

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL
ANXIETY AND FACEBOOK USE AMONG
UNDERGRADUATES: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL
PERSPECTIVE**

HAZAL ATALAY

İSTANBUL, 2020

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL ANXIETY AND FACEBOOK USE
AMONG UNDERGRADUATES: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL PERSPECTIVE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY

BY

HAZAL ATALAY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

JUNE 2020

T.C. BAHCESEHIR UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY MASTER’S PROGRAM

Title of the Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL ANXIETY AND FACEBOOK USE AMONG UNDERGRADUATES: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Name and Surname Of The Student: Hazal Atalay

Thesis Defense Day: 25/06/2020

This thesis has been approved by the Institute of Social Sciences which has fulfilled the necessary conditions as Master thesis.

Assoc. Prof. Burak Küntay
Institute Director

I certify that this thesis has fulfilled the necessary requirements as Master thesis.

Assist. Prof. Burçak Vatansever Durmaz
Program Coordinator

This thesis was read by us, quality and content as a Master’s thesis has been seen and accepted as sufficient.

	Title/Name	Signature
Thesis Advisor’s	Assist. Prof. Hale Ögel Balaban	
Member’s	Assist. Prof. Başak Türküler Aka	
Member’s	Assist. Prof. Nilüfer Ercan	

“I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and ethical conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.”

Name Surname: Hazal Atalay

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL ANXIETY AND FACEBOOK USE AMONG UNDERGRADUATES: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Atalay, Hazal

M.A., Clinical Psychology

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Hale Ögel Balaban

June 2020, 119 pages

The goal of the current study was to examine the quantitative (the time-spent on Facebook, the frequency of Facebook use, and the number of Facebook friends) and qualitative (the patterns and motivations of Facebook use; also the perceived social support on Facebook) dimensions of Facebook use in relation to social anxiety among undergraduate students. Whether social anxiety predicts these quantitative and qualitative dimensions of Facebook use was investigated in the light of social compensation hypothesis. Data were collected from 731 undergraduates; data analyses were conducted with 382 undergraduates (251 female, 131 male) who have a Facebook account. Participants' age ranged between 18 and 25 ($M = 21.34$, $SD = 1.47$). Participants with a Facebook account completed the following forms: Demographic Information Form, Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale, Use of Social Media Form, Motivations of Facebook Use Scale, Self-Presentation Subscale of Self-

Focused Gratifications on Facebook Scale, Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC), Facebook Activity Measure (FAME), Perceived Stress Scale-10, and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS). Female and male participants were significantly different on social anxiety scores, the frequency of Facebook use, time-spent on Facebook and communication/socializing motivation of Facebook use. Age significantly predicted the number of Facebook friends. Social anxiety was found to predict significantly the number of Facebook friends, curiosity motivation of Facebook use, passive following of strangers/friends with no contact pattern of Facebook use, and perceived offline social support. These findings were discussed in terms of their implications for the social compensation hypothesis.

Keywords: Social anxiety, the social compensation hypothesis, Facebook, undergraduates

ÖZ

ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNDE SOSYAL KAYGI VE FACEBOOK KULLANIMI İLİŞKİSİNİN İNCELENMESİ: ÇOK BOYUTLU BİR YAKLAŞIM

Atalay, Hazal

Yüksek Lisans, Klinik Psikoloji

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hale Ögel Balaban

Haziran 2020, 119 sayfa

Bu araştırmanın amacı niceliksel (Facebook'ta zaman geçirme süresi, Facebook kullanım sıklığı ve Facebook arkadaş sayısı) ve niteliksel (Facebook kullanım örüntüleri, Facebook kullanma motivasyonları ve Facebook üzerinden algılanan sosyal destek) Facebook kullanım boyutlarının sosyal kaygı ile ilişkisini üniversite öğrencilerinde incelemektir. Bir diğer amacı ise sosyal kaygının, niceliksel ve niteliksel Facebook kullanım boyutlarını sosyal telafi hipotezi ışığında yordayıp yordamadığını araştırmaktır. Bu çalışmada toplam 731 üniversite öğrencisinden veri toplanmıştır ve Facebook hesabı bulunan 382 üniversite öğrencisi (251 kadın, 131 erkek) üzerinden analizler gerçekleştirilmiştir. Katılımcıların yaşı 18 ile 25 arasındadır ($Ort. = 21.34$, $S = 1.47$). Facebook hesabı bulunan katılımcılar şu ölçekleri doldurmuştur: Demografik Bilgi Formu, Liebowitz Sosyal Kaygı Ölçeği, Sosyal Medya Kullanım Formu, Facebook Kullanım Motivasyonları Ölçeği, Benlik

Odaklı Doyumlar Ölçeğinin Öz-Sunum Alt-Ölçeği, Facebook Sosyal Destek Ölçeği, Facebook Aktiviteleri Ölçeği, Algılanan Stres Ölçeği-10 ve Çokboyutlu Algılanan Sosyal Destek Ölçeği. Kadın ve erkek katılımcılar; sosyal kaygı skorları, Facebook kullanım sıklığı, Facebook'ta zaman geçirme süresi ve iletişim/sosyalleşme Facebook motivasyonu skorlarında anlamlı şekilde farklılık göstermiştir. Yaş değişkeninin Facebook arkadaş sayısını anlamlı olarak yordadığı bulunmuştur. Sosyal kaygı; yüz yüze görüşülmeyen/yabancı kişileri Facebook üzerinden pasifçe takip etme örüntüsünü, Facebook arkadaş sayısını, Facebook kullanım motivasyonlarından merak motivasyonunu ve algılanan çevrimdışı sosyal destek düzeyini anlamlı olarak yordamıştır. Bu bulgular sosyal telafi hipotezi ışığında tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Sosyal kaygı, sosyal telafi hipotezi, Facebook, üniversite öğrencileri

To my family



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank to my mother Uğur and to my friends who supported me every time I felt anxious and who gave me strength in difficult times. Also, I would like to thank to my teachers Assist. Prof. Hale Ögel Balaban, Prof. Falih Köksal, Prof. Feyza Çorapçı, Hakan Kızıltan and many other respected teachers who supported me for the career path I chose and who stood by me through the challenging times I experienced on this path.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Definition of Social Anxiety	1
1.2. Social Anxiety and Social Network Sites	3
1.3. Facebook as a SNS	5
1.4. Social Anxiety, Facebook, and The Social Compensation Hypothesis	5
1.5. Social Anxiety and the Quantitative Dimensions of Facebook Use	6
1.5.1. Social Anxiety, the Frequency of FB use, and the Time-Spent on FB	6
1.5.2. Social Anxiety and the Number of FB Friends	7
1.6. Social Anxiety and the Qualitative Dimensions of Facebook Use	8
1.6.1. Social Anxiety and Online/Offline Social Support	8
1.6.2. Social Anxiety and the Patterns of FB Use	11
1.6.3. Social Anxiety and the Motivations of FB Use	13
1.6.4. Social Anxiety and the Self-Presentation Motivation of FB Use	14
1.7. The Aim of Thesis	16
1.8. Hypotheses	17
1.8.1. Hypotheses for the Quantitative Dimensions of FB Use	17
1.8.2. Hypotheses for the Qualitative Dimensions of FB Use	17
1.9. The Importance of Thesis	18

2. METHOD	19
2.1. Participants.....	19
2.2. Measurements	22
2.2.1. Demographic Information Form.....	22
2.2.2. The Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale.....	22
2.2.3. Use of Social Media Form	23
2.2.4. Motivations of Facebook Use Scale	24
2.2.5. The Self-Presentation Subscale of Self-Focused Gratifications on Facebook Scale.....	29
2.2.6. Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC).....	29
2.2.7. Facebook Activity Measure (FAME)	33
2.2.8. Perceived Stress Scale-10 (PSS-10)	38
2.2.9. Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support	38
2.3. Procedure	39
3. RESULTS.....	40
3.1. Descriptive Statistics of Participants.....	40
3.2. Correlations between Study Variables	45
3.3. Test of the Gender Difference in Study Variables	48
3.4. Multiple Regression Analyses	49
3.4.1. Regression Analyses with the Number of FB Friends	49
3.4.2. Regression Analyses with the Perceived Offline Social Support.....	51
3.5. Linear Regression Analyses	52
3.5.1. Linear Regression Analysis with Social Anxiety and the Curiosity Motivation of FB Use	52
3.5.2. Linear Regression Analysis with Social Anxiety and the Passive Following of Strangers/Friends with no Contact Pattern of FB Use	53
4. DISCUSSION	55
4.1. Social Anxiety and Quantitative Dimensions of FB Use.....	56

4.2. Social Anxiety and Qualitative Dimensions of FB Use.....	58
4.3. Clinical Implications of the Findings	63
4.4. Limitations of the Current Study and Suggestions for Future Studies	65
4.5. Conclusion	69
REFERENCES	70
APPENDICES	82



LIST OF TABLES

Table 2. 1. Demographics of all Participants.....	20
Table 2. 2. Demographics of the Participants with FB Account.....	21
Table 2. 3. Varimax-Rotated Factor Loadings of the Motivations of Facebook Use Scale Items and Explained Variance of the Five Factors	26
Table 2. 4. Varimax-Rotated Factor Loadings of the Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC) Items and Explained Variance of the Three Factors	31
Table 2. 5. Varimax-Rotated Factor Loadings of the Facebook Activity Measure (FAME) Items and Explained Variance of the Three Factors	35
Table 3. 1. Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Each Variable	41
Table 3. 2. Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Each Variable after Deletion of Outliers.....	43
Table 3. 3. Descriptive Statistics for Social Anxiety Scores and FB-Quantitative Variables.....	44
Table 3. 4. Descriptive Statistics for FB-Qualitative Variables	44
Table 3. 5. Correlations between Study Variables	47
Table 3. 6. Regression Analyses with the Number of FB friends by the Predictors of Age and Social Anxiety	50
Table 3. 7. Regression Analyses with the Perceived Offline Social Support by the Predictors of Age and Social Anxiety.....	52
Table 3. 8. Linear Regression Analysis for Predicting the Curiosity Motivation of FB Use by Social Anxiety	53
Table 3. 9. Linear Regression Analysis for Predicting the Passive Following of Strangers/Friends with no Contact Pattern of FB Use by Social Anxiety	54

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The current study aimed to examine the relationship between the quantitative (e.g., the time-spent on Facebook, the frequency of Facebook use, and the number of Facebook friends) and qualitative (e.g., the patterns and motivations of Facebook use; also the perceived social support on Facebook) dimensions of Facebook use and social anxiety among undergraduates in the light of social compensation hypothesis. This chapter gives information about the definition of the variables, relationships between the variables, the aim, the hypotheses, and the importance of this study.

1.1. Definition of Social Anxiety

Social anxiety disorder (SAD) was defined as feeling markedly anxious or fearful in social settings where the person may be subject to close examination by others (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2013). For example, one may feel intense emotional distress while meeting strangers; having a conversation; and eating, drinking, or speaking while other people are watching (APA, 2013). One may excessively fear of being humiliated, negatively judged, rejected, or embarrassed by others as a result of showing anxiety signs or behaving in a certain way. As fear or

anxiety arises, one either tends to avoid a social setting or bear it with marked anxiety or fear (APA, 2013).

Previous research demonstrated that SAD was frequently comorbid with major depression and it has been consistently shown that the onset of depression was preceded by SAD in most cases (De Graaf, Bijl, Spijker, Beekman, & Vollebergh, 2003; Kessler et al., 1996). Other common comorbid disorders of SAD were “generalized anxiety disorder, specific phobia, and panic disorder with agoraphobia” (De Lima Osório, 2013, p. 83) and it has been demonstrated that this comorbidity was linked to greater impairments in social life and also in school (e.g., absenteeism) than SAD without any comorbid anxiety disorder (Chartier, Walker, & Stein, 2003; Magee, Eaton, Wittchen, McGonagle, & Kessler, 1996; Schneier, Johnson, Hornig, Liebowitz, & Weissman, 1992). In addition, some studies showed that SAD and substance dependence were frequently associated (Filho et al., 2010; Lydiard, 2001).

Social anxiety exists in a continuum between shyness and SAD (Shaw, Timpano, Tran, & Joormann, 2015). People with social anxiety frequently avoid social interactions which they fear from, such as talking to and making eye contact with strangers or authority figures, going to parties or social events, doing presentations in front of others, and dating (De Lima Osório, 2013). Avoidance of social situations, which is a characteristic of social anxiety, leads to a less qualified social and sexual life, as well as it is related to underperformance in occupational and academic life (De Lima Osório, 2013). Considering its effect on social life, it was shown that social anxiety was related with impaired social lives in which the quality of friendships and the perceived social support are low (Davidson, Hughes, George,

& Blazer, 1994; Rodebaugh, 2009). Also, other studies showed that people with social anxiety tended to have reduced quality of life and tended to be dissatisfied with their health (Safren, Heimberg, Brown, & Holle, 1996; Wittchen & Beloch, 1996).

1.2. Social Anxiety and Social Network Sites

Boyd and Ellison (2007) defined social network sites (SNSs) as:

Web-based services that allow individuals to construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system. (p. 211)

In other words, SNSs are online platforms that members use to create public profiles, show their friendship connections, message each other, upload photos and/or videos, and interact with others by liking and/or commenting on shared content (Ellison, Vitak, Gray, & Lampe, 2014). According to the social media statistics of world prepared by “We Are Social” in 2018, the number of active social media users was 3.196 billion worldwide. Thus, it seems that SNSs are commonly used by the majority of people all around the world.

It was argued that the prevalence of SNSs is important in the sense that it creates a social sphere for maintaining relationships with others (Special & Li-Barber, 2012). Besides, SNSs may also provide a new social sphere to socially anxious people (Schouten, Valkenburg, & Peter, 2007). The cognitive model of SAD stated that people with social anxiety tend to be more self-focused in social

interactions because they experience physical (e.g., tremor and/or sweating) and cognitive symptoms (e.g., negative thoughts and/or beliefs) in one or more social situations; all of which lead them to anticipate anxiety in social settings (Clark, 2001). Therefore, face-to-face interactions are mostly avoided by them, which in turn sustain their anxiety (Clark, 2001). Since in-person interactions do not occur on SNSs, these platforms may be an attractive social sphere for people with social anxiety (Shaw et al., 2015).

Moreover, people with social anxiety may be attracted to the SNSs, because they can control their self-presentations significantly during online interaction and SNSs may avert the anxiety symptoms which are somatic and cognitive (Erwin, Turk, Heimberg, Fresco, & Hantula, 2004; Lee & Stapinski, 2012; Shepherd & Edelmann, 2005; Young & Lo, 2012). In one study done with adults living in Australia, a significant relationship was found between social anxiety and a sense of higher control over self-presentation during online interactions (Lee & Stapinski, 2012). Another study conducted with university students showed that people who were socially anxious felt more comfortable during online interaction where they were more in control of their self-presentations (Shepherd & Edelmann, 2005).

There is some support in literature regarding the relationship between the symptoms of social anxiety and a preference of online interaction over in-person social interaction (Caplan, 2007; Pierce, 2009; Weidman et al., 2012). For example, Weidman et al. (2012) found that undergraduate students with high social anxiety felt more comfortable and did more self-disclosure in online social interactions than

undergraduate students who were less socially anxious. In another study conducted with adolescents, Pierce (2009) showed a positive association between communicating online with others and social anxiety.

1.3. Facebook as a SNS

Facebook (FB) is one of the most popular SNSs. According to the social media statistics of world prepared by “We Are Social” in 2018, FB (2.167 million) had the most monthly active users followed by Youtube (1.500 million). It has been argued that some features of FB, such as the friends list, the status, messages, sharing photos and/or videos, and writing on wall facilitate the social interaction between users (Nadkarni & Hofmann, 2012). Since FB is very popular worldwide and offers many opportunities for social interaction, it is one of the most rational platforms to examine the online social behaviors (Wilson, Gosling, & Graham, 2012).

1.4. Social Anxiety, Facebook, and the Social Compensation Hypothesis

The Social Compensation (“Poor Get Richer”) hypothesis provides an explanation for the relationship between the use of SNSs and being socially anxious. According to this hypothesis, individuals who feel inadequate and anxious in offline social interactions tend to compensate for that impaired in-person connections with larger online social networks (Valkenburg, Schouten, & Peter, 2005; Weidman et al., 2012). McKenna, Green and Gleason (2002) also stated that socially anxious individuals may be better at coping with the shyness and anxiety in online social interactions which consist of less audiovisual cues compared to the face-to-face

communication. Considering the popularity of SNSs worldwide, they would be important social spheres to examine the online social interactions between members. Since FB is one of the most popular SNSs, some previous research examined this platform in relation to social anxiety. In line with the social compensation hypothesis, it was suggested that FB may be perceived by socially anxious people as a less anxiety-driven platform to socially interact with others and a favorable compensation for impaired offline interactions (Fernandez, Levinson, & Rodebaugh, 2012).

To my knowledge, no studies examined the relationship between various dimensions of FB use and social anxiety comprehensively in the light of social compensation hypothesis among undergraduates. Therefore, it is important to evaluate the relationship between social anxiety and the quantitative (e.g., the time-spent on FB, the frequency of FB use, and the number of FB friends) and qualitative (e.g., the patterns and motivations of FB use; also the perceived social support on FB) dimensions of FB use studied in previous research in order to conduct the current study in a comprehensive way.

