

**Relationship between Social Media Dependency,
Perceived Parenting Style, Delay of Gratification,
and Narcissism**

Muhammet Burak Derebaşı

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

Master of Science
in
Developmental Psychology

Eastern Mediterranean University
September 2015
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Serhan Çiftçiođlu
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Őenel Hüsnu Raman
Chair, Department of Psychology

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. İlmiye Seçer

ABSTRACT

Worldwide, there is an increasing interest to study social media dependency. Currently, most of the researches compare social media dependency with other dependencies such as substance abuse and gambling. Although, there is limited research to investigate the effect of personality on social media dependency. Therefore, the main aim of the current study was to examine the predictor roles of narcissism, perceived parenting styles and delay of gratification on social media dependency. A total of 152 women and 146 men aged between 18 to 40 years ($M=23.76$, $SD=4.79$) were recruited from a Turkish speaking community. Participants were recruited through online surveys, and face-to-face distributions at Eastern Mediterranean University. Results showed that authoritarian and authoritative parenting, and delay of gratification significantly predicted social media dependency. However, narcissism, age, gender and permissive parenting style were not significant predictors. Findings indicated the importance of parental practices, and delay of gratification for the prevention of social media dependency.

Keywords: Dependency – Social Media – Delay of Gratification – Narcissism – Parenting Style

ÖZ

Sosyal medya bağımlılığı dünya genelinde popülerleşen bir araştırma konusudur. Güncel olarak, araştırmaların çoğu sosyal medya bağımlılığını, madde ve kumar bağımlılığı gibi davranışlarla karşılaştırmaktadır. Ancak, kişilik farklılıklarının sosyal medya bağımlılığı üzerindeki etkisini inceleyen araştırmaların sayısı yeterli seviyede değildir. Bu yüzden, bu çalışmanın ana amacı narsisizm, haz erteleme, ve algılanan ebeveynlik tarzının sosyal medya bağımlılığı üzerindeki yordayıcı etkisini araştırmaktır. Çalışma Türkçe konuşan, 18 ile 40 yaş ($M=23.76$, $SD=4.79$) arasında, 152 kadın ve 146 erkek katılımcı ile yürütülmüştür. Veriler çevrimiçi şekilde, ve Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi'nde yüzyüze dağıtılan anketlerle toplanmıştır. Sonuçlar otoriter ve yetkili ebeveynlik tarzının, ve haz erteleme becerisinin sosyal medya bağımlılığını anlamlı düzeyde yordadığını göstermiştir. Diğer yandan; narsisizm, izin verici ebeveynlik tarzı, yaş ve cinsiyet değişkenleri ile sosyal medya bağımlılığı arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmamıştır. Bulgular ebeveynlik tarzlarının ve haz erteleme becerisinin sosyal medya bağımlılığını önlemede önemli değişkenler olduğunu düşündürmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Bağımlılık – Sosyal medya – Haz erteleme – Narsisizm – Ebeveynlik tarzı

To My Family and Friends

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Firstly, I want to thank my family; my father, mother, grandmother and grandfather. This wouldn't be possible without their continuous support.

Secondly, I want to thank my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar for his patient, tolerant and understanding personality during this process. He was very supportive and informative at every step of this thesis. His knowledge on academic publications was very helpful and important for me. He will always be remembered as a valuable teacher and an understanding, wise friend.

I want to thank my teachers at Psychology Department as well, their knowledge and experience were always ready to be shared. I especially thank to Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan for being a patient and understanding person to my impatient and procrastinating personality. Her advice and experiences will always be valuable and respected.

Additionally, I want to thank Raziye Nevzat for being a kind, understanding, and open minded boss for 4 years. She supported me almost my whole university education, and master's degree. Thanks to the job opportunity offered by her, I was able to focus on social media field for my study.

I also want to thank my friends in IEG group; Kaan, Onur, Ziba, Simay, Kemal, Gizem, Nadir, Sevgi, and Elnaz. Their support and friendship will always be remembered.

I can't finish without thanking my dog Miço for entertaining me in stressful moments during my whole university education and thesis process.

Finally, I would like to thank my beloved future wife, Melis for her putting this much effort with her help, emotional support and patience for my thesis and my university life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ.....	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Social Media.....	1
1.1.1 What is social media?.....	1
1.1.2 Social Media Platforms	1
1.2 Social Media Dependency.....	2
1.2.1 Social Media Usage.....	5
1.2.2 Treatment.....	7
1.3 Parenting Style.....	10
1.3.1 Permissive Parenting.....	10
1.3.2 Authoritarian Parenting.....	10
1.3.3 Authoritative Parenting.....	11
1.3.4 Parenting Style and Dependencies.....	11
1.4 Impulsivity and Delay of Gratification.....	13
1.4.1 Impulsivity and General Psychopathology.....	13
1.4.2 Impulsivity and Dependencies.....	14
1.4.3 Delay of Gratification and Dependencies.....	15
1.5 Narcissism.....	16

1.5.1 Definition and Characteristics.....	16
1.5.2 Narcissism and Social Media.....	17
1.6 Ecological Systems Theory.....	19
1.7 Current Study.....	20
2 METHODS.....	21
2.1 Participants.....	21
2.2 Materials.....	21
2.2.1 Demographics.....	22
2.2.2 Generalized Problematic Internet Use Scale (GPIUS) – Modified for Social Media Use	22
2.2.3 Parental Authority Questionnaire.....	23
2.2.4 Delaying Gratification Inventory.....	23
2.1.5 Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI-16).....	24
2.2 Procedure.....	24
3 RESULTS.....	28
3.1 Descriptive Statistics.....	28
3.2 Factor Analysis of Parental Authority Questionnaire.....	29
3.3 Correlational Analyses.....	30
3.4 Regression Analysis on Social Media Dependency.....	32
4 DISCUSSION.....	34
4.1 Social Media Dependency and Parenting Styles.....	34
4.2 Social Media Dependency and Delay of Gratification.....	38
4.3 Social Media Dependency and Narcissism.....	41
4.4 Limitations.....	42
4.5 Suggestions for Future Studies.....	43

4.6 Conclusion.....	46
REFERENCES.....	47
APPENDICES.....	66
Appendix A: The Questionnaire.....	67
Appendix B: Department’s Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter	73
Appendix C: Permission Letter to Translate and Modify Generalized Problematic Internet Use Scale (GPIUS).....	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Comparison table of social media platforms' global rank and Average Time Spend for Each Visitor (ATSEV) in 2012 and 2015.....	7
Table 2: Mean score and Cronbach's Alpha comparisons of Online and Offline participants.....	27
Table 3: Mean numbers of all variables for study sample.....	29
Table 4: Correlation coefficients values (Pearson) of the variables	31
Table 5: Hierarchical multiple regression on social media dependency.....	33

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

APA	American Psychological Association
DSM	Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders
Doi	Digital Object Identifier
e.g.	Example Given
et al.	And others
etc	et cetera
GPIUS	Generalized Problematic Internet Use Scale
PAQ	Parental Authority Questionnaire
i.e.	That is
α	Alpha
β	Beta
F	F-ratio
M	Mean
p	Probability
r	Pearson's Correlation Coefficient
R^2	R-square
ΔR^2	R-square change
SD	Standard Deviation
SE_b	Standard Error
t	Critical Value

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Social Media

1.1.1 What is social media?

Social media is defined as interactive internet platforms which are accessible through mobile or web-based devices such as smartphones and personal computers (Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCharty, & Silvestre, 2011). The content on social media platforms are provided by social media users (Mangold & Faulds, 2009). In other words, social media platforms allow users to share, discuss, re-create, and modify the content provided by others (Kietzmann et al., 2011).

1.1.2 Social Media Platforms

Alexa (2015a) is a globally accepted website monitoring platform that ranks websites according to their visitors and statistics (Hynes, 2010; Wozniak and Buchnowska, 2013). Alexa (2015b) rankings of the year 2015 shows that Facebook is the most used social media platform, followed by YouTube, Twitter, LinkedIn, Instagram, Blogger, Pinterest, and Tumblr (based on top 50 global websites).

Facebook is a social media platform that is available on website (desktop and laptop computers) and mobile applications (smartphones, tablets, and wearable devices) for it's users (Facebook, 2015a; Alexa, 2015b). YouTube is a Google company which allows users to create video channels and share previously edited or live broadcasting videos (YouTube, 2015a; Wozniak, & Buchnowska, 2013). Popular video channel

owners on YouTube can make up to 4 million dollars in a year with partnership system (Kain, 2014). Blogs are online personal journals for users to express their ideas, tell their stories, and discuss other user generated contents on blogs (Blogger, 2015; Wozniak and Buchnowska, 2013). Blogs have high quality content but lower interaction compared to other social media platforms such as Facebook (Chang, Tang, Inagaki, & Liu, 2014). Blog users who want a higher level of interaction could use microblogs such as Twitter (Chang et. al., 2014). Pinterest and Instagram provide photograph and video sharing platforms for social media users but, Instagram requires a mobile device for registration and photograph sharing (Hansen, Nowlan,& Winter, 2012; Manikonda, Hu, & Kambhampati, 2014). LinkedIn is preferred for professional business related interactions between users (Benson, Filippaios, & Morgan, 2009). The number of LinkedIn users was increased especially during 2007-2008 financial crisis (Benson et. al., 2009, LinkedIn, 2008).

All of these social media platforms are based on users' interaction with each other (Kuss & Griffiths, 2011). Therefore, the existence of social media platforms is relying on user activity and because of this, social media platforms send notifications to their users, and try to keep them connected as much as possible (Facebook, 2015b; Instagram, 2015; LinkedIn, 2015; Pinterest, 2015; Tumblr, 2015; Twitter, 2015; YouTube, 2015b).

1.2 Social Media Dependency

Social media dependency is the continuous excessive and compulsive use of social media platforms, despite the negative outcomes on users' lives caused by social media usage (Griffiths, Kuss, & Demetrovics, 2014; LaRose, Kim, & Peng, 2010). Griffiths (2005) emphasized six base components (salience, mood modification, tolerance,

withdrawal symptoms, conflict, and relapse) to operationally define any behavior which can be considered as dependency. Accordingly, Griffiths et al. (2014) modified these components to define social media dependency:

- Salience: Social media becomes the most important thing in users' lives, affect their thoughts (i.e. preoccupation with thinking to use social media), feelings (i.e. cravings), and behaviors (the impairment with social environment). Resulting with poor work-school performance, and relational problems with other individuals.
- Mood Modification: Social media is used by users as a coping strategy with their personal experiences (i.e. escaping from real life problems), .
- Tolerance: In order to get the same mood modification feelings which were experienced by users before, users try to increase the time spend on social media after using it for a period of time.
- Withdrawal symptoms: If users can't engage with their social media accounts, they start to experience unpleasant physical and emotional effects such as anger, shaking, focusing problems.
- Conflict: As their social media dependency increase, users start to experience interpersonal (friends, family), social (hobbies, interests, job, and other social activities), and individual (loss of control) conflicts with their environment and themselves.
- Relapse: After a successful behavioral strategy against social media dependent behaviors (e.g. excessive use), users might turn back to their earlier behaviors and start to use social media with dependence.

Social media dependency has been compared to other dependency types in terms of symptoms. For example, Echeburua and de Corral (2009) found that both substantial (e.g. alcohol, or drugs) and non-substantial (e.g. gambling) dependencies have similar symptoms with social media and internet dependencies. This finding supports Griffiths (2005) work for defining dependencies and provides evidence to study social media dependency by using similar problematic behaviors in other dependency types.

Social media dependency can be related to psycho-physiological problems such as sleep disorders. Studies showed that using electronic media devices excessively could delay people's sleep and waking up times (Brunborg, et al., 2011; Suganuma, et al., 2007) and disturbance in sleeping activities can be related to negative outcomes such as poor decision making (Horne & Harrison, 2000), lowered cognitive performance and alertness (Thomas et. al. 2000). These problems in individuals' lives can be related to tolerance (spending more time) and conflict (work performance) components of social media dependency (Griffiths et al., 2014).

In addition, social media platforms can be preferred due to their social functions as well; social media users can maintain their real life social relationships or create new relationships in social media platforms (Ellison, Steinfield,& Lampe, 2007; Joinson, 2008; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008). Wan's (2009) study on social media with 335 participants showed that social media dependency had a significant positive relationship with socializing and building new relationships. Interpersonal relationship expectations to communicate on social media could be leading social media users to be online more, and as a result of this online participation expectation, some of the users could develop social media dependency.

