosophical review*, 88(2), 167-197. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2184505>
- Krok, D. (2018). When is meaning in life most beneficial to young people? Styles of meaning in life and well-being among late adolescents. *Journal of adult development*, 25(2), 96-106. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-017-9280-y>
- Längle, A. (2007). The search for meaning in life and the existential fundamental motivations. *International Journal of Existential Positive Psychology*, 1(1). <https://www.meaning.ca/web/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/93-13-457-1-10-20171212.pdf>
- Leondari, A., & Gialamas, V. (2009). Religiosity and psychological well-being. *International journal of psychology*, 44(4), 241-248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590701700529>
- Levin, J. S., & Taylor, R. J. (1998). Panel analyses of religious involvement and well-being in African Americans: Contemporaneous vs. longitudinal effects. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 695-709. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1388151>
- Librán, E. C. (2006). Personality dimensions and subjective well-being. *The Spanish journal of psychology*, 9(1), 38-44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1138741600005953>
- Lim, C. (2015). Religion and Subjective Well-Being Across Religious Traditions: Evidence from 1.3 Million Americans. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 54(4), 684-701. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jssr.12232>
- Lyke, J. (2013). Associations among aspects of meaning in life and death anxiety in young adults. *Death studies*, 37(5), 471-482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481187.2011.649939>

- Martela, F., & Steger, M. F. (2016). The three meanings of meaning in life: Distinguishing coherence, purpose, and significance. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 11*(5), 531-545. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1137623>
- Martínez-Marín, M. D., & Martínez, C. (2019). Subjective well-being and gender-typed attributes in adolescents: The relevance of emotional intelligence. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 71*(3), 296-304. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12247>
- McLeod, J. D., & Owens, T. J. (2004). Psychological well-being in the early life course: Variations by socioeconomic status, gender, and race/ethnicity. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67*(3), 257-278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250406700303>
- Meyer, I. H. (2013). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1*(S), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1037/2329-0382.1.S.3>
- Mulhall, S. (2005). *Routledge philosophy guidebook to Heidegger and being and time* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Musick, M. A. (2000). Theodicy and life satisfaction among black and white Americans. *Sociology of Religion, 61*(3), 267-287. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3712579>
- Myers, D. G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy?. *Psychological science, 6*(1), 10-19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1995.tb00298.x>
- Nes, R. B., & Røysamb, E. (2015). The heritability of subjective well-being: Review and meta-analysis. In M. Pluess (Ed.), *Genetics of Psychological Well-Being* (pp. 75-96). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nouvilas-Pallejà, E., Silván-Ferrero, P., de Apodaca, M. J. F. R., & Molero, F. (2018). Stigma consciousness and subjective well-being in lesbians and gays. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 19*(4), 1115-1133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9862-1>
- O'Connell, K. A., & Skevington, S. M. (2005). The relevance of spirituality, religion and personal beliefs to health-related quality of life: Themes from focus groups in

- Britain. *British journal of health psychology*, 10(3), 379-398.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/135910705X25471>
- Petts, R. J., & Jolliff, A. (2008). Religion and adolescent depression: The impact of race and gender. *Review of Religious Research*, 395-414.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/20447514>
- Petersen, L. R., & Roy, A. (1985). Religiosity, anxiety, and meaning and purpose: Religion's consequences for psychological well-being. *Review of Religious Research*, 49-62. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3511937>
- Pöhls, K., Schlösser, T., & Fetchenhauer, D. (2020). Non-religious identities and life satisfaction: Questioning the universality of a linear link between religiosity and well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 21(7), 2327-2353.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00175-x>
- Rappaport, H., Fossler, R. J., Bross, L. S., & Gilden, D. (1993). Future time, death anxiety, and life purpose among older adults. *Death studies*, 17(4), 369-379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481189308252631>
- Rasmussen, C. A., & Brems, C. (1996). The relationship of death anxiety with age and psychosocial maturity. *The Journal of psychology*, 130(2), 141-144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1996.9914996>
- Rossiter, E. (2016). Hedonism and natural law in Locke's moral philosophy. *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 54(2), 203-225. [10.1353/hph.2016.0044](https://doi.org/10.1353/hph.2016.0044)
- Routledge, C., & Juhl, J. (2010). When death thoughts lead to death fears: Mortality salience increases death anxiety for individuals who lack meaning in life. *Cognition and Emotion*, 24(5), 848-854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930902847144>
- Routledge, C., Ostafin, B., Juhl, J., Sedikides, C., Cathey, C., & Liao, J. (2010). Adjusting to death: the effects of mortality salience and self-esteem on psychological well-being, growth motivation, and maladaptive behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 99(6), 897. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021431>