1.5. Social Anxiety and the Quantitative Dimensions of Facebook Use

1.5.1. Social Anxiety, the Frequency of FB use, and the Time-Spent on FB

Some studies have tested the social compensation hypothesis by predicting that FB users who are socially anxious will be spending more time on FB or will use FB more frequently than the users who are less socially anxious because they mostly

prefer online social interactions over offline (Fernandez et al., 2012; Murphy & Tasker, 2011; Shaw et al., 2015). Two studies found a significant and positive relationship between social anxiety symptoms and time-spent on FB (Murphy & Tasker, 2011; Shaw et al., 2015). In other words, as the social anxiety increases, spending time on FB also increases. However, Fernandez et al. (2012) did not find a relationship between the frequency of FB use and social anxiety. Therefore, mixed findings for the social compensation hypothesis have been provided by previous research (McCord, Rodebaugh, & Levinson, 2014).

1.5.2. Social Anxiety and the Number of FB Friends

As it was mentioned above, the social compensation hypothesis suggested that people who are socially anxious in offline interactions tend to build larger online social networks in order to compensate for their impaired in-person connections (Valkenburg et al., 2005). Therefore, it could be assumed that individuals with social anxiety would have more FB friends in order to compensate for their impaired offline social relationships. The findings of some studies were in line with this assumption in the sense that socially anxious people preferred more online social interactions rather than face-to-face communications (Caplan, 2007; Pierce, 2009; Weidman et al., 2012).

However, Weidman and Levinson (2015) suggested that people with social anxiety may also be socially inactive in online platforms because having impaired social relationships is a characteristic of social anxiety. In line with this suggestion, it was stated that people with social anxiety may feel inhibited in online social

interactions as they feel in offline relationships (Mansell & Clark, 1999; Moscovitch, Rodebaugh, & Hesch, 2012). As a result, they may use social media in an inactive, isolated way (Erwin et al., 2004).

Moreover, people with social anxiety were likely to describe their offline friendships as lack in quality in previous studies (Erwin et al., 2004; Whisman, Sheldon, & Goering, 2000). Previous research suggested that socialization in online media may occur mainly among people who also have offline social connections (Valkenburg & Peter, 2009). Therefore, it was suggested that people with social anxiety symptoms have fewer offline friends with whom they can interact online (Weidman & Levinson, 2015). With regard to these suggestions, it was predicted that higher social anxiety symptoms will be related to fewer FB friends (Weidman & Levinson, 2015). In line with this prediction, the results of two studies conducted with university students showed a negative relationship between social anxiety and the number of FB friends (Fernandez et al., 2012; Weidman & Levinson, 2015). Consequently, mixed findings and suggestions have been provided by previous research regarding the relationship between social anxiety and the number of FB friends.

1.6. Social Anxiety and the Qualitative Dimensions of Facebook Use

1.6.1. Social Anxiety and Online/Offline Social Support

One of the qualitative dimensions of FB use may be the social support derived from it. Social support was regarded as an important aspect of one's life,

especially during the college years (Largo-Wight, Peterson, & Chen, 2005; Mallinckrodt & Wei, 2005). It involves:

1. Information leading the subject to believe that he is cared for and loved.
2. Information leading the subject to believe that he is esteemed and valued.
3. Information leading the subject to believe that he belongs to a network of communication and mutual obligation. (Cobb, 1976, p. 300)

It was also suggested that social support might have a positive influence on one's resistance to health-related problems and/or one's well-being (Cohen, Gottlieb, & Underwood, 2000).

The terms of online and offline social support have been used and examined in the literature. Within the scope of offline support, perceived social support was described as an individual's perception of availability of support derived from one's offline social network including family, friends, etc. (Porter & Chambless, 2017). Online social support was regarded as receiving support from other people through Internet (Nick et al., 2018). In this regard, SNSs may provide users diverse opportunities in order to interchange social support (Meng, Martinez, Holmstrom, Chung, & Cox, 2017). As the popularity of SNSs increases, the significance of their role in providing social support also increases (Meng et al., 2017). Therefore, examining the relationship between social support and the use of SNSs has gained importance in recent years (Meng et al., 2017). For example, the results of a study showed that FB social-connectedness was related with lower anxiety and greater life satisfaction (Grieve, Indian, Witteveen, Tolan, & Marrington, 2013). Morahan-Martin and Schumacher (2003) found that undergraduates who perceived more social

isolation tended to use online connections to gain emotional support and they reported more social companionship online compared to others.

Although few studies examined the direct relationship between social anxiety and perceived social support, they showed that socially anxious individuals reported less social support on offline interactions (Haemmerlie, Montgomery, & Melchers, 1988; Porter & Chambless, 2017; Torgrud et al., 2004). It was also shown that social anxiety was related with impaired social lives in which the quality of friendships and the perceived social support were low (Davidson et al., 1994; Rodebaugh, 2009). As it was mentioned above, some studies demonstrated that socially anxious individuals were more likely to feel comfortable in online social interactions (Caplan, 2007; Pierce, 2009; Weidman et al., 2012). Considering the popularity of FB, the various features of it (e.g., messaging/chatting with friends, likes, comments, newsfeed, content sharing, stories, etc.) may encourage users to interact with others; thus, may provide members with online social support (McCloskey, Iwanicki, Lauterbach, Giammittorio, & Maxwell, 2015; Olson, Liu, & Shultz, 2012). Since the social compensation hypothesis suggested that people with social anxiety tend to build more social connections on online platforms in order to compensate for their impaired social lives, these individuals may tend to use the social features of FB more. Thus, they may also perceive more social support online, specifically on FB. As a result, examining whether there is a positive relationship between social anxiety and perceived online social support through greater online social connections seems to be important. One study examined the roles of online and offline social support in the well-being of high and low socially anxious people (Indian & Grieve, 2014). The

results of this study showed that online social support derived from FB contributed significantly to the well-being of people with high social anxiety over the contribution of offline social support (Indian & Grieve, 2014). It was also demonstrated that online social support derived from FB did not significantly contribute to the well-being of people with low social anxiety over the contribution of offline social support (Indian & Grieve, 2014). In line with these findings, Cole, Nick, Zelkowitz, Roeder and Spinelli (2017) found that individuals with impaired social lives perceived SNSs as a new and more needed sphere to gain social support.

1.6.2. Social Anxiety and the Patterns of FB Use

Another qualitative aspect of FB use that might be related to social anxiety is the patterns of its use. These patterns involve interactive communication with FB friends (e.g., chatting, commenting on photos or videos, and messaging), passive consumption of FB friends' contents (e.g., passively observing others' videos, photos or status updates), and sharing of one's own contents (e.g., sharing photos, videos or stories, and updating statuses) (Shaw et al., 2015). It was stated that these patterns were related to various positive or negative consequences (Clerkin, Smith, & Hames, 2013). For example, it was found that interactive communication with FB friends was related to stronger bonds with them and lower loneliness, however passive consumption of FB friends' contents was related to weaker bonds with them and higher loneliness (Burke, Marlow, & Lento, 2010).

To date, very few studies examined the relationship between patterns of FB use and social anxiety. In one study, it was found that although individuals with high levels of social anxiety were highly anxious about using FB socially, they used interactive features of FB more than individuals with low levels of social anxiety (McCord et al., 2014). According to McCord et al. (2014), this finding was compatible with the social compensation hypothesis in the sense that FB may be used by socially anxious individuals with the motivation to compensate for their impaired in-person social communications. Thus, individuals with higher social anxiety levels may be motivated to use FB in an interactive way even they feel anxious while using the social features of it.

Since socially anxious individuals are specifically concerned about their self-presentation to others (Clark & Wells, 1995), it was suggested that they may be also highly motivated to present themselves favorably on FB via content production (Shaw et al., 2015). For example, Fernandez et al. (2012) found a positive relationship between social anxiety symptoms and the number of content shared in several parts of users' FB profiles. In line with the social compensation hypothesis, Fernandez et al. (2012) stated that since individuals with social anxiety often experience discomfort in displaying their interests during face-to-face communication, they may prefer to show their interests during online communication with slightest anxiety. Another study also found that individuals with social anxiety were more likely to disclose themselves online than offline (Weidman et al., 2012). However, Liu, Ang and Lwin (2013) showed that adolescents with social anxiety disclosed less information about themselves on FB. Also, Shaw et al. (2015) found a

significant positive relationship between passive use of FB and social anxiety symptoms among undergraduates but did not find a significant relationship between interactive FB use or content production on FB and social anxiety. As a result, mixed findings were presented in previous studies.

1.6.3. Social Anxiety and the Motivations of FB Use

Previous research has also examined the motivations of FB use (i.e., ‘why’ people use FB); apart from the patterns of FB use (i.e., ‘how’ people use FB). Motivations of FB use were mostly examined within the scope of the uses and gratifications (U&G) theory in the literature. The U&G theory stated that the audience of media actively chooses and uses media in relation to their specific motivations (Quan-Haase & Young, 2010). Therefore, the U&G approach aims to explain these motivations and the reasons for choosing specific communication media over others (Cheung, Chiu, & Lee, 2011). Within this context, SNSs differ from the traditional media in some aspects, such as functionality, system structure, and the way they used (Alhabash & Ma, 2017). As a result, the gratifications attained and sought from SNSs tend to be also different than those from traditional media (Alhabash & Ma, 2017).

Some studies examined the gratifications sought and attained from SNSs use in the light of U&G approach. For example, Karlis (2013) conducted a study with university students and identified five gratifications to use social media “perpetual entertainment, information seeking, surveillance/guidance, voyeurism, and social

interaction” (p. 74). Whiting and Williams (2013) defined ten motivations for social media use which were “social interaction, information seeking, passing time, entertainment, relaxation, communicatory utility, convenience utility, expression of opinion, information sharing, and surveillance or knowledge about others” (p. 362). Wellman and Gulia (1999) showed that individuals use SNSs in order to get social support and companionship. Some previous studies examined the motivations of FB use. Specifically, Lampe, Ellison and Steinfield (2006) found that university students use FB mainly to gain information about other people. Moreover, Joinson (2008) demonstrated the unique motivations for FB use as “social connection, shared identities, content, social investigation, social network surfing and status updating” (p. 1027). Cheung et al. (2011) found that instant connection with friends can be counted as one of the specific motivations of FB use and Alhabash, Chiang and Huang (2014) showed entertainment as another unique motivation to use FB. Thus, various motivations to use FB were found in the previous studies. From the viewpoint of social compensation hypothesis, it is important to examine whether higher social anxiety levels would be related with higher communication/socializing motivation of FB use because social anxiety would be related with more motivation for having online social interactions in order to compensate for the impaired offline social relationships.

1.6.4. Social Anxiety and the Self-Presentation Motivation of FB Use

Self-presentation (i.e., impression management) was described as the ways through which people attempt to control others’ impressions about themselves (Leary, 1995). In order to give desired impressions to others, people engage in

various impression management actions (Schlenker & Pontari, 2000). In the case of social anxiety, the self-presentation theory suggested that when high motivation for self-presentation or for giving desired impressions to others followed by belief in lack of social skills; it results in social anxiety, which in turn leads to perception or imagination of negative evaluations by others (Caplan, 2007; Catalino, Furr, & Bellis, 2012; Schlenker & Leary, 1982). Previous studies showed a positive relationship between social anxiety levels and the motivation for self-presentation which contributes to the self-presentation theory of social anxiety (Catalino et al., 2012; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Schlenker & Leary, 1982). Reno and Kenny (1992) also showed that people with high social anxiety were more worried about making a preferred impression on others than people with less social anxiety. Thus, being more motivated to give positive impressions to others is linked to being more prone to have higher levels of social anxiety.

Moreover, Lee and Jang (2019) suggested that people may have motivation to positively impress others in online settings as well as offline (Lee & Jang, 2019). Specifically, Ercan (2016) focused on the gratifications of self-related needs through FB use and the self-presentation need was identified as one of these gratified motivations through FB use. In this respect, SNSs and offline social settings have similar and different characteristics (Lee & Jang, 2019). Differently from offline settings, SNSs allow users to disclose or hide certain personal information and various characteristics of themselves (Krämer & Winter, 2008). Also, behaviours of users tend to be more easily noticed by others on SNSs compared to the offline social settings. Consequently, SNSs may be considered as platforms in which one can more

easily impress others than in face-to-face communications. Considering the social compensation hypothesis, the relative ease of impression management on SNSs may be especially important for socially anxious people because of their preference for online social interactions over offline and their high motivation for presenting themselves positively to others. A literature review showed that higher social anxiety levels were related with inauthentic self-presentation (i.e., distorted presentation of oneself) (Twomey & O'Reilly, 2017). In other words, people with social anxiety are more prone to present themselves in an inauthentic way in order to impress others as desired. Also, Burke and Ruppel (2015) found a positive relationship between high levels of social anxiety and concerns about negative self-presentation on FB. This result showed that people with higher levels of social anxiety reported greater concerns about giving others an undesirable impression on FB. In accordance with the social compensation hypothesis, Caplan (2007) stated that people who are socially anxious would be more gratified by their impression management or self-presentations online compared to the offline social interactions. For example, Bodroža and Jovanović (2016) showed that self-presentation on FB was predicted by social anxiety, which is in line with the statement that people who have difficulties in presenting themselves as desired in offline settings would be more motivated to do self-presentation online.

1.7. The Aim of Thesis

Considering the studies mentioned above, it can be concluded that previous research examined the relationship between the quantitative (e.g., the time-spent on FB, the frequency of FB use and the number of FB friends) and qualitative (e.g., the

patterns and motivations of FB use; also the perceived social support on FB) dimensions of FB use and social anxiety separately. Nevertheless, to my knowledge, no studies comprehensively investigated this relationship in the light of the social compensation hypothesis among undergraduates. In the current study, these qualitative and quantitative aspects were combined to shed light on the relationship between social anxiety and FB use in a multidimensional perspective. Another aim of this study was to investigate whether social anxiety would predict these qualitative and quantitative aspects of FB use among undergraduates.

1.8. Hypotheses

1.8.1. Hypotheses for the Quantitative Dimensions of FB Use

- 1) Social anxiety would predict more frequent use of FB and more time spent on FB.
- 2) Social anxiety would predict higher number of FB friends.

1.8.2. Hypotheses for the Qualitative Dimensions of FB Use

- 1) Social anxiety would predict lower levels of perceived offline social support. Also, social anxiety would predict higher levels of perceived social support on FB.
- 2) Social anxiety would predict more content production on FB and more interactive use of FB.
- 3) Social anxiety would predict higher communication/socializing motivation of FB use.

- 4) Social anxiety would predict higher gratification of self-presentation motivation on FB.

1.9. The Importance of Thesis

To my knowledge, no studies comprehensively investigated the relationship between the quantitative (e.g., the time-spent on FB, the frequency of FB use and the number of FB friends) and qualitative (e.g., the patterns and motivations of FB use; also the perceived social support on FB) dimensions of FB use and social anxiety in the light of the social compensation hypothesis among undergraduates. Thus, the present study contributes to the existing literature by examining this relationship among undergraduates in a multidimensional perspective. Secondly, it is important to examine whether social anxiety predicts the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of FB use in the light of social compensation hypothesis because understanding the way people with social anxiety use FB might provide an insight on how they practice their social skills in online settings, which in turn may improve their offline social skills (Campbell, Cumming, & Hughes, 2006). Thirdly, to my knowledge, there was no scale measuring the patterns of FB use (with new FB features added) and the social support gained from FB in the Turkish literature. Thus, the adaptation studies regarding these measures were conducted in the current study as a contribution to the Turkish literature.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

The demographic characteristics of participants, measurements, and procedure were provided in this chapter.

2.1. Participants

In this study, seven hundred and thirty one undergraduate students participated. Thirty students older than the age of 25 were excluded and 701 participants remained. Four hundred and eighty five participants (69.2%) were female and 216 participants (30.8%) were male. Participants' age ranged between 18 and 25 years, ($M = 21.27$, $SD = 1.57$). Information regarding the marital status and perceived income were presented in Table 2.1.

Participants were recruited from various universities around Turkey; 665 participants (94.9%) were in Istanbul and the remaining 5.1% were in Izmit, Bursa, Tekirdag, Aydin, Gaziantep, Manisa, Izmir, Mersin, Konya, Ankara, Nevsehir, Zonguldak, Eskisehir, Sivas, Yalova, Erzurum.

Table 2. 1.

Demographics of all Participants (N=701)

	<i>N</i>	Percentage (%)
Marital Status		
Single	428	61.1
In a relationship	273	38.9
Perceived Income		
Very Good	27	3.9
Good	284	40.5
Moderate	367	52.4
Poor	20	2.9
Very Poor	3	.4

Three hundred and eighty two participants (54.5%) reported to have a FB account. Following analyses were done with these participants. Two hundred and fifty one participants (65.7%) were female and 131 participants (34.3%) were male. Participants' age ranged between 18 and 25 years ($M = 21.34$, $SD = 1.47$). Information regarding the marital status and perceived income of the participants were presented in Table 2. 2.

Three hundred and sixty three participants (95%) were recruited from different universities in Istanbul and the remaining 5% were recruited from different universities in Izmit, Tekirdag, Gaziantep, Manisa, Izmir, Mersin, Konya, Ankara, Zonguldak, and Yalova.