1.2.1 Social Media Usage

With the increasing number of users in social media, these platforms have created their own population. In 2013, there were 2.5 billion internet users and 1.8 billion of them were social media users (Masters, 2015). Starting from 2005 to 2015, the number of Facebook users increased from 6 million to 1,49 billion (Facebook, 2015). Önerli (2014) states that in U.S.A. 85% of internet users had Facebook accounts, and this number was higher in Turkey with 93%. Önerli (2014) states that in U.S., 85% of internet users had Facebook accounts, and this number was higher in Turkey with 93%. Average time spend on the internet in Turkey, was 4.9 hours in a day via computers, and 1.9 hours in a day via smartphones, with 2.5 hours of this time was spent in social media. However, to the best of our knowledge, there are no statistics for other Turkish speaking countries like North Cyprus. These numbers support the claim that social media is widely used and common among internet users. As the number of social media users increase, the number of individuals who face social media dependency risks also increases.

Pew Research Center (2012) report shows that smartphone usage was more common among young users (18-29) compared to older ones (30+), with 64% rate for social media use on smartphones. In the same report, average daily time spend on social media platforms was also included by using Alexa statistics. The comparison table including the rankings and average time for each visitor in 2012 and 2015 are given below (Table 1). In the table it can be seen that Blog platforms (Tumblr, and Blogger) decreased on the ranking list but, other social media platforms maintained their positions, or got higher. This table supports Chang et al. (2014) assumption on the desire to get higher level of activity and interaction between users because; Blogs were

described as social media platforms with lower level of interaction compared to others (e.g. Facebook, or Twitter).

Table 1: Comparison table of social media platforms' global rank and Average Time Spend for Each Visitor (ATSEV) in 2012 and 2015 data based on Alexa.com statistics

Social media platform	Global Rank (2012)	Global Rank (2015)	ATSEV (seconds) (2012)	ATSEV (seconds) (2015)
Facebook	2	2	28:29	21:09
YouTube	3	3	19:35	17:53
Twitter	9	9	8:53	7:44
LinkedIn	14	14	7:02	7:26
Pinterest	36	36	8:30	6:21
Tumblr	33	43	7:53	12:23
Blogger	46	83	14:59	8:52
Instagram	84	27	2:35	4:35

Note: Alexa.com doesn't provide statistics for mobile usage.

1.2.2 Treatment

Young (1999) suggested that internet dependency cannot be treated in the same way with other dependencies because, internet has a practical value in users' lives and the complete removal of internet use couldn't be a good option. In addition to Young (1999), Echeburua and Corral (2009) found that rather than taking social media completely out of users' lives, it is better to learn about the risks and opportunities of social media and use it with guidance. As a result, it can be said that social media dependency should be approached with caution and self-control of the users should be enhanced. Young (1999) provided eight important strategies for treatment of these dependencies;

- Practicing the opposite: Dependent users' routines for weekly internet use should be learned and the timing of the internet use should be asked precisely. After learning this routine, the professional (i.e. psychologist, or psychiatrist)

should create a time table which replaces dependent person's internet use times with other activities other than using internet. The aim of this method is to create a disruption in dependent person's internet using routine, and try to make them adapt new activities (e.g., sports, or going out with friends).

- External Stoppers: In order to control individuals' time for using internet, external stoppers such as alarm clocks can be set. The alarm clock can warn individuals to log off from computers and social media, and help them to control the time which they are spending on internet.
- Setting Goals: The goal of controlling the use of internet should not be an ambiguous schedule or a statement because, users are already having problems with self-control and setting some goals with certain limits could guide them. Users should have specific, time bounded, scheduled time periods to use internet or social media. For instance, rather than saying "I will decrease the time I spend on internet", users should be able to say "I am going to start using the internet at 8:00 p.m. and log off at 10:30 p.m., on Thursdays". In this way, the decision to stop using internet has been made before using it, and it is more controllable.
- Abstinence: This strategy requires knowing the content which social media or internet users are dependent on (e.g., chat rooms, surfing on World Wide Web, or online gaming). For instance, if the person is dependent on online gaming, the online games should be removed from internet using context, and chat rooms or surfing on web should be allowed only.
- Reminder Cards: Users can write down the advantage and disadvantages of using social media to small cards, and carry them in their pockets with them. Whenever they feel they need to use social media, they can look at the cards

and remember the positive and negative effects, and they can have a better chance to control themselves.

- Personal Inventory: The dependent individuals should be asked with a personal inventory and the things they neglect to use social media (e.g., going to sports, concerts, reading books, or having a coffee with friends), should be learned according to its' importance for users. This process could help dependent individuals to have awareness on what they are missing while using social media or internet.
- Support Groups: The online relationship and loneliness in real life could be another reason for dependency. Because of this, support groups should be formed and dependent users should be guided to join these groups.
- Family Therapy: Internet users' family lives or marriages could be affected because of social media or internet dependency. In order to solve this problem, families should be educated about the dependency risks, dependent individuals shouldn't be blamed, and families should have more and better communication with new hobbies and activities.

The online risks such as chatting, shopping, surfing on the web, and pornography can be related to social media but, not every internet or social media user becomes dependent on these contents. Since not every user is becoming dependent on social media, there can be some other factors increasing the chance of social media dependency such as personality differences. Some of the factors that is important in social media and internet dependencies are online relationships, self-control, and family (Griffiths et al., 2014; Young, 1999). Accordingly, social media dependency was found to be linked with users' narcissism (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008), delay of

gratification (Caplan, 2010; Wood & Neal, 2007), and parenting styles (Floros & Siomos, 2013; Kalaitzaki & Birtchnell, 2014). These factors could be predicting a higher risk for social media dependency, and the current study tries to investigate and explain social media dependency, by looking at the relationship between these factors and social media dependency.

1.3 Parenting Style

Parenting style is the behavior set of parents including their demands, responsibilities, physical and emotional relationship, influence, directivity, trust, and behavioral shaping strategies towards their children (Baumrind, 1967). Baumrind's (1966) parenting style categorization includes three parenting styles; permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting.

1.3.1 Permissive Parenting

According to Baumrind (1966) permissive parents have fewer requests from their children than other parenting styles. They are undemanding but responsive.

Permissive parenting allows children to have their own strategy for self-regulation, and decide on their actions by themselves. Parents' punitive behaviors towards their children are at the lowest level in permissive parenting style compared to authoritarian and authoritative parenting. It can be said, permissive parenting is the least dominant parenting style among three types.

1.3.2 Authoritarian Parenting

Authoritarian parents can be perceived as the opposite of permissive parents. Baumrind (1966) stated that these parents expect high obedience for their requests from their children. Their demanding, and unresponsive characteristics differ this parenting style from others. Authoritarian parents are dominant and strict about their parental practices. These parents direct their children according to their demands.

Parents tend to show less affection and be less attached to their children. Punishment in parent-child relationship is more probable than other parenting styles.

1.3.3 Authoritative Parenting

Baumrind (1966) informed that authoritative parents were both demanding and responsive to their children. They give freedom of choice to children, and emphasize their authority in child-parent relationship, at the same time. These parents don't completely direct children, but they don't let them stay idled as well. Authoritative parents give clear directions to their children, and explain the reasons behind it. These parents are more likely to have a good communication with their children.

1.3.4 Parenting Styles and Dependencies

The literature for parenting styles and dependencies provides different relational statistics for different parenting style types, and perceived parenting styles; Kalaitzaki and Birtchnell's (2014) research on the relationship between internet dependency, parental rearing styles, and relationship with other people showed that parenting styles were indirectly linked with children's internet dependency. Shih (2004) found that parents' attitudes for their children's internet use directly affect children's internet dependency. For this reason, parenting style can be considered as an important factor for social media dependency.

Optimal parenting (protective but respectful parenting) was observed to be negatively linked to social media participation and internet dependency (Floros & Siomos, 2013). Parents' active involvement and restrictive behaviors for children's internet use was found to be negatively linked with excessive internet use of children (Kalmus, Blinka, & Ólafsson, 2013).

Another research which was conducted with parents and children reported that authoritarian parenting predicted the lowest level of internet use (Valcke, Bonte, Wever, & Rots, 2010). These studies indicate that parental practices such as authoritarian (dominant and prim) or authoritative (active authority with respect and reason) which use an active authority strategy towards children, would be negatively related to social media dependency. In addition to these, the absence of an authority figure could be related to social media dependency. Inadequate affection from parents and paucity of perceived parenting support were found to be some of the most related factors for increased internet dependency (Lin & Gau, 2013), and permissive parenting style was found to be predicting the highest level of internet use among children (Valcke et al., 2010). These additional studies support the literature for active authority practices on social media dependency because, permissive parenting (undemanding and least authoritarian parenting) doesn't use an active authority towards children.

On the other hand, there were some other studies suggesting that authority could be a risk factor for social media dependency; Yao, He, Ko, and Pang (2014) reported that rejection of father and mother, and overprotection of father were significantly related to internet dependency. Kwon, Chung, and Lee (2011) found that parental hostility had a positive relation with internet gaming dependency, and studies also suggested a positive correlation between internet dependency and parent-child conflict (Yen, Yen, Chen, Chen, & Ko, 2007). Another research which included internet dependent and non-dependent participants showed that people with internet dependency was more likely to perceive their relationships with their mothers as punitive, with inadequate emotional warmth, too much controlling, and rejecting (Xiuqin et al., 2010). The parent-child conflict can occur when parental authority and children's desires are

against each other, and this situation requires an active authority figure such as authoritarian or authoritative parents. As a result, studies showing a positive correlation between authority and social media dependency are oppositions to the studies in the previous paragraph. The previous paragraph suggested a negative relationship between authoritarian and authoritative parental practices, and social media dependency, whereas this paragraph provided the opposite; a positive relationship between active authority and social media dependency. Accordingly, the literature requires more research to clarify the relationship between social media dependency and parenting styles.

1.4 Impulsivity and Delay of Gratification

One of the most important features about dependency is people's ability to control themselves, in other words self-control because, dependent individuals have lower self-control against to the material that they are dependent on (Young, 1998). Self-control has frequently been studied in association with two other psychological concepts such as impulsivity and delay of gratification. For example, Romer, Duckworth, Sznitman, and Park (2010) used delay of gratification as an inhibitory factor against their participants' impulsivity in their study, and found that delay of gratification was more likely to inhibit impulsive behaviors. Metcalfe and Mischel (1999) also used delay of gratification as a self-regulation variable to inhibit impulse responses. This makes delay of gratification an important predictor for individuals' impulsivity which is a key factor for dependencies. Therefore, delay of gratification could be an important predictor for dependencies as well.

1.4.1 Impulsivity and General Psychopathology

Impulsivity is a set of behaviors in which people usually behave without considering the conditions in the environment, without thinking about other people's expectations,

sometimes with taking risky decisions and generally result in unwanted consequences (Moeller et. al., 2014).

Other than evaluated as a personality trait, impulsivity is also important to understand psychopathologic disorders. Impulsivity was one of the most frequently used criterion in DSM-IV to diagnose a disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Moreover, DSM-IV (American Psychiatric Association, 1994) had a special section for impulsivity, named as Impulse Control Disorders. Kleptomania, Pathologic Gambling Disorder, Intermittent Explosive Disorder, Pyromania, and Trichotillomania had been listed under this section. Other than these, impulsivity is an important predictor for substance abuse and substance related disorders. For example, Patton, and Stanford (1995) found a significant difference between substance abuser and non-abuser participants' impulsivity, participants with substance abuse had significantly higher impulsivity scores compared to participants without abuse.

1.4.2 Impulsivity and Dependencies

Young (1998), and Kuss, Griffiths, and Binder's (2013) study for adapting gambling criteria to internet dependency reported that impulsivity was an important concept for internet dependency (5th ed.; DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Young and Griffiths' suggestions have been supported by other research findings, proving that addictive disorders share similar behavioral patterns with each other (Saville, Gisbert, Kopp, & Telesco, 2010). Accordingly, a series of studies indicated that internet dependency shares same characteristics with other dependencies (Beard & Wolf, 2001; Shapira, Goldsmith, Keck, Khosla, and McElroy, 2000; Treuer, Fabian, and Füredi, 2001). Dong, Lu, Zhou, and Zhao (2010) found that participants with internet dependency were observed to have lower ability to control their impulses than

participants who were not with internet dependency. Moreover, Cao, Su, Liu, and Gao, (2007) reported that, participants with internet dependencies were more likely to show impulsive behaviors than non-dependent participants in their research. Impulsivity was also reported as a relapse predicting factor in drug use treatment (Moeller et al., 2001).