- Russac, R. J., Gatliff, C., Reece, M., & Spottswood, D. (2007). Death anxiety across the adult years: An examination of age and gender effects. *Death studies*, 31(6), 549-561. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481180701356936>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 141-166. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141>
- Ryff, C. D. (1989a). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 57(6), 1069. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069
- Ryff, C. D. (1989b). Beyond Ponce de Leon and life satisfaction: New directions in quest of successful ageing. *International journal of behavioral development*, 12(1), 35-55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016502548901200102>
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 69(4), 719. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719>
- Sarracino, F. (2013). Determinants of subjective well-being in high and low income countries: Do happiness equations differ across countries?. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 42, 51-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2012.11.006>.
- Sawyer, J. S., Brewster, M. E., & Ertl, M. M. (2021). Death anxiety and death acceptance in atheists and other nonbelievers. *Death Studies*, 45(6), 459-468. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481187.2019.1648339>
- Schilt, K., & Westbrook, L. (2009). Doing Gender, Doing Heteronormativity: “Gender Normals,” Transgender People, and the Social Maintenance of Heterosexuality. *Gender & society*, 23(4), 440-464. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243209340034>
- Schumaker, J. F. (Ed.). (1992). *Religion and mental health*. Oxford University Press.
- Sedlar, A. E., Stauner, N., Pargament, K. I., Exline, J. J., Grubbs, J. B., & Bradley, D. F. (2018). Spiritual struggles among atheists: Links to psychological distress and well-being. *Religions*, 9(8), 242. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel9080242>

- Sherkat, D. E., & Reed, M. D. (1992). The effects of religion and social support on self-esteem and depression among the suddenly bereaved. *Social Indicators Research*, 26(3), 259-275. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00286562>
- Shiah, Y. J., Chang, F., Chiang, S. K., Lin, I. M., & Tam, W. C. C. (2015). Religion and health: Anxiety, religiosity, meaning of life and mental health. *Journal of religion and health*, 54(1), 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-013-9781-3>
- Silver, C. F. (2013). *Atheism, agnosticism, and nonbelief: A qualitative and quantitative study of type and narrative* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga).
- Silver, C. F., Coleman III, T. J., Hood Jr, R. W., & Holcombe, J. M. (2014). The six types of nonbelief: A qualitative and quantitative study of type and narrative. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 17(10), 990-1001. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.987743>
- Steger, M. F., & Frazier, P. (2005). Meaning in life: One link in the chain from religiousness to well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(4), 574. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.574>
- Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The meaning in life questionnaire: assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 53(1), 80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.80>
- Steger, M. F., Oishi, S., & Kashdan, T. B. (2009). Meaning in life across the life span: Levels and correlates of meaning in life from emerging adulthood to older adulthood. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4(1), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760802303127>
- Stephenson, M. T., & Holbert, R. L. (2003). A Monte Carlo simulation of observable versus latent variable structural equation modeling techniques. *Communication Research*, 30, 332-353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650203030003004>
- Stone, M. H. (2017). Dread according to Kierkegaard. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychoanalysis*, 3(1), 1-8. DOI: 10.23937/2572-4037.1510018

- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*, (6th ed.), Pearson Education Limited.
- Tay, L., Li, M., Myers, D., & Diener, E. (2014). Religiosity and subjective well-being: An international perspective. In *Religion and spirituality across cultures* (pp. 163-175). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8950-9_9
- Templer, D. I. (1970). The construction and validation of a death anxiety scale. *The Journal of general psychology*, 82(2), 165-177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221309.1970.9920634>
- Templer, D. I., & Dotson, E. (1970). Religious correlates of death anxiety. *Psychological reports*, 26(3), 895-897. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1970.26.3.895>
- Thorson, J. A. (1977). Variations in death anxiety related to college students' sex, major field of study, and certain personality traits. *Psychological Reports*, 40(3), 857-858. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1977.40.3.857>
- Ueno, K. (2005). Sexual orientation and psychological distress in adolescence: Examining interpersonal stressors and social support processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(3), 258-277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250506800305>
- Ulloa, B. F. L., Møller, V., & Sousa-Poza, A. (2013). How does subjective well-being evolve with age? A literature review. *Journal of Population Ageing*, 6(3), 227-246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12062-013-9085-0>
- Vail III, K. E., & Soenke, M. (2018). The impact of mortality awareness on meaning in life among Christians and atheists. *Religion, Brain & Behavior*, 8(1), 44-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2153599X.2016.1238845>
- Vail III, K. E., Soenke, M., & Waggoner, B. (2019). Terror management theory and religious belief. In *Handbook of terror management theory* (pp. 259-285). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-811844-3.00011-1>