Table 2. 2.

Demographics of the Participants with FB Account

(*N* = 382)

	<i>N</i>	Percentage (%)
Marital Status		
Single	233	61
In a relationship	149	39
Perceived Income		
Very Good	11	2.9
Good	153	40.1
Moderate	203	53.1
Poor	14	3.7
Very Poor	1	.3

In order to examine whether participants with a FB account and participants without a FB account differed significantly in terms of their gender, marital status, and perceived income; Pearson Chi-Square tests were conducted. The results showed that participants with a FB account and participants without a FB account differed significantly in terms of their gender, $\chi^2(1) = 4.77, p < .05$. Considering the groups of participants with a FB account and participants without a FB account, female participants were more than male participants in each group. For the group of participants with a FB account, there were 251 female participants (65.7%) and 131 male participants (34.3%); and for the group of participants without a FB account, there were 234 female participants (73.4%) and 85 male participants (26.6%). However, they did not differ significantly in terms of their marital status, $\chi^2(1) = .001, p > .05$, and perceived income, $\chi^2(4) = 4.68, p > .05$. Also, independent samples t-test demonstrated that participants with a FB account ($M = 21.34, SD = 1.47$) and

participants without a FB account ($M = 21.19$, $SD = 1.68$) did not differ significantly in terms of their age, $t(637.36) = 1.24$, $p > .05$.

2.2. Measurements

2.2.1. Demographic Information Form

Demographic Information Form was used to obtain information about age, gender, marital status, perceived income, the name and department of the university, the psychiatric diagnoses, and the psychological treatment of participants (See Appendix A).

2.2.2. The Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale

The Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale was used to measure the social anxiety levels of participants. This scale was developed by Liebowitz (1987) in order to assess a variety of social situations in which people with social phobia are more likely to experience difficulties. However, in literature, this scale was also used in order to measure the social anxiety levels (Aderka, Weisman, Shahar, & Gilboa-Schechtman, 2009; Aka, 2011; Kalecik, 2016). This measure has twenty-four items with two subscales that are fear and avoidance. Each item is rated separately for both subscales on a 4-point Likert scale. The subscale of fear is rated from 0 (none) to 3 (severe) and the subscale of avoidance is rated from 0 (never) to 3 (usually). Higher total scores demonstrate higher levels of social anxiety. The Cronbach's alpha of the

original version of the whole scale was found as ranging from .81 to .92 (Heimberg et al., 1999). The Turkish version of this scale was constructed by Soykan, Devrimci and Gençöz (2003) and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found as .95 for the whole scale (See Appendix B). In the present study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found as .96 for the whole scale. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of fear subscale was found as .94 and the avoidance subscale was found as .91.

2.2.3. Use of Social Media Form

The Use of Social Media Form was developed for this study in order to assess the frequency of FB use, time-spent on FB, and number of FB friends of participants (See Appendix C). This measure has eight items. The first item asks whether participants have a FB account or not and measures the frequency of FB use which ranges from 1 (never) to 4 (very often). The second item measures the length of FB use which ranges from 1 (0 to 3 years) to 4 (more than 10 years). The third item measures the number of FB friends of participants. With how many FB friends participants have also offline contact is assessed by the fourth item ranging from 1 (none of them) to 5 (all of them). The fifth item measures the frequency of FB use which ranges from 1 (never) to 7 (more than once in a day). The sixth item assesses the frequency of content production on FB ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (more than once in a day). The seventh item measures the time-spent on FB ranging from 1 (less than 15 minutes) to 4 (more than two hours). Lastly, the eighth item measures

whether participants have accounts on other SNSs and the frequency of the use of these SNSs ranging from 1 (never) to 4 (very often).

2.2.4. Motivations of Facebook Use Scale

The Motivations of Facebook Use Scale was used to examine the motivations of FB use (See Appendix D). It was developed by Yeniçıktı (2016). This measure has forty seven items with five subscales which are information exchange (13 items), communication/socializing (15 items), connection/observation (9 items), entertainment/spending time (6 items), and curiosity (4 items). Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Totally Disagree) to 5 (Totally Agree). Higher total scores on each subscale demonstrate higher motivations on that subscale. The Cronbach's alpha of the whole scale was found as .96. Also, the Cronbach's alpha of the information exchange subscale was found as .89, of the communication/socializing subscale as .90, of the connection/observation subscale as .85, of the entertainment/spending time subscale as .81, and of the curiosity subscale as .80.

In order to re-analyze the structure of the scale, a factor analysis was conducted with Principal Components Factor Analysis (PCA) and varimax rotation. A five-factor solution was forced in the analysis. Firstly, Bartlett's test of sphericity was found as significant and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was .95, which

showed that the procedures of factor analysis were suitable for the data matrix (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Items with factorial loading lower than .40 and items that loaded to more than one factor were not included in the factors (Field, 2009). The results showed that 59.23% of the total variance was explained (Table 2. 3).



Table 2. 3.

Varimax-Rotated Factor Loadings of the Motivations of Facebook Use Scale Items and Explained Variance of the Five Factors

	Factors				
	1 Entertainment/ Spending Time	2 Connection/ Observation	3 Communication/ Socialising	4 Information Exchange	5 Curiosity
% of Variance	13.04	12.71	12.28	11.68	9.52
Eigenvalues	6.13	5.98	5.77	5.49	4.48
Items					
22.Facebook kullanmak zevklidir.	.750				
29.Facebook kullandığım zaman eğlenabiliyorum.	.723		.402		
17.Zaman geçirebiliyorum.	.673				
19.Facebook'ta olduğum zaman, zaman çabuk geçer.	.670				
24.Merak uyandırıcı olduğu için kullanıyorum.	.669				
8.Çalışmak istemediğim zamanlarda kullanıyorum.	.563				
42.Fotoğraf paylaşabiliyorum.	.529	.408			
23.Arkadaşlarımı tebrik etmek ya da doğum günlerini kutlayabiliyorum.	.480	.431			
45.Benim fotoğraflarıma yapılan yorumları görebiliyorum.	.466	.431			
25.Çok sık görmediğim insanlara yorum bırakabiliyorum.	.451				
12.Eski arkadaşlarımla bağlantı kurabiliyorum.		.748			
5.Facebook kullanmak ulaşamadığım arkadaşlarımla bağlantı kurmak için iyi bir yoldur.		.717			
10.Mesaj gönderebiliyorum.		.688			
11.Arkadaşlarımla şu an ne yaptıklarını öğrenebiliyorum.		.576			
9.Profilimi güncelleyebiliyorum.	.479	.565			
21.Başkalarından gelen mesajları kontrol edebiliyorum.		.529		.506	
15.Diğerleriyle/arkadaşlarımla ilişki kurmada benim için iyi bir yoldur.		.525			
7.Duvara yorum bırakabiliyorum.		.481	.475		
46.Etkinlik duyurabiliyorum.		.452		.415	
13.Telefon yerine Facebook kullanıyorum.			.745		
16.E-mail yerine Facebook kullanıyorum.			.736		
43.Benim için Facebook kullanmak sıkıntıları engeller.			.704		
30.Birileriyle yüz yüze konuşmak yerine sadece Facebook kullanıyorum.			.691		
14.Profilime daha fazla uygulamaya yükleyebiliyorum.			.592		
41.Duvar yorumlarımı okumak için Facebook oturumu açıyorum.			.579		
28.Arkadaş bulmak daha kolaydır.			.506		

36.Facebook sayesinde yeni arkadaşlar ediniyorum.		.497	
27.Arkadaşlarıma onlar hakkındaki düşüncelerimi bildirebiliyorum.		.494	
35.Yeni tanıştığım insanlar hakkında daha fazla bilgi alabiliyorum.			.432
44.Arkadaşlarımın iletişim bilgilerini bulabiliyorum.		.626	
37.Mesajlarımı kontrol etmek için Facebook oturumu açıyorum.		.575	
31.Çok fazla çaba sarf etmeden bazı kişilerle irtibat kurmak için kolay bir yoldur.		.564	
40.İrtibatı kaybettiğim eski arkadaşlarımı bulabiliyorum.	.486	.555	
32.Kullanıcı adı ya da e mail adreslerini bulabiliyorum.		.550	
39.Lise arkadaşlarımla temas halinde olmak için kullanıyorum.		.545	
26.Bir etkinlik hakkında fikir elde edebiliyorum.		.505	
34.Facebook insanlarla birliktelik sağlar.		.456	
18.Facebook çok fazla sorumluluk yüklemekten başkalarıyla görüşmede kolaylık sağlar.		.433	
20.Arkadaşlarım ve ortak arkadaşlarımı görmek istediğim zaman.		.431	
4.Eski kız arkadaşımı/erkek arkadaşımı kontrol edebiliyorum.		.428	
1.Çekici olduğunu düşündüğüm birinin profiline bakabiliyorum.			.781
47.Hoşlandığım birinin profiline bakabiliyorum.			.733
3.Arkadaşlarımın fotoğraf albümüne bakabiliyorum.	.455		.680
6.Arkadaşlarım hakkında dedikodu alabiliyorum.		.594	
38.Arkadaşlarımın arkadaşlarının fotoğraflarına göz atmak için kullanıyorum.		.581	
33.Profil resimlerini görebiliyorum.		.516	
2.Arkadaşlarımın Facebook'tan ne dinlediği, okuduğu ya da izledikleri hakkında fikir edinebiliyorum.	.432	.462	.483
			.460

Thirteen items were removed from the scale due to their loading to more than one factor. The first factor “entertainment/spending time” explained 13.04% of the total variance and it has six items (22, 17, 19, 24, 8, and 25). The second factor “connection/observation” explained 12.71% of the total variance and has five items (12, 5, 10, 11, and 15). The third factor “communication/socializing” explained 12.28% of the total variance and has nine items (13, 16, 43, 30, 14, 41, 28, 36, and 27). The fourth factor “information exchange” explained 11.68% of the total variance and has nine items (44, 37, 31, 32, 39, 26, 34, 18, and 20). Lastly, the fifth factor “curiosity” explained 9.52% of the total variance and has five items (4, 1, 47, 6, and 38).

The reliability analyses were conducted for each factor and the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of the entertainment/spending time subscale was found as .89, of the connection/observation subscale as .87, of the communication/socializing subscale as .90, of the information exchange subscale as .87, and of the curiosity subscale as .83 in this study. The scores were obtained by the sum of items in each factor.

2.2.5. The Self-Presentation Subscale of Self-Focused Gratifications on Facebook Scale

The Self-Presentation Subscale of Self-Focused Gratifications on Facebook Scale was used to examine the gratification of self-presentation motivation through FB use (See Appendix E). Based on previous research (e.g., Gonzales & Hancock, 2008; Gonzales & Hancock, 2011; Walther, 2007), Ercan (2016) constructed this scale. It has sixty items with five subscales that are self-aggrandizement, self-enhancement, self-expression, self-presentation and performing ideal self. Four items in this subscale assess the self-presentational motivations and gratifications of FB use. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Totally Disagree) to 5 (Totally Agree). Higher average scores indicate higher self-presentation needs to be gratified. Specifically, the Cronbach's alpha of the self-presentation subscale was found as .85 (Ercan, 2016). In the present study, the Cronbach's alpha of the self-presentation subscale was found as .89.

2.2.6. Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC)

Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC) was used in order to assess the perceived online social support of FB users. This scale was developed by Chung, Yang and Chen (2014). This measure has twenty-three items with three subscales which are information support (10 items), appraisal support (7 items), and emotional support (6 items). Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Totally Disagree) to 5 (Totally Agree). Higher scores demonstrate greater levels of

perceived online social support. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of information support, appraisal support, and emotional support were reported as .90, .86, and .74 respectively.

The Turkish version of this scale did not exist. Therefore, in the present study this scale was adapted to Turkish (See Appendix F) with 382 participants. First, it was translated to Turkish and then back translated to English by translators who have a doctoral degree. The translators discussed the controversial items and finalized the questionnaire. In order to test the construct validity of this scale, a factor analysis was conducted with Principal Components Factor Analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation. A three-factor solution was forced in the analysis. Firstly, Bartlett's test of sphericity was found as significant and Kaiser-Myer-Olkin (KMO) value was .95, which showed that the procedure of factor analysis was suitable for the data matrix (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Items with factorial loading lower than .40 and items that loaded to more than one factor were not included in the factors (Field, 2009). The results showed that 70.20% of the total variance was explained (See Table 2. 4).

Table 2. 4.

Varimax-Rotated Factor Loadings of the Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC)

Items and Explained Variance of the Three Factors

	Factors		
	1	2	3
	Emotional Support	Informational Support	Appraisal Support
% of Variance	30.45	23.35	16.40
Eigenvalues	7.00	5.37	3.77
Items			
3.Facebook'taki özel duygularımı anlattığımda beni dinleyen biri var.	.828		
4.Facebook'taki üzüntümü paylaşabildiğim biri var.	.826		
5.Facebook'ta birine destek almak için güvenebilirim.	.798		
22.Yanlış bir şey yaptığımda, Facebook'ta biri bana önerilerde bulunur.	.722	.405	
1.Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım duygusal tepkilerimi önemser.	.703		
17.Facebook'ta kötü bir ruh hali içinde olduğumda, biri mesajla beni rahatlatır ve destekler.	.699	.412	
23.Facebook'ta biri ne söyleyeceğim veya ne yapacağım hakkında bana geri bildirim verir.	.696	.405	
21.Facebook'ta biri kararlarımı adil şekilde değerlendirir.	.665		.409
2.Facebook'ta mutluluğumu benimle paylaşan arkadaşlarım var.	.662		.496
16.Facebook'ta günlük konularla ilgili danışabildiğim biri var.	.582	.558	
20.Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım, sonuçları ne olursa olsun çabalarımı takdir eder.	.572		.527
7.Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım benimle okula dair konulardan söz eder.	.502	.501	
6.Facebook'ta birinin beni dürtmesi ve oyun oynamaya davet etmesi; kendimi kabul görmüş gibi hissettirir.	.474		
12.Facebook'ta biri akademik konularla ilgili problemlerimi çözmeme yardım eder.		.845	
13.Facebook'ta birine okulla ilgili konuları danışırım.		.811	
11.Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım mesleki problemlerimi çözmeme yardım eder.		.768	
10.Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım benimle mesleki konulardan söz eder.		.765	
15.Facebook'ta okuldaki kulüpler hakkında bilgi alabildiğim biri var.		.681	

14.Facebook'ta okul arkadaşlarımın neler yaptıklarını sorabildiğim, okul arkadaşlarım hakkında konuşabildiğim biri var.	.461	.680	
19.Kendimle ilgili iyi şeyleri Facebook'ta paylaştığımda, biri bana olumlu geri bildirim verir.			.769
8.Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım gönderdiğim mesajlara cevap verir.			.748
18.Bir başarıyı Facebook'ta paylaştığımda, biri "Beğen" tuşuna basar ve benim adıma sevinir.	.425		.744
9.Facebook'ta mesleki bir bilgi/haber paylaştığımda, biri paylaşımımı cevaplar (beğenir, yorum bırakır vs.).		.457	.724

Eleven items were removed from the data due to their loading to more than one factor. The first factor "emotional support" explained 30.45% of the total variance and has five items (3, 4, 5, 1, and 6). The second factor "informational support" explained 23.35% of the total variance. It has five items (10, 11, 12, 13, and 15). Lastly, the third factor "appraisal support" explained 16.40% of the total variance and has two items (8 and 19). Reliability analyses were conducted for each factor and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of information support was reported as .91, of appraisal support as .75, and of emotional support as .88. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the whole scale found as .92. The scores of each subscale were calculated by adding the items separately and the total score was calculated by adding the subscale scores.

Based on the research on the relationship between stress levels and social support (Chung et al., 2014; Uyan, 2014), the criterion validity of this scale was calculated by assessing the relationship between the emotional support subscale of

FSSC and Perceived Stress Scale-10 (PSS-10; Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983). However, the results did not show a significant correlation between the emotional support subscale of FSSC and Perceived Stress Scale, $r(380) = .04, p > .05$. Also, the correlation between FSSC and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support was measured in order to examine the convergent validity of FSSC. The results did not show a significant correlation between FSSC and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support, $r(380) = .04, p > .05$.

2.2.7. Facebook Activity Measure (FAME)

The Facebook Activity Measure (FAME) was used in order to examine the patterns of FB use. Shaw et al. (2015) developed this scale with three sections: general use of FB, FB usage after dissolution of relationship, and FB usage during different mood states. In the present study, only the patterns of FB use items within the general use of FB section were used in order to measure how frequently people engage in various activities on FB. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very frequently). In total, the general use of FB section consisted of 26 items including three subscales which are passive use, content production, and interactive communication. Higher average scores on each subscale indicate higher activity on that pattern of FB use. The internal consistency of passive use and interactive communication subscales were found between .77 to .80; and the internal consistency of content production subscale was found as .52.