1.4.3 Delay of Gratification and Dependencies

Delay of gratification (DG) is people's ability to choose to do an unwanted (boring) task with a delayed and bigger reward against a wanted (interesting) task with a more simple immediate reward (Mischel, Ebbesen, and Zeiss, 1972).

Delay of gratification's effect on people's lives can be seen during their lifespan development. Shoda, Mischel, and Peake (1990) reported that children who could learn delay of gratification in younger ages, achieved more school and business success in the future, whereas children who didn't build a strong ability to delay their gratifications would always have problems in their future lives unless they work on this issue.

Delay of gratification is used in self-control and self-regulation literature (Demetriou 2000; Muraven and Baumeister 2000; Muraven et al. 1999), which are key factors in dependencies (National Institute of Drug Abuse, 2009). DG and social media dependency was discussed in other studies such as LaRose et. al. (2010); discussing self-regulation as a key factor for social media dependency.

LaRose et. al. (2010) focused on human habituation; and reported that as automated behaviors continue to be practiced; they could need less attention in human mind to be done, resulting with a deficiency in self-regulation ability of people. Social media

could be getting an automated behavior as it practiced more and more, and it can be requiring less attention, resulting with self-regulation problems. Accordingly, social media dependency was described as personal negative outcomes which caused by deficient self-regulation of internet use by social media users (Orbell & Verplanken, 2003; Wood & Neal, 2007), and deficient self-regulation of internet use causes individuals to experience negative outcomes which are based on internet use (Caplan, 2010; Lee, Cheung & Thadania, 2012). Kisyovska, Krönung and Eckhard (2015) claims that social media dependency can be described as a conditioned behavior with its positive outcomes for users (relaxing, getting attention, etc.) and reinforced behaviors.

1.5 Narcissism

1.5.1 Definition and Characteristics

Narcissism is a personality disorder and defined as person's overestimation of his/her self-importance, seeking for more appreciation and compliments from others (Wilson, Fornaiser, & White, 2010). Individuals with this disorder are highly concerned about their physical appearance; they seek attention from their environment, and sometimes exhibit themselves (Wilson et al., 2010). Narcissist people like to have expensive and flashy clothes, an attractive appearance with lots of preparation (Vazire, Naumann, Rentfrow, & Gosling, 2008). As narcissistic behaviors, makeup and revealing clothes were observed to be worn among females (Vazire, et. al., 2008), whereas greater authority, superiority, entitlement, and exploiting behaviors were observed among males (Foster, Campbell, & Twenge, 2003). Due to narcissistic people's lack of understanding for empathy, they can't show the same applauding behaviors for other people (5th ed.; DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

1.5.2 Narcissism and Social Media

Social media allows users to share things that they want to show and hide the ones that they don't want to show to other users (Hopkins, 2008). With social media's functions to reach larger audiences and users' ability to express themselves, social media is a suitable place for narcissistic people, and narcissism is predictable with higher social media use (Rosen, Whaling, Rab, Carrier, & Cheever, 2013). Also, with social media's immediate reaction and notification systems, users can interact with others faster and achieve their goals easier (Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, & Bushman, 2008). As an important part of narcissism, self-presentation and media attention on social media are found to be linked to narcissistic personality traits (Ong et. al., 2011).

According to Buffardi and Campbell (2008), social media is a suitable online platform for narcissistic users by providing them absolute control on their observable profile to others. This makes it perfect for the users who are anxious about their appearance. Therefore, narcissistic users seem to have more friends, wall posts, and share physically exhibitionist photos more than non- narcissistic users. These behaviors are supported (reinforced) when they get more interaction (likes, comments, and shares) for their posts.

Bibly (2008) also found that narcissistic users tend to be more preoccupied for Facebook. Bibly (2008) stressed that, because of the way that social media works, narcissistic users interact with others in social media for more romantic reasons and enjoy to exhibit in their personal profiles.. In addition, narcissistic social media users prefer more attractive and self-promoting photos for their social media profiles to get more interaction and to be seen by others more (Ong et al., 2011). Mehdizadeh's

(2010) study found that higher narcissism and was related to higher online activity. These studies suggest a positive correlation between narcissism and social media dependency, indicating that if the narcissism level is higher, the social media usage would be higher as well.

Narcissistic social media rewards can be achieved on Twitter by tweeting (posts with short texts) while Facebook's other features (longer posts, notes, videos, games, etc.) give users to achieve more narcissistic outcomes according to their needs (Davenport, Bergman, Bergman, Fearrington, 2014). McKinney, Kelly, and Duran (2012) reports that Twitter can be used more for narcissistic people because there is a significant relationship between people's narcissistic traits and the number of tweets they post. Also, narcissistic and non-narcissistic individuals' behaviors in the social media may show similarities but their motivations show differences; for example it was found that narcissistic users were more likely to share self-focused pictures and they tended to believe that other social media users were always interested about their lives and updates. (Bergman, Fearrington, Davenport, & Bergman, 2011). Since the content of social media is created by users, it also gives chance to users to become famous in social media by getting as much as online followers. The desire to become famous or have fame is linked with narcissism (Greenwood, Long, & Dal Cin, 2013; Maltby, 2010). Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky (2010) showed that social media users with narcissistic personality traits tried to reach maximum number of friends in their social media profiles. The desire to become famous could be another reason for users to become dependent on social media.

1.6 Ecological Systems Theory

Ecological systems theory was pioneered by Bronfenbrenner (1977), to show the importance of humans' relationship with their environment during their lifespan development. The system takes insemination as the starting point and studies development with connected environment systems around the person as microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem.

Microsystem includes the closest, active relationships of developing children with particular people in particular environments such as parents, school, or neighbors. Bronfenbrenner (1977) states that the interaction styles, reinforcements, and response rate of people in the microsystem environment are essential behaviors to the developing individual. These behaviors were also studied in Baumrind's (1966) parenting styles, and they were considered as important practices which related to child development. Mesosystem, refers to the interactions among developing children's microsystems' (e.g., the relationship between parents and school teachers). Exosystem includes formal and informal constructs which don't contain developing children actively but still can be affective on them (e.g., mass media, neighborhood, and government agencies). Families are surrounded by media devices at homes, a developing individual (2-17 years old) spends 6 hours in a day with media such as televisions, videotapes, videogames, and computers (Schmitt, 2000). Jordan's (1990) review of developmental and media studies with Ecological Systems Theory stated that heavy media exposure and spending more time with media could have negative consequences for development process. Macrosystem consists of the institutional culture constructs such as government policies, religion, and socioeconomic level. The

last system is chronosystem, referres to major life events (e.g., natural disasters, parents' death, or divorce).

1.7 Current Study

Social media dependency was studied with Turkish speaking sample before (Cam & İsbulan, 2012; Koc & Gulyagci, 2013; Tosun, 2012; Uysal et. al., 2013). In addition, social media dependency's relationship with delay of gratification, parenting styles, and narcissism were also studied in different cultures, as the literature shows. However, there were no studies conducted with Turkish speaking sample, looking at social media dependency's relationship with delay of gratification, narcissism, and perceived parenting style. The current study aims to look at these relationships and tries to find if the previous study results in the literature regarding these variables are applicable to Turkish speaking sample, or not. It is hypothesized that;

- 1) Higher scores in permissive parenting style will predict higher scores in social media dependency
- 2) Higher scores in authoritative parenting style will predict lower scores in social media dependency
- 3) Higher scores in authoritarian parenting style will predict higher scores in social media dependency.
- 4) Delaying gratification will be negatively related to social media dependency.
- 5) Narcissism will be positively related with social media dependency.

Chapter 2

METHODS

2.1 Participants

Current study was conducted with 298 participants; 152 (51%) of them were women and 146 (49%) were men. Age range was 18-40 ($M=23.76$, $SD=4.79$). One hundred and fifty-three of them participated via online surveys on social media, and 145 participants were recruited from Eastern Mediterranean University's Psychology Department and Faculty of Engineering. Most of the participants' (90,7%) education level was undergraduate degree or higher.

In order to have a more homogenous sample Turkish speaking participants were targeted, and only Turkish speaking participants were asked to participate to the study. Since the study is not targeting the nationality differences and comparisons, participants' nationality was not questioned in the questionnaires.

2.2 Materials

Participants were asked to fill a short demographic questionnaire, Generalized Problematic Internet Use Scale (GPIUS), Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ), Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI-16), and Delaying Gratification Inventory (DGI). Because Turkish speaking participants were recruited for the study as mentioned before, GPIUS, PAQ, NPI-16 and DGI scales were translated into Turkish language by researchers, and back translation was done by Eastern Mediterranean University's official web page translator... Parallel to the aims of the research, None

of the scales had cut off points and none of the participants were categorized such as social media dependents, or narcissistic participants. Consequently, analyses were conducted with participants' continuous scores on the scales.

2.2.1 Demographics

In this section, participants were asked to fill questions regarding their age, gender, education level, and relationship status. Because the study focuses on the social media use in general, no question was asked about specific social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter etc.

2.2.2 Generalized Problematic Internet Use Scale (GPIUS) - Modified for Social Media Use

Generalized Problematic Internet Use Scale (GPIUS) was developed and validated by Caplan (2002), to measure the behavior of problematic internet use. The scale has 7 sub-scales to assess problematic internet use behaviors. These are mood alteration (e.g., "I have used the internet to talk with others when I was feeling isolated"), social benefits (e.g., "I am treated better in my online relationships than in my face-to-face relationships"), negative outcomes (e.g., "I have gotten into trouble with my employer or school because of being online"), compulsive use (e.g., "I want to or have made unsuccessful efforts to, cut down or control my use of the internet"), excessive time online (e.g., "I lose track of time when I am online"), withdrawal (e.g., "I miss being online if I can't get on it") and social control (e.g., "when I am online, I socialize with other people without worrying about how I look"). The scale has 29 items and participants response ranging from 1 (I totally agree) to 5 (I totally disagree) to the statements (items) in the scale. Higher scores indicate higher problematic social media use behaviors. Current study focuses social media dependency score as a whole, rather than subscale differentiation. Because of this, a total score was used instead of sub-

scores. In order to be able to assess social media use behaviors with GPIUS, researchers reworded the items (e.g., “I want to or have made unsuccessful efforts to, cut down or control my use of social media”) with the approval of the author of the original scale. Internal consistency was high (Crobach’s Alpha =.91).

2.2.3 Parental Authority Questionnaire

Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) was developed and validated by Buri (1991) to assess participants’ perceived parenting style. It included 30 items for both mother and father separately. The items were same in both versions. The only difference between father and mother questionnaire were the words “father” and “mother”. Participants gave answers ranging from 1 (I totally agree) to 5 (I totally disagree) to the statements (items) in the scale, assessing perceived parental permissiveness, authoritarianism, and authoritativeness.

In this study, rather than questioning mother and father separately, the items were united as “parents” and the number of items was reduced to 30. The first reason behind this is the risk of some participants’ loss of their parents. In the scenario of loss of a parent, research could make participant feel uncomfortable. Also, one of the ways to gather data was to conduct research with online survey services. Accordingly, scales had to be as short as possible to lower the risk of participants’ attention loss for research. In order to eliminate these potential problems, the questionnaire was given as a combined survey. The higher score in the scale refers to an elevation in the given parenting styles.

2.2.4 Delaying Gratification Inventory (DGI)

The scale was developed by Hoerger, Quirk, and Weed (2011) to assess participants’ ability to delay their gratifications. It has 35 items about participants’ delay of gratification behaviors. The scale has 5 sub-scales. These are food (e.g., “It is easy for

me to resist candy and bowls of snack foods”), physical (e.g., “I have given up physical pleasure or comfort to reach my goals), social (e.g., “I try to consider how my actions will affect other people in the long-term”), money (e.g., “I try to spend my money wisely”), and achievement (e.g., “I have always felt like my hard work would pay off in the end”). Participants give answers ranging from 1 (I totally agree) to 5 (I totally disagree) to the statements (items) in the scale. The higher score in the scale means higher delay of gratification. Parallel to the aims of the study, a total score of delay of gratification score was used. Internal consistency was .83.