- Ventegodt, S., Merrick, J., & Andersen, N. J. (2003). Quality of life theory III. Maslow revisited. *The Scientific World Journal*, 3, 1050-1057. <https://doi.org/10.1100/tsw.2003.84>
- Villani, D., Sorgente, A., Iannello, P., & Antonietti, A. (2019). The role of spirituality and religiosity in subjective well-being of individuals with different religious status. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 1525. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01525>
- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 64(4), 678. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.4.678>
- Waterman, A. S. (2008). Reconsidering happiness: A eudaimonist's perspective. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(4), 234-252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760802303002>
- Weston, R., & Gore Jr, P. A. (2006). A brief guide to structural equation modeling. *The counseling psychologist*, 34(5), 719-751. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006286345>
- Witter, R. A., Okun, M. A., Stock, W. A., & Haring, M. J. (1984). Education and subjective well-being: A meta-analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 6(2), 165-173. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737006002165>
- Witter, R. A., Stock, W. A., Okun, M. A., & Haring, M. J. (1985). Religion and subjective well-being in adulthood: A quantitative synthesis. *Review of Religious Research*, 332-342. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3511048>
- Yakovlev, P., & Leguizamon, S. (2012). Ignorance is not bliss: On the role of education in subjective well-being. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 41(6), 806-815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2012.08.009>
- Yalom, I. D. (1980). *Existential psychotherapy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Yeniçeri, Z. (2013). *Impact of self orientations on well-being during adulthood: The mediating roles of meaning in life, attitudes towards death and religious outlook*. Metu University Unpublished Doctoral Thesis.

- Zhang, J., Peng, J., Gao, P., Huang, H., Cao, Y., Zheng, L., & Miao, D. (2019). Relationship between meaning in life and death anxiety in the elderly: self-esteem as a mediator. *BMC geriatrics*, 19(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-019-1316-7>
- Zuckerman, P. (2007). Atheism: Contemporary numbers and patterns. In M. Martin (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to atheism* (pp. 47–65). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL0521842700.004>
- Zuckerman, P. (2008). *Society Without God: What the Least Religious Nations Can Tell Us About Contentment*. NY: New York University Press.
- Zuckerman, P. (2009). Atheism, secularity, and well-being: How the findings of social science counter negative stereotypes and assumptions. *Sociology Compass*, 3(6), 949-971. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2009.00247.x>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu araştırma Başkent Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Zuhall Yenicheri Kökdemir'in danışmanlığında, Sosyal Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Sena Tekçe tarafından yürütölmektedir. Çalışmanın amacı, hayatta anlam ile iyilik hali arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir.

Çalışmada sizlerden öncelikle demografik bilgi formunu doldurmanız ve ardından çalışma doğrultusunda doldurulması beklenen ölçeklere yanıt vermeniz istenmektedir. Ankette yer alan soruların doğru veya yanlış yanıtı yoktur, sizden istediğimiz kendi düşüncelerinizi belirtmenizdir. Anket içerisinde sizden kimliğinizle ilgili hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Vereceğiniz bilgiler yalnızca araştırmacı tarafından diğer katılımcıların yanıtlarıyla birleştirilip grup düzeyinde değerlendirilecektir. Araştırmaya katılım yaklaşık 15 dakika sürmektedir ve tamamen gönüllölük esasına dayanmaktadır. Çalışmada sizi rahatsız eden herhangi bir soruyla karşılaşsanız ya da devam etmek istemezseniz bu durumda çalışmayı yarıda bırakmakta tamamen özgürsünüz.

Araştırma veya araştırma sonuçları ile ilgili bilgi almak isterseniz e-posta adresinden araştırmacıya ulaşabilirsiniz. Yardımlarınız ve katılımınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllölük olarak katılıyorum ve istediğim zaman yarıda kesip çıkabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.

- ☐ Evet, kabul ediyorum.
- ☐ Hayır, kabul etmiyorum.

APPENDIX 2: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Cinsiyetiniz:

- ☐ Kadın
- ☐ Erkek
- ☐ İkili olmayan (non-binary)
- ☐ Belirtmek istemiyorum

Yaşınız: _____

Tamamladığınız en üst eğitim seviyesi nedir?

- ☐ Ortaokul ve altı
- ☐ Lise
- ☐ Yüksekokul / Üniversite (Lisans)
- ☐ Üniversite (Yüksek lisans, doktora)

Eğer üniversite okuyorsanız ya da mezunuysanız üniversitede okuduğunuz bölümün adı: _____

Herhangi bir dine inanıyor musunuz?

- ☐ Evet
- ☐ Hayır

Eğer herhangi bir dine inanıyorsanız kendinizi ne kadar inançlı olarak tanımlarsınız? Lütfen, sizin için en uygun olan rakamı yuvarlak içine alınız.

(Herhangi bir dine inanıyor musunuz, sorusuna yanıtınız **hayır** ise bu kısmı doldurmadan geçip ölçeğe devam etmelisiniz.)

(1: Hiç inançlı değilim, 7: Çok inançlıyım)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Eğer herhangi bir dine inanmıyorsanız lütfen aşağıdaki tanımlamalardan sizi en çok tanımlayan metni seçiniz. (Herhangi bir dine inanıyor musunuz, sorusuna yanıtınız evet ise bu kısmı doldurmadan geçip ölçeğe devam etmelisiniz.)

- ☐ **1. Entelektüel Ateist / Agnostik (IAA):** “Birçok arkadaşım beni sürekli öğrenmeye hevesli bir entelektüel olarak görüyor. Bunun nedeni toplumsal, psikolojik, siyasi, bilimsel ve /veya dinin ontolojik değeri ile ilgili konuları eleştirel bir şekilde tartışmaya yönelik becerimdir. Bazı durumlarda kendim kadar diğerlerinin görüşlerini değerlendirirken de felsefi ve şüpheci bir yaklaşım kullanıyorum. Entelektüel demokratik bir tartışma ve diyaloga açık oldukları sürece, inançlılarla, hakikati tanımlamakla ilgili entelektüel konu ve sorunları tartışmaktan keyif alıyorum. Diğerlerinin görüşlerine saygı gösteririm. Boş zamanlarımda genellikle bilim ve felsefe kitapları ve hatta bazen ateizm veya benzer konular üzerine yazılmış popüler yazıları okuyorum.. Kendilerini dindar kabul edenlere kıyasla dini konularda daha bilgili olduğumu düşünüyorum. Kendi görüşüme güvenmekle birlikte diğer görüşlere de büyük saygı duyuyorum. Diğerleriyle tartışırken genellikle onları dinler ve saygı gösteririm. Bir entelektüel olarak, insanın aynı görüşte olmadığı kişilere bile saygı duyacak olgunlukta olması gerektiğini düşünüyorum. Sağlıklı tartışmalardan keyif alır ve böyle tartışmaların içinde bulunmaya çalışırım.
- ☐ **2. Eylemci Ateist / Agnostik (AAA):** “Toplumun iyileştirilmesi gerekiyor ve eylemcilik bunu sağlamanın iyi bir yolu. Benim gibi bir insan olmanın zorluklarından biri, değerlerimin ve inançlarımin diğerlerinininkinden farklı olması. Hümanizm, feminizm, LGBT sorunları, sosyal ve siyasi kaygılar, insan hakları temaları, çevre sorunları, hayvan hakları veya din-devlet işlerinin ayrılması gibi konularda harekete geçtiğim oluyor. Yasalar azınlık grupları baskıladığında sivil itaatsizliği anlamlı buluyorum. Benim için önemli bir konu veya sorun varsa sesimi yükseltirim ve diğerlerini de bununla ilgili harekete geçirmeye çalışırım. Toplumdaki herkesin eşit temsil hakkı ve çevreyi koruyarak dünyanın sürekliliğinin sağlanması ve toplumsal değişim konularıyla ilgileniyorum. Kendimi agnostik veya ateist olarak tanımlasam da, diğer inançsızları tüm azınlık gruplarındaki sosyal eşitsizliklerin farkında olmaları için cesaretlendirmeye çalışıyorum. Ateist ve Agnostik gruplar, bu ülkede eşit haklara sahip olmayı hak eden çok sayıdaki gruptan sadece biridir.”
- ☐ **3. Arayışta Agnostik (SA):** “Arkadaşlarım din ve Tanrı (ilah) üzerine görüşlerinden emin olabilirler ama ben o kadar emin değilim. Bazıları bunu kendimi ateist olarak nitelendirmekten kaçınmam için yaptığım bir hamle olarak görüyor ama benim için daha çok konforlu bir alan. Basit bir şekilde tanrının veya bir ilahın varlığı hakkında konuşamam. Bence bunda bir sorun yok ve benim görüşümü sorgulayanlar belirsizliğim konusuna takılmamalıdır. Hayatta, hakkında kesin konuşamayacağımız çok fazla şey var. Bilim ve felsefeyi ilginç buluyorum ve kendimi bir çeşit hakikati aramak için eğitiyorum. Sosyal çevremde çok dindar veya konumunu savunan ateist kişiler de dahil farklı görüşlerde insanlar olmasını seviyorum. Kısacası, hakikatin metafiziksel ve bilimsel olasılıklarına açığım ve arayıştayım. İnsan deneyimi ve dünya karmaşıktır ve henüz bilmediğimiz birçok şeyle doludur.”
- ☐ **4. Anti-Teist:** “Agnostikler ve ateistler günümüzün en çok nefret edilen insanları arasındalar. Din halen birçok ülkede ateistlerin haklarını ve özgürlüklerini kısıtlıyor. Bu kabul edilemez girişimler karşılıksız kalmayacak. Bu tür bir baskı karşısında itirazımı paylaşmam gerektiğini hissediyorum. Açık olarak din ve dini ideallere

karşıyım ve muhalefetimle gurur duyuyorum. Birilerinin inançsızlığı savunması gerekiyor. Din, köhnedir ve hiçbir anlam ifade etmez. Akli başında herhangi bir insanın bu saçmalıklara nasıl inandığını anlamakta zorlanıyorum. Gereken her durumda bu cehaleti vurgulamak benim görevim. Birçok düşünce sistemi dini olayların ve öğretilerin gerçek bir zemini olmadığını kesinlikle göstermiştir. Toplum olarak gelişeceksek, bizi geriye çeken dini aşmalıyız. Dinin yaydığı cehalet ve nefretten rahatsızım ve öfke duyuyorum. Din hakkında ne yazık ki dini olanların bildiğinden daha çok şey biliyorum. Hakikat görelidir; bilim, bilimsel yöntem sayesinde neyin hakikat olup olmadığını gösterebilir. Bilim sayesinde, şu an her şeyi biliyor olmasak da en azından dinin köhne bir düşünce sistemi olduğundan emin olabiliriz. Din, baskıcı ve saldırgandır. Bana kendini inancına adanmış birini getirin ve ona ne kadar hatalı olduğunu göstereyim.”

- 5. Non-Teist: “Bu din ve spiritüel işlerden gerçekten kime ne? Din, eski insanlara anlam getirmiş olan köhne bir düşünce sistemidir. Bugün dine ihtiyacımız yok çünkü bizim yaşamlarımızın herhangi bir unsuruna dayanmıyor. Dinle bir diyalog içerdiği için ateist veya agnostik sözcüklerini sevmiyorum. Din, benim düşünce sistemimin bir parçası değil ve açıkçası hiç umursamıyorum, nokta. Kimse benim hakkımda ateist veya agnostik demesin”
- 6. Ritüel Ateist / Agnostik (RAA): “Ben kesinlikle bir ateist veya agnostiğim ve Tanrı veya bir ilahın varlığını sorguluyorum. Dünya hakkında anlam sağlamak için sembollerini nasıl yapılandığı konusunda dinin insan unsurunu büyüleyici buluyorum. Anlamlı ritüelleri ve hatta bazen dinsel olanları da takdir ediyorum. İnsanlar, dünyayı yapılandırmak konusunda gerçekten çok zeki ve yaratıcılar. Dini veya seküler semboller benim için güçlü ve anlamlıdır ve onları ilginç bulurum. Bir ilaha ya da doğaüstü bir güce inanmıyorum ama bayramları, sembollerini ve ritüellerini takdir ediyorum. Benim ilgim insan deneyiminin bu derin bileşenlerine yönelik. Ben de bir etnik veya kültürel grubun bir parçasıyım ve bu ritüeller ait olduğum grubun diğer üyeleriyle veya geçmişle bir bağ kurmamı sağlıyor. Bu ritüelleri, sembollerini veya bayramları yaşamıma anlam katan kazanımlar olarak görüyorum. Dünya ile ilgili düşünürken ek bir bağlam sağlıyorlar. Tanrı veya ilah ise yoktur.”

APPENDIX 3: TEMPLER'S DEATH ANXIETY SCALE

Lütfen, aşağıdaki ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyun ve hislerinize en yakın olan cevabı işaretleyin. Bu ifadeleri yanıtlarken, doğru veya yanlış cevapların olmadığını ve cevaplarının kişiden kişiye değişebileceğini unutmayınız.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

Hiç katılmıyorum
katılıyorum

Kararsızım

Tamamen

1. Ölmekten çok korkuyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Ölüm düşüncesi çok sık aklıma gelir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Diğer insanların ölüm hakkında konuşması beni rahatsız eder.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Ameliyat geçirme fikri beni çok rahatsız eder.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Ölümden hiç korkmuyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Kansere yakalanmak gibi özel bir korkum yok.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Ölüm düşüncesi beni rahatsız etmez.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Zamanın çok hızlı geçmesinden sık sık endişe duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Acı çekerek ölmekten korkuyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Ölümden sonraki yaşam fikri beni çok rahatsız ediyor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	6
11. Kalp krizi geçirmekten gerçekten korkuyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Sık sık yaşamın ne kadar kısa olduğunu düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. İnsanların III. Dünya Savaşı'ndan bahsettiğini duyarsam endişeleniyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Ölmüş birinin görüntüsü beni korkutur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Gelecek bende korku uyandırmıyor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX 4: THE MEANING IN LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE

Lütfen, aşağıdaki ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyun ve hislerinize en yakın olan cevabı işaretleyin. Bu ifadeleri yanıtlarken, doğru veya yanlış cevapların olmadığını ve cevaplarının kişiden kişiye değişebileceğini unutmayınız.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

Kesinlikle doğru değil

Kararsızım
doğru

Kesinlikle

1. Hayatımın anlamını kavriyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Bana kendi hayatımın anlamlı olduğunu hissettirecek bir şeylerin arayışı içerisindeyim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Sürekli hayatımın amacını bulmaya çalışıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Hayatımın net bir amacı var.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Hayatımı neyin anlamlı kıldığına dair iyi bir fikrim var.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Tatmin edici bir yaşam amacı keşfetmiş bulunmaktayım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Sürekli bana kendi hayatımın önemli olduğunu hissettirecek bir şeylerin arayışı içerisindeyim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Yaşamamın amacını veya misyonunu arıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Hayatımın hiçbir net amacı yok.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Hayatımda anlam arıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX 5: PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING SCALE

Lütfen, aşağıdaki ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyun ve hislerinize en yakın olan cevabı işaretleyin. Bu ifadeleri yanıtlarken, doğru veya yanlış cevapların olmadığını ve cevaplarının kişiden kişiye değişebileceğini unutmayınız.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

Hiç katılmıyorum
katılıyorum

Kararsızım

Tamamen

1. Güçlü fikirleri olan insanların etkisi altında kalırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. İnsanların genel kabullerine uymasa bile kendi düşüncelerime güvenirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Kendimi başkalarının önemli gördüğü değerlere göre değil, kendi önemli gördüklerime göre yargılarımla.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Genel olarak yaşamımda duruma hakimimdir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Günlük yaşamın gerekleri çoğu zaman beni zorlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Gündelik yaşamın çeşitli sorumluluklarıyla genellikle oldukça iyi baş ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Hayatı gün be gün yaşar, aslında geleceği düşünmem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Bazı insanlar yaşamda anlamsızca dolanırlar ama ben onlardan değilim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Bazen hayatta yapılması gereken her şeyi yapmışım gibi hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Yaşam öyküme baktığımda, olayların gelişme şekline memnuniyet duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Kişiliğimin çoğu yönünü beğenirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Birçok bakımdan, hayatta başarabildiklerimi hayal kırıcı bulurum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Yakın ilişkileri sürdürmek benim için zor olagelmıştır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. İnsanlar benim verici, vaktini diğerleriyle paylaşmaktan kaçınmayan biri olduğumu söyleyeceklerdir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. İnsanlarla sıcak ve güvene dayalı çok ilişkim olmadı.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Bence insanın kendisiyle ve dünyayla ilgili görüşlerini sorgulamasına yol açacak yeni yaşantıları olması önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Benim için hayat sürekli bir öğrenme, değişme ve gelişme süreci olagelmıştır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Hayatımda büyük değişiklikler veya gelişmeler kaydetmeye çalışmaktan çoktan vazgeçtim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX 6: FACULTIES / DEPARTMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS

Table 14. *Faculties / Departments of Participants (N = 385)*

Faculties / Departments	N
Adalet	1
Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı	1
Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri	1
Bilgisayar Bilimleri	3
Bilgisayar Mühendisliği	8
Bilgisayar ve Öğretim Teknolojileri	5
Biyoloji	2
Çalışma Ekonomisi ve Endüstri İlişkileri	1
Çocuk Gelişimi	1
Endüstri Mühendisliği	1
Eğitim Fakültesi	2
Ekonomi ve Finans	1
Elektrik Elektronik Mühendisliği	6
Elektrik Teknikerliği	1
Felsefe	2
Finans ve Bankacılık	1
Fizik	1
Fransızca Mütercim ve Tercümanlık	1
Fransızca Öğretmenliği	1
Gazetecilik	1
Gıda Mühendisliği	2
Görsel İletişim Tasarımı	1
Grafik Tasarımı	1
Halkla İlişkiler ve Tanıtım	3
Harita Kadastro	1
Hemşirelik	2
Hukuk	4
İktisat	2
İngilizce Öğretmenliği	2
Uluslararası İlişkiler	1
İlahiyat	191
İletişim Bilimleri	2
İnşaat Mühendisliği	1
İstatistik	1
İşletme	10
İşletme Mühendisliği	1
Jamyö	1
Kimya	2
Maden Mühendisliği	2
Makine Mühendisliği	4

Table 14. (continued) *Faculties / Departments of Participants (N = 385)*

Maliye	1
Matematik	2
Matematik Mühendisliği	1
Matematik Öğretmenliği	1
Mekatronik Mühendisliği	1
Metalurji ve Malzeme Mühendisliği	2
Mimarlık	1
Moleküler Biyoloji ve Genetik	1
Muhasebe ve Vergi Uygulamaları	1
Okul Öncesi Öğretmenliği	1
Orman Endüstri Mühendisliği	2
Otomotiv Teknolojisi	1
Özel Güvenlik ve Koruma	1
Peyzaj Mimarlığı	2
Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik	3
Psikoloji	22
Radyo Sinema ve Televizyon	3
Radyoloji	1
Sivil Savunma ve İtfaiyecilik	1
Siyasal Bilimler ve Siyasal İktisat	1
Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler	1
Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenliği	1
Sosyal Hizmet	1
Sosyoloji	2
Tarih	3
Tıbbi Görüntüleme Teknikleri	1
Tıp	5
Turizm İşletmeciliği	2
Turizm Rehberliği	1
Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı	2
Türk Musikisi Devlet Konservatuarı	1
Türkçe Öğretmenliği	1
Uluslararası İlişkiler	2
Uluslararası Ticaret	1
Yaşlı Bakımı	1
Yazılım Mühendisliği	3
Yönetim Bilişim Sistemleri	1
Zihinsel Engelliler Öğretmenliği	1
Ziraat Mühendisliği	1

APPENDIX 7: MULTIPLE COMPARISONS FOR TYPOLOGIES

Table 15. *Multiple Comparisons for Typologies*

Dependent Variable	Typology (I)	Typology (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Subjective Well-Being	Intellectual Atheist/Agnostic	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	.36	.22	1.00	-.29	1.01
		Seeker-Agnostic	.20	.24	1.00	-.52	.92
		Anti-Theist	.54	.20	.12	-.06	1.14
		Non-Theist	-.13	.21	1.00	-.75	.50
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.22	.28	1.00	-1.06	.62
	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	Seeker-Agnostic	-.16	.28	1.00	-.98	.66
		Anti-Theist	.18	.24	1.00	-.54	.90
		Non-Theist	-.49	.25	.79	-1.23	.25
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.58	.31	1.00	-1.51	.35
	Seeker-Agnostic	Anti-Theist	.34	.26	1.00	-.44	1.12
		Non-Theist	-.33	.27	1.00	-1.13	.47
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.42	.33	1.00	-1.40	.56

Table 15. *(continued) Multiple Comparisons for Typologies*

Dependent Variable	Typology (I)	Typology (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Subjective Well-Being	Anti-Theist	Non-Theist	-.67	.24	.07	-1.36	.03
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.76	.30	.18	-1.65	.13
	Non-Theist	Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.09	.31	1.00	-1.00	.82
Psychological Well-Being	Intellectual Atheist/Agnostic	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	.13	.10	1.00	-.15	.41
		Seeker-Agnostic	.43*	.11	.00	.12	.74
		Anti-Theist	.18	.09	.63	-.08	.44
		Non-Theist	.08	.09	1.00	-.19	.35
	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	.21	.12	1.00	-.15	.57
		Seeker-Agnostic	.30	.12	.19	-.05	.66
		Anti-Theist	.05	.10	1.00	-.26	.36
		Non-Theist	-.05	.11	1.00	-.37	.27

Table 15. *(continued) Multiple Comparisons for Typologies*

Dependent Variable	Typology (I)	Typology (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Psychological Well-Being	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	.08	.14	1.00	-.32	.48
		Anti-Theist	-.25	.11	.41	-.59	.08
		Non-Theist	-.35*	.12	.04	-.70	.00
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.22	.14	1.00	-.64	.20
	Anti-Theist	Non-Theist	-.10	.10	1.00	-.40	.20
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	.03	.13	1.00	-.35	.42
	Non-Theist	Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	.13	.13	1.00	-.26	.52
Death Anxiety	Intellectual Atheist/Agnostic	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	-.11	.15	1.00	-.56	.33
		Seeker-Agnostic	-.73*	.17	.00	-1.23	-.24
		Anti-Theist	-.15	.14	1.00	-.56	.26
		Non-Theist	-.09	.15	1.00	-.52	.34
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	.49	.19	.19	-1.06	.09

Table 15. *(continued) Multiple Comparisons for Typologies*

Dependent Variable	Typology (I)	Typology (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Death Anxiety	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	Seeker-Agnostic	-.62*	.19	.02	-1.18	-.06
		Anti-Theist	-.04	.17	1.00	-.53	.45
		Non-Theist	.02	.17	1.00	-.48	.53
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.38	.22	1.00	-1.01	.26
	Seeker-Agnostic	Anti-Theist	.58*	.18	.02	.05	1.12
		Non-Theist	.64*	.19	.01	.09	1.19
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	.24	.23	1.00	-.43	.91
	Anti-Theist	Non-Theist	.06	.16	1.00	-.42	.54
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.34	.21	1.00	-.95	.27
	Non-Theist	Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.40	.21	.89	-1.02	.22
Presence of Meaning	Intellectual Atheist/Agnostic	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	-.08	.23	1.00	-.75	.59
		Seeker-Agnostic	.55	.25	.41	-.19	1.29

Table 15. *(continued) Multiple Comparisons for Typologies*

Dependent Variable	Typology (I)	Typology (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Presence of Meaning	Intellectual Atheist/Agnostic	Anti-Theist	.97	.21	.41	-.26	1.03
		Non-Theist	.39	.22	1.00	-.73	1.00
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	.14	.29	1.00	-.73	1.00
	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	Seeker-Agnostic	.64	.29	.40	-.21	-1.48
		Anti-Theist	.18	.25	1.00	-.56	.92
		Non-Theist	.47	.26	1.00	-.29	1.23
	Seeker-Agnostic	Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	.22	.32	1.00	-.73	1.17
		Anti-Theist	-.46	.28	1.00	-1.26	.35
		Non-Theist	-.17	.28	1.00	-.99	.66
	Anti-Theist	Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.42	.34	1.00	-1.42	.59
		Non-Theist	.29	.24	1.00	-.43	1.00
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	.04	.31	1.00	-.88	.96

Table 15. *(continued) Multiple Comparisons for Typologies*

Dependent Variable	Typology (I)	Typology (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Presence of Meaning	Non-Theist	Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-.25	.32	1.00	-1.19	.69
Search for Meaning	Intellectual Atheist/Agnostic	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	-.16	.25	1.00	-.91	.60
		Seeker-Agnostic	-.91*	.28	.02	-1.74	-.07
		Anti-Theist	-.01	.23	1.00	-.70	.68
		Non-Theist	.09	.25	1.00	-.63	.81
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-1.17*	.33	.01	-2.14	-.20
	Activist Atheist/Agnostic	Seeker-Agnostic	-.75	.32	.30	-1.70	.20
		Anti-Theist	.14	.28	1.00	-.69	.97
		Non-Theist	.25	.29	1.00	-.61	1.10
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-1.01	.36	.08	-2.08	.06
	Seeker-Agnostic	Anti-Theist	.89	.30	.05	-.01	1.80
		Non-Theist	1.00*	.28	.02	.07	1.10

Table 15. *(continued) Multiple Comparisons for Typologies*

Dependent Variable	Typology (I)	Typology (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Search for Meaning	Seeker-Agnostic	Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-1.01	.36	.08	-2.08	.06
	Anti-Theist	Non-Theist	.10	.27	1.00	-.70	.91
		Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	-1.16*	.35	.02	-2.19	-.13
	Non-Theist	Ritual Atheist/Agnostic	1.26*	.36	.01	.21	2.31

Notes. *. The difference in means is significant at the 0.05 level.

APPENDIX 8: ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 21.05.2022-128464



1993

BAŞKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Akademik Değerlendirme Koordinatörlüğü

Sayı : E-62310886-605.99-128464
Konu : Sena Tekçe'nin Etik Onay Başvuru Hk.

21.05.2022

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi : 05.05.2022 tarih ve 122565 sayılı yazınız.

Enstitünüz Sosyal Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Sena Tekçe'nin, Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Zuhal Yeniçeri Kökdemir'in danışmanlığında yürüteceği "To Believe or Not to Believe: The Relationship Between Death Anxiety, Meaning in Life and Well-Being in an Existential Context" başlıklı yüksek lisans tez çalışması değerlendirilmiş ve bilgilerinize ekte sunulmuştur.

Prof. Dr. M. Abdülkadir VAROĞLU
Kurul Başkanı

Ek: Değerlendirme Formu

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Sayı : 17162298.600-140
Konu : Tez Çalışması

12 MAYIS 2022

İlgili Makama

Üniversitemiz Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Sena Tekçe'nin, Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Zuhale Yeniçeri Kökdemir'in danışmanlığında yürüteceği "To Believe or Not to Believe: The Relationship Between Death Anxiety, Meaning in Life and Well-Being in an Existential Context" başlıklı yüksek lisans tez çalışması değerlendirilmiş ve yapılmasında bir sakınca olmadığı tespit edilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımızla sunarız.

Başkent Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler ve Sanat Araştırma Kurulu

Ad, Soyad	Değerlendirme	İmza
Prof. Dr. M. Abdülkadir Varoğlu	Olumlu/ ~~Olumsuz~~	
Prof. Dr. Kudret Güven	Olumlu/ ~~Olumsuz~~	
Prof. Ali Sevgi	Olumlu/Olumsuz	
Prof. Dr. Işıl Bulut	Olumlu/Olumsuz	
Prof. Dr. Sadegül Akbaba Altun	Olumlu/ ~~Olumsuz~~	
Prof. Dr. Can Mehmet Hersek	Olumlu/Olumsuz	
Prof. Dr. Özcan Yağcı	Olumlu/ ~~Olumsuz~~	

Prof. Dr. Sadegül Akbaba Altun, Üniversitemiz Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Sena Tekçe'nin, Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Zuhal Yeniçeri Kökdemir'in danışmanlığında yürüteceği "To Believe or Not to Believe: The Relationship Between Death Anxiety, Meaning in Life and Well-Being in an Existential Context" başlıklı yüksek lisans tez çalışmasının yapılabileceği; ancak, araştırmada kullanılacak ölçeklerin sahiplerinden izin alınması gerektiği; ayrıca, onama formunda yazılan ölçekleri doldurmak için verilen 15 dakikanın gerçekçi olmadığı için değiştirilmesi gerektiği görüşündeler.

Prof. Dr. Özcan Yağcı, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Sena Tekçe'nin, Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Zuhal Yeniçeri Kökdemir'in danışmanlığında yürüteceği "To Believe or Not to Believe: The Relationship Between Death Anxiety, Meaning in Life and Well-Being in an Existential Context" başlıklı yüksek lisans tez çalışmasının uygun olduğu düşüncelerini iletmışlerdir.