The Turkish version of this scale did not exist. Therefore, this scale was adapted to Turkish with 382 participants in the present study (See Appendix G). First, it was translated to Turkish and then back translated to English by translators who have doctoral degree. The translators discussed the controversial items and finalized the questionnaire. For the purposes of the present study, nine items on some features of FB use were also added to this scale. In order to test the construct validity of this scale, a factor analysis was conducted with Principal Components Factor Analysis (PCA) and varimax rotation. A three-factor solution was forced in the analysis. Firstly, Bartlett's test of sphericity was found as significant and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was .90, which showed that the procedures of factor analysis were suitable for the data matrix (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Items with factorial loading lower than .40 and items that loaded to more than one factor were not included in the factors (Field, 2009). The results showed that 48.01% of the total variance was explained (See Table 2. 5).

Table 2. 5.

Varimax-Rotated Factor Loadings of the Facebook Activity Measure (FAME) Items and Explained Variance of the Three Factors

	Factors		
	1 Active or Passive Following of Content Shared by Others	2 Interactive Communication/ Content Production	3 Passive Following of Strangers/ Friends with No Contact
% of Variance	19.30	18.20	10.52
Eigenvalues	6.18	5.82	3.37
Items			
18.Facebook üzerinden ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla etkinlikleri incellersiniz/takip edersiniz?	.781		
31.Facebook'ta beğendiğiniz sayfalarındaki paylaşımları/hareketleri ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz/takip edersiniz?	.778		
24.Facebook'ta ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla gruplarda paylaşılanları incellersiniz/takip edersiniz?	.747		
15.Ana sayfayı/Haber kaynağını (Newsfeed) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz?	.740		
22.Başkalarının paylaştığı videoları ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla görüntülersiniz?	.697		
23.Facebook'ta ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla grup kurarsınız ve/veya gruplara katılırsınız?	.633		
16.Ana sayfaya/Haber kaynağına (Newsfeed) düşen gönderilere (örn., durum güncellemeleri, duvar gönderileri, fotoğraflar vs.) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla yorum yazarsınız, ifade bırakırsınız ve/veya bu gönderileri beğenirsiniz?	.610		
17.Facebook üzerinden ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla etkinlik oluşturunuz ve/veya etkinliklere katılım durumunuzu bildirirsiniz?	.580		
25.Facebook gruplarında ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla başkalarıyla iletişim kurarsınız (örn., paylaşım yapmak, yorum/beğeni bırakmak vs.)?	.579		
32.Facebook'ta beğendiğiniz/takip ettiğiniz sayfaların yayınlarına ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla yorum/beğeni bırakırsınız?	.572		
5.Facebook üzerinden ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla mesaj alırsınız/mesaj gönderirsiniz?	.457		
6.Facebook Sohbet (Chat) aracılığıyla ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla başkalarıyla iletişim kurarsınız?	.411		
27.Facebook Hikayenizde (Stories) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla video veya fotoğraf paylaşırsınız?		.744	
7.Facebook'ta ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla durum güncellemesi ("şu anda ne düşünüyorsunuz/hissediyorsunuz?" alanı) yaparsınız?		.712	
9.Facebook'ta ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla fotoğraf paylaşırsınız?		.709	
26.Diğer sosyal medya hesaplarınızdaki (örn., Instagram, Twitter vs.) paylaşımlarınızı ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla Facebook'ta da paylaşırsınız?		.678	
20.Zaman tünelinizde ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla link, haber, metin vs. paylaşırsınız?	.443	.613	
29.Başkalarının Facebook Hikayelerine (Stories) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla yanıt yazarsınız?		.603	

14.Profil fotoğrafınızı ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla değiştirirsiniz?		.582
21.Zaman tünelinizde ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla video paylaşırsınız?		.566
3.Başkalarının zaman tüneline ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla gönderi paylaşırsınız (örn., bir şeyler yazarsınız ya da link, fotoğraf veya video paylaşırsınız vs.)?		.524
4.Başkaları ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla sizin zaman tünelinizde gönderi paylaşır (örn., bir şeyler yazar ya da link, fotoğraf veya video paylaşır vs.)?		.521
13.Profil bilgilerinizi (örn., hakkımda (about me), eğitim, iş, temel bilgiler) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla güncellersiniz?		.519
30.Facebook'ta ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla yeni arkadaşlar ararsınız/eklersiniz?	.424	.431
28.Başkalarının Facebook Hikayelerini (Stories) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla izlersiniz?		.408
8.Facebook'ta diğer kişilerin durum güncellemelerini ("şu anda ne düşünüyorsunuz/hissediyorsunuz?" alanı) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz/takip edersiniz?		.407
19.Facebook arkadaşlarınızla ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla oyun oynarsınız?		
1.Artık yüz yüze görüşmediğiniz (örn., eski bir arkadaş/erkek arkadaş/ kız arkadaş vs.) veya iletişimde olmadığınız bir kişinin profilini ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla ziyaret edersiniz/incellersiniz?		.812
11.Artık yüz yüze görüşmediğiniz (örn., eski bir arkadaş/erkek arkadaş/ kız arkadaş) veya iletişimde olmadığınız bir kişinin fotoğraflarını ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz?		.805
12.Tanımadığınız birinin (örn., arkadaşınızın arkadaşı) fotoğraflarını ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz?		.764
2.Tanımadığınız birinin (örn., arkadaşınızın arkadaşı) profilini ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla ziyaret edersiniz/incellersiniz?		.757
10.Facebook arkadaşlarınızın paylaştığı fotoğrafları ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz?	.423	.475

Three items were removed from the data due to their loading onto two factors and one item was removed because it did not fall under any factor. The factor analysis resulted in different factors than the ones in the original scale. The first factor “active or passive following of content shared by others” explained 19.30% of the total variance and has 12 items (18, 31, 24, 15, 22, 23, 16, 17, 25, 32, 5, and 6). The second factor “interactive communication/content production” explained 18.20% of the total variance and has 12 items (27, 7, 9, 26, 29, 14, 21, 3, 4, 13, 28, and 8). Lastly, the third factor “passive following of strangers/friends with no contact” explained 10.52% of the total variance and has 4 items (1, 11, 12, and 2). In addition, reliability analyses were conducted for each factor and the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of “active or passive following of content shared by others” was reported as .90, of “interactive communication/content production” as .86, and of “passive following of strangers/friends with no contact” as .84 in this study. The means of each subscale were calculated.

In order to test the criterion validity of this scale, the relationship between the passive following of strangers/friends with no contact subscale scores and the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale (Liebowitz, 1987) was calculated. The results showed a significant correlation between the “passive following of strangers/friends with no contact” subscale and the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale, $r(380) = .21, p < .001$.

2.2.8. Perceived Stress Scale-10 (PSS-10)

The Perceived Stress Scale-10 (PSS-10) was used in order to test the criterion validity of the Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC). Cohen et al. (1983) developed it in order to assess how stressful one perceives the situations in his/her life. The fourteen-item version of this measure has two subscales, namely “perceived insufficient self-efficacy” and “perceived stress/distress”. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale and the responses were ranged from 0 (Never) to 5 (Very Often). The scores of positive items were reversed and added to the total score. Higher total scores indicate higher perception of stress. Eskin, Harlak, Demirkıran and Dereboy (2013) carried out the Turkish adaptation of this scale and the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was found as .82 for the whole scale (See Appendix H). The Cronbach’s alpha of the perceived insufficient self-efficacy subscale was found as .69 and the Cronbach’s alpha of the perceived stress/distress subscale was .80. In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of the whole scale was found as .88.

2.2.9. Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support

The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) was used to examine the extent to which one perceives the availability of support from family, friends, and a significant other and it was developed by Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet and Farley (1988). This measure has twelve items with three subscales that are perceived support from family, friends, and a significant other. Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale and the responses were ranged from 1 (Very Strongly Disagree) to

7 (Very Strongly Agree). Higher total scores indicate higher perception of social support. The Cronbach's alpha scores of the subscales and the whole scale ranged from .85 to .91. Eker, Arkar and Yaldız (2001) carried out the Turkish version of this scale (See Appendix I) and the Cronbach's alpha scores ranged between .80 and .95. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found as .90.

2.3. Procedure

All the measurements were given to participants online. Firstly, the informed consent that involves information about confidentiality, voluntary participation, and the aim of study was given to all participants (See Appendix J). Then, participants with a FB account were provided with the measurements in the following order: Demographic Information Form, The Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale, Use of Social Media Form, Motivations of Facebook Use Scale, The Self-Presentation Subscale of Self-Focused Gratifications on Facebook Scale, Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC), Facebook Activity Measure (FAME), Perceived Stress Scale-10 (PSS-10), and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. Participants without a FB account completed only the following measurements: Demographic Information Form, The Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale, Use of Social Media Form, and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. Participants with a FB account completed the measurements approximately in 30 minutes and other participants completed them approximately in 15 minutes.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, independent samples t-test, and regression analyses were presented in this section. Scores obtained from the scales were analyzed with IBM SPSS Statistics 25.0 for accuracy of the data entry and missing values before the data analyses. There were no missing values in the data and the data entry was accurate.

3.1. Descriptive Statistics of Participants

The skewness and kurtosis values for each variable were examined separately (See Table 3. 1).

Table 3. 1.

Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Each Variable

	Skewness			Kurtosis	
	N	Statistic	SE	Statistic	SE
Social Anxiety	382	1.079	.125	1.618	.249
Number of FB Friends	382	1.947	.125	5.681	.249
Frequency of FB Use	382	-.117	.125	-.907	.249
Time-Spent on FB	382	3.415	.125	13.400	.249
Entertainment/Spending Time	382	.606	.125	-.702	.249
Connection/Observation	382	-.034	.125	-1.146	.249
Communication/Socializing	382	1.309	.125	1.161	.249
Information Exchange	382	.129	.125	-.955	.249
Curiosity	382	.376	.125	-.929	.249
Self-presentation	382	.191	.125	-1.112	.249
Appraisal Support	382	-.194	.125	-1.281	.249
Information Support	382	.475	.125	-.839	.249
Emotional Support	382	.925	.125	.067	.249
Perceived Online Social Support	382	.509	.125	-.416	.249
Passive Following of Strangers/Friends with no Contact	382	.761	.125	.659	.249
Interactive Communication/Content Production	382	1.595	.125	3.315	.249
Active or Passive Following of Content Shared by Others	382	.865	.125	.660	.249
Perceived Offline Social Support	382	-.669	.125	-.078	.249

The kurtosis value for the time-spent on FB scale was 13.40 and it was not within the acceptable range. Therefore, scores of the time-spent on FB scale were transformed into a z distribution in order to detect if there is any univariate outlier in the data. Six outliers (ID numbers were 17, 128, 442, 513, 703, and 159) which were out of the range of -3.29 and 3.29 were detected. Outliers were deleted from the data and then, the skewness and kurtosis values for each variable were examined again.

After the deletion of outliers, the skewness and kurtosis values for each variable were examined again separately (See Table 3. 2). The descriptive statistics for each variable were presented in Table 3. 3 (for FB-Quantitative Variables) and Table 3. 4 (for FB-Qualitative Variables).

Table 3. 2.

Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Each Variable after Deletion of Outliers

	Skewness			Kurtosis	
	N	Statistic	SE	Statistic	SE
Social Anxiety	376	1.088	.126	1.666	.251
Number of FB Friends	376	1.986	.126	5.894	.251
Frequency of FB Use	376	-.106	.126	-.894	.251
Time-Spent on FB	376	2.707	.126	5.358	.251
Entertainment/Spending Time	376	.625	.126	-.660	.251
Connection/Observation	376	-.025	.126	-1.143	.251
Communication/Socializing	376	1.336	.126	1.301	.251
Information Exchange	376	.141	.126	-.963	.251
Curiosity	376	.402	.126	-.899	.251
Self-presentation	376	.191	.126	-1.126	.251
Appraisal Support	376	-.184	.126	-1.290	.251
Information Support	376	.501	.126	-.805	.251
Emotional Support	376	.967	.126	.192	.251
Perceived Online Social Support	376	.533	.126	-.367	.251
Passive Following of Strangers/Friends with no Contact	376	.773	.126	.774	.251
Interactive Communication/Content Production	376	1.515	.126	3.195	.251
Active or Passive Following of Content Shared by Others	376	.805	.126	.405	.251
Perceived Offline Social Support	376	-.697	.126	-.041	.251

Table 3. 3.

Descriptive Statistics for Social Anxiety Scores and FB-Quantitative Variables

	N	Min	Max	M	SD
Social Anxiety	376	.00	134.00	38.32	23.75
Number of FB Friends	376	0	2041	351.03	305.34
Frequency of FB Use	376	1	7	4.07	1.80
Time-Spent on FB	376	1	2	1.10	.30

Table 3. 4.

Descriptive Statistics for FB-Qualitative Variables

	N	Min	Max	M	SD
Entertainment/Spending Time	376	6.00	30.00	12.04	5.63
Connection/Observation	376	5.00	25.00	13.59	5.58
Communication/Socializing	376	9.00	39.00	14.24	6.34
Information Exchange	376	9.00	43.00	22.26	8.50
Curiosity	376	5.00	25.00	11.49	5.23
Self-presentation	376	1.00	5.00	2.55	1.20
Appraisal Support	376	2.00	10.00	5.76	2.61
Information Support	376	5.00	25.00	11.06	5.57
Emotional Support	376	5.00	25.00	9.07	4.45
Perceived Online Social Support	376	12.00	60.00	25.89	10.84
Passive Following of Strangers/Friends with no Contact	376	1.00	4.00	1.73	.57
Interactive Communication/Content Production	376	1.00	3.00	1.37	.36
Active or Passive Following of Content Shared by Others	376	1.00	4.00	1.81	.62
Perceived Offline Social Support	376	18.00	84.00	64.07	15.05

3.2. Correlations between Study Variables

The relationships between variables were examined through Pearson correlation and age as a demographic variable was included in this analysis (See Table 3. 5). These variables are social anxiety scores, three items of the Use of Social Media Form (the number of FB friends, the frequency of FB use scores, and the scores of time-spent on FB), Motivations of Facebook Use Form (Entertainment/Spending time scores, Connection/Observation scores, Communication/Socializing scores, Information exchange scores, and Curiosity scores), the Self-Presentation scores, Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC; Emotional Support scores, Information Support scores, Appraisal Support scores, and perceived online social support scores), Facebook Activity Measure (FAME; the scores of Active or Passive following of Content shared by Others, Interactive Communication/Content Production, and Passive following of Strangers/Friends with no Contact subscales), and perceived offline social support scores.

Social anxiety was not significantly related with the time-spent on FB, $r(374) = .04, p > .05$ and with the frequency of FB use, $r(374) = .01, p > .05$; however, it was negatively correlated with the number of FB friends $r(374) = -.14, p < .01$. Also, there was a significant positive relationship between social anxiety and the curiosity subscale of Motivations of Facebook Use Scale, $r(374) = .20, p < .01$; however, there was no significant relationship between social anxiety and the communication/socializing motivation of FB use, $r(374) = -.04, p > .05$. The

relationship between social anxiety and self-presentation scores was not significant, $r(374) = -.02, p > .05$ in this study.

Moreover, social anxiety was not significantly correlated with emotional support, $r(374) = -.02, p > .05$; information support $r(380) = -.05, p > .05$; appraisal support $r(374) = .03, p > .05$; and perceived online social support scores $r(374) = -.03, p > .05$. Social anxiety was positively related with passive following of strangers/friends with no contact subscale scores $r(374) = .22, p < .01$; however, social anxiety was not significantly related with active or passive following of content shared by others $r(374) = .07, p > .05$ and interactive communication/content production subscale scores, $r(374) = -.02, p > .05$. Lastly, there was a significant negative relationship between social anxiety and perceived offline social support scores $r(374) = -.22, p < .01$.

Table 3. 5.

Correlations between Study Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1.Social Anxiety	1	-.060	-.140**	.010	.035	.007	.014	-.042	-.015	.204**	-.024	-.023	-.054	.030	-.030	.216**	-.019	.073	-.222**
2. Age		1	.152**	.177**	.116*	.078	-.029	.099	.005	-.031	-.005	-.012	.060	-.052	.013	-.019	.039	.126*	.106*
3.Number of FB Friends			1	.096	.015	.058	.113*	.123*	.104*	.059	.041	.009	-.008	.062	.014	.040	.119*	.073	.061
4.Frequency of FB Use				1	.455**	.539**	.246**	.315**	.351**	.185**	.155**	.251**	.405**	.311**	.386**	.223**	.398**	.639**	-.048
5.Time-Spent on FB					1	.358**	.008	.180**	.080	.054	.041	.111*	.184**	.171**	.181**	.131*	.239**	.335**	.023
6.Entertainment						1	.537**	.758**	.697**	.511**	.373**	.554**	.512**	.440**	.597**	.305**	.531**	.556**	-.021
7.Connection/Ob servation							1	.574**	.736**	.529**	.413**	.510**	.426**	.497**	.548**	.212**	.420**	.378**	.112*
8.Communication /Social								1	.705**	.529**	.389**	.614**	.497**	.364**	.595**	.218**	.522**	.378**	.029
9.Information Exchange									1	.623**	.519**	.627**	.574**	.541**	.683**	.293**	.461**	.505**	.030
10.Curiosity										1	.498**	.424**	.315**	.386**	.429**	.497**	.359**	.300**	-.055
11.Self- presentation											1	.437**	.319**	.357**	.429**	.228**	.271**	.317**	-.055
12.Emotional Support												1	.612**	.570**	.862**	.241**	.447**	.377**	.061
13.Information Support													1	.557**	.900**	.284**	.410**	.518**	.021
14.Appraisal Support														1	.761**	.272**	.376**	.407**	.048
15.Online Social Support															1	.311**	.485**	.519**	.047
16. Passive Use of FB																1	.391**	.327**	-.072
17.Active Use of FB																	1	.598**	.009
18. Following Others																		1	-.085
19.Perceived Social Support																			1

*p < .05, ** p < .01

Notes. Entertainment: Entertainment/Spending Time, Communication/Social: Communication/Socializing, Passive Use of FB: Passive Following of Strangers/Friends with No Contact, Active Use of FB: Interactive Communication/Content Production, Following Others: Active or Passive Following of Content Shared by Others, Perceived Social Support: Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS)

3.3. Test of the Gender Difference in Study Variables

Independent samples t-test was performed in order to examine whether male and female participants significantly differ on social anxiety scores. Homogeneity of variance was not satisfactory for social anxiety $F(374) = 6.01, p = .02$. The results of independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between male and female participants on social anxiety $t(327.65) = 2.47, p = .01$. Female participants ($M = 40.27, SD = 25.69$) had higher social anxiety levels than male participants ($M = 34.50, SD = 18.90$).