2.2.5 Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI-16)

The original scale, NPI-40 (which included 40 items), was developed by Raskin and Terry (1998) to assess participants’ narcissistic traits. It was shortened to 16 items and validated by Ames, Rose, and Anderson (2006). In the scale, participants chose the statements which fits them most and the overall score for each participant was used. Since the items has two options to choose, responses which given by participants to items can be scored as 1 or 2 in SPSS. Internal consistency was .66.

2.3 Procedure

The ethical approval was obtained from Eastern Mediterranean University Psychology Department Ethics and Research Committee. Opportunistic and convenient sampling methods were used to recruit participants. Research was conducted in both online and offline settings. Typeform (online survey website) was used to create online survey. After forming of the survey on Typeform, social media was used for distribution of the survey for the online part of the research. Average time for completing the online survey was 28 minutes. In total, 681 internet users visited the online survey page on Typeform, but only 171 (25%) of them completed the survey and included to analyses as participants. Offline (i.e. paper and pencil) data collection was conducted in

Department of Psychology and Faculty of Engineering classrooms, at Eastern Mediterranean University. 160 surveys were distributed as offline surveys and 145 of them were completed by participants with 91% response rate. The general response rate to online and offline surveys was 52,5%.

Participants were briefly informed about the study before their participation. Participants were told that their participation was voluntary and they were free to leave any time they wanted, without any explanation needed. Researchers also made sure that participants might ask questions about research if they needed more information. Consent forms were given to participants and research started after completion of consent forms. It took almost 30 minutes for participants to finish the survey. After participants finish the survey, researcher gave debrief form about the current study. Debriefing procedure also included recommendations for visiting a professional for consultation, if participants feel the need for help in their lives about the research topics.

The same procedure was also applied to online surveys. Online survey opened with the consent form. Participants needed to click “start” button to see survey items and start research. After they finish the survey, debriefing form was presented to them and same recommendations were offered. Also, researchers gave their personal contact information in the consent form and debriefing form, in case if participants needed more information.

Average time for completing the online survey was 28 minutes. In total, 681 internet users visited the online survey page on Typeform via smartphones (339 visitors),

desktop and laptop computers (304 visitors), and tablet computers (18 visitors). 25% of the visitors completed the survey and included to analyses as participants. 108 of the responses came from participants with desktop and laptop computers, 56 participants used smartphones, and 4 participants used tablet computers to complete the survey.

On the other hand, 160 surveys were disturbed as offline surveys and 145 of them were completed by participants with 91% response rate. 65 participants were recruited from Department of Psychology and 80 participants were recruited from the Faculty of Engineering. In general, online and offline surveys were presented to 841 people and 316 of them participated to the study with a response rate of 37%.

The comparison table for online and offline participants scores can be seen with Cronbach's alpha values in Table 2. The scores between online and offline surveys were consistent with each other and they were entered into further analysis together as one sample.

Table 2: Mean score and Cronbach's Alpha comparisons of Online and Offline participants

Variable	Online Participants		Offline Participants	
	M (<i>SD</i>)	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	M (<i>SD</i>)	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
Social Media Dependency	2.57 (.60)	.92	2.49 (.62)	.92
Delay of Gratification	3.45 (.40)	.84	3.63 (.41)	.83
Narcissistic Personality	1.46 (.18)	.66	1.63 (.20)	.66
Permissive Parenting	2.92 (.53)	.66	3.15 (.51)	.64
Authoritarian Parenting	3.16 (.80)	.87	2.77 (.51)	.76
Authoritative Parenting	3.35 (.77)	.89	3.63 (.68)	.81

Chapter 3

RESULTS

IBM SPSS 20th version was used in the study for data analysis, and assumptions of homogeneity of variance and normality were completed for each scale. In addition, participants who have more than +3/-3 z-score was also excluded from the analysis, resulting with eighteen excluded participants at total and further analyses were completed with 298 participants. Correlation and hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted on the data entered into SPSS. Correlation coefficients were measured to see the associations among the variables for further analysis. Hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to find the potential predictors of social media dependency.

3.1 Descriptive Statistics

The mean scores and standard deviations of age, social media dependency, delay of gratification, narcissism, and parenting styles can be seen in Table 3. For analysis and descriptive statistics, social media dependency, delay of gratification, narcissism, and perceived parenting style scores are evaluated as total scores of scale items.

Table 3: Mean numbers of all variables for study sample (with standard deviations)

Variables	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Age	23.76	4.79
Social Media Dependency	2.55	0.63
Delay of Gratification	3.55	0.44
Narcissism	1.53	0.17
Permissive Parenting	3.06	0.55
Authoritarian Parenting	2.82	0.74
Authoritative Parenting	3.48	0.76

3.2 Factor Analysis of Parental Authority Questionnaire

The 30 items of the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) were subjected to Principle Component Analysis (PCA). Prior to performing PCA the suitability of the data for Factor Analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed that majority of the coefficients were .30 and above. The KMO value was .88 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance, supporting factorability of the data ($p=.00$).

PCA revealed the presence of 3 components with eigenvalues exceeding 1. These components explained 28.68%, 10.97%, and 5.84% of the variance respectively. An inspection of the scree plot revealed a clear break after the third component.

The three components solution explained the total of 45.39% of the variance.. For the interpretation of these 3 components, oblimin rotation was performed. The rotated solution revealed that 3 components were consistent with previous research on the PAQ, with Permissive Parenting item numbers 1, 6, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21 24, and 28 loading strongly on component 1, Authoritarian Parenting item numbers 2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 16,18, 25, 26, and 29 strongly loading on component 2, and Authoritative Parenting items 3, 5, 8, 11, 15, 20, 22, 23, 27, and 30 strongly loading on component 3.

The Cronbach alpha value for total items of PAQ was .61. The internal consistencies were .64, .83 and .87 for permissive, authoritarian and authoritative parenting subscales respectively.

3.3 Correlational Analyses

Before further analyses, a simple correlation analysis was conducted to see the associations among variables.. Correlation coefficients of variables can be seen in Table 4. As key findings, the correlational coefficients indicated that social media dependency was significantly correlated with delay of gratification ($r=-0.34, p=0.00$) and authoritarian parenting style ($r=0.27, p=0.00$).

Table 4: Correlation coefficients values (Pearson) of the variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Social media dependency	-							
2. Age	-,058	-						
3. Gender	,053	-,033	-					
4. Permissive Parenting	,005	-,117*	-,134*	-				
5. Authoritarian Parenting	,274**	,051	,101	-,250**	-			
6. Authoritative Parenting	-,022	-,115*	-,110	,651**	-,400**	-		
7. Narcissism	,090	-,113	,074	,046	,074	,122*	-	
8. Delay of Gratification	-,336**	,071	-,018	,189**	-,117*	,234**	,145*	-

Note: *. Correlation is significant at 0.05 level

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

3.4 Regression Analysis on Social Media Dependency

A three step hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with social media dependency as the dependent variable. Age and gender was entered at the first step of the regression as control measures. Perceived parenting styles (permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative) were entered at step two. Delay of gratification and narcissism were entered at step three. Variables in step two and three were entered in different stages for a better evaluation of their separated relationship with dependent variable.

The results showed that at step one, age and gender didn't have a significant contribution to the regression model, $F(2,292) = .754, p > 0.05$ and accounted for 1% of the variation in social media dependency. Perceived parenting style variables explained an additional 8% of variation in social media dependency and this change in R^2 was significant, $F(3,289) = 8.22, p = 0.00$. Authoritarian parenting ($\beta = .30, p = 0.00$) significantly predicted social media dependency. Whereas permissive parenting ($\beta = .04, p > 0.05$), and authoritative parenting ($\beta = .06, p > 0.05$) didn't reach to a significant value for predicting social media dependency. In the third and final step, adding narcissism and delay of gratification to the regression model explained an additional 11% of the variation in social media dependency and this change in R^2 was significant, $F(2,287) = 19.26, p = 0.00$. In the final model, two of the variables significantly predicted social media dependency; authoritarian parenting ($\beta = .29, p = 0.00$) and delay of gratification ($\beta = -.34, p = 0.00$). Together all the variables accounted for 19% of the variance in social media dependency. Detailed information on regression analysis is present in Table 5.

Table 5: Hierarchical multiple regression on social media dependency

Variables	R²	ΔR²	B	SEb	β
Step1	.006	.006			
Age			-.01	.01	-.06
Gender			.06	.07	0.05
Step2	.09	.084			
Age			-.01	.01	-.06
Gender			.04	.07	.03
Permissive Parenting			.03	.08	.03
Authoritarian Parenting			.26	.05	.31**
Authoritative Parenting			.07	.06	-.08
Step3	.199	.109			
Age			-.00	.01	-.02
Gender			.05	.07	.04
Permissive Parenting			.06	.08	.05
Authoritarian Parenting			.26	.05	.30**
Authoritative Parenting			.12	.06	.15*
Narcissism			.02	.19	.01
Delay of Gratification			-.49	.08	-.34**

Note: * $p=0.05$

** $p<0.01$

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

4.1. Social Media Dependency and Parenting Styles

The first hypothesis stating that higher scores in authoritative parenting style would predict lower scores in social media dependency was not supported. Authoritative parenting style (democratic, guiding, responsive, openly communicating) score was found to be a significant positive predictor of social media dependency, indicating that the increased practice of authoritative parenting was related to higher social media dependency levels.

The second hypothesis for parenting style scores stated that higher scores in authoritarian parenting style would predict higher scores in social media dependency, and it was supported. Authoritarian parenting style (most dominant, punitive, and unresponsive) score was a significant positive predictor for social media dependency; Parental practices which perceived as dominant, strict, and restrictive by participants were significantly related to higher social media dependency levels.

The last hypothesis stating that higher scores in permissive parenting style would predict higher scores in social media dependency was not supported as well. There was not a significant relationship between permissive parenting style (least dominant and undemanding) scores and social media dependency levels. The result pointed that social media dependency level was not related to parents' perceived permissive

parenting practices such as giving chance to children for making decisions, not leading them to a direction, not restricting them, or not showing parental authority to them.

In the first chapter (Introduction), it can be seen that literature on the relationship between parenting styles and social media dependency were separated as two groups. Hypotheses regarding the relationship of perceived parental authority scores and social media dependency levels were partially consistent with the literature.

The first group of previous studies reported that an active authority practice (authoritative and authoritarian parenting) would be predicting lower social media dependency, and the absence of authority figure (permissive parenting) would predict higher social media dependency (Floros & Siomos, 2013; Kalmus et al., 2013; Lin & Gau, 2013; Valcke et al., 2010). The current study results were not consistent with any of these studies; authoritative and authoritarian parenting style scores predicted higher levels of social media dependency, and permissive parenting style scores had no relationship with participants' social media dependency scores.

The second group of previous researches found that parental practices with an active authority (authoritarian and authoritative) could be related to higher social media dependency levels (Kwon et al., 2011; Xiuqin et al., 2010; Yao et al., 2014; Yen et al., 2007). As previous studies foresaw, current study results were consistent with these studies; authoritarian and authoritative parenting style scores were significant positive predictors for social media dependency.

The current study results for authoritarian parenting style scores were expected because the literature on parenting styles frequently indicates that authoritarian

parents are strict and dominant (Rudy & Grusec, 2001), they are giving directions to their children and expect children to follow it without discussion (Kelley, Power, & Wimbush, 1992). This could be leading to a behavioral pattern in children, making them less autonomous as individuals, more dependent to the authority figure, and giving them less chance to gain their own experiences. In addition, authoritative parenting also works as an active authority figure and expects children to follow parental guidelines, which could also be related to less autonomous, authority directed individuals. However, social media is a more independent environment than offline life; users can easily access and use it as they wish. In an environment like this, a user could have difficulties if he/she is not used to be an autonomous person. They could use social media in a risky way, but wouldn't notice it in the absence of adequate experience and information. In the end, they could face social media dependency, with the lack of knowledge for using social media. On the other hand, users with permissive parents could get used to make their own decisions in a non-restrictive environment, they could be growing in an environment where they could learn to evaluate situations and make decisions themselves. Because of this, the individuals with permissive parents could be more eligible to use social media with their more experienced background, compared to users who were grown with authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles.

Also, the literature on parental mediation can give some hints for the positive relationship between authoritative parenting style scores and social media dependency. One of the parental mediation styles is active mediation which includes higher involvement into the relationship between the child and the media. It is well known that active mediation can be a practice of authoritative parenting style (Atkin, Greenberg, & Baldwin, 2006). Whether active mediation can be a protective factor

for online risks which include social media dependency (Mesch, 2009), some studies indicated a positive relationship between active mediation and online risks (ex: Garmedia, Garitaonandia, Martinez, & Casado, 2012). This link is defined as co-evolution of parental mediation and online risk (i.e. When the children experience online risks, the parents try to learn more about internet to reduce the risk). In other words, when social media dependency among children become more visible, the parents could develop active mediation strategies which was included under the umbrella of authoritative parenting style.

The findings of the current study should be interpreted with caution, literature findings (Kwon et al., 2011; Xiuqin et al., 2010; Yao et al., 2014; Yen et al., 2007) and results of the current study indicates that parenting styles with an active authority figure such as authoritarian and authoritative are risk factors for higher levels of social media dependency. On the other hand, parenting styles with children freedom such as permissive parenting appears to be having no relationship with social media dependency. These results could give some hints to parents for administering children's social media use; parents shouldn't be an authority figure which is restrictive, and punitive towards children's social media use because this could result with a conflict between parents and children, resulting with higher levels of social media use (Yen et al, 2007). Instead of focusing to decrease the social media use of children directly by limiting and restricting it, parents can try to introduce their children to new activities and hobbies as Young (1999) suggested as a treatment step. Introducing children to new hobbies and giving them new things to be interested in can give the feeling of control to the children and help parents to avoid parent-child conflict.

4.2. Social Media Dependency and Delay of Gratification

The hypothesis which stated that delaying gratification would be negatively related to social media dependency was supported. It was found that higher delay of gratification level significantly predicted lower social media dependency. The results were consistent with previous literature which indicates a negative correlation between delay of gratification and social media dependency (Demetriou 2000; LaRose et al., 2010; Muraven & Baumeister 2000; Muraven et al. 1999). This relationship between delay of gratification and social media can be explained in various ways. First aspect for the relationship between delay of gratification and social media dependency is social media itself. Delay of gratification is a key concept for social media dependency as previous and current study results suggest (e.g. LaRose et al., 2010). In the current study, GPIUS (Generalized Problematic Internet Use Scale) included items for participants' desires to check the updates on social media, and the real life problems caused by social media. In line with this, social media users' account checking and sharing (photographs, text, video, etc.) behaviors are related to delay of gratification negatively because users want to check their accounts and see what the new shared things on social media are. However, users have many things to do in their daily lives other than checking social media and this can create a conflict between daily duties and the desire of spending time on social media. When this conflict comes up, there are two ways to go for social media users; checking social media at that moment, or continue to do whatever they are doing and check social media after they finish their jobs. Delay of gratification becomes an important factor at this step; users with lower ability to delay their gratification can check their social media account immediately, and lose focus of their job. On the other hand, users who have higher ability of delaying their gratifications can continue to do their duties and check social media after they

finish their job. Of course, there is a chance for social media users are working for social media companies and the social media usage could be relating no conflict for their lives. However, a good counter-argument for this can be seen with Facebook's user and employee numbers; Facebook has 1,49 billion users and only 10,995 employees with a user/employee rate of less than one percent (Facebook Newsroom, 2015), the chance of working for a social media company becomes a really rare occasion and can't be generalized.

The second aspect is social media's stimulators around users. In social media platforms, there are many algorithms that monitor users' behaviors to change social media news accordingly, and make them as attractive as possible for the users. Social media platforms' creators are aware of the fact that these platforms can only exist with user interaction, and letting users stay away from social media would have negative effects on social media companies. In order not to lose company value, these companies (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, etc.) send notifications to their users to keep them connected. Unless users disable these notifications or disconnect from the internet, they keep getting them. This could be a risk factor for users with higher levels of social media dependency; in the delaying gratification process, focusing on the reward is a factor that lowers delay of gratification (Peake, Mischel, & Hebl, 2002), and if the interaction and notifications on social media is a gratifying feeling for users, their delay of gratification can be negatively affected. In this step, delay of gratification becomes important because social media users' determination on not using social media requires resistance against the desire to check social media.

Third aspect of social media dependency and delay of gratification relationship can be procrastination. Procrastination is the behavior of delaying an unwanted, boring task

such as studying for a hard test as much as possible by choosing to do a funnier, wanted task (Neenan, 2008). Social media and delay of gratification can step in at this point because social media is very easy to reach; users can reach their social media accounts in seconds, as long as they have internet connection. Butt and Phillips (2008) reports that some internet users prefer to avoid social media use because it creates an easy way for procrastination and making them delay their tasks. When individuals want to procrastinate a task, social media can offer a fast and easy escape with its easy accessibility. Social media and delay of gratification relationship can have a role in this because users' procrastination behavior can be controlled or inhibited with their ability of delaying gratification. This aspect can look similar to first aspect of delay of gratification but, in the first aspect checking social media was the motivation itself. In this aspect, checking social media is covered as the behavioral outcome and procrastination as the motivation to check social media. This aspect covers social media as a construct, not the content itself because procrastination behavior can be performed with or without social media use.

Last aspect of delay of gratification and social media could be the desire to learn new information by reaching endless resources on social media such as documentaries, books, and articles. There are many informational things to learn on social media and this information is beyond of any social media users' limit to follow. For instance, 300 hours of video is uploaded to YouTube for every one minute (YouTube, 2015) and with this ratio and speed, no human can learn 'everything' on social media. Because of this, social media is like a river of information; some users can try to catch and learn as much as they can but they will never be catching the actual information ratio on social media. Since learning new things and challenging their minds with new information is important for these users, it can be said that this is a behavior that

gratifies them. If these individuals have lower ability to delay their gratifications, they can have big problems because the information on the internet never ceases to change. This could be another link between delay of gratification and social media dependency.

4.3. Social Media Dependency and Narcissism

It was hypothesized that narcissism would be positively related with social media dependency. This hypothesis was not supported; narcissism was not a significant predictor of social media dependency. Participants' narcissism scores was not related to their social media dependency levels, and this finding was not consistent with previous literature (Bibly, 2008; Buffardi & Campbell, 2008; Mehdizadeh, 2010). Previous studies suggested a high level of relationship between narcissism and social media dependency but, current study results didn't find the same relationship.

One explanation for this result could be the statistical evaluation of narcissism scale. When a behavior is studied to understand if it is a disorder or not, participants who are out of the normal score range distribution are taken to the consideration. In other words, for a behavior to be perceived as problematic, that behavior should not be observed in larger groups in the research; if it does, this means that behavior has become a usual thing between participants. The current study results for narcissism scores and its standard deviation refers to a homogeneous distribution, indicating that most of the scores were fallen to normal range. This information is particularly important to understand because if participants' narcissism scale scores are similar to each other, their statistical evaluation wouldn't give any significant difference in terms of narcissism. Because of this, behavioral labels and limits could blend into each other, and shift from a disorder's spectrum to "normal" range. For instance, some behaviors can be narcissistic such as "selfie" photographs, but become normal after most of the

people start doing it. With this distribution situation, narcissistic behaviors related to social media use could be hard to detect statistically.

Another reason could be the differentiation of behaviors in social media and real life. Narcissistic personality inventory was not designed for social media use behaviors and the items on the inventory refer to participants' perceptions of their behaviors in real life. There are items such as "I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so". The questioned behaviors in this item may not be observable in social media; a user can share photos, videos, or thoughts with narcissistic motivations but, if no one likes or comments on their shared posts, this means no one is telling them how good they are. Narcissistic personality inventory items can be not applicable at some steps for social media usage.

4.4. Limitations

The difference between literature and current study results regarding narcissism and social media dependency findings can be the methodology differences. Current study used NPI-16, with Turkish speaking participants, and social media dependency was evaluated with GPIUS. However, Bibly (2008) used NPI-40 to evaluate participants' narcissism, his participants were English speaking university students, and social media use was evaluated with a newly developed social media use scale. Buffardi & Campbell (2008) used NPI-40 as well, and they monitored social media use by evaluating participants' Facebook page information (number of friends, number of wall posts, number of joined groups, the text length of the about me section). Mehdizadeh (2010) used NPI-16 like the current study but, the social media usage was evaluated with a method similar to Buffardi & Campbell (2008) researchers rated participants' social media use by monitoring their Facebook (About me section, Profile photo, the last 20

shared pictures, notes, and status updates). It can be seen that there are methodology differences between current and previous studies in terms of participants, materials, and the way to evaluate social media use. Also, Narcissistic Personality Inventory's item ratings can be a limitation; participants read one item and choose between two choices for the item, resulting with giving 1 or 2 points for each item in the statistics. This can affect standard deviation and can cause statistical insignificance for study results. Because of this, a likert scale with rating from 1 to 5 could be a better option.

Most of the participants were university students. Different people from different backgrounds can have different social media using behaviors. Because of this, the results of the study can be generalized to similar samples. A more representative sample would include equal number of participants from different educational backgrounds to be able to evaluate educational difference in social media dependency.

Lastly, the study was based on self-reports in the questionnaires. This method always has an inevitable limitation; participants can answer questions with socially desirable answers rather than their real thoughts. This limitation becomes more important while using a self-report survey for narcissism as a relatively negative concept. With their lack of empathy (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), it is possible that they perceive their behaviors different than their actual behaviors. This could affect their perception of themselves.

4.5. Suggestions for Future Studies

In the future studies, narcissism should be studied in detail with included social media aspects. Current study findings were not consistent with literature of narcissism and social media use. However, more detailed surveys with up-to-date items should be

developed for these studies. It is important to find out and separate if people's real life narcissistic behaviors are different than their narcissistic behaviors on social media.

The literature especially on delay of gratification, and perceived parenting styles are mostly based on children – parent studies. There was very little information in the literature regarding these two variables with adult studies. Even though these variables were evaluated in the current study with adults, the discussion can barely go over being simple assumptions because there is no literature to support the implications for adults. This limits the implications of the current study with children-parent relationship aspects and creates an inconsistency with result and discussion sections. The research trend that sees social media, internet, or internet gaming dependency as clinical disorders should be changed. The researches on these matters should see these dependencies as a process rather than a consequence. If studies start to see these dependencies from a developmental view, longitudinal studies can be done, and different variables can be evaluated to predict these dependencies.

Another investigated thing about social media dependency is the behavior of checking social media. It is important to define a time interval and a daily limit to check social media to understand when users feel the need to check it and how this affects their daily lives. However, the preoccupation (thinking social media before checking it) is another factor in this matter because; users can be interrupted from daily duties with the idea of checking social media, without actually checking it physically. Because of this, instead of looking at the times users actually check social media, looking at how many times a person thinks to check social media in a day could be a better option.

Psychologists and researchers who work on social media dependency should develop new techniques for their research processes. The social media concept changes and develops so fast that literature can't follow these new developments. For instance, a smartphone application can go viral and downloaded by many people on social media in one month. In order to psychologists to study this topic, the behavior should be observed, the tools to assess these behaviors should be created, their reliability and consistency should be rated, and testing-retesting process should be covered. This means in order to assess a 1 month old behavior on social media, psychologists should be working a couple of months. In this time period many thing could happen, and the behavior could change. Maybe the application that creates the specific behavior can be deleted. Before researchers finish the study, the topic could become insignificant. Because of this, psychologists should define a new way to research social media dependency. Rather than focusing on social media platforms' usage level and personality differences in those platforms, researchers can focus on social media platforms' features such as sharing photos, videos, or chatting with other users. Psychologists can conduct research with different individuals in different personality types (e.g. individuals with narcissism, low self-esteem, low self-efficacy, social anxiety, etc.) and try to match which social media features suits the different personality types most. For instance, individuals with lower self-esteem could like social media for chatting with other users, or individuals with narcissism could like the feature of sharing photographs on social media; in this way, psychologists could which personality types likes which function of social media. This could give the time advantage because researchers can look at a social media platform's features and can predict potential users who are at risk.

4.6. Conclusion

The current study examined the relationship of social media dependency in terms of perceived parenting styles, delay of gratification, and narcissism; results showed that parenting styles which include active authority figures such as authoritative and authoritarian, were found to be positively linked to higher levels of social media dependency. In addition, a lower level in delay of gratification was linked to higher social media dependency as well. On the other hand, narcissism had no relationship with social media dependency.