Independent samples t-test was performed in order to examine whether male and female participants significantly differ on the frequency of FB use. Homogeneity of variance was satisfactory for the frequency of FB use, $F(374) = .003, p = .96$. The results of independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between male and female participants on the frequency of FB use, $t(374) = -5.52, p = .000$. Male participants ($M = 4.76, SD = 1.74$) used FB more frequently than female participants ($M = 3.71, SD = 1.73$).

Independent samples t-test was performed in order to examine whether male and female participants significantly differ on time-spent on FB. Homogeneity of variance was not satisfactory for time-spent on FB, $F(374) = 344.58, p = .000$. The results of independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between male and female participants on time-spent on FB, $t(139.52) = -5.84, p = .000$. Male

participants ($M = 1.25$, $SD = .44$) spent more time on FB than female participants ($M = 1.02$, $SD = .14$).

Independent samples t-test was performed in order to examine whether male and female participants significantly differ on communication/socializing motivation of FB scores. Homogeneity of variance was not satisfactory for communication/socializing motivation of FB scores, $F(374) = 15.38$, $p = .000$. The results of independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between male and female participants on communication/socializing motivation of FB scores, $t(204.43) = -3.09$, $p = .002$. Male participants ($M = 15.76$, $SD = 7.32$) had more communication/socializing motivation to use FB than female participants ($M = 13.47$, $SD = 5.64$).

3.4. Multiple Regression Analyses

To test the predictive relationship of social anxiety with the FB use, regression analyses were conducted with variables that were significantly correlated with qualitative and qualitative dimensions of FB use.

3.4.1. Regression Analyses with the Number of FB Friends

Before conducting the multiple regression analysis, the assumption of collinearity showed that VIF scores were below 10 (Field, 2009). Collinearity

analysis indicated that there was not a multicollinearity between variables of the model (Age, VIF = 1.00; Social Anxiety, VIF = 1.00).

Multiple regression analyses were calculated to predict the number of FB friends based on social anxiety scores and age. Age was entered in the first step of the regression analysis and then, social anxiety scores were entered in the second step through the enter method.

In the first step of the regression analysis, the predictive effect of age was tested through the enter method. The model was found to be significant, $R^2 = .02$, Adjusted $R^2 = .02$, $F(1, 374) = 8.86$, $p = .003$. Age was found to be a significant predictor. In the second step, social anxiety scores were included through the enter method. The model was found to be significant, $R^2 = .04$, Adjusted $R^2 = .04$, $F(2, 373) = 7.84$, $p = .000$. As shown in Table 3. 6, age and social anxiety scores were found to be significant predictors.

Table 3. 6.

Regression Analyses with the Number of FB friends by the Predictors of Age and Social Anxiety

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficient	t	p
	B	SE	β		
1 (Constant)	-324.897	227.560		-1.428	.154
Age	31.658	10.633	.152	2.977	.003**

2 (Constant)	-225.433	229.109		-.984	.326
Age	30.029	10.572	.144	2.840	.005**
Social Anxiety	-1.688	.653	-.131	-2.584	.010*

*p < .05, ** p < .01

3.4.2. Regression Analyses with the Perceived Offline Social Support

Before conducting the multiple regression analysis, the assumption of collinearity showed that VIF scores were below 10 (Field, 2009). Collinearity analysis indicated that there was not a multicollinearity between variables of the model (Age, VIF = 1.00; Social Anxiety, VIF = 1.00).

Multiple Regression Analyses was calculated to predict the perceived offline social support scores based on social anxiety scores and age. Age was entered in the first step of the regression analysis and then, social anxiety scores were entered in the second step through the enter method.

In the first step of the regression analysis, the predictive effect of age was tested through the enter method. The model was found to be significant, $R^2 = .01$, Adjusted $R^2 = .01$, $F(1, 374) = 4.24$, $p = .04$. Age was found to be a significant predictor. In the second step, social anxiety scores were included through the enter method. The model was found to be significant, $R^2 = .06$, Adjusted $R^2 = .05$, $F(2, 373) = 11.49$, $p = .000$. As shown in Table 3. 7, social anxiety scores were found to be a significant predictor of the perceived offline social support scores; however, age was

no longer a significant predictor of it after entering the social anxiety scores as another predictor.

Table 3. 7.

Regression Analyses with the Perceived Offline Social Support by the Predictors of Age and Social Anxiety

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficient	t	p
	B	SE	β		
1 (Constant)	40.876	11.287		3.622	.000
Age	1.086	.527	.106	2.059	.040*
2 (Constant)	48.970	11.191		4.376	.000
Age	.954	.516	.093	1.847	.066
Social Anxiety	-.137	.032	-.217	-4.305	.000***

*p < .05, *** p < .001

3.5. Linear Regression Analyses

3.5.1. Linear Regression Analysis with Social Anxiety and the Curiosity

Motivation of FB Use

Linear regression analysis was calculated to examine whether social anxiety scores predict the curiosity motivation of FB use. The predictive effect of social anxiety scores was tested through the enter method.

The regression model was found to be significant, $R^2 = .04$, Adjusted $R^2 = .04$, $F(1, 374) = 16.24$, $p = .000$. Thus, social anxiety was found to be a significant predictor of the curiosity motivation of FB use (See Table 3. 8).

Table 3. 8.

Linear Regression Analysis for Predicting the Curiosity Motivation of FB Use by Social Anxiety

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficient	t	p
	B	SE	β		
1 (Constant)	9.770	.503		19.437	.000
Social Anxiety	.045	.011	.204	4.030	.000***

*** $p < .001$

3.5.2. Linear Regression Analysis with Social Anxiety and the Passive Following of Strangers/Friends with no Contact Pattern of FB Use

Linear regression analysis was calculated to examine whether social anxiety scores predict the passive following of strangers/friends with no contact pattern of FB use. The predictive effect of social anxiety scores was tested through the enter method.

The regression model was found to be significant, $R^2 = .05$, Adjusted $R^2 = .04$, $F(1, 374) = 18.22$, $p = .000$. Thus, social anxiety was found to be a significant predictor of the passive following of strangers/friends with no contact pattern of FB use (See Table 3. 9).

Table 3. 9.

Linear Regression Analysis for Predicting the Passive Following of Strangers/Friends with no Contact Pattern of FB Use by Social Anxiety

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficient	t	p
	B	SE	β		
1 (Constant)	1.528	.055		27.933	.000
Social Anxiety	.005	.001	.216	4.269	.000***

*** p < .001

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to examine the quantitative (the time-spent on FB, the frequency of FB use, and the number of FB friends) and qualitative (the patterns and motivations of FB use; also the perceived social support on FB) dimensions of FB use in relation to social anxiety among undergraduate students. Another aim of this study was to investigate whether social anxiety predicts these dimensions of FB use in the light of social compensation hypothesis.

The current findings showed that social anxiety levels significantly differed based on gender; specifically female participants had significantly more social anxiety levels than male participants. These findings were in line with the literature review of Asher, Asnaani and Aderka (2017) in which women were shown to have more social anxiety than men. Gender was not found to be related to the dimensions of FB use included in the present study (e.g., the number of Facebook friends, curiosity motivation of Facebook use, passive following of strangers/friends with no contact pattern of Facebook use, and perceived offline social support), thus its relationship with these variables were not further analyzed.

4.1. Social Anxiety and Quantitative Dimensions of FB Use

The present study hypothesized that social anxiety would predict more frequent use of FB; also more time-spent on FB. However, it was shown that social anxiety was not significantly associated with the frequency of FB use and time-spent on FB. The current findings were in line with the study of Fernandez et al. (2012) who also did not find a significant relationship between the frequency of FB use and social anxiety. However, some previous studies found a significant and positive relationship between social anxiety and time-spent on FB (Murphy & Tasker, 2011; Shaw et al., 2015). Thus, previous research presented mixed findings regarding the relationship between social anxiety, the frequency of FB use, and time-spent on FB. From the viewpoint of social compensation hypothesis, online social interactions would be more preferred by individuals with social anxiety in order to compensate for their impaired face-to-face social interactions (Fernandez et al., 2012). Therefore, social anxiety was expected to be related with more frequent use of FB and more time-spent on FB in the current study. However, the current findings did not support this hypothesis. Also, the present findings showed that the frequency of FB use and time-spent on FB significantly differed based on gender; specifically male participants use FB more frequently and spent more time on FB than female participants. These findings were in line with the study of Aghazamani (2010) which was conducted with university students and found that male participants spent more time on FB than female participants.

The present study hypothesized that social anxiety would predict higher number of FB friends. However, a significant and negative relationship between the number of FB friends and social anxiety was found; also social anxiety was demonstrated as a significant predictor of the number of FB friends. The current

findings were in accordance with the results of two studies which were also conducted with university students (Fernandez et al., 2012; Weidman & Levinson, 2015). Specifically, these studies showed a negative relationship between social anxiety and the number of FB friends (Fernandez et al., 2012; Weidman & Levinson, 2015). Weidman and Levinson (2015) suggested that people with social anxiety may also be socially inactive in online platforms because having impaired social relationships is a characteristic of social anxiety. As a result, this suggestion may be an explanation for the current findings. Moreover, socially anxious people are likely to describe their offline friendships as lack in quality (Erwin et al., 2004; Whisman et al., 2000) and previous research suggested that socialization in online media may occur mainly among people who also have offline relationships (Valkenburg & Peter, 2009). Consequently, people with social anxiety may have less offline friends with whom to interact also on FB and this could be another explanation of the current findings. Since the social compensation hypothesis suggested that people with social anxiety tend to compensate for their impaired face-to-face social interactions via socializing in online settings, the current findings were not in line with this hypothesis. Moreover, age was found as significantly and positively related with the number of FB friends; also age was a significant predictor of it. This finding was not in line with the extensive study of McAndrew and Jeong (2012) who found that as age increases the number of FB friends decreases. However, it is important to state that the sample of current study consisted of undergraduates within the age range between 18 to 25 whereas the age range was between 18 to 79 in the study of McAndrew and Jeong (2012). Therefore, the restricted age range of current study may be a reason for the present findings because the variance in the range of age could not be examined. The current findings may also be related with the decrease in

the popularity of FB in recent years (DataReportal, 2020). In other words, younger undergraduates may use other more popular SNSs more than FB; therefore, they may have fewer friends on FB.

4.2. Social Anxiety and Qualitative Dimensions of FB Use

The present study hypothesized that social anxiety would predict lower levels of perceived offline social support. The current findings showed a significant and negative relationship between social anxiety and perceived offline social support; also social anxiety was found as a significant predictor of less perceived offline social support. These findings were consistent with the previous research (Haemmerlie et al., 1988; Porter & Chambless, 2017; Torgrud et al., 2004). Specifically, Haemmerlie et al. (1988) assessed the relationship between social anxiety and perceived social support among undergraduates based on the assumption that social anxiety represents social avoidance and less face-to-face interactions. Haemmerlie et al. (1988) found that social anxiety was significantly and negatively related with perceived social support. Moreover, age was found as significantly and positively related with the perceived offline social support but age was no longer a significant predictor of it after entering the social anxiety scores in the current study. The current findings were not in line with the study of Prezza and Giuseppina Pacilli (2002) that found a negative relationship between age and support from friends and significant others. Although Prezza and Giuseppina Pacilli (2002) used the same scale (MSPSS) in order to measure the perceived offline social support as in the current study, the age range was 18 to 77 which differed from the current study. Since the current study consisted of a restricted age-range, this difference in findings could be explained by that because the variance in the age-range could not be

examined. The current findings may also be explained by the expansion of social sphere (e.g., going to a university) as age increases from 18 to 25.

The present study also hypothesized that social anxiety would predict higher perceived social support on FB. However, the current findings did not demonstrate a significant relationship between the perceived social support on FB and social anxiety. This finding was not in line with the findings of Indian and Grieve (2014). Specifically, Indian and Grieve (2014) demonstrated that people with social anxiety gained more from the online social support derived from FB in terms of well-being compared to the offline social support. Thus, the findings of Indian and Grieve (2014) implied a positive relationship between social anxiety and perceived social support on FB. From the viewpoint of social compensation hypothesis, it was expected that people with social anxiety tend to build more social connections on online platforms; as a result, they would be more likely to perceive social support on online platforms, in this case on FB. However, the current findings did not support this hypothesis in this respect. The scale (Facebook Social Support Scale, FSSC) used in the current study in order to measure the perceived social support on FB may provide an explanation for the present findings due to the methodological limitation of it. Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC) was adapted to Turkish due to the lack of this measurement in Turkish literature. As it was mentioned in the Method section, this scale was found as reliable and the items under the factors were mostly similar to the original scale; however, the convergent and criterion validity of this scale were not found as significant. For this reason, this scale may not be measuring what it intended to measure and that may hinder a possible significant relationship between social anxiety and the perceived social support on FB.

The present study hypothesized that social anxiety would predict more content production on FB and more interactive use of FB. However, the current findings showed that social anxiety was not significantly related with active or passive following of content shared by others and interactive communication/content production patterns of FB use. The current findings did not support the social compensation hypothesis which suggested that people with social anxiety may prefer to show their interests via content production on FB with slightest anxiety because they often experience more discomfort in displaying their interests in-person. Considering the interactive communication pattern of FB use, the current findings were not in line with the findings of McCord et al. (2014) which showed that individuals with higher social anxiety levels were motivated to use FB in an interactive way even they feel anxious while using the social features of it. Thus, the present findings were not in accordance with the social compensation hypothesis because FB was expected to be used by socially anxious individuals with the motivation to compensate for their impaired in-person social communications. Unexpectedly, the current findings showed a significant and positive relationship between the passive following of strangers/friends with no contact pattern of FB use and social anxiety; also social anxiety significantly predicted this pattern of FB use. These findings were in line with the study of Shaw et al. (2015) which found a significant positive relationship between passive use of FB and social anxiety symptoms among undergraduates but did not find a significant relationship between interactive FB use or content production on FB and social anxiety. To my knowledge, the relationship between passive use of FB and social anxiety was not examined in an extensive way but Sheldon (2008) presented some findings that are

important in that sense. Sheldon (2008) found that university students who felt anxious regarding the in-person interactions used FB more for passing the time; however, they had less expectations to build new social interactions on FB. Moreover, the current findings could be explained by the rich-get-richer hypothesis which is contrary to the social compensation hypothesis. Rich-get-richer hypothesis suggested that individuals who have more offline social connections may be more likely to establish new social relationships and reinforce their existing ties on online settings rather than individuals who have less offline social connections (Kraut et al., 2002). Since social anxiety was linked with having impaired social relationships, the rich-get-richer hypothesis may present an explanation for the finding that social anxiety was not significantly related with interactive communication/content production patterns of FB use but related with using FB passively.

The present study hypothesized that social anxiety would predict higher communication/socializing motivation of FB use. However, the current findings did not find a significant relationship between social anxiety and communication/socializing motivation of FB use. Since the social compensation hypothesis assumed that people with social anxiety would prefer online social interactions in order to compensate for their impaired offline social connections, the current findings did not support this hypothesis. Unexpectedly, the curiosity motivation of FB use was the only factor that had a significant and positive relationship with social anxiety; also social anxiety significantly predicted the curiosity motivation of FB use. Since the items under the curiosity subscale implies the motivation of passively following others on FB, the positive relationship between curiosity motivation of FB use and social anxiety would be in line with the

significant and positive relationship between the passive following of strangers/friends with no contact pattern of FB use and social anxiety. As it was mentioned above, these findings may be explained by the rich-get-richer hypothesis rather than social compensation hypothesis. Moreover, the current findings showed that the communication/socializing motivation of FB use significantly differed based on gender; specifically male participants have more communication/socializing motivation to use FB than female participants. These findings were somewhat in line with the study of Muscanell and Guadagno (2012) which was conducted with undergraduates. They found that male users were more motivated to form new social relationships on SNSs (FB/MySpace) than female users. The differences in expected gender roles were suggested to be the reason for this finding by Muscanell and Guadagno (2012). In other words, being more adventurous was expected from men; thus, they may tend to be more eager to form new social relationships via online platforms compared to women (Muscanell & Guadagno, 2012).