Overall findings for parenting styles indicated that restrictive and dominant behaviors could result with higher levels of social media dependency. Because of this, parents should avoid parent-child conflict situations, and try to give freedom of choice to children by introducing them to new activities other than social media usage. Findings for delay of gratification was similar to previous studies and indicated that delay of gratification is a key concept for social media dependency, and should be enhanced by social media users to avoid the risk of social media dependency.

REFERENCES

Alexa (2015). About Us. *Alexa.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.alexacom/about>

Alexa (2015). The top 500 sites on the web. *Alexa.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.alexacom/topsites>

Alvarez, A. (2013). What Is This "Harlem Shake" Thing Anyway. *ABC News*.
www.abcnews.go.com

American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 4th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 5th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association, 553-557.

Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(4), 440-450.

Amichai-Hamburger, Y., & Vinitzky, G. (2010). Social Network Use and Personality. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(6), 1289-1295.

Atkin, D. J., Greenberg, B. S., & Baldwin, T. F. (2006). The home ecology of children's television viewing: Parental mediation and the new video environment. *Journal of Communication*, 41, 40-52.

- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development* 37(4), 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75(1), 43-88.
- Beard, K. W., & Wolf, E. M. (2001). Modification in the proposed diagnostic criteria for Internet addiction. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 4(3), 377-383.
- Benson, V., Filippaios, F., & Morgan, S. (2010). Online social networks: Changing the face of business education and career planning. *International Journal of E-Business Management*, 4(1), 20.
- Bergman, S. M., Fearington, M. E., Davenport, S. W., & Bergman, J. Z. (2011). Millennials, narcissism, and social networking: What narcissists do on social networking sites and why. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(5), 706-711.
- Bibly, P. A. (2008). Dispositional factors in the use of social networking sites: Findings and implications for social computing research. *Intelligence and Security Informatics Conference*, 392-400. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-69304-8_40
- Blogger (2015). Blogger Content Policy. *Blogger.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.blogger.com/content.g?hl=en>

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward An Experimental Ecology Of Human Development. *American Psychologist*, 32(7), 513.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1992). Ecological systems theory. *Jessica Kingsley Publishers*.
- Brunborg, G. S., Mentzoni, R. A., Molde, H., Myrseth, H., Skouverøe, K. J. M., Bjorvatn, B., & Pallesen, S. (2011). The relationship between media use in the bedroom, sleep habits and symptoms of insomnia. *Journal of Sleep Research*, 20(4), 569-575. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2869.2011.00913.x
- Buffardi, L. E., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Narcissism and social networking web sites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(10), 1303-1314. DOI: 10.1177/0146167208320061
- Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57(1), 110-119.
- Cam, E., & Isbulan, O. (2012). A New Addiction for Teacher Candidates: Social Networks. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 11(3), 14-19.
- Cao, F., Su, L., Liu, T., & Gao, X. (2007). The relationship between impulsivity and Internet addiction in a sample of Chinese adolescents. *European Psychiatry*, 22(7), 466-471.
- Caplan, S. E. (2010). Theory and measurement of generalized problematic Internet use: A two-step approach. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), 1089-1097.

- Caplan, S. E. (2002). Problematic Internet use and psychosocial well-being: development of a theory-based cognitive-behavioral measurement instrument. *Computers in Human Behavior, 18*, 553-575.
- Chang, Y., Tang, L., Inagaki, Y., & Liu, Y. (2014). What is tumblr: A statistical overview and comparison. *SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter, 16*(1), 21-29.
- CNNTurk (2013). Facebook'ta çeyrek trilyon fotoğraf. *Cnnturk.com*
- Cohen, E. (2009). Five clues that you are addicted to Facebook. *CNN Health*.
- Davenport, S. W., Bergman, S. M., Bergman, J. Z., & Ferrington, M. E. (2014). Twitter versus Facebook: Exploring the role of narcissism in the motives and usage of different social media platforms. *Computers in Human Behavior, 32*, 212-220. DOI:10.1016/j.chb.2013.12.011
- Demetriou, A. (2000). Organization and development of self-understanding and self-regulation. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 209–251). London: Academic Press.
- Dong, G., Lu, Q., Zhou, H., & Zhao, X. (2010). Impulse inhibition in people with Internet addiction disorder: electrophysiological evidence from a Go/NoGo study. *Neuroscience Letters, 485*(2), 138-142.

- Echeburúa, E., & de Corral, P. (2009). Addiction to new technologies and to online social networking in young people: A new challenge. *Adicciones*, 22(2), 91-95.
- Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook “friends:” Social capital and college students’ use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4), 1143-1168.
- Facebook (2015). User Statistics. *Facebook Newsroom Website*. Retrieved from <http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/>
- Facebook (2015). Notification Basics & Settings. *Facebook.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.facebook.com/settings?tab=notifications>
- Floros, G., & Siomos, K. (2013). The relationship between optimal parenting, Internet addiction and motives for social networking in adolescence. *Psychiatry Research*, 209(3), 529-534.
- Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Twenge, J. M. (2003). Individual differences in narcissism: Inflated self-views across the lifespan and around the world. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(6), 469-486.
- Garmedia, M., Garitaonandia, C., Martinez, G., & Casado, M.A. (2012). The effectiveness of parental mediation. In S. Livingstone, L. Haddon, & A. Görzig (Eds.) *Children, Risk and Safety on The Internet* (pp. 231-244). Bristol: The Policy Press.

- Greenwood, D., Long, C. R., & Dal Cin, S. (2013). Fame and the social self: The need to belong, narcissism, and relatedness predict the appeal of fame. *Personality and Individual Differences, 55*(5), 490-495.
- Griffiths, M. D. (2005). A 'components' model of addiction within a biopsychosocial framework. *Journal of Substance Use, 10*, 191–197.
- Griffiths, M. D. (2012). Internet sex addiction: A review of empirical research. *Addiction Research & Theory, 20*(2), 111-124. DOI: 10.3109/16066359.2011.588351
- Griffiths, M. D., Kuss, D. J., & Demetrovics, Z. (2014). Social networking addiction: An overview of preliminary findings. *Behavioral addictions: Criteria, Evidence and Treatment, 119-141*.
- Gundecha, P., & Liu, H. (2012). Mining social media: a brief introduction. *Tutorials in Operations Research, 1*(4).
- Hansen, K., Nowlan, G., & Winter, C. (2012). Pinterest as a tool: Applications in academic libraries and higher education. *Partnership: the Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research, 7*(2).
- Harrison, Y., & Horne, J. A. (2000). The impact of sleep deprivation on decision making: a review. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 6*(3), 236. DOI: 10.1037//1076-808X.6.3.236

- Hoerger, M., Quirk, S. W., & Weed, N. C. (2011). Development and validation of the Delaying Gratification Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 23*(3), 725.
- Hynes, M. (2010). Leveraging new opportunities from the use of web widgets in online web 2.0 environments. *Journal of Internet Business, 8*, 109-141.
- Instagram (2015). About us. *Instagram.com*. Retrieved from <https://instagram.com/about/us/>
- Jeong, E. J., & Kim, D. H. (2011). Social activities, self-efficacy, game attitudes, and game addiction. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 14*(4), 213-221. doi:10.1089/cyber.2009.0289.
- Joinson, A. N. (2008, April). Looking at, looking up or keeping up with people?: motives and use of facebook. *Computer Human Interaction 5*(10), 1027-1036.
- Jordan, A. (2004). The role of media in children's development: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics, 25*(3), 196-206.
- Kabasakal, Z. (2015). Life satisfaction and family functions as-predictors of problematic Internet use in university students. *Computers in Human Behavior 53*, 294-304. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2015.07.019.
- Kain, E. (2014). YouTuber 'PewDiePie' Is Making \$4 Million A Year. *Forbes.com*

Kalaitzaki, A. E., & Birtchnell, J. (2014). The impact of early parenting bonding on young adults' Internet addiction, through the mediation effects of negative relating to others and sadness. *Addictive behaviors*, 39(3), 733-736.

Kalmus, V., Blinka, L., & Ólafsson, K. (2013). Does it matter what mama says: evaluating the role of parental mediation in European adolescents' excessive Internet use. *Children & Society*. DOI: 10.1111/chso.12020

Kelley, M. L., Power, T. G., & Wimbush, D. D. (1992). Determinants of Disciplinary Practices in Low-Income Black Mothers. *Child development*, 63(3), 573-582.

Kientz, J. A., Choe, E. K., & Truong, K. N. (2013). Texting from the Toilet: Mobile Computing Use and Acceptance in Private and Public Restrooms. Knowledge Media Design Institute, University of Toronto. *Technical Report KMD-13*, 1.

Kietzmann, J. H., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, I. P., & Silvestre, B. S. (2011). Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media. *Business Horizons*, 54(3), 241-251.

King, D. L., Haagsma, M. C., Delfabbro, P. H., Gradisar, M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2013). Toward a consensus definition of pathological video-gaming: A systematic review of psychometric assessment tools. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 33(3), 331-342. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpr.2013.01.002

- Kisyovska, Y., Krönung, J., & Eckhardt, A. (2015). Peer Influence, Family Dysfunction or Conditioning?—An Empirical Analysis of Facebook Addiction Predispositions. *International Conference on Wirtschaftsinformatik*.
- Koc, M., & Gulyagci, S. (2013). Facebook addiction among Turkish college students: the role of psychological health, demographic, and usage characteristics. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 16(4), 279-284.
- Kuss, D. J., & Griffiths, M. D. (2011). Online social networking and addiction—a review of the psychological literature. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 8(9), 3528-3552.
- Kuss, D. J., & Griffiths, M. D. (2012). Internet gaming addiction: A systematic review of empirical research. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 10(2), 278-296. DOI 10.1007/s11469-011-9318-5.
- Kuss, D. J., Griffiths, M. D., & Binder, J. F. (2013). Internet addiction in students: Prevalence and risk factors. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 959-966.
- Kwon, J. H., Chung, C. S., & Lee, J. (2011). The effects of escape from self and interpersonal relationship on the pathological use of Internet games. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 47(1), 113-121. DOI: 10.1007/s10597-009-9236-1

- Lee, Z. W., Cheung, C. M., & Thadani, D. R. (2012). An investigation into the problematic use of Facebook. *Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. DOI: 10.1109/HICSS.2012.106
- LaRose, R., Kim, J. H., & Peng, W. (2010). Social networking: Addictive, compulsive, problematic, or just another media habit. *A Networked Self: Identity, Community, and Culture on Social Network Sites*, 59-81.
- Lim, J. S., Bae, Y. K., & Kim, S. S. (2004, August). A learning system for internet addiction prevention. In *Advanced Learning Technologies, 2004. Proceedings. IEEE International Conference on* (pp. 836-837).
- Lin, Y. H., & Gau, S. S. F. (2013). Association between morningness–eveningness and the severity of compulsive Internet use: the moderating role of gender and parenting style. *Sleep medicine*, 14(12), 1398-1404. DOI: 10.1016/j.sleep.2013.06.015
- LinkedIn (2008). What is LinkedIn. *LinkedIn Press*. Retrieved from https://www.linkedin.com/static?key=what_is_linkedin
- LinkedIn (2015). Showing or Hiding Activity Updates About You. *LinkedIn.com*. Retrieved from https://help.linkedin.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/78/~/-/showing-or-hiding-activity-updates-about-you
- Linshi, J. (2015). Here’s How the ‘Don’t Judge Challenge’ Totally Backfired. *Time.com*

- Liu, C. Y., & Kuo, F. Y. (2007). A study of Internet addiction through the lens of the interpersonal theory. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 10*(6), 799-804. DOI: 10.1089/cpb.2007.9951
- Maltby, J. (2010). An interest in fame: Confirming the measurement and empirical conceptualization of fame interest. *British Journal of Psychology, 101*(3), 411-432.
- Mangold, W. G., & Faulds, D. J. (2009). Social media: The new hybrid element of the promotion mix. *Business Horizons, 52*(4), 357-365.
- Manikonda, L., Hu, Y., & Kambhampati, S. (2014). What we instagram: A first analysis of instagram photo content and user types. *Arizona State University*.
- Masters, K. (2015). Social Networking Addiction among Health Sciences Students in Oman. *Sultan Qaboos University Medical Journal, 15*(3), e357.
- McClard, A., & Anderson, K. (2008). Focus on Facebook: Who are we anyway. *Anthropology News, 49*(3), 10-12.
- McKinney, B. C., Kelly, L., & Duran, R. L. (2012). Narcissism or openness?: College students' use of Facebook and Twitter. *Communication Research Reports, 29*(2), 108-118.

- Mehdizadeh, S. (2010). Self-presentation 2.0: Narcissism and self-esteem on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *13*(4), 357-364.
- Mesch, G. S. (2009). Parental mediation, online activities, and cyberbullying. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, *12*, 387-393.
- Metcalf, J., & Mischel, W. (1999). A hot/cool-system analysis of delay of gratification: dynamics of willpower. *Psychological Review*, *106*(1), 3.
- Mischel, W., Ebbesen, E. B., & Raskoff Zeiss, A. (1972). Cognitive and attentional mechanisms in delay of gratification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *21*(2), 204.
- Moeller, F. G., Barratt, E. S., Dougherty, D. M., Schmitz, J. M., & Swann, A. C. (2014). Psychiatric aspects of impulsivity. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.158.11.1783
- Moeller, F. G., Dougherty, D. M., Barratt, E. S., Schmitz, J. M., Swann, A. C., & Grabowski, J. (2001). The impact of impulsivity on cocaine use and retention in treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *21*(4), 193-198.
- Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*(2), 247–259.

- Muraven, M., Baumeister, R. F., & Tice, D. M. (1999). Longitudinal improvement of self-regulation through practice: Building selfcontrol strength through repeated exercise. *Journal of Social Psychology, 139*(4), 446–457.
- National Institute on Drug Abuse (2009). Treatment Approaches for Drug Addiction. *National Institute on Drug Abuse; drugabuse.gov*
- Ng, B. D., & Wiemer-Hastings, P. (2005). Addiction to the internet and online gaming. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 8*(2), 110-113.
- Önerli, B. (2014). İnternet ve Sosyal Medya Kullanım İstatistikleri. *Dijitalajanslar.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.dijitalajanslar.com/internet-ve-sosyal-medya-kullanici-istatistikleri-2014/>
- Ong, E. Y., Ang, R. P., Ho, J. C., Lim, J. C., Goh, D. H., Lee, C. S., & Chua, A. Y. (2011). Narcissism, extraversion and adolescents' self-presentation on Facebook. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(2), 180-185. DOI:10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.022
- Orbell, S., & Verplanken, B. (2010). The automatic component of habit in health behavior: habit as cue-contingent automaticity. *Health Psychology, 29*(4), 374.
- Patton, J. H., & Stanford, M. S. (1995). Factor structure of the Barratt impulsiveness scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 51*(6), 768-774.

Pew Research Center (2012). Social networking popular across the globe. *Pewglobal.org*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewglobal.org/2012/12/12/social-networking-popular-across-globe/>

Pinterest (2015). Notification settings. *Pinterest.com*. Retrieved from <https://help.pinterest.com/en/articles/notifications>

Raacke, J., & Bonds-Raacke, J. (2008). MySpace and Facebook: Applying the uses and gratifications theory to exploring friend-networking sites. *Cyberpsychology & behavior, 11(2)*, 169-174. DOI: 10.1089/cpb.2007.0056

Romer, D., Duckworth, A. L., Sznitman, S., & Park, S. (2010). Can adolescents learn self-control? Delay of gratification in the development of control over risk taking. *Prevention Science, 11(3)*, 319-330.

Rosen, L. D., Whaling, K., Rab, S., Carrier, L. M., & Cheever, N. A. (2013). Is Facebook creating “iDisorders”? The link between clinical symptoms of psychiatric disorders and technology use, attitudes and anxiety. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29(3)*, 1243-1254.

Rudy, D., & Grusec, J. E. (2001). Correlates of authoritarian parenting in individualist and collectivist cultures and implications for understanding the transmission of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32(2)*, 202-212.

- Saville, B. K., Gisbert, A., Kopp, J., & Telesco, C. (2010). Internet Addiction and Delay Discounting in College Students. *The Psychological Record, 60*, 273–286
- Schmitt, K. L. (2000). Public policy, family rules and children's media use in the home. *Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania*.
- Shapira, N. A., Goldsmith, T. D., Keck, P. E., Khosla, U. M., & McElroy, S. L. (2000). Psychiatric features of individuals with problematic internet use. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 57*(1), 267-272.
- Shih, S. R. (2003). Network characteristics of the virtual world and its influence on the young. *Student Counseling Bimonthly, 89*, 80-89.
- Shoda, Y., Mischel, W., & Peake, P. K. (1990). Predicting adolescent cognitive and self-regulatory competencies from preschool delay of gratification: Identifying diagnostic conditions. *Developmental Psychology, 26*(6), 978–986.
- Suganuma, N., Kikuchi, T., Yanagi, K., Yamamura, S., Morishima, H., Adachi, H., & Takeda, M. (2007). Using electronic media before sleep can curtail sleep time and result in self-perceived insufficient sleep. *Sleep and Biological Rhythms, 5*(3), 204-214.
- Thomas, M., Sing, H., Belenky, G., Holcomb, H., Mayberg, H., Dannals, R., & Redmond, D. (2000). Neural basis of alertness and cognitive performance impairments during sleepiness. Effects of 24 h of sleep deprivation on waking

human regional brain activity. *Journal of Sleep Research*, 9(4), 335-352. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2869.2000.00225.x

Tosun, L. P. (2012). Motives for Facebook use and expressing “true self” on the Internet. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(4), 1510-1517.

Treuer, T., Fábíán, Z., & Füredi, J. (2001). Internet addiction associated with features of impulse control disorder: is it a real psychiatric disorder. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 66(2), 283.

Tumblr (2015). What is Tumblr. *Tumblr.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.tumblr.com/>

Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Keith Campbell, W., & Bushman, B. J. (2008). Egos inflating over time: a cross-temporal meta-analysis of the Narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of Personality*, 76(4), 875-902.

Twitter (2015). The story of a Tweet. *Twitter.com*. Retrieved from <https://about.twitter.com/what-is-twitter/story-of-a-tweet>

Uysal, R., Satici, S. A., & Akin, A. (2013). Mediating Effect Of Facebook® Addiction On The Relationship Between Subjective Vitality And Subjective Happiness. *Psychological Reports*, 113(3), 948-953.

- Valcke, M., Bonte, S., De Wever, B., & Rots, I. (2010). Internet parenting styles and the impact on Internet use of primary school children. *Computers & Education*, 55(2), 454-464. DOI: 10.1016/j.compedu.2010.02.009
- Vazire, S., Naumann, L. P., Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2008). Portrait of a narcissist: Manifestations of narcissism in physical appearance. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(6), 1439-1447. DOI:10.1016/j.jrp.2008.06.007
- Verplanken, B., & Orbell, S. (2003). Reflections on Past Behavior: A Self-Report Index of Habit Strength1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(6), 1313-1330.
- Vitaro, F., Arseneault, L., & Tremblay, R. E. (1999). Impulsivity predicts problem gambling in low SES adolescent males. *Addiction*, 94(4), 565-575.
- Wan, C. (2009). Gratifications and loneliness as predictors of campus-SNS websites addiction & usage pattern among Chinese college students. *Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong, China*.
- Wilson, K., Fornasier, S., & White, K. M. (2010). Psychological predictors of young adults' use of social networking sites. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 13(2), 173-177.
- Wood, W., & Neal, D. T. (2007). A new look at habits and the habit-goal interface. *Psychological Review*, 114, 843– 863.

- Woźniak, M., & Buchnowska, D. (2013). The role and use of social media by universities-ranking of universities in social media. *Researchgate.net*.
- Xiuqin, H., Huimin, Z., Mengchen, L., Jinan, W., Ying, Z., & Ran, T. (2010). Mental health, disorder. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, 13(4), 401–406.
- Yen, J. Y., Yen, C. F., Chen, C. C., Chen, S. H., & Ko, C. H. (2007). Family factors of internet addiction and substance use experience in Taiwanese adolescents. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 10(3), 323-329.
- Yao, M. Z., He, J., Ko, D. M., & Pang, K. (2014). The Influence Of Personality, Parental Behaviors, And Self-Esteem On Internet Addiction: A Study Of Chinese College Students. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 17(2), 104-110. DOI: 10.1089/Cyber.2012.0710
- Young, K. S. (1998). Internet addiction: The emergence of a new clinical disorder. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 1(3), 237-244.
- Young, K. S. (1999). Internet addiction: symptoms, evaluation and treatment. *Innovations in Clinical Practice: A Source Book*, 17, 19-31.
- YouTube (2015). About YouTube. *YouTube.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/yt/about/>

YouTube (2015). YouTube partner program overview. *YouTube.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/yt/creators/get-started.html>

YouTube (2015). Account notifications. *YouTube.com*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/account_notifications

Zaremohzzabieh, Z., Samah, B. A., Omar, S. Z., Bolong, J., & Kamarudin, N. A. (2014). Addictive Facebook use among university students. *Asian Social Science, 10*(6), p107.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: The Questionnaire

Kişisel Bilgi Formu

1) Yaşınız: _____

2) Kadın Erkek

3) Eğitim durumunuz:

İlköğretim

Lise

Önlisans

Lisans

Yüksek Lisans / Üzeri

4) Lütfen romantik ilişki durumunuz işaretleyiniz

a) İlişkisi Yok

b) İlişkisi var

c) Partneriyle beraber yaşıyor

d) Evli

e) Boşanmış

Genelleştirilmiş Sosyal Medya Kullanım Ölçeği

Lütfen aşağıdaki cümleleri okuyarak kendi yaşamınızdaki davranışlarınıza göre 1'den (Kesinlikle Katılıyorum) 5'e (Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum) kadar derecelendirerek uygun kutucuğa işaretleyiniz.	1	2	3	4	5
1. Sosyal medya başındayken zamanın nasıl akıp gittiğini anlamadığım olur.					
2. Sosyal medyada olamadığım zamanlarda acaba orada neler oluyor diye düşünürüm.					
3. Soyutlanmış hissettiğimde sosyal medyada başkalarıyla konuşurum.					
4. Moralim bozuk olduğunda sosyal medyayı kendimi daha iyi hissetmek için kullanırım.					
5. Sosyal medyadayken, yüz yüze olan ilişkilere kıyasla daha iyi muamele görürüm.					
6. Sosyal medyada başkalarıyla bağlantı kurarken yüzyüze kurduklarımdan daha güvende hissederim.					
7. Sosyal medyada olduğum süreyi azaltmadığım olur.					
8. Soyutlanmış hissettiğimde sosyal medyada başkalarını ararım.					
9. Sosyal medyada sosyalleşirken, çevrimdışı (offline) halime göre daha kendimden eminim.					
10. İşimde veya okulda sosyal medya yüzünden sıkıntılar yaşadığım olur.					
11. Kötü hissettiğimde daha iyi hissetmek için sosyal medyada çevrimiçi (online) olurum.					
12. Sosyal medyada geçirdiğim süreyle ilgili suçlu hissederim.					
13. Sosyal medya kullanımım yüzünden iş veya dersleri kaçırdığım olur.					
14. Sosyal medyadayken (online), sosyal medya dışındaki (offline) olmama kıyasla daha iyi muamele görürüm.					
15. Bilgisayarlar ile vakit geçirirken insanlarla olduğumdan daha rahatım.					
16. Dışarıdayken değersiz hissediyorum ama sosyal medyadayken bir bireyim.					
17. Sosyal medyada olmamdan ötürü sosyal etkinlikleri kaçırdığım olur.					
18. Sosyal medyada olamadığımda kaybolmuş gibi hissederim.					
19. Sosyal medya kullanımımı kontrol etmede başarısız girişimlerim var.					
20. Sosyal medyayı, beklediğimden daha uzun süre kullanırım.					
21. Sosyal medyada çok fazla zaman harcarım.					
22. Amaçladığımdan daha uzun süre sosyal medyada kalırım.					
23. Sosyal medyada sosyalleşirken, nasıl görüldüğümle ilgili endişelenmem.					
24. Başında olmadığımda sosyal medyada olmayı özlerim.					
25. Sosyal medyada beni nelerin beklediğini düşünmekten kendimi alıkoyamadığım olur.					
26. Sosyal medyada sosyalleşirken, bir ilişkiye bağlanmakla ilgili endişelenmem.					
27. Sosyal medyada insanların benim hakkımdaki algılarını şekillendirebilirim.					
28. Bir süre bağlanamadığımda aklım sosyal medya ile meşgul olur.					
29. Çok uzun süreler sosyal medya kullanmayı bırakmayı denediğim olur.					

Algılanan Ebeveynlik Tarzı Ölçeği

Lütfen aşağıdaki cümleleri okuyarak kendi yaşamınızdaki davranışlarınıza göre 1'den (Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum) 5'e (Kesinlikle Katılıyorum) kadar derecelendirerek uygun kutucuğa işaretleyiniz.	1	2	3	4	5
1. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim düzgün idare edilen bir evde çocukların ebeveynlerinin yollundan gitmesi gerektiğini düşünürdü.					
2. Çocuğu onlarla aynı fikirde olmasa bile ebeveynlerim, çocukların kendi iyiliği için ebeveynlerinin dediklerini kabul etmeye zorlanmasının doğru olduğunu düşünürdü.					
3. Ben büyürken ebeveynlerim ne zaman benden bir şey yapmamı istese, bu işin sorgulamadan hızlıca yapılmasını beklerdi.					
4. Ben büyürken, ailemizin izleyeceği yol belirlendiği zaman ebeveynlerim bu yolu izlememizin arkasındaki sebepleri ailedeki çocuklarla da tartıştırdı.					
5. Ne zaman ailedeki kural ve yasakların mantıksız olduğunu düşünsem, ebeveynlerim bu konu hakkındaki kendi fikirlerimi ailemle tartışmamı cesaretlendirirdi.					
6. Ebeveynlerim her zaman onların istekleriyle uyuşmasa bile, çocukların kendi fikirlerini oluştururken ve karar verirken özgür olması gerektiğini düşünürdü.					
7. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim aldığı kararları sorgulamama izin vermezdi.					
8. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim ailedeki çocukların eylem ve kararlarını mantık çerçevesinde yönlendirirdi.					
9. Ebeveynlerim çocukların gerektiği gibi davranmalarını sağlamak için ebeveynlerin daha fazla güç kullanması gerektiğini düşünürdü.					
10. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim kural ve düzenlemelere yalnızca otoritedekiler öyle istiyor diye uymam gerektiğini düşünmezdi.					
11. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerimin benden aile içinde ne beklediğini bilirdim ama aynı zamanda bu beklentilerinin mantıksız olduğunu hissettiğimde onlarla bu beklentileri tartışabilirdim.					
12. Ebeveynlerim aklı başında ailelerin çocuklarına patronun kim olduğunu erkenden öğretmesi gerektiğine inanırdı.					
13. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim davranışlarım hakkında bana nadiren yol gösterir ve beklentilerinden bahsederdi.					
14. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim aile kararlarını alırken çoğunlukla ailedeki çocukların istediği şekilde karar alırdı.					
15. Ailedeki çocuklar büyürken, ebeveynlerim devamlı olarak mantıklı ve tarafsız şekilde yol gösterir ve tavsiyeler verirdi.					
16. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim ile aynı fikirde olmadığımı belirtmeye çalıştığımda ebeveynlerim çok kızardı.					
17. Ebeveynlerimin düşüncesine göre, aileler çocukları büyürken çocuklarının eylemlerini, fikirlerini ve isteklerini yasaklamasa toplumdaki sorunların çoğu çözülebilir.					
18. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim benden ne tarz davranışlar beklediğini söylerdi, eğer onların beklediği gibi davranmazsam cezalandırırdı.					
19. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim çoğu şeyde beni yönlendirmez ve kendi kararlarımı almama izin verirdi.					
20. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim aile kararlarını almadan önce ailedeki çocukların da fikrini alırdı ama karar verirken yalnızca çocuklar öyle istedi diye bu yönde karar almazdı.					

21. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim kendini benim davranışlarımı yönlendirmek veya yol göstermekten sorumlu olarak görmezdi					
22. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim evdeki çocukların davranışları hakkında net çizgileri vardı ama içinde bulunulan duruma göre bu çizgileri ailedeki her çocuğun ihtiyacına göre ayarlayabilirdi.					
23. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim benim davranışlarım ve eylemlerim hakkında beni yönlendirdi ve bu yönlendirmeyi izlememi isterdi ama ebeveynlerimin yönlendirmeleri hakkında endişelerim varsa, bunları dinleyebilirdi.					
24. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim aile meseleleri hakkında kendi görüşlerimi oluşturmama izin verir ve genelde ilerde ne yapacağım hakkında kendim kararlarımı vermeme izin verirdi.					
25. Ebeveynlerimin düşüncesine göre, aileler çocukları büyürken çocuklarının ne yapması ve ne yapmaması gerektiği hakkında katı olup güç uygularsa toplumdaki sorunların çoğu çözülebilir.					
26. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim sık sık benden ne yapmamı ve nasıl yapmamı bekliyorsa net olarak söylerdi.					
27. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim eylem ve davranışlarım hakkında bana net yönergeler verirdi ama onlarla aynı fikirde olmadığım zaman bunu anlayışla karşılardı.					
28. Ben büyürken ebeveynlerim ailedeki çocukların eylem, davranış ve isteklerini yönlendirmezdi.					
29. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerimin benden aile içindeki beklentilerini bilirdim ve onlar bu beklentileri kabul etmem konusunda ısrarcı olur, onların otoritesine saygı göstermemi beklerdi.					
30. Ben büyürken, ebeveynlerim ailede beni kıran bir karar aldıysa, bunu benimle tartışabilir ve hata yaptıysa hatasını kabullenebilirdi.					

Narsistik Kişilik Envanteri

Lütfen kendinize uygun gördüğünüz seçeneği işaretleyiniz

İlgi odağı olmak çok hoşuma gider		İlgi odağı olmak beni çok rahatsız eder
Birçok insandan daha iyi ya da daha kötü değilim		Özel bir insan olduğumu düşünüyorum
Herkes benim hikayelerimi dinlemekten hoşlanır		Bazen güzel hikayeler anlatırım
Genelde hakettiğim saygıyı görürüm		Hakettiğim saygıyı görene kadar ısrar ederim
Diğer insanları takip etmekten rahatsız olmam		Diğer insanların <u>üzerinde</u> otoritem olması hoşuma gider
Çok başarılı bir insan olacağım		Başarılı bir insan olmayı umuyorum
İnsanlar bazen ne dersem inanır		İstediğim insanı istediğim şeye inandırabilirim
Diğer insanlardan menfaat beklerim		Diğer insanlar için bir şeyler yapmaktan hoşlanırım
İlgi odağı olmak isterim		Kalabalığın içine karışmayı tercih ederim
Ben de herkes gibiyim		Ben sıradışı bir kişiyim
Her zaman ne yaptığımı bilirim		ne yaptığımdan emin olamam
Kendimi diğer insanları yönlendiriyor olarak bulmaktan hoşlanmam		Diğer insanları yönlendirmek benim için çok kolaydır
Otorite olmak bana çok şey ifade etmez		İnsanlar her zaman benim otoritemi tanır
İyi birisi olduğumu biliyorum çünkü herkes bana böyle söylüyor		İnsanlar bana iltifat ettiğinde bazen utanırım
Gösterişli birisi olmamaya çalışırım		Elime şans geçtiği zaman gösteriş yapmaya hazırım.
Diğer insanlardan daha yetenekliyim		Diğer insanlardan öğrenebileceğim çok şey var

Haz Erteleme Ölçeği

Lütfen aşağıdaki cümleleri okuyarak kendi yaşamınızdaki davranışlarınıza göre 1'den (Kesinlikle Katılıyorum) 5'e (Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum) kadar derecelendirerek uygun kutucuğa işaretleyiniz.	1	2	3	4	5
1. İsteddiğimde abur-cubur yiyeceklere karşı direnebilirim					
2. Fiziksel ihtiyaçlarımı kontrol edebilirim					
3. Başkalarıyla nöbetleşe olarak iş yapmaktan nefret ederim					
4. Acil durumlar ortaya çıkabilir düşüncesiyle yapabildiğim oranda para biriktirmeye çalışırım					
5. Okulda kendimi bir birey olarak geliştirmek için çok çalışırım/çalıştım					
6. Özel, sağlıklı bir diyetle devam etmekte zorlanırım					
7. Bir insanla fiziksel bir ilişki yaşamadan önce o kişiyi tanımak isterim					
8. Genelde eylemlerimin diğer insanları nasıl etkilediğini göz önünde bulundurmaya çalışırım					
9. Gücümün yetmediği şeyleri almaya direnmek benim için zordur					
10. Daha iyi bir geleceğe sahip olmak için okulda derslerime iyi çalıştım/çalışırım					
11. Eğer sevdiğim yiyecek önümde duruyor olsa, onu yemeyi beklemekte zorlanırım					
12. Bana 'İyi Hissettiren' şeylere odaklanma alışkanlığım uzun vadede bana çok şeye mal oldu.					
13. Bence insanların birbirine yardım etmesi topluma yarar sağlar					
14. Paramı akılcıca harcamaya çalışırım					
15. Okuldayken daha kolay yolları seçmeye çalışırım/çalıştım					
16. Benim için şeker ve bir kase dolusu abur – cubur yiyeceğe karşı dayanmak kolaydır					
17. Hedeflerime ulaşmak için fiziksel zevk ve rahatlığımdan vazgeçtim					
18. Eylemlerimin diğer insanları uzun vadede nasıl etkileyeceğini önemserim					
19. Para konusunda güvenilmez birisiyim					
20. Hayatta bir adım öne geçmek için çok çalışabilirim					
21. Bazen kendimi hasta edecek kadar yerim					
22. Romantik ilişkilerin fiziksel yanlarını hemen keşfetmeyi tercih ederim					
23. Eylemlerimin diğer insanları nasıl etkilediğini önemsemem					
24. Birisi bana para verdiğinde hemen harcamayı tercih ederim					
25. Uzun vadeli hedeflerimi gerçekleştirmek için kendimi motive edemem					
26. Sağlığımı uzun sürede iyi şekilde etkileyeceğini bildiğim için her zaman sağlıklı beslenmeye çalışırım					
27. Fiziksel olarak zorlayıcı bir işle karşılaştığımda, her zaman yapmamanın bir yolunu aradım.					
28. Çevremdeki insanların ihtiyaçlarına önem veririm					
29. Paramı çok iyi yönetirim					
30. Her zaman, çok çalışmanın bana eninde sonunda kazandıracağını düşündüm/düşünürüm					
31. Aç olsam bile yemek zamanına kadar bir şeyler atıştırmadan bekleyebilirim					
32. Daha keyif verici bir şey yapmak için bahane uydurduğum veya yalan söylediğim oldu					
33. Eylemlerimin diğer insanları nasıl etkilediğini düşünmenin bir anlamı yoktur					
34. Parayı aldığım an harcamak bana keyif verir					
35. Hayatta bir adım öne geçmek için kısa yolu tercih ederim					

Appendix B: Eastern Mediterranean University Psychology Department's Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter

University



Eastern
Mediterranean

The Department of Psychology
Eastern Mediterranean University
Research & Ethics Committee
Senel Husnu Raman-Chairperson

Famagusta, Turkish Republic of Northern
Cyprus
Tel: +(90) 392 630 1389
Fax: +(90) 392 630 2475
e-mail:
shenelhusnu.raman@emu.edu.tr

Web: <http://brahms.emu.edu.tr/psychology>

Ref Code: 14/11-04

Date: 26.11.2014

Dear Muhammet Burak Derebaşı,

Thank you for submitting your revised application entitled *Relationship between Social Media Dependency, Perceived Parenting Style, Delay of Gratification, and Narcissism*. Your application has now been *approved* by the Research & Ethics Committee on 26.11.2014.

If any changes to the study described in the application or supporting documentation is necessary, you must notify the committee and may be required to make a resubmission of the application. This approval is valid for one year.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "SHR", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Senel Husnu Raman
On Behalf of the Research & Ethics Committee
Psychology Department
Eastern Mediterranean University

Appendix B: Permission Letter to Translate and Modify Generalized Problematic Internet Use Scale (GPIUS)



UNIVERSITY of DELAWARE

Scott Caplan <caplan@udel.edu>
Alici: Burak Derebaşı <derebasiburak@gmail.com>

25 September 2015 15:18

Hi,
Yes, you have my permission to use the scale and to change the wording to measure social media

If you need anything else, just let me know

Scott Caplan

*Associate Professor
Department of Communication*

*University of Delaware
250 Pearson Hall
Newark, DE 19716
<http://www.udel.edu/communication>*

Scott Caplan

*Associate Professor
Department of Communication*

*University of Delaware
250 Pearson Hall
Newark, DE 19716*