The last hypothesis of the present study was that social anxiety would predict higher gratification of self-presentation motivation on FB. However, the current findings did not support this hypothesis, in other words having higher social anxiety was not significantly and positively related with more gratification of self-presentation motivation on FB. This finding was not in line with the assumption that the relative ease of impression management (i.e., self-presentation) on SNSs may be especially important for socially anxious people because of their higher motivation for presenting themselves positively to others and their preference for online social interactions over offline. The current finding was also not in accordance with the results of some studies. Specifically, Lee and Jang (2019) assessed the relationship

between social anxiety and the motivation for impression management (i.e., self-presentation) on FB among South Koreans and a positive relationship was found between these variables. Another study conducted by Burke and Ruppel (2015) also found a positive relationship between high levels of social anxiety and concerns about negative self-presentation on FB, which showed that people with higher levels of social anxiety reported greater concerns about giving others an undesirable impression on FB. Burke and Ruppel (2015) conducted this study with undergraduate students in United States. It is important to state that the current study conducted with Turkish undergraduates and the gratification of self-presentation motivation on FB was measured by a different scale than the previous studies. Therefore, these differences could be accounted for the current finding.

4.3. Clinical Implications of the Findings

Previous studies showed that social anxiety was related with impaired social lives in which the quality of friendships and the perceived social support were low (Davidson et al., 1994; Rodebaugh, 2009). The current study examined the relationship between social anxiety and FB use within a multidimensional perspective based on the social compensation hypothesis. The current findings were mostly not in line with this hypothesis. Specifically, it was shown that social anxiety was positively related with the passive following of strangers/friends with no contact pattern and curiosity motivation of FB use, also a negative association between social anxiety and the number of FB friends was found. These findings implicated that people with social anxiety tend to be socially inactive on FB in addition to their impaired offline social interactions. Carruthers, Warnock-Parkes and Clark (2019) stated that socially anxious individuals may gain more from online social interactions

through active use of SNSs rather than passive use of these sites. Concordantly, Roberts, Smith and Pollock (2000) suggested that people who are socially fearful may improve their social skills via online interactions and that improvement of social skills may also be generalized to their offline social interactions. Campbell et al. (2006) explained that as socially anxious people interact with others on online settings, they may be practicing social skills and behaviors, which may also improve their otherwise inhibited face-to-face social interactions. The findings of a study conducted by Roberts et al. (2000) were in line with this argument. They showed that the level of shyness of the highly shy individuals in the offline social interactions decreased after their active online social interactions. Thus, interventions consisting of active online social interactions may improve the online and face-to-face social interactions of socially anxious individuals. Moreover, Fernandez et al. (2012) stated that SNSs have been emerging as a frequent topic to talk about in psychotherapy. In this regard, the current findings may indicate useful information for therapy as the relationship patterns between social anxiety and qualitative/quantitative dimensions of FB use were examined comprehensively. Specifically, the assumptions of socially anxious individuals regarding their FB use (e.g., maladaptive beliefs about being socially active on FB) may provide beneficial information to talk about in therapy (Fernandez et al., 2012). Discovering the maladaptive beliefs and safety behaviors (e.g., passive use of FB) of socially anxious individuals regarding their FB use and experimenting to change them may maximize the treatment efficiency because online social settings have gained great importance recently (Carruthers et al., 2019). Carruthers et al. (2019) also recommended that socially anxious individuals may benefit from organizations which provide online support through articles or blogs about changing the maladaptive FB use behaviors into more social and active ones.

To my knowledge, there was no scale measuring the patterns of FB use (with new FB features added) and perceived social support on FB in the Turkish literature. Thus, the adaptation studies regarding these measures were conducted in the current study as a contribution to the Turkish literature.

4.4. Limitations of the Current Study and Suggestions for Future Studies

The participation of undergraduates from diverse universities all around Turkey was strength of the current study; however, the distribution of gender in the sample was not even (251 female, 131 male). The sample size was relatively small and convenience sampling was used to select the participants; therefore, the generalizability of the findings was restricted. Although the current findings indicated some relationship patterns, causal inferences could not be made because the present study had a correlational design. The responses of participants were anonymous but the measurements consisted of self-report questionnaires; therefore, the social desirability bias might have an effect on the responses. Also, the measurements were reliable and valid except the adaptation of Facebook Social Support Scale (FSSC) as it was not significantly valid.

The current study investigated the relationship between social anxiety and FB use comprehensively in the light of social compensation hypothesis. Facebook was selected due to its popularity among other SNSs (We Are Social, 2018). However, 2020 statistics of We Are Social showed that Youtube and Instagram have more active users than Facebook when compared to 2018 statistics (DataReportal, 2018;

DataReportal, 2020). As a result, future studies may be conducted with these SNSs because assessing the most popular SNSs would give more accurate patterns of relationships among variables. For example, the relationship between self-presentation motivation and social anxiety could be examined on more popular SNSs than FB because socially anxious people may gratify their self-presentation needs more on the popular ones than FB. The decline in the ranking of FB might hinder the possible finding that social anxiety would be significantly and positively related with the time-spent on FB and the frequency of FB use among undergraduates. The reason could be that socially anxious individuals may be using other more popular SNSs more frequently and spending more time on these sites in order to compensate for their impaired social relationships.

The current study showed that social anxiety was positively related with the passive following of strangers/friends with no contact pattern and curiosity motivation of FB use, also a negative association between social anxiety and the number of FB friends was found. Thus, it was implicated that people with social anxiety tend to be socially inactive on FB in addition to their impaired offline social interactions. These findings were in line with the study of Sheldon (2008) in which social anxiety was not necessarily related with building more social interactions on FB. Sheldon (2008) also found that people who are active in offline social relationships were also more engaged in online social interactions and more likely to establish new social connections on FB than individuals with difficulties in offline social interactions. Sheldon (2008) stated that these findings were inconsistent with the social compensation hypothesis; however, supported the rich-get-richer hypothesis (Kraut et al., 2002). The rich-get-richer hypothesis suggests that

individuals who have more offline social connections may be more likely to establish new social relationships and reinforce their existing ties on online settings (Kraut et al., 2002). In contrast to the rich-get-richer hypothesis, the current study conducted in the light of social compensation hypothesis but could not support it; therefore, future studies may investigate the relationship between social anxiety and use of SNSs in the light of both rich-get-richer and social compensation hypotheses. Considering the current findings, future studies may also investigate the motivations of using FB passively in order to gain more information about the relationship between social anxiety and passive FB use.

The present study was conducted with undergraduate students between the ages of 18 to 25 because previous research stated that college-aged individuals could be regarded as one of the age-groups that have most active users on SNSs (Mese & Aydin, 2019; Miller & Melton, 2015). However, individuals' patterns of use on SNSs could differ between various age groups; therefore, future studies may also examine the relationship between social anxiety and use of SNSs for the other age groups.

To my knowledge, there were no Turkish measurements in order to assess the patterns of FB use (with new FB features added) and the perceived social support on FB. Therefore, two scales (i.e., FAME and FSSC) were adapted to Turkish. The adaptation study of FSSC resulted in three factors which have similar items with the original factors and had high reliability; however, the criterion and convergent validities of FSSC were not significant. Since FSSC was not regarded as a valid scale to measure the perceived social support on FB within this sample, future studies may

use a different scale, which should be reliable and valid, in the assessment of its relationship with social anxiety more accurately. Another adaptation study was conducted for FAME in order to assess the participants' patterns of FB use. The adaptation study of FAME resulted in three factors (i.e., active or passive following of content shared by others, interactive communication/content production, and passive following of strangers/friends with no contact) which were different than the original ones (i.e., passive use, content production, and interactive communication). The reason could be that the participants of the original study (mostly Caucasian undergraduates) and the current study (Turkish undergraduates) were from different cultures. The adapted version of FAME was reliable and valid. Thus, future studies may use the adapted version of FAME which also assessed recently added features on FB.

In the current findings, the predictors could explain only a low variance in the use of Facebook; therefore, future studies may investigate other possible significant predictors that may play a role. For instance, future studies may examine the social comparison orientation and neuroticism as possible predictors of passive FB use because these variables were found to be significantly related with passive FB use in a study (Rozgonjuk, Ryan, Kuljus, Täht, & Scott, 2019).

Furthermore, future studies may examine the relationship between FB use and social anxiety via qualitative approach in order to provide more exploratory information. Since causal inferences could not be made via the current findings, future studies may use an experimental design to investigate the relationship between FB use and social anxiety comprehensively.

4.5. Conclusion

The current study examined the quantitative (the time-spent on FB, the frequency of FB use, and the number of FB friends) and qualitative (the patterns and motivations of FB use; also the perceived social support on FB) dimensions of FB use in relation to social anxiety among undergraduate students. Whether social anxiety predicted these quantitative and qualitative dimensions of FB use was also investigated in the light of social compensation hypothesis.

Female and male participants were significantly different on social anxiety scores, the frequency of Facebook use, time-spent on Facebook and communication/socializing motivation of Facebook use scores. Age significantly predicted the number of Facebook friends. Social anxiety was found to predict significantly the number of Facebook friends, curiosity motivation of Facebook use, passive following of strangers/friends with no contact pattern of Facebook use, and perceived offline social support. These findings were discussed in terms of their implications for the social compensation hypothesis.

REFERENCES

- Aderka, I. M., Weisman, O., Shahar, G., & Gilboa-Schechtman, E. (2009). The roles of the social rank and attachment systems in social anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(4), 284-288.
- Aghazamani, A. (2010). How do university students spend their time on Facebook? An exploratory study. *Journal of American Science*, 6(12), 730-735.
- Aka, B. T. (2011). *Perceived parenting styles, emotion recognition, and emotion regulation in relation to psychological well-being: Symptoms of depression, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and social anxiety* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Alhabash, S., Chiang, Y. H., & Huang, K. (2014). MAM & U&G in Taiwan: Differences in the uses and gratifications of Facebook as a function of motivational reactivity. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 35, 423-430.
- Alhabash, S., & Ma, M. (2017). A tale of four platforms: Motivations and uses of Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat among college students? *Social Media+ Society*, 3(1), 1-13.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Asher, M., Asnaani, A., & Aderka, I. M. (2017). Gender differences in social anxiety disorder: A review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 56, 1-12.
- Bodroža, B., & Jovanović, T. (2016). Validation of the new scale for measuring behaviors of Facebook users: Psycho-Social Aspects of Facebook Use (PSAFU). *Computers in Human Behavior*, 54, 425-435.
- Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210-230.
- Burke, M., Marlow, C., & Lento, T. (2010). Social network activity and social wellbeing. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, 85, 455-459.

- Burke, T. J., & Ruppel, E. K. (2015). Facebook self-presentational motives: daily effects on social anxiety and interaction success. *Communication Studies*, 66(2), 204-217.
- Campbell, A. J., Cumming, S. R., & Hughes, I. (2006). Internet use by the socially fearful: Addiction or therapy? *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 9(1), 69-81.
- Caplan, S. E. (2007). Relations among loneliness, social anxiety, and problematic Internet use. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 10(2), 234-242.
- Carruthers, S. E., Warnock-Parkes, E. L., & Clark, D. M. (2019). Accessing social media: Help or hindrance for people with social anxiety? *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, 10(2), 1-11.
- Catalino, L. I., Furr, R. M., & Bellis, F. A. (2012). A multilevel analysis of the self-presentation theory of social anxiety: Contextualized, dispositional, and interactive perspectives. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 46(4), 361-373.
- Chartier, M. J., Walker, J. R., & Stein, M. B. (2003). Considering comorbidity in social phobia. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 38(12), 728-734.
- Cheung, C. M., Chiu, P. Y., & Lee, M. K. (2011). Online social networks: Why do students use facebook? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(4), 1337-1343.
- Chung, T. Y., Yang, C. Y., & Chen, M. C. (2014). Online social support perceived by Facebook users and its effects on stress coping. *European Journal of Economics Management*, 1, 196-216.
- Clark, D. M. (2001). A cognitive perspective on social phobia. In W. R. Crozier & L. E. Alden (Eds.), *International handbook of social phobia: Concepts, research, and interventions relating to self and shyness* (pp. 405–430). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Clark, D. M., & Wells, A. (1995). A cognitive model of social phobia. In R. G. Heimberg, M. R. Liebowitz, D. A. Hope, & F. R. Schneier (Eds.), *Social phobia: Diagnosis, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 69-93). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

- Clerkin, E. M., Smith, A. R., & Hames, J. L. (2013). The interpersonal effects of Facebook reassurance seeking. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 151(2), 525-530.
- Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 38(5), 300-314.
- Cohen, S., Gottlieb, B. H., & Underwood, L. G. (2000). Social relationships and health. In S. Cohen, L. Underwood, & B. H. Gottlieb (Eds.), *Social support measurement and intervention: A guide for health and social scientists* (pp. 3–25). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 385-396.
- Cole, D. A., Nick, E. A., Zelkowitz, R. L., Roeder, K. M., & Spinelli, T. (2017). Online social support for young people: Does it recapitulate in-person social support; can it help?. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 68, 456-464.
- Davidson, J. R., Hughes, D. C., George, L. K., & Blazer, D. G. (1994). The boundary of social phobia: Exploring the threshold. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 51(12), 975-983.
- DataReportal. (2018, October 12). *Digital 2018 Turkey (January 2018)* [PowerPoint slides]. SlideShare. <https://www.slideshare.net/DataReportal/digital-2018-turkey-january-2018>
- DataReportal. (2020, February 18). *Digital 2020 Turkey (January 2020)* [PowerPoint slides]. SlideShare. https://www.slideshare.net/DataReportal/digital-2020-turkey-january-2020-v01?from_action=save
- De Graaf, R., Bijl, R. V., Spijker, J., Beekman, A. T. F., & Vollebergh, W. A. M. (2003). Temporal sequencing of lifetime mood disorders in relation to comorbid anxiety and substance use disorders. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 38(1), 1-11.
- De Lima Osório, F. (2013). *Social Anxiety Disorder: From Research to Practice*. Nova Biomedical.

- Eker, D., Arkar, H., & Yaldız, H. (2001). Çok Boyutlu Algılanan Sosyal Destek Ölçeğinin gözden geçirilmiş formunun faktör yapısı, geçerlik ve güvenirliği. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 12(1), 17-25.
- Ellison, N. B., Vitak, J., Gray, R., & Lampe, C. (2014). Cultivating social resources on social network sites: Facebook relationship maintenance behaviors and their role in social capital processes. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(4), 855-870.
- Ercan, N. (2016). *Self on Facebook: A social psychological investigation within uses and gratifications framework* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Erwin, B. A., Turk, C. L., Heimberg, R. G., Fresco, D. M., & Hantula, D. A. (2004). The internet: Home to a severe population of individuals with social anxiety disorder? *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 18(5), 629-646.
- Eskin, M., Harlak, H., Demirkıran, F., & Dereboy, Ç. (2013). Algılanan stres ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması: güvenirlik ve geçerlik analizi. *New/Yeni Symposium Journal*, 51(3), 132-140.
- Fernandez, K. C., Levinson, C. A., & Rodebaugh, T. L. (2012). Profiling: Predicting social anxiety from Facebook profiles. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(6), 706-713.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Sage Publishing.
- Filho, A. S., Hetem, L. A. B., Ferrari, M. C. F., Trzesniak, C., Martín-Santos, R., Borduqui, T., de Lima Osorio F., Loureiro S. R., Busatto Filho G., Zuardi A. W., Crippa J. A. S. (2010). Social anxiety disorder: what are we losing with the current diagnostic criteria? *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 121(3), 216–226.
- Gonzales, A. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2008). Identity shift in computer-mediated environments. *Media Psychology*, 11(2), 167-185.
- Gonzales, A.L., & Hancock, J. T. (2011). Mirror, mirror on my Facebook wall: Effects of exposure to Facebook on self-esteem. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, 14(1-2), 79-83.

- Grieve, R., Indian, M., Witteveen, K., Tolan, G. A., & Marrington, J. (2013). Face-to-face or Facebook: Can social connectedness be derived online? *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 29, 604–609.
- Haemmerlie, F. M., Montgomery, R. L., & Melchers, J. (1988). Social support, perceptions of attractiveness, weight, and the CPI in socially anxious males and females. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 44(3), 435-441.
- Heimberg, R. G., Horner, K. J., Juster, H. R., Safren, S. A., Brown, E. J., Scheier, F.R., & Liebowitz, M. R. (1999). Psychometric properties of the liebowitzsocial anxiety scale. *Psychological Medicine*, 29, 199-212.
- Indian, M., & Grieve, R. (2014). When Facebook is easier than face-to-face: Social support derived from Facebook in socially anxious individuals. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 59, 102-106.
- Joinson, A. N. (2008). Looking at, looking up or keeping up with people? Motives and use of Facebook. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1027–1036). New York, NY: ACM.
- Kalecik, S. (2016). *Emotion regulation, self-control, novelty seeking, depression and social anxiety symptoms in relation to problematic internet and smartphone use* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Karlis, J. V. (2013). *That's news to me: An exploratory study of the uses and gratifications of current events on social media of 18-24 year-olds*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina]. Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/2347>
- Kessler, R. C., Nelson, C. B., McGonagle, K. A., Liu, J., Swartz, M., & Blazer, D. G. (1996). Comorbidity of DSM–III–R major depressive disorder in the general population: results from the US National Comorbidity Survey. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 168(S30), 17-30.
- Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J., Helgeson, V., & Crawford, A. (2002). Internet paradox revisited. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 49–74.

- Krämer, N. C., & Winter, S. (2008). Impression management 2.0: The relationship of self-esteem, extraversion, self-efficacy, and self-presentation within social networking sites. *Journal of Media Psychology*, 20, 106–116.
- Lampe, C., Ellison, N. B., & Steinfield, C. (2006). A face(book) in the crowd: Social searching vs. Social browsing. *Proceedings of the 2006 20th Anniversary Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work* (pp. 167–170). Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.321.7801&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Largo-Wight, E., Peterson, P. M., & Chen, W. W. (2005). Perceived problem solving, stress, and health among college students. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 29(4), 360-370.
- Leary, M. R. (1995). *Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior*. Brown & Benchmark Publishers.
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 34-47.
- Lee, B. W., & Stapinski, L. A. (2012). Seeking safety on the internet: Relationship between social anxiety and problematic internet use. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 26(1), 197-205.
- Lee, S. Y., & Jang, K. (2019). Antecedents of impression management motivations on social network sites and their link to social anxiety. *Media Psychology*, 22(6), 890-904.
- Liebowitz, M. R. (1987). Social phobia. *Modern Problems of Pharmacopsychiatry*, 22, 141-173.
- Liu, C., Ang, R. P., & Lwin, M. O. (2013). Cognitive, personality, and social factors associated with adolescents' online personal information disclosure. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36(4), 629-638.
- Lydiard, R. B. (2001). Social anxiety disorder: comorbidity and its implications. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 62, 17-24.

- Magee, W. J., Eaton, W. W., Wittchen, H. U., McGonagle, K. A., & Kessler, R. C. (1996). Agoraphobia, simple phobia, and social phobia in the National Comorbidity Survey. *Archives of general psychiatry*, 53(2), 159-168.
- Mallinckrodt, B., & Wei, M. (2005). Attachment, social competencies, social support, and psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(3), 358-367.
- Mansell, W., & Clark, D. M. (1999). How do I appear to others? Social anxiety and processing of the observable self. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 37, 419-434.
- McAndrew, F. T., & Jeong, H. S. (2012). Who does what on Facebook? Age, sex, and relationship status as predictors of Facebook use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(6), 2359-2365.
- McCloskey, W., Iwanicki, S., Lauterbach, D., Giammittorio, D. M., & Maxwell, K. (2015). Are Facebook “friends” helpful? Development of a Facebook-based measure of social support and examination of relationships among depression, quality of life, and social support. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 18(9), 499-505.
- McCord, B., Rodebaugh, T. L., & Levinson, C. A. (2014). Facebook: Social uses and anxiety. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 34, 23-27.
- McKenna, K. Y. A., Green, A. S., & Gleason, M. E. J. (2002). Relationship formation on the Internet: What’s the big attraction? *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 9-31.
- Meng, J., Martinez, L., Holmstrom, A., Chung, M., & Cox, J. (2017). Research on social networking sites and social support from 2004 to 2015: A narrative review and directions for future research. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 20(1), 44-51.
- Mese, C., & Aydin, G. S. (2019). The Use of Social Networks among University Students. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 14(6), 190-199.

- Miller, R., & Melton, J. (2015). College students and risk-taking behaviour on Twitter versus Facebook. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 34(7), 678-684.
- Morahan-Martin, J., & Schumacher, P. (2003). Loneliness and social uses of the internet. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 19(6), 659-671.
- Moscovitch, D. A., Rodebaugh, T. L., & Hesch, B. D. (2012). How awkward! Social anxiety and perceived consequences of social blunders. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 50, 142-149.
- Murphy, E. C., & Tasker T. E. (2011). Lost in a crowded room: A correlation study of Facebook and social anxiety. *The Journal of Education, Community, and Values*, 11, 89-94.
- Muscanell, N. L., & Guadagno, R. E. (2012). Make new friends or keep the old: Gender and personality differences in social networking use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(1), 107-112.
- Nadkarni, A., & Hofmann, S. G. (2012). Why do people use Facebook? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(3), 243-249.
- Nick, E. A., Cole, D. A., Cho, S. J., Smith, D. K., Carter, T. G., & Zelkowitz, R. L. (2018). The Online Social Support Scale: Measure development and validation. *Psychological Assessment*, 30(9), 1127-1143.
- Olson, D. A., Liu, J., & Shultz, K. S. (2012). The influence of Facebook usage on perceptions of social support, personal efficacy, and life satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 12(3/4), 133-144.
- Pierce, T. (2009). Social anxiety and technology: Face-to-face communication versus technological communication among teens. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25(6), 1367-1372.
- Porter, E., & Chambless, D. L. (2017). Social anxiety and social support in romantic relationships. *Behavior Therapy*, 48(3), 335-348.
- Prezza, M., & Giuseppina Pacilli, M. (2002). Perceived social support from significant others, family and friends and several socio-demographic

- characteristics. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 12(6), 422-429.
- Quan-Haase, A., & Young, A. L. (2010). Uses and gratifications of social media: A comparison of Facebook and instant messaging. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 30(5), 350-361.
- Reno, R. R., & Kenny, D. A. (1992). Effects of self-consciousness and social anxiety on self-disclosure among unacquainted individuals: An application of the social relations model. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 79-94.
- Roberts, L. D., Smith, L. M., & Pollock, C. M. (2000). "U r a lot bolder on the net": Shyness and internet use. In W. R. Crozier (Ed.), *Shyness: Development, consolidation and change* (pp. 121-138). New York: Routledge.
- Rodebaugh, T. L. (2009). Social phobia and perceived friendship quality. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 23(7), 872-878.
- Rozgonjuk, D., Ryan, T., Kuljus, J. K., Täht, K., & Scott, G. G. (2019). Social comparison orientation mediates the relationship between neuroticism and passive Facebook use. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 13(1).
- Safren, S. A., Heimberg, R. G., Brown, E. J., & Holle, C. (1996). Quality of life in social phobia. *Depression and Anxiety*, 4(3), 126-133.
- Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M. R. (1982). Social anxiety and self-presentation: A conceptualization model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92, 641-669.
- Schlenker, B. R., & Pontari, B. A. (2000). The strategic control of information: Impression management and self-presentation in daily life. In A. Tesser, R. Felson, & J. Sul (Eds.), *Perspectives on self and identity* (pp. 199-232). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Schneier, F. R., Johnson, J., Hornig, C. D., Liebowitz, M. R., & Weissman, M. M. (1992). Social phobia: Comorbidity and morbidity in an epidemiologic sample. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 49(4), 282-288.

- Schouten, A., Valkenburg, P., & Peter, J. (2007). Precursors and underlying processes of adolescents' online self-disclosure; developing and testing and "Internet-Attribute-Perception" model. *Media Psychology*, 10(2), 292-315.
- Shaw, A. M., Timpano, K. R., Tran, T. B., & Joormann, J. (2015). Correlates of Facebook usage patterns: The relationship between passive Facebook use, social anxiety symptoms, and brooding. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48, 575-580.
- Sheldon, P. (2008). The relationship between unwillingness-to-communicate and students' Facebook use. *Journal of Media Psychology*, 20(2), 67-75.
- Shepherd, R. M., & Edelman, R. J. (2005). Reasons for internet use and social anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(5), 949-958.
- Soykan, Ç., Devrimci-Özgüven, H., & Gençöz, T. (2003). Liebowitz social anxiety scale: The Turkish version. *Psychological Reports*, 93, 1059-1069.
- Special, W. P., & Li-Barber, K. T. (2012). Self-disclosure and student satisfaction with Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(2), 624-630.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Torgud, L. J., Walker, J. R., Murray, L., Cox, B. J., Chartier, M., & Kjernisted, K. D. (2004). Deficits in perceived social support associated with generalized social phobia. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 33(2), 87-96.
- Twomey, C., & O'Reilly, G. (2017). Associations of self-presentation on Facebook with mental health and personality variables: A systematic review. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 20(10), 587-595.
- Uyan, A. (2014). *Ergenlerde algılanan stres ile sosyal destek arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Valkenburg, P. M., Schouten, A.P., & Peter, J. (2005). Adolescents' identity experiments on the Internet. *New Media & Society*, 7(3), 383-402.

- Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2009). Social consequences of the Internet for adolescents: A decade of research. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(1), 1-5.
- Walther, J. B. (2007). Selective self-presentation in computer-mediated communication: Hyperpersonal dimensions of technology, language, and cognition. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(5), 2538-2557.
- We Are Social. (2018). *GLOBAL DIGITAL REPORT 2018*.
<https://digitalreport.wearesocial.com/>
- Weidman, A. C., Fernandez, K. C., Levinson, C. A., Augustine, A. A., Larsen, R. J., & Rodebaugh, T. L. (2012). Compensatory internet use among individuals higher in social anxiety and its implications for well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53(3), 191-195.
- Weidman, A. C., & Levinson, C. A. (2015). I'm still socially anxious online: Offline relationship impairment characterizing social anxiety manifests and is accurately perceived in online social networking profiles. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 49, 12-19.
- Wellman, B., & Gulia, M. (1999). Net surfers don't ride alone: Virtual communities as communities. In B. Wellman (Ed.), *Networks in the global village* (pp. 331–366). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Whisman, M. A., Sheldon, C. T., & Goering, P. (2000). Psychiatric disorders and dissatisfaction with social relationships: Does type of relationship matter? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 109, 803-808.
- Whiting, A., & Williams, D. (2013). Why people use social media: A uses and gratifications approach. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 16, 362–369.
- Wilson, R. E., Gosling, S. D., & Graham, L. T. (2012). A review of Facebook research in the social sciences. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(3), 203-220.

- Wittchen, H. U., & Beloch, E. (1996). The impact of social phobia on quality of life. *International Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 11, 15-23.
- Yeniçıktı, N. T. (2016). *Sosyal medya kullanım motivasyonları: Facebook ve twitter kullanıcıları üzerine kullanımlar ve doyumlar araştırması* [Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi]. Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Young, C. M. Y., & Lo, B. C. Y. (2012). Cognitive appraisal mediating relationship between social anxiety and internet communication in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(1), 78-83.
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of personality assessment*, 52(1), 30-41.
- Zywica, J., & Danowski, J. (2008). The faces of Facebookers: Investigating social enhancement and social compensation hypotheses; predicting Facebook™ and offline popularity from sociability and self-esteem, and mapping the meanings of popularity with semantic networks. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(1), 1-34.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Yaşınız:

Cinsiyetiniz:

Kadın

Erkek

Medeni durumunuz:

İlişkisi yok

İlişkisi var

Nişanlı

Evli

Ailenizin gelir durumunu belirtiniz:

Çok düşük

Düşük

Orta

İyi

Çok iyi

Okuduğunuz okul:

Okuduğunuz bölüm:

Bugüne kadar herhangi bir psikiyatrik tanı aldınız mı?

Evet

Hayır

Evet ise belirtiniz:

Bugüne kadar herhangi bir psikolojik yardım aldınız mı?

Evet

Hayır

APPENDIX B

THE LIEBOWITZ SOCIAL ANXIETY SCALE

Tüm seçeneklere geçen haftayı düşünerek-bugün de dahil olacak şekilde puan veriniz. Eğer durumlardan biri geçen hafta içerisinde oluşmadıysa, bu durumla karşılaştığınızda göstereceğiniz tepkiyi puanlayınız. Her bir durum için (yaşanmış olan ya da yaşanmış olduğu varsayılan) hem “korku ya da anksiyete”nin derecesini hem de “kaçınma” sıklığını puanlayınız.		
	Korku ya da anksiyete 0=yok 1=hafif 2=orta 3=şiddetli	Kaçınma 0=asla (% 0) 1=ara sıra (% 1-33) 2=sıkça (% 34-67) 3=genellikle (% 68-100)
1. Topluluk içerisinde telefon etmek		
2. Küçük bir grupla beraber bir aktiviteye katılmak		
3. Toplulukta yemek yemek		
4. Toplulukta içecek içmek		
5. Yönetici konumundaki biri ile konuşmak		
6. Seyirci önünde rol yapmak, oynamak ya da konuşmak		
7. Bir partiye / davete gitmek		
8. Biri ya da birileri tarafından izlenirken çalışmak		
9. Biri ya da birileri tarafından izlenirken yazı yazmak		
10. Çok iyi tanımadığınız birine telefon etmek		
11. Çok iyi tanımadığınız biri ile yüz yüze konuşmak		
12. Yabancılarla tanışmak		
13. Genel bir tuvalette idrar yapmak		
14. Başkalarının oturuyor olduğu bir odaya girmek		

15. İlgil merkez olmak		
16. Ön hazırlık olmadan bir toplumda konuşmak		
17. Beceri, bilgi ya da yetenek ile ilgili bir sınava girmek		
18. Çok iyi tanımadığınız birine karşı görüş bildirmek ya da onunla aynı fikirde olmadığınızı söylemek		
19. Çok iyi tanımadığınız birinin doğrudan gözlerinin içine bakmak		
20. Bir gruba sözlü rapor vermek		
21. Cinsel ya da romantik bir ilişki amacıyla biriyle yakınlaşmaya çalışmak		
22. Bir malı parası iade edilmek üzere geri götürmek		
23. Bir parti / davet vermek		
24. İsrarcı bir satıcıyı reddetmek		

APPENDIX C

USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA FORM

1. Facebook hesabınız var mı?

- ☐ Evet ☐ Hayır

Varsa, ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık

2. Ne kadar süredir Facebook hesabınız var?

- ☐ 0-3 yıl
☐ 4-7 yıl
☐ 8-10 yıl
☐ 10 yıldan fazla

Lütfen aşağıdaki soruları yanıtlarken ihtiyaç duyduğunuzda Facebook hesabınıza bakınız.

3. Şu anda Facebook hesabınızda kaç arkadaşınız var? (Tam sayıyı veremeyecekseniz yaklaşık olarak belirtebilirsiniz) _____

4. Facebook arkadaşlarınızın ne kadarı ile Facebook dışında da iletişim halindesiniz (telefon, e-mail, yüz yüze)?

- ☐ Hiçbiri
☐ Yarısından azı
☐ Yarısı
☐ Yarısından fazlası
☐ Hepsi

5. Facebook hesabınızı ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Günde 1 defa
☐ Günde 1 defadan daha sık
☐ Haftada birkaç defa
☐ Ayda birkaç defa
☐ Yılda birkaç defa
☐ Yılda birkaç defadan daha az
☐ Hiç

6. Facebook sayfanızda ne sıklıkla paylaşımda bulunuyorsunuz?

- ☐ Günde 1 defadan daha sık
☐ Günde 1 defa
☐ Haftada birkaç defa
☐ Ayda birkaç defa
☐ Yılda birkaç defa
☐ Yılda birkaç defadan daha az
☐ Hiç

7. Facebook'ta gün içinde ortalama olarak ne kadar vakit geçiriyorsunuz?

- ☐ 15 dakikadan az

- ☐ 15 dakika – 1 saat
- ☐ 1 - 2 saat
- ☐ 2 saatten fazla

8. Aşağıda listelenen sosyal medya kanallarından hesabınız olanları işaretleyiniz:

a)Twitter

- ☐ Var ☐ Yok

Varsa, ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık

b)Instagram

- ☐ Var ☐ Yok

Varsa, ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık

c)Snapchat

- ☐ Var ☐ Yok

Varsa, ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık

d)LinkedIn

- ☐ Var ☐ Yok

Varsa, ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık

e)Google+

- ☐ Var ☐ Yok

Varsa, ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık

f)Pinterest

- ☐ Var ☐ Yok

Varsa, ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık

g)Youtube

- ☐ Var ☐ Yok

Varsa, ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık

h)Skype

- ☐ Var ☐ Yok

Varsa, ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık

Üstteki listede bulunmayan ama hesabınızın olduğu diğer sosyal medya kanallarını yazınız.

1. _____

Ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

- ☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık

2. _____

Ne sıklıkla kullanıyorsunuz?

☐ Hiç ☐ Bazen ☐ Sık ☐ Çok Sık



APPENDIX D

MOTIVATIONS OF FACEBOOK USE SCALE

Aşağıda Facebook kullanma motivasyonları ile ilgili çeşitli ifadeler yer almaktadır. Bu ifadelerden hangisine ne ölçüde katıldığınızı ya da katılmadığınızı belirtiniz.

Facebook kullanıyorum. Çünkü;....		Hiç Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
1	Çekici olduğunu düşündüğüm birinin profiline bakabiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
2	Arkadaşlarımın Facebook'tan ne dinlediği, okuduğu ya da izledikleri hakkında fikir edinebiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
3	Arkadaşlarımın fotoğraf albümüne bakabiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
4	Eski kız arkadaşımı/erkek arkadaşımı kontrol edebiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
5	Facebook kullanmak ulaşamadığım arkadaşlarımla bağlantı kurmak için iyi bir yoldur	1	2	3	4	5
6	Arkadaşlarım hakkında dedikodu alabiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
7	Duvara yorum bırakabiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
8	Çalışmak istemediğim zamanlarda kullanıyorum	1	2	3	4	5
9	Profilimi güncelleyebiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
10	Mesaj gönderebiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
11	Arkadaşlarımın şu an ne yaptıklarını öğrenebiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
12	Eski arkadaşlarımla bağlantı kurabiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
13	Telefon yerine Facebook kullanıyorum	1	2	3	4	5
14	Profilime daha fazla uygulama yükleyebiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
15	Diğerleriyle/arkadaşlarımla ilişki kurmada benim için iyi bir yoldur	1	2	3	4	5
16	E-mail yerine Facebook kullanıyorum	1	2	3	4	5
17	Zaman geçirebiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5

18	Facebook çok fazla sorumluluk yüklemekten başkalarıyla görüşmede kolaylık sağlar	1	2	3	4	5
19	Facebook'ta olduğum zaman, zaman çabuk geçer	1	2	3	4	5
20	Arkadaşlarım ve ortak arkadaşlarımızı görmek istediğim zaman	1	2	3	4	5
21	Başkalarından gelen mesajları kontrol edebiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
22	Facebook kullanmak zevklidir.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Arkadaşlarımı tebrik etmek ya da doğum günlerini kutlayabiliyorum	1	2	3	4	5
24	Merak uyandırıcı olduğu için kullanıyorum	1	2	3	4	5
25	Çok sık görmediğim insanlara yorum bırakabiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
26	Bir etkinlik hakkında fikir elde edebiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
27	Arkadaşlarıma onlar hakkındaki düşüncelerimi bildirebiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
28	Arkadaş bulmak daha kolaydır	5	4	3	2	1
29	Facebook kullandığım zaman eğlenabiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
30	Birileriyle yüz yüze konuşmak yerine sadece Facebook kullanıyorum	5	4	3	2	1
31	Çok fazla çaba sarf etmeden bazı kişilerle irtibat kurmak için kolay bir yoldur	5	4	3	2	1
32	Kullanıcı adı ya da e mail adreslerini bulabiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
33	Profil resimlerini görebiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
34	Facebook insanlarla birliktelik sağlar	5	4	3	2	1
35	Yeni tanıştığım insanlar hakkında daha fazla bilgi alabiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
36	Facebook sayesinde yeni arkadaşlar ediniyorum	5	4	3	2	1
37	Mesajlarımı kontrol etmek için Facebook oturumu açıyorum	5	4	3	2	1
38	Arkadaşlarıma arkadaşlarının fotoğraflarına göz atmak için kullanıyorum	5	4	3	2	1
39	Lise arkadaşlarımla temas halinde olmak için kullanıyorum	5	4	3	2	1
40	İrtibatı kaybettiğim eski arkadaşlarımı bulabiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
41	Duvar yorumlarımı okumak için Facebook oturumu açıyorum	5	4	3	2	1

42	Fotoğraf paylaşabiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
43	Benim için Facebook kullanmak sıkıntıları engeller	5	4	3	2	1
44	Arkadaşlarımın iletişim bilgilerini bulabiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
45	Benim fotoğraflarıma yapılan yorumları görebiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
46	Etkinlik duyurabiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1
47	Hoşlandığım birinin profiline bakabiliyorum	5	4	3	2	1



APPENDIX E

SELF-PRESENTATION SUBSCALE

Aşağıda Facebook kullanma ve tercih etme sebeplerine dair bazı ifadeler verilmiştir. Bu ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı 1 - 5 arasında değişen rakamlardan size en uygun olanı seçerek işaretleyiniz (1:Kesinlikle katılmıyorum, 5:Kesinlikle katılıyorum). Her bir ifadenin Facebook'u kullanmanızdaki ve tercih etmenizdeki rolünü değerlendirdiğinizi soru boyunca göz önünde bulundurunuz.

Facebook kullanıyorum çünkü;		Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
1	Facebook'ta kendimi nasıl istersem o şekilde sunabiliyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Facebook'ta önem verdiğim birine/birilerine yönelik (örn. potansiyel sevgili yada potansiyel işveren), onların beni görmesini istediğim gibi bir profil yaratabilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Gerek duyarsam Facebook sayesinde bilinmesini istemediğim yönlerimi saklayabiliyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Facebook, kendimle ilgili kötü hissettirecek şeyleri saklamama izin veriyor.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX F

FACEBOOK SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALE

Kendi Facebook kullanım süreçlerinizi düşünerek, aşağıdaki ifadeleri değerlendiriniz. Aşağıdaki her bir ifade için sizi en iyi yansıtan seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

		Hiç Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
1	Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım duygusal tepkilerimi önemser.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Facebook'ta mutluluğumu benimle paylaşan arkadaşlarım var.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Facebook'ta özel duygularımı anlattığımda beni dinleyen biri var.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Facebook'ta üzüntümü paylaşabildiğim biri var.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Facebook'ta birine destek almak için güvenebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Facebook'ta birinin beni dürtmesi ve oyun oynamaya davet etmesi; kendimi kabul görmüş gibi hissettirir.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım benimle okula dair konulardan söz eder.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım gönderdiğim mesajlara cevap verir.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Facebook'ta mesleki bir bilgi/haber paylaştığımda, biri paylaşımımı cevaplar (beğenir, yorum bırakır vs.).	1	2	3	4	5
10	Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım benimle mesleki konulardan söz eder.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım mesleki problemlerimi çözmeme yardım eder.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Facebook'ta biri akademik konularla ilgili problemlerimi çözmeme yardım eder.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Facebook'ta birine okulla ilgili konuları danışırım.	1	2	3	4	5

14	Facebook'ta okul arkadaşlarımın neler yaptıklarını sorabildiğim, okul arkadaşlarım hakkında konuşabildiğim biri var.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Facebook'ta okuldaki kulüpler hakkında bilgi alabildiğim biri var.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Facebook'ta günlük konularla ilgili danışabildiğim biri var.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Facebook'ta kötü bir ruh hali içinde olduğumda, biri mesajla beni rahatlatır ve destekler.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Bir başarıyı Facebook'ta paylaştığımda, biri "Beğen" tuşuna basar ve benim adıma sevinir.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Kendimle ilgili iyi şeyleri Facebook'ta paylaştığımda, biri bana olumlu geri bildirim verir.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Facebook'taki arkadaşlarım, sonuçları ne olursa olsun çabalarımı takdir eder.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Facebook'ta biri kararlarımı adil şekilde değerlendirir.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Yanlış bir şey yaptığımda, Facebook'ta biri bana önerilerde bulunur.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Facebook'ta biri ne söyleyeceğim veya ne yapacağım hakkında bana geri bildirim verir.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX G

FACEBOOK ACTIVITY MEASURE

Facebook'ta gerçekleştirdiğiniz aktiviteleri (ortalama olarak) düşünerek, aşağıdaki ifadeleri değerlendiriniz. Aşağıdaki her bir ifade için sizi en iyi yansıtan şıkkı işaretleyiniz.

1. Artık yüz yüze görüşmediğiniz (örn., eski bir arkadaş/erkek arkadaş/ kız arkadaş vs.) veya iletişimde olmadığınız bir kişinin profilini ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla ziyaret edersiniz/incelersiniz?
 - a. Hiçbir zaman
 - b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
 - c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
 - d. sık (haftada birkaç kez; ama her gün değil)
 - e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)
2. Tanımadığınız birinin (örn., arkadaşınızın arkadaşı) profilini ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla ziyaret edersiniz/incelersiniz?
 - a. Hiçbir zaman
 - b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
 - c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
 - d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
 - e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)
3. Başkalarının zaman tüneline ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla gönderi paylaşırsınız (örn., bir şeyler yazarsınız ya da link, fotoğraf veya video paylaşırsınız vs.)?
 - a. Hiçbir zaman
 - b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
 - c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
 - d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
 - e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

4. Başkaları ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla sizin zaman tünelinizde gönderi paylaşır (örn., bir şeyler yazar ya da link, fotoğraf veya video paylaşır vs.)?
- a. Hiçbir zaman
 - b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
 - c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
 - d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
 - e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)
5. Facebook üzerinden ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla mesaj alırsınız/mesaj gönderirsiniz?
- a. Hiçbir zaman
 - b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
 - c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
 - d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
 - e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)
6. Facebook Sohbet (Chat) aracılığıyla ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla başkalarıyla iletişim kurarsınız?
- a. Hiçbir zaman
 - b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
 - c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
 - d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
 - e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)
7. Facebook'ta ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla durum güncellemesi ("şu anda ne düşünüyorsunuz/hissediyorsunuz?" alanı) yaparsınız?
- a. Hiçbir zaman
 - b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
 - c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
 - d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
 - e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

8. Facebook'ta diğer kişilerin durum güncellemelerini ("şu anda ne düşünüyorsunuz/hissediyorsunuz?" alanı) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz/takip edersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

9. Facebook'ta ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla fotoğraf paylaşırsınız?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

10. Facebook arkadaşlarınızın paylaştığı fotoğrafları ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

11. Artık yüz yüze görüşmediğiniz (örn., eski bir arkadaş/erkek arkadaş/ kız arkadaş) veya iletişimde olmadığınız bir kişinin fotoğraflarını ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

12. Tanımadığınız birinin (örn., arkadaşınızın arkadaşı) fotoğraflarını ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

13. Profil bilgilerinizi (örn., hakkımda (about me), eğitim, iş, temel bilgiler) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla güncellersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

14. Profil fotoğrafınızı ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla değiştirirsiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

15. Ana sayfayı/Haber kaynağını (Newsfeed) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

16. Ana sayfaya/Haber kaynağına (Newsfeed) düşen gönderilere (örn., durum güncellemeleri, duvar gönderileri, fotoğraflar vs.) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla yorum yazarsınız, ifade bırakırsınız ve/veya bu gönderileri beğenirsiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

17. Facebook üzerinden ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla etkinlik oluşturunuz ve/veya etkinliklere katılım durumunuzu bildirirsiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

18. Facebook üzerinden ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla etkinlikleri incellersiniz/takip edersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

19. Facebook arkadaşlarınızla ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla oyun oynarsınız?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

20. Zaman tünelinizde ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla link, haber, metin vs. paylaşırsınız?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

21. Zaman tünelinizde ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla video paylaşırsınız?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

22. Başkalarının paylaştığı videoları ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla görüntülersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

23. Facebook'ta ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla grup kurarsınız ve/veya gruplara katılırsınız?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

24. Facebook'ta ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla gruplarda paylaşılanları incellersiniz/takip edersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

25. Facebook gruplarında ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla başkalarıyla iletişim kurarsınız (örn., paylaşım yapmak, yorum/beğeni bırakmak vs.)?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

26. Diğer sosyal medya hesaplarındaki (örn., Instagram, Twitter vs.) paylaşımlarınızı ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla Facebook'ta da paylaşırsınız?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

27. Facebook Hikayenizde (Stories) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla video veya fotoğraf paylaşırsınız?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

28. Başkalarının Facebook Hikayelerini (Stories) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla izlersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

29. Başkalarının Facebook Hikayelerine (Stories) ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla yanıt yazarsınız?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

30. Facebook'ta ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla yeni arkadaşlar ararsınız/eklersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

31. Facebook'ta beğendiğiniz sayfalardaki paylaşımları/hareketleri ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla incellersiniz/takip edersiniz?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)

32. Facebook'ta beğendiğiniz/takip ettiğiniz sayfaların yayınlarına ortalama olarak ne sıklıkla yorum/beğeni bırakırsınız?

- a. Hiçbir zaman
- b. Nadiren (ayda 1 kez veya daha az)
- c. Bazen (haftada 1 kez veya daha az)
- d. sık (haftada birkaç kez, ama her gün değil)
- e. çok sık (günde 1 kez veya daha fazla)



APPENDIX H

PERCEIVED STRESS SCALE-10

Aşağıda geçtiğimiz ay içerisindeki kişisel deneyimleriniz hakkında bir dizi soru yöneltilmektedir. Her soruyu dikkatlice okuyarak size en uygun seçeneği işaretleyiniz. Soruların doğru veya yanlış cevabı yoktur. Önemli olan sizin duygu ve düşüncelerinizi yansıtan yanıtları vermenizdir.

	Hiçbir Zaman	Neredeyse Hiçbir Zaman	Bazen	Oldukça Sık	Çok Sık
1. Geçen ay, beklenmedik bir şeylerin olması nedeniyle ne sıklıkta rahatsızlık duydunuz?					
2. Geçen ay, hayatınızdaki önemli şeyleri kontrol edemediğinizi ne sıklıkta hissettiniz?					
3. Geçen ay, kendinizi ne sıklıkta sinirli ve stresli hissettiniz?					
4. Geçen ay, kişisel sorunlarınızı ele alma yeteneğinize ne sıklıkta güven duydunuz?					
5. Geçen ay, her şeyin yolunda gittiğini ne sıklıkta hissettiniz?					
6. Geçen ay, ne sıklıkta yapmanız gereken şeylerle başa çıkamadığınızı fark ettiniz?					
7. Geçen ay, hayatınızdaki zorlukları ne sıklıkta kontrol edebildiniz?					
8. Geçen ay, ne sıklıkta her şeyin üstesinden geldiğinizi hissettiniz?					
9. Geçen ay, ne sıklıkta kontrolünüz dışında gelişen olaylar yüzünden öfkelenediniz?					
10. Geçen ay, ne sıklıkta problemlerin üstesinden gelemeyeceğiniz kadar biriktiğini hissettiniz?					

APPENDIX I

MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALE OF PERCEIVED SOCIAL SUPPORT (MSPSS)

Aşağıda 12 cümle ve her bir cümle altında da cevaplarınızı işaretlemek için 1'den 7 'ye kadar rakamlar verilmiştir. Her cümlede söylenenin sizin için ne kadar çok doğru olduğunu veya olmadığını belirtmek için o cümle altındaki rakamlardan yalnız bir tanesini işaretleyiniz. Bu şekilde 12 cümlenin her birine bir işaret koyarak cevaplarınızı veriniz.

Lütfen hiçbir cümleyi cevapsız bırakmayınız. Sizce doğruya en yakın olan rakamı işaretleyiniz.

- 1. Ailem ve arkadaşlarım dışında olan ve ihtiyacım olduğunda yanımda olan bir insan (örneğin, flört, nişanlı, sözlü, akraba, komşu, doktor) var.**
Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet
- 2. Ailem ve arkadaşlarım dışında olan ve sevinç ve kederlerimi paylaşabileceğim bir insan (örneğin, flört, nişanlı, sözlü, akraba, komşu, doktor) var.**
Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet
- 3. Ailem (örneğin, annem, babam, eşim, çocuklarım, kardeşlerim) bana gerçekten yardımcı olmaya çalışır.**
Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet
- 4. İhtiyacım olan duygusal yardım ve desteği ailemden (örneğin, annem, babam, eşim, çocuklarım, kardeşlerim) alırım.**
Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet
- 5. Ailem ve arkadaşlarım dışında olan ve beni gerçekten rahatlatan bir insan (örneğin, flört, nişanlı, sözlü, akraba, komşu, doktor) var.**
Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet
- 6. Arkadaşlarım bana gerçekten yardımcı olmaya çalışırlar.**
Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet
- 7. İşler kötü gittiğinde arkadaşlarıma güvenilebilirim.**
Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet
- 8. Sorunlarımı ailemle (örneğin, annem, babam, eşim, çocuklarım, kardeşlerim) konuşabilirim.**
Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet
- 9. Sevinç ve kederlerimi paylaşabileceğim arkadaşlarım var.**
Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet

10. Ailem ve arkadaşlarım dışında olan ve duygularıma önem veren bir insan (örneğin, flört, nişanlı, sözlü, akraba, komşu, doktor) var.

Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet

11. Kararlarımı vermede ailem (örneğin, annem, babam, eşim, çocuklarım, kardeşlerim) bana yardımcı olmaya isteklidir.

Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet

12. Sorunlarımı arkadaşlarımla konuşabilirim.

Kesinlikle hayır 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Kesinlikle evet



APPENDIX J

INFORMED CONSENT

Bu çalışma, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Klinik Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Hazal Atalay tarafından yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında, Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Hale Ögel Balaban danışmanlığında yürütülmektedir. Bu çalışmada, sosyal ilişkiler ile Facebook kullanımı arasındaki ilişki incelenmektedir. Çalışmaya katılım tamamen gönüllülük temeline dayanmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacına ulaşması için sizden beklenen, bütün soruları eksiksiz, kimsenin baskısı altında olmadan, size en uygun gelen cevapları içtenlikle verecek şekilde cevaplamanızdır.

Araştırma yaklaşık olarak 30 dakika sürecektir. Lütfen soruların başındaki yönergeleri dikkatlice okuyunuz ve her soruyu size en yakın olan cevabı vererek yanıtlayınız. Araştırma içinde yer alan soruların doğru ya da yanlış cevapları yoktur. Vermiş olduğunuz cevaplar gizli tutulacak ve yalnızca araştırma amacına yönelik kullanılacaktır. Çalışmaya katılmaktan herhangi bir anda vazgeçebilirsiniz veya çalışmayı yarım bırakabilirsiniz. Çalışma ile ilgili bir sorunuz olduğu takdirde aşağıdaki e-mail adresleri üzerinden araştırmacı ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz. Katılımınız için teşekkür ederim.

Hazal Atalay

Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

E-mail: hazalatalay@hotmail.com

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Hale Ögel Balaban

Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü

E-mail: hale.ogelbalaban@eas.bau.edu.tr

Yukarıdaki metni okudum ve anladım. Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Evet ☐ Hayır ☐

Tarih: