A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF NON-MATERIAL BELIEFS IN TURKISH SAMPLE: THE PREDICTIBILITY OF LOCUS OF CONTROL, SYSTEM JUSTIFICATION, RELIGIOUS/SPIRITUAL COPING AND RELIGIOSITY

DEMET İSLAMBAY

SEPTEMBER 2014

A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF NON-MATERIAL BELIEFS IN
TURKISH SAMPLE: THE PREDICTIBILITY OF LOCUS OF CONTROL,
SYSTEM JUSTIFICATION, RELIGIOUS/SPIRITUAL COPING AND
RELIGIOSITY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

DEMET İSLAMBAY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

SEPTEMBER 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

—————————————————
Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

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

—————————————————
Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Head of Department

This is to 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.

—————————————————
Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Bahar Öz	(METU, PSY)	—————————
Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan	(METU, PSY)	—————————
Assist. Prof. Dr. Müjde Koca-Atabey	(İpek University, PSY)	—————————

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

Name, Last name: Demet İslambay

Signature:

ABSTRACT

-

A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF NON-MATERIAL BELIEFS IN TURKISH SAMPLE WITH THE PREDICTABILITY OF LOCUS OF CONTROL, SYSTEM JUSTIFICATION, RELIGIOUS/SPIRITUAL COPING AND RELIGIOSITY

İslambay, Demet

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan

September 2014, 115 pages

The aim of the present thesis was to examine non-material beliefs, namely supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitions, with regards to locus of control, general system justification, religious/spiritual coping and religiosity levels based on a sample from Turkey. In the first part of the study, semi-structured interviews were done with 29 interviewees in order to extract certain themes with regards to non-material beliefs. Then, non-material beliefs scale was developed with three subscales; namely, supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitious beliefs. For the aim of examining the reliability and validity issues of the developed scale, a pilot analysis was conducted. After determining the validity and reliability of the constructed scale, main data were collected. 606 participants (376 females, 228 males and 2 other) filled the web-based questionnaires from different indices of socio-demographic backgrounds. Participants filled a set of scales: *Locus of Control Scal*e, *General System Justification Scale, Religious/Spiritual Coping Scale (RCOPE)* and a set of questions related to socio-demographic variables. Male participants tended to believe non-material beliefs more than female participants. Participants who have different levels of age, income and education did not differ significantly in terms of non-material beliefs. In addition, people who had internal locus of control tended to report non-material beliefs more than who had external locus of control. As expected, higher general system justification scores predicted non-material beliefs positively. Higher religious/spiritual coping scores predicted supernatural powers and superstitious beliefs negatively.

iv

Finally, religiosity predicted all subscales of non-material beliefs scale significantly and positively. Results were presented and discusses accordingly. Different speculations, limitations and contributions of the present thesis were presented in the last part.

Keywords: non-material beliefs, locus of control, general system justification, religious/spiritual coping, religiosity

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE TOPLUMUNDA MANEVİ İNANÇLAR İÇİN BİR ÖN ANALİZ: DENETİM ODAĞI, SİSTEMİN MEŞRULAŞTIRILMASI, DİNİ/MANEVİ BAŞA ÇIKMA VE DİNDARLIK AÇISINDAN BİR İNCELEME

İslambay, Demet

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan

Eylül 2014, 115 sayfa

Bu tezin amacı, manevi inançların (doğaüstü güçler, ruhanilik ve batıl inançlar), Türkiye toplumunda bazı sosyo-demografik değişken farklılıklarını gözeterek, denetim odağı, genel sistemin meşrulaştırılması, dini/manevi başa çıkma ve dindarlık değişkenleriyle olan ilişkisini incelemektir. Çalışmanın ilk bölümünde, manevi inançlara yönelik belli temaları çıkarmak için, ekonomik olarak farklı sınıflardan gelen (düşük, orta, yüksek) 29 katılımcıya yarı-yapılandırılmış mülakat uygulanmıştır. Daha sonra doğaüstü güçler, ruhanilik ve batıl inançlar olmak üzere 3 alt ölçekten oluşan manevi inançlar ölçeği oluşturulmuştur. Geliştirilen ölçeğin güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik durumlarını incelemek amacıyla bir pilot çalışma yapılmıştır. Ölçeğin geçerlilik ve güvenilirliği teyit edildikten sonra, ana veri toplanmıştır. İnternet üzerinden sunulan anketler, farklı sosyo-demografik kökenden gelen 606 katılımcı (376 kadın, 228 erkek ve 2 diğer) tarafından doldurulmuştur. Bütün katılımcılar *Kontrol Odağı Ölçeği, Genel Sistemi Meşrulaştırma Ölçeği, Dini / Ruhani Başa Çıkma Ölçeği (RCOPE)* ölçeklerinin yanı sıra sosyo-demografik değişkenlere ilişkin bazı soruları cevaplandırmıştır. Erkek katılımcıların, kadın katılımcılara kıyasla daha fazla manevi inanç taşıdığı görülmüştür. Farklı yaş, gelir düzeyi ve eğitim seviyesine sahip katılımcılar, manevi inançları taşımada birbirlerinden anlamlı bir şekilde farklılaşmamıştır. Ayrıca, içsel denetim odağına sahip katılımcıların, dışsal denetim

odağına sahip katılımcılara göre daha fazla manevi inanç taşıma eğiliminde oldukları görülmüştür. Beklendiği gibi, yüksek genel sistemi meşrulaştırma skorları, manevi inançları pozitif bir şekilde yordamıştır. Yüksek dini / manevi başa çıkma skorları, doğaüstü güçlere ve batıl inançlara olan inancı negatif bir şekilde yordamıştır. Son olarak, dindarlık; manevi inançları ve manevi inanç ölçeğinin bütün alt ölçeklerini anlamlı ve pozitif bir şekilde yordamıştır. İlgili analizler sonuç kısmında verilmiştir. Farklı spekülasyonlar, mevcut çalışmanın kısıtlılıkları ve katkıları, çalışmanın son bölümünde sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: manevi inançlar, denetim odağı, genel sistemi meşrulaştırma, dini/manevi başa çıkma, dindarlık

To all freedom birds…

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Firstly, I want to thank my supervisor Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan for her helping and supporting me from the deciding this topic till the completing of my thesis. She was very supportive and patient during my thesis process. Without her inspiration, motivation, suggestions and deep support, my thesis writing process would not be such painless.

I would also like to thank my examining committee members Assist. Prof. Dr. Bahar Öz and for Assist. Prof. Dr. Müjde Koca-Atabey taking part in this committee with their invaluable comments and contributions.

I would like to thank my beloved home mates Derya, Yağmur and Hatice, who were very patient towards me and give me total freedom to be myself…They have always encouraged me and they are close to me with their endless love, energy, and support.

I would like to express my special appreciation to Gülay, Ayşe, Hatice, Duygu, Merve and Eyüp Can for their continuous supports and comments in every manner throughout my thesis process. I would also appreciate Erman, who helped me for finding some articles that I could not reach. I would like to indicate my gratitude to Mine, Onur and Serhat, and many of my friends who helped me during data collection process.

Finally, my special thanks go to my lovely family for their supports and staying with me until the very end…

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xi

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Introduction to Beliefs and Overview of the Present Thesis

Mythology is a *holy* concept which may be encountered at many stages of life. People have been tended to explain different things in different areas of life (daily life, agriculture, illness, success, relationships etc. may be given as some examples) mythologically since the beginning of humanity (e.g. Cameron, 2010).

Bourdieu (1994), who is a famous sociologist, developed a term called "habitus", which consisted of one's "place" in the universe where symbolic productions are made. These symbolic productions may also be related to myths. It may be inferred that, myths and narratives are human products which are produced throughout the history.

At early times of humanity, numbers and numeric data were not given much importance, since science had not been developed sufficiently. In addition, there were also no scientific communication tools as today. Theories would have not been found, and found ones could not have a chance to be spread out. Hence, determinism was tried to be found via invisible supernatural or spiritual powers. As we look through history, there are clear evidences that myths are generally separated from beliefs in religion or spirituality, as Bascom (1965) also indicated. For example, there are numbers of Gods who are responsible from different kinds of natural events, such as rain, wind, or earthquake.

However, later on, lots of scientific areas appeared; statistics and mathematics have become indispensable disciplines which are used almost everywhere (e.g. Shafer, 1990). Wundt (1862), who has been called as the father of the psychology, had a striking claim that first thing which shows that love complies with the psychology laws is statistics. From this quote, it may be understood that natural sciences including

mathematics, statistics...etc. are used widely to express and prove certain things or events, even love!

As Barthes (1972) claims, very old myths may be designed but there is no myth which is eternal, because history of mankind processes the truth to verbal statements, which become old, by time. It may be inferred that myths and truths of each period vary. On the other hand, history of humankind has a very important role of keeping rituals alive. Functions of kept rituals may have relieved people, then, they have been preserved by them until today. These claims open the doors of parapsychology to us. Parapsychology is defined by Irwin and Watt (2007, p.1) as "the scientific study of experiences which, if they are as they seem to be, are in principle outside the realm of human capabilities as presently conceived by conventional scientists". Then, it may be said that the things which are outside the human reality and capacity are included in the parapsychology, such as paranormal, supernatural and superstitious beliefs and spiritualism.

Although huge advancements in science can be seen throughout history; some source of beliefs, according to believers, cannot be proven for the time being; such as God, Devil or Satan, angels, fairies, jinns. On the other hand, numerous scientists reject the existence of such kind of non-material beliefs, rather they believe the illusion of causality with everyday coincidences (e.g. Blackmore, 1990; Brugger, Landis & Regard, 1990).

Existence of supernatural and spiritual powers has not been proved scientifically. Some scientists' assertion is true to this extent, because there is no scientific finding or reification about these non-*psychical* presences. However, it is an irrefutable truth that great many of people are affected by those beliefs (e.g. Lawrence, Edwards, Barraclough, Church & Hetherington, 1995), which should be examined by social scientists like psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists.

In order to encompass all so-called invisible powers, Pepitone (1997) refers to them as non-material beliefs. In this thesis, three of non-material beliefs namely supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitions will be examined. Pepitone (1997) tries to attract researchers' attention to the neglect of non-material culture, which was seen as a

problem and neglected by social psychologists, should be indeed clearly examined. He criticizes social psychologists for ignoring fundamentals of cultural norms and beliefs; and asserts that non-material beliefs are crucial for understanding people's lives from a social psychological perspective (Pepitone, 1997).

Pepitone (1997) also asserts that there are three reasons that non-material beliefs lead to psychological adaptive functions. First of all, above-mentioned beliefs satisfy people's basic needs, believing in God helps giving people power. Secondly, such beliefs bring people together and create group unity. Lastly, such beliefs also help people for unexplained life events by asserting some examples and causal attributions.

Moreover, things that cannot be attributed to any cause, and encompass fear lead people to carry some beliefs (e.g. Cameron, 2010). For this reason, people want to justify actions or events with supernatural powers or beliefs. Otherwise, people's well-being may be affected negatively because of uncertainty. For people, this process of attributing supernatural power may also be regarded as irregularities turning into an order.

Some experiences profoundly affect and change people's lives. Severe or traumatic experiences lead people to follow or believe in non-material beliefs, which is a condition frequently encountered (e.g. Cameron, 2010; Futrell, 2011). Everyday experiences of people should also be taken into consideration. For example, some people are very impressed by their dreams from which they assert that they get some signs for the future events (e.g. Cameron, 2010). Some of them come true in their opinion, or some of them affect people because of the possibility of their realization. Even, some of people act according to their dreams in case of any possibility of happening of good or bad events. In addition, according to Psychodynamic Functions Hypothesis (Irwin, 1992), traumatic events that are experienced in childhood can create a feeling of insecurity or desperation. Hence, individuals may take measures to control their environment in order to decrease uncertainty, which is constructed throughout and after childhood (Irwin, 1992).

According to Watt, as demonstrated by numerous research studies, an individual's heuristic judgments are greatly affected by pre-existing or *a priori* beliefs (as cited in

Rogers, Davis & Fisk, 2009); so, individuals' misperception of chance events is possible. That is, they make idiosyncratic affirmations (Marks, 2002). In addition, Taburoğlu (2011) mentions Freud's basic contention about obsession: things remaining outside and weird are co-founders of the self. So, objects that create obsessions, although it may seem contradictory, would have to be a part of the self.

In addition, narratives about superstitions and myths should be able to saturate the appetite directed to prospective "new and surprising" things (Woodall, 1996). It may be understood from this sentence that people continue to explain unusual current events from the viewpoint of narratives and myths. For example, in November 2007, before the cause of the plane crash in Isparta was discovered after opening the black box of the plane, people already had produced extraordinary stories about the crash ("Atlasjet Flight 4203", n.d.). Hence, people love to create some of the mysteries about the events.

Contextual factors may also have effects on the believing behaviors. If an individual is under a stressful or fearful condition, (s)he may be appealed by aforementioned beliefs. Acquiring such kind of beliefs may be highly correlated with the upbringing styles of people. As some people grow, read and question those beliefs, they start to elude themselves; yet, some of them still continue to practice them. Some of them, on the other hand, do not believe anymore but still follow those beliefs due to habits, routines or rituals causing reliefs consciously or unconsciously (e.g. Arslan, 2004; Köse & Ayten, 2009).

Furthermore, according to Aarnio and Lindeman (2005), individuals differ from each other with respect to their intuitive or analytical thinking, which constitute dual processes. Unlike analytical thinkers, individuals who direct themselves by innate codes will be more prone to believe non-material beliefs, because they generally do not question events or issues; they behave intuitively. But innate codes may not have to be evolutionary. That is, people may not carry non-material beliefs with inborn tendencies.

Kirkpatrick (1999, p.233), defines adaptation as "features or traits designed by natural selection for a particular adaptive function". On the basis of this definition, he argues

that religion cannot be adaptive. Otherwise, there might not be atheists in the world according to evolutionary approach. It is an incontestable truth that evolution has great roles in human's lives but it is quite arguable to say that evolution has important roles in the religion or religious issues.

On the other hand, behavioral approach may be taken into consideration. The Skinner's experiment with pigeons influenced social psychologists very much. In his experiment, Skinner (1948), who is a very famous person for behavioral psychology, fed the pigeons at random time intervals. Then he recognized that pigeons were acting as if their movements were the result of that they are fed by him; thus, he interpreted that pigeons also develop superstitious beliefs.

In the light of literature, sometimes those beliefs or concepts are defined interchangeably or they are nested in each other. Lindeman and Aarnio (2007) touch upon a critical point and claim that it is important to distinguish superstitious beliefs from other fallacious beliefs. The present thesis aims to understand and differentiate how people interpret those beliefs, and then examine the relationship between some other concepts; such as socio-demographic variables, locus of control, general system justification, religious/spiritual coping and religiosity. Because it is important to understand individuals' belief tendencies and attributions to them, since this is a frequently faced phenomenon. Literature indicates that people who have external locus of control tend to carry such beliefs more than who have internal locus of control (Dag, 1999; Randall & Desrosiers, 1980; Tobacyk, Nagot & Miller, 1988), but there are few studies within Turkish culture (e.g. Dag, 1999). On the other hand, since religion itself has a spiritual base, people who have high religiosity levels may be more inclined to carry those beliefs.

Moreover, there is a social psychological concept called system justification (Jost & Banaji, 1994) which attracts great interest recently. People who carry non-material beliefs may tend to justify system more than others. From this perspective the present thesis will be mainly exploratory with regards to relationship between system justification and non-material beliefs.

The following sections will include the detailed explanations and speculations for each topic. Firstly, in the introduction part, supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitious beliefs will be explained through the literature. After presenting the literature review on these beliefs, locus of control, system justification theory, religious/spiritual coping and religiosity will be explained and discussed. Then hypotheses of the present study, method and results will be presented. Moreover, presented results will be discussed accordingly and limitations and future directions will be debated. Lastly, contributions of the present study will be mentioned.

1.2 Supernatural Powers

Almost every person have heard statements about spiritual and metaphysical phenomena that science is not able to address adequately (Irwin & Watt, 2007) or is violated by those beliefs (e.g. Goode, 2000a & 2000b). On the other hand, according to Kurtz (as cited in Orenstein, 2002), some researchers assert that science itself has a negative association for people who carry non-material, paranormal or supernatural beliefs. In fact, it does not mean that, there is a dyadic denial between supporters of paranormal or supernatural beliefs and supporters of science. On the contrary, supporters of supernatural or paranormal beliefs do not necessarily deny science. They may rather have a tendency to look from an external locus of control view, or, as Irwin (1993) claims, they may rather have a subjective worldview.

In addition, there is a point that should be understood clearly. The terms "paranormal" and "supernatural" are sometimes used interchangeably (King, Burton, Hicks & Drigotas, 2007), sometimes used differently, some other researchers claim that paranormal beliefs encompasses numbers of non-material beliefs such as superstitious, religious, magical beliefs (Irwin, 1993). It is debatable that whether each non-material belief is put under the paranormal belief, because cultures are different from each other and their practices and rituals also differ. A belief may be seen logical and normal by different people but not by some others, for example most people in the world belong to certain religions, while it can be seen absurd or nonsensical by some people, e.g. who are deists (http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/156154/Deism).

Although both supernatural and paranormal beliefs imply similar things, the term paranormal may have a negative effect on or connotation to people. However, researchers meet at a point that they are both related to *physical absence* of human realities or capabilities. Thalbourne (1982) refers paranormal beliefs as "physically impossible". From this perspective and for this reason, the term paranormal belief is avoided and the term supernatural powers is used instead.

Then, a question may be asked to understand people's preferences for these beliefs: "Why do people believe in or carry supernatural beliefs?" Blackmore and Trościanko (1985) mention that there would be two reasons behind this question: people may misread normal events as paranormal or by "selective forgetting" people may misremember likelihood of occurrence of events (1985). Moreover, as true for superstitious beliefs, people are evolved to believe *things.* Society has also a great effect on individuals. For example, in Turkey, people who do not believe in God are generally marginalized and disdained by conservative people. Individuals in Turkey are generally trained with certain religious and cultural codes from childhood and thus, it is not easy to stand out from the present and dominant mainstream beliefs.

Numerous beliefs or rituals may be included in the supernatural powers. For instance, with regards to faith in God, and according to this faith, some religions' requirements such as belief in angels, fairies, jinns or Satan is the most mentioned examples. Belief in afterlife might bef also a God-related belief. Besides, it is believed that some people may also have supernatural powers.

In the world, there are different evaluations and categorizations of beliefs under different topics. For example King et. al., (2007), examine UFO (Unidentified Flying Object) (Rice, 2003) and ghosts under supernatural powers. Studies done in this area show that Turkish people might not even think about UFOs and ghosts or they do not believe in such phenomenon, and they are not mentioned in the Turkish articles. Rice (2003) also examines reincarnation, extrasensory perception and psychic healing under this topic.

Magic is the most common example, which is made by some hodjas or exorcists. Turkish people may take magic as a supernatural power because it is stated as an

absolute fact in Quran (as cited in Ayati and Ahmadi, 2013). Moreover, clairvoyance is also known (Doğan & Demiral, 2007) and may be seen as a supernatural power by Turkish people. People may think that God gives special powers to some people, who may foresee the future.

In sum, there are number of reasons that explain why people believe in supernatural powers. Supernatural power may be a sign of individuals' adaptation to their environment for the reasons discussed above and classified differently from culture to culture. The present study will try to investigate Turkish sample and their belief tendencies.

1.3 Spiritualism

In early times of human history, paganism was a popular doctrine and people were punished if they voiced something different. Paganism was a lifestyle for people and, they believed that some spiritual creatures were helping them to cope with difficulties. For examples, there were Shamans who were believed to help people to communicate with spirits. By time, people started to change their belief styles. The time here refers not to several years, it refers to thousands of years since belief systems as ideological units are really hard to change and when they change, they tend to change slowly (e.g. Mardin, 1983). Developments of science, proliferation of education and interaction of cultures have huge effects on this change. Despite those radical changes, lots of people do still rely on spiritualism, which is generally mentioned together with religion. A very early definition is made by Denton who defines spiritualism as "a belief in the communication of intelligence from the spirits of the departed, which is commonly obtained through a person of susceptibility, called a 'medium'" (Denton, 1871, p.4). From this definition, spiritualism may be distinguished from religion. Spiritualism is rather related with spirits and communication with them; on the other hand, religion is about people's life style, geography, culture, social interactions and maybe even related to the language they speak, because there are different religions, while spiritualism itself is a unit. It may be said that spirituality is a function of religion (Zinnbauer, Pargament & Scott, 1999). Those terms indeed, are very difficult to define.

The reality is that people generally start to evaluate events or things from their experience and move forward with regard to religious or spiritual issues (e.g. Irwin, 2007; Lawrence, Edwards, Barraclough, Church & Hetherington, 1995). Hence, those beliefs have been maintained and look like to be maintained for the future also.

People often confuse the supernatural and spiritual beliefs with each other and assume that they are interchangeable. In order to distinguish between these two definitions, in his book, Charet (1993) touches upon a very important and striking point. He claims that the leaders of spirituality from about 1850s follow four basic tenets: 1) supernaturalism is declined because it proposes that spirits will be ended with the end of material world, whereas spirituality supports the idea of immortality of the spirits; 2) laws of nature are unassailable; the belief which supports that there is no superior power over the nature; 3) objectivism should be the core issue rather than subjectivism; the followers should make objective and generalizable assertions rather than subjective; and 4) knowledge should be developed and followed. From these four tenets, it may be understood that since spiritual leaders pursue a *scientific* point of view, as they claim, spiritualism is a different belief from supernaturalism. Moreover, spiritualism allows people to follow science and their own religion (Charet, 1993). According to Nelson (2013), there are also community movements within spiritualism, and that proponents of different beliefs come and be acted together.

Several examples can be seen around the world about spiritualism. Those may be rituals or beliefs, that some mediums are believed to bring a communication between people and spirits. In addition, it is also believed that the soul continues to exist even though individuals die. Some researchers include ghosts to this category, spiritualism (e.g. Bering, McLeod & Shackelford, 2005). As mentioned earlier, those beliefs have been examined with different namings and categorized differently. So, examining such kind of beliefs within cultures comes into prominence. For example, in China, there is a philosophy called *feng shui* or "wind water" which may be categorized as an example of spiritualism (Chen, 2007). Skinner (1982, p. 4) defines *feng shui* as "the art of living in harmony with the land, and deriving the greatest benefit, peace and prosperity from being in the right place at the right time". In addition, *feng shui* is about the implementation of a number of techniques by which people live their lives positively

at interior and exterior spaces. In short, according to this philosophy, the current environment is the science of living in harmony. *Feng shui* believers give a great importance to numbers or *lucky* numbers (Bourassa & Peng, 1999) and furniture styles (Chen, 2007). That is, in different cultures or countries, people may interpret spiritualism according to their lifestyles.

Furthermore, spiritualism is associated with New Age in recent years. The New Age movement is defined as, "a spiritual movement seeking to transform individuals and society through mystical union with a dynamic cosmos" (Newport, 1998, p.1). New age has been popular from the late 1950s and it attracts a growing interest. It supports that everyone passes through certain stages of life; briefly, there are past lives of people. For the believers of New Age, nothing is a coincidence; everyone helps to the creation of everything, which means taking responsibility of everything in life. Although New Age is very popular in Western countries for years, it was not so popular in Turkey until recent years. But in recent years, there are newly formed unions about this philosophy.

Furthermore, reincarnation and karma are central philosophies in the New Age Movement (Holloway, 2000). Although the New Age Movement may not be heard by Turkish people much, these two philosophies may sound familiar. Reincarnation is eternal that is immortal souls' come to the universe again and again as different creatures; on the other hand, karma is about cause and effect relationships between acts and consequences of these acts (Holloway, 2000). The present study will show us whether Turkish people carry on such beliefs or not, which is an interesting topic to investigate with respect to a social psychological perspective due to rareness of the number of the studies.

Those examples are given in order to present people's shaping their lives according to these beliefs. In addition, people make relationships with each other on the grounds of such beliefs. Since Turkish culture is a religious-oriented culture, most people are expected to make a connection between spiritualism and religion. This may be an additional reason to investigate why people carry non-material beliefs.

1.4 Superstitious Beliefs

Superstition, a term which is generally associated with negative feelings, e.g. bad luck, inauspiciousness etc. is consisted of beliefs or rituals that people maintain. They may be functional for people's survival, and therefore individuals might want to sustain those beliefs.

Some researchers claim that superstitions are more alike to magical thinking (e.g. Zusne & Jones, 1989). On the contrary, some researchers have suggested that superstitions should be included in the paranormal beliefs (e.g. Lindeman & Aarnio, 2006; Tobacyk & Wilkinson, 1990). Oxford Dictionary defines the term superstition as "...a widely held but irrational belief in supernatural influences, especially as leading to good or bad luck, or a practice based on such a belief" (http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/superstition).

Albeit that superstitiousness is seen as a sign of primitiveness and ignorance (Juenemen, 2001), they may be seen in most cultures. Then, interpretation of these beliefs becomes very important.

In his famous novel, Sophie's World, Gaarder (1996) mentions superstitious as: *"Superstitious." What a strange word. If you believed in Christianity or Islam, it was called "faith". But if you believed in astrology or Friday the thirteenth it was superstition! Who had the right to call other people's belief superstition?"*

The quote above clearly displays the understanding that superstitious beliefs change from culture to culture or religion to religion. That is, a belief might not be recognized same by different individuals. In order to understand the fundamentals of these beliefs, one of the aims of the present study is to examine the way beliefs are categorized by the Turkish sample.

There are lots of studies with the findings that superstitious beliefs are culture-specific and yet presence of them is universal; that is, in almost all cultures, people carry on such beliefs even today. Those acts and beliefs are culturally transmitted or learned through reinforcement and they are appealed under conditions of uncertainty (Zusne & Jones, 1989). Generally, individuals want to actualize themselves and live in a

meaningful life. They, sometimes use superstitious beliefs for some conditions that science *is not able to explain*. They are the tools for clinging to life for people when people are not able to materialize some valued things and feel socially powerless.

Superstitious beliefs may be grouped according to people's assumptions or expectations that those beliefs help to cast out misfortune (e.g. pulling hair when seeing a black cat), to bring auspiciousness and luck (e.g. lucky charms), to achieve some specific consequences about things or people (e.g. magic or amulets), to foresee the future (e.g. fortune-telling) etc.

On the other hand, it may be seen that psychological stress is one of the most effective elements of believing superstitions. People, who are under stressful conditions, develop more magical beliefs as it can be seen in Malinowski's studies (1954). Malinowski (1954), who did observational research and lived with the observers for years, indicates that superstitious beliefs and behaviors are used to reduce threats and anxiety, which are felt because of psychological stress. He also concluded that individuals in high-risk jobs, such as deep-sea fishing as he observed, exhibit more superstitious beliefs with respect to those in low-risk jobs, such as fresh water fishing. People in high-risk conditions are expected to be more stressful than those in low-risk jobs, accordingly reckon on superstitious beliefs and behaviors more because they would most probably think that those behaviors would protect them from any kind of trouble. Although, there is no proof about the benefits of them, people still see them as a *shelters*.

There are several examples of superstitious beliefs across cultures. Some athletes or sportsmen perform superstitious rituals before matches (e.g. Mowen & Carlson, 2003) and lucky charms are present in most of societies in today's world. Culture-specific superstitious beliefs are also remarkable all around the world. Thus, this topic is important to investigate because such beliefs may affect people's actions all over the world. The present thesis will investigate Turkish people's belief tendencies.

1.5 Locus of Control

Locus of control was first used and developed by Rotter (1966), which was the general framework of his social-learning theory. In order to understand how people would react in a given environment; variables such as perceptions, expectations, and values must be taken into consideration (Seyhan, 2012). Thus, in order to understand how personality is shaped by these values, Rotter (1966), developed the concept of locus of control and defined it as the extent of control that an individual is able to exert on events or actions. Then it was divided into two categories: internal and external locus of control. Internal locus of control is generally about personal peculiarities, such as emotions, personality traits… etc.; whereas external locus of control is generally associated with the terms on which people have no or little control such as fate, luck…etc. (Rotter, 1966).

There are numbers of research studies about locus of control investigating the relationship between several variables; job satisfaction and job performance (Jugde & Bono, 2001), leadership styles (Howell & Avolio, 1993), health (Wallston, Wallston, Kaplan & Maides,1976), psychiatry (Levenson, 1973), innovativeness (Mueller & Thomas 2001), learned helplessness (Hiroto, 1974), academic achievement (Findley & Cooper, 1983), God image and self-esteem (Benson & Spilka, 1973), depression (Benassi & Dufour, 1988) etc., with respect to each branch of psychology. Since locus of control is a concept related with the personality, there may be intrinsic and extrinsic motivations behind it.

Beliefs generally rely on some personal or social motivations. So, locus of control may be a helpful agent to understand people's motivations to beliefs and fundamentals behind them. Examining the relationship between locus of control and belief systems may be a good idea. In fact, the relationship between supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitious beliefs and locus of control has also been examined in several research studies as mentioned before. Literature indicates that people who have external locus of control are more inclined to carry non-material beliefs than who have internal locus of control (e.g. Dag, 1999; Randall & Desrosiers, 1980; Scheidt, 1973; Tobacyk, Nagot & Miller, 1988). Numerous studies were pursued both in Turkey (e.g. superstitions, Dag, 1999; Seyhan, 2012) and abroad (e.g. magic; Belter & Brinkmann, 1981; Randall & Desrosiers, 1980; Tobacyk, Nagot & Miller, 1988) gave the same

results for people who believe magic or paranormal phenomena. On the contrary, Groth-Marnat and Pegden found that people who have internal locus of control more tended to believe in superstitions (1998). They claim that individuals stay away from things that are believed to bring bad luck and controlling it in the hands of them. Individuals believe that they may avoid bad luck by avoiding superstitious rituals. For example, if they avoid the number 13 or black cats, they may feel themselves safe and exerting such a control over events may lead to feel themselves as having internal locus of control (Groth-Marnat & Pegden, 1998). Moreover, Belter and Brinkmann found that there is no correlation between locus of control and belief in God (1981).

Some studies have only included superstition; some others only include religious beliefs. Several studies examine only magical beliefs, as mentioned above. Since all three beliefs, namely, belief in supernatural power, spiritualism and superstitions, are also based on abstract and unproved thoughts or assumptions like religion, it is expected that locus of control will be correlated with them.

1.6 System Justification Theory

The term "justification" sounds equivocal and may evoke different thoughts. From one side, it may be associated with legitimate issues; from the other side, it may also be associated with the illegitimate issues. The important thing is to look at how people use justification. Jost and Banaji (1994) wondered about this situation and developed System Justification Theory, defined as "process by which existing social arrangements are legitimized, even at the expense of personal and group interest" and their theory is fed by several other theories such as social identity theory, just world belief, cognitive dissonance theory, ideology of Marxist-Feminist theories and social dominance theory; which reveals it is a highly inclusive theory. Jost and Banaji (1994) sought to answer some questions: 1) why do disadvantaged groups justify and support the system, 2) why status-quo is supported by people when it is even disadvantageous for them and what are the fundamentals under this understanding and lastly, 3) why people engage in negative stereotyping for both themselves and their groups. Those questions are answered by researchers by using ego and group justification processes.

Ego-justification function refers to the seeking for the positive-self and satisfying psychological needs of one's own. Group-justification function, on the contrary; refers to the seeking to draw a desirable group image for *others* and to defend group rights and actions, which is also an assertion of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1981).

A recent study, which was conducted by Jost, Pietrzak, Liviatan, Mandisodza, and Napier (2008), indicates four inferences from the overall hypotheses and research studies about the theory. Firstly, if system or the regime is felt smoothly and helpful, people want to maintain the status quo and thus, this may be a goal to pursue. Secondly, justification of system stems from some dispositional and situational factors (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003). For example if threat is present in the environment, then the individual or group may justify system more; it is also valid for the uncertain situations. Then, a palliative function assists system justification for both disadvantaged and advantaged individuals and groups. That is, although it has also negative impacts on individuals and groups, it mitigates people by reducing anxiety and uncertainty; people see this as a shelter. Lastly, when the change becomes inevitable, individuals or groups want change as soon as possible and adapt the new system rapidly.

The first tenet that system or status quo is justified cognitively and ideologically by people when it is helpful, is highly related with the topic that want to be investigated. Non-material beliefs have been one of the major factors which shape people's lives and life styles. Those beliefs facilitate people's lives since the very early time because of that living without questioning is to flee from certain realities. In this case, maintaining status quo, and carrying on such kinds of beliefs and rituals may get life easier for people, because ambiguity will be lessened in their lives. Additionally, resisting present system and regime requires to take certain risks, to illustrate, people may be marginalized or *otherized* for not pursuing the system. Since humans are social creatures, this means a great risk is on the way. Literally, by resisting, their relationships with other people may deteriorate.

Furthermore, it may be inferred that status quo is related with the "power". People pursue status quo and reproduce it to benefit from advantages it provides (Foucault, 1998; Jost & Banaji, 1994). On account of power issues, then, a set of myths or ideas

are developed in order to legalize unequal and unsteady relations between the dominant and subordinate groups (De Oliveira & Dambrun, 2007).

Jost & Banaji (1994) also referred to a Marxist notion called 'false consciousness'. They adapt this economic-based Marxist notion to a social psychological form and define it as "the ideas of the dominant tend to be the ideas of dominated" (Jost & Banaji, 1994). It does not have to become consciously, it may also become unconsciously. In relation to the present study, individuals may not be aware of their behaviors or attitudes. Superstitions may serve a good example, to illustrate; some people for example, knock on the wood when they hear something bad. Then they realize that the act of knocking on the wood was just unconsciously done. The most probable reason of knocking on the wood is the environment of these people. They may become dominated by the environment they live in, people they live together, or even their cognitive processes; and this causes them to make such rituals without realizing it.

In the light of the literature provided above, it is expected that system justification will be correlated with the belief in supernatural power, spiritualism and superstitions; all of which can be named as non-material beliefs.

1.7 Religious/Spiritual Coping

Religion, like spiritualism, exists from the early times of the humankind, from hunter-gatherer societies. If religion had not a survival value, it would not have been maintained until today. In addition, religion may have both positive and negative effects on people. For example, religion may remind people their death and afterlife (if s(he) believes it), or, they can feel peaceful because they bind themselves to a *safe shelter.* Religion also helps to improve achievement orientation and affects motivation (Weber & Parsons, 1998).

Religion is one of the most popular topics in the psychology literature. Many famous psychologists (Freud, James, Allport, Jung, Fromm, Maslow, Frankl, Hill etc.) argued

that religion and spirituality should not be ignored, unless the total understanding of individuals will be very hard.

Durkheim (2012), who is one of the fathers of the Sociology, defines religion as *"a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, i.e., things set apart and forbidden – beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them"* (p. 44).

The term Church, in my opinion, might be replaced with the other sacred or worship places. Although this definition seems old, it can still be used to define religion. On the other hand, Beyer, highlights the transnationality of religion: "as a global societal system which is transnational in character and acts like nation-states or the economy" (as cited in Akçapar, 2006, p. 819).

In consideration of those definitions, religion is a notably social entity. As Durkheim claims, it is the most important example of "collective conscious" which turn into "collective representations" (2012), by which societies aggregate their consciousness for sacred things, worships and relationships Moscovici (1981), takes the concept of "collective representations" one step further and names it "social representations". He asserts that social representations are dynamic, in contrast to collective representations. On this condition, religion may be placed under both "collective" and "social". People may lean in religion for the fear of death (Allport, 1950; Jost & Kay, 2009). This fear is clearly observable in mostly elder people. For example, as a Muslim country, in Turkey, it may be inferred that sometimes elder women wear hijab or head scarf due to the fear of God or after life. According to a research survey done in Turkey by Çarkoğlu and Toprak (2006), the elders, come first among people who define themselves as Muslims. Also, women who define themselves as Muslim, generally veil. In this case, it may be inferred that elder people veil more than young people.

Moreover, when a person thinks that (s) he did a bad or unpleasant thing, (s) he may direct herself/himself to pray or ritually worship. Darwin (2003) states that religion brings groups together and via this togetherness, their selfishness will be repressed.

Religions do not change readily, but interpretation of it may change in the process of time. People try to find ways that relieve them in terms of beliefs, rituals, attitudes,

behaviors, and relationships. However, there are also disturbing and uncomfortable situations, such as stress and anxiety. Most people see religion as a savior to overcome for such kind of personal problems.

Namely, each person interprets religion according to herself/himself. Different interpretations may bring different strategies of individuals. Religious/Spiritual coping (Pargament, 1997) may be considered as one of those strategies developed by individuals, which draws researchers' attention mostly in recent years. Pargament (1990) serves three ways that coping and religion can go together: 1) religion can be seen as a coping strategy for many things; 2) coping process can be shaped by religion; and 3) religion can be shaped after coping process.

In the past studies, religious/spiritual coping is often examined in relation to stress, anxiety (Pargament, Koening & Perez, 2000), mental health (Bergin, Masters & Richards, 1987) and well-being (Pargament, 1997). Further, after traumatic events, people can turn to religion and spirituality (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004). The sense of fear, fear of losing something, fear of possibility of an unpleasant event may direct people to religion and spirituality. Then, people may again develop religious/spiritual coping strategies.

Pargament, Smith, Koenig and Perez (1998) propose religious/spiritual coping as consisted of positive or negative. Positive religious/spiritual coping is about individuals' building a secure and comfortable relationship with God, who helps to overcome particular problems. Negative religious/spiritual coping, on the contrary, is about individuals' building an insecure and uncomfortable relationship with God, who is blamed for happening of bad events (Pargament et al., 1998). Individuals who have negative religious/spiritual coping strategy might not have a just-world belief which stems from the understanding that world is a just place and people are responsible for their acts and God rewards or punishes people (Lerner, 1980). Just-world believers have been found to be more religious-oriented, more authoritarian, and more tend to have internal locus of control than non-believers (Rubin & Peplau, 1975). Therefore, people who use religious/spiritual coping strategies may be inclined to carry non-material beliefs.

Although religiosity is generally mentioned with spirituality, supernatural powers and superstitions are considered as separate concepts; yet, there are also lots of studies examining the relationship between religiosity levels and supernatural powers and superstitions. Religiosity and religious/spiritual coping may be perceived as a shelter for people to explain certain events or issues, like belief in superstitions and supernatural powers. In their research study, Aarnio and Lindeman (2007) have an impressive and logical finding that paranormal believers and skeptics tend to find a positive relationship between religiosity levels and paranormal beliefs, whereas, religious people tend to find a negative relationship between religiosity levels and paranormal beliefs.

If it is thought as people who have high religiosity levels use religious/spiritual coping strategies, people who use religious/spiritual coping strategies can be expected to think in the same way. Then, in the light of Aarnio and Lindeman's finding (2007), it may be expected that religious/spiritual coping strategy oriented individuals will be tended to find a negative relationship between superstitions and religious/spiritual coping. Supernatural powers and spirituality are excluded because they are generally associated with the belief in God and religions. In sum, religious/spiritual coping strategies may prevent people from believing in superstitions. In this way, it is expected that religious/spiritual coping strategies, whether negative or positive, are related with the superstitions, besides supernatural powers and spirituality.

1.8 Religiosity

Religion, as Durkheim (2012) claims, is about beliefs and rituals with regards to sacred things and it comes from very early times, and yet religiosity is different from religion. Simmel (1997, p. 165) differentiates religion and religiosity from each other as he defines religiosity as "a state or a spiritual rhythm lacking any object". Religiosity might be considered as a phenomenon that has been passed through the filter of religion in order to keep faith.

Allport (2004) claims that people generally tend to become more religious at crisis times than the normal times. In addition, Allport and Ross (1967) indicates that being

religious is a way to contribute people's becoming more mature. Thus, it may be understood why the masses follow or believe in religions or why they become religious.

Psychologists, especially in the area of social psychology, examined and studied religion and religiosity which have become quite a popular topic from the very past to the present (e.g. Baumeister, 2002; Freud & Strachey, 1985; Jones, 1996; Spilka & McIntosh, 1997). There are also numerous research studies examining the relationship between religiosity and non-material beliefs; namely supernatural powers (e.g. Harris, 2003; Norenzayan & Hansen, 2006; Shtulman, 2013), spiritualism (e.g. MacDonald, 1995; Orenstein, 2002) and superstitious beliefs (e.g. Mowen & Carlson, 2003; Rice, 2003; Tobacyk, 1988; Torgler, 2007; Yip, 2003).

As mentioned before, since the religion and religiosity non-material basis, it might be beneficial to investigate the relationship between these variables and non-material beliefs. In sum, in the present thesis, like religious/spiritual coping strategies, religiosity levels of people are expected to be related to the non-material beliefs. Particularly, in the light of the literature and expectations in Turkish culture, supernatural powers and spiritualism may be positively related with the non-material beliefs, while superstitious beliefs may be negatively related with the non-material beliefs as mentioned before. Briefly, religious/spiritual coping strategies and religiosity levels of people are expected to be related non-material beliefs.

1.9 Hypotheses and Aims of the Present Study

Non-material beliefs, for example, supernatural powers, spiritualism, superstitions, paranormal beliefs, extrasensory perception or magical beliefs have long been ignored by psychologists. However, there is an increasing interest to these topics which may be understood from the number of publications in recent years.

In Turkish culture, non-material beliefs are generally studied by theologists (e.g. Arslan, 2010; Köse & Ayten, 2009; Topuz, 2013), medical doctors (e.g. Ogenler & Yapici, 2012) or some members of faculty of education (e.g. Oksal, Şenşekerci &

Bilgin, 2006). Some of them only deal with superstitious beliefs while some others only deal with supernatural beliefs. There are only few studies from the psychological perspective (e.g. Ayhan & Yarar, 2005; Dag, 1999) that examine the nature of material beliefs.

Since non-material beliefs shape and affect most people's lives, it should be also studied by psychologists. In the present study, non-material beliefs will be examined from a social psychological perspective with the variables of locus of control, general system justification and religious/spiritual coping. Then, non-material beliefs, which evoke both positive and negative feelings, should be examined. In the literature, scales generally include the items which have negative connotations. Besides, scales are generally about one specific topic such as Paranormal Belief Scale (PBS; Tobacyk, 1988), Australian Sheep-Goat Scale (Thalbourne, 1981), Supernaturalism Scale (Randall & Desrosiers, 1980), Extraordinary Belief Inventory (Otis & Alcock, 1982) etc.

A scale was developed for the present study. It was constructed by a great deal of non-material beliefs, which consists of three parts; supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitious beliefs. This scale will contribute to the literature as there is no such comprehensive scale for Turkish sample, with regards to such kinds of beliefs.

Then, there is only one study, as far as known, investigating the relationship between general system justification and non-material beliefs. In fact, it examines the relationship between God and the government (Kay, Gaucher, Napier, Callan & Laurin, 2008). Relationship between system justification and other beliefs have not been examined hitherto. The present study will look at this relationship.

Locus of control is a very popular topic for the psychologists or researchers. The relationship between locus of control and non-material beliefs has been examined widely, but again, those beliefs were examined only partially. With the current comprehensive scale, it will be beneficial to see whether there are to be differences between supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitions, individually.

Lastly, religious/spiritual coping is a topic which is often investigated with religion or spirituality, naturally. However, there is not much research about superstitions.

Findings are expected to be contributing to the literature from a social psychological perspective.

In sum, the scale developed for the present study for Turkish people, will be an important input for the future research and findings may direct researchers to similar topics. Research questions and suggested hypotheses are stated as follows:

Research Question 1: Are gender, age and socioeconomic status (income and education) significant predictors of carrying non-material beliefs?

Hypothesis#1: In the light of literature, gender is found to be related to non-material beliefs (e.g. Cameron, 2010; Dag, 1999; Randall, 1990; Vyse, 1997). It is expected that women and men will differ in tendencies to carry non-material beliefs. Namely, women are expected to be more inclined to carry such beliefs.

Hypothesis#2: Age (e.g. Keinan 1994; Köktaş, 1993; Tobacyk, Pritchett & Mitchell, 1988) and socioeconomic status (income, e.g. Gorer, 1955; Paul, 2010; education, e.g. McCleary & Barro, 2006; Rice, 2003; Swami, Pietschnig, Stieger & Voracek, 2011) are found to be related to non-material beliefs. It is expected that older people will differ from young people in carrying non-material beliefs. Specifically, older people will be more tended to carry non-material beliefs. In addition, it is also expected that educated people will be less likely to believe in superstitious beliefs but it is expected that there will be no difference in supernatural powers and spiritualism.

Research Question 2: Are locus of control, general system justification, religious/spiritual coping and religiosity level significant predictors of carrying non-material beliefs?

Hypothesis#3: LOC is founded to be related non-material beliefs (e.g. Dag, 1999; Randall & Desrosiers, 1980; Scheidt, 1973; Tobacyk, Nagot & Miller, 1988). In fact, some of research studies include only superstitious beliefs; some other studies include only religious beliefs. Since those beliefs are all "non-psychical", and control from an external source is believed, it is expected that people who have external locus of control will be more tended to carry non-material beliefs.

Hypothesis#4: There is almost no study in the literature which looks at the relationship between non-material beliefs and general system justification (Jost & Banaji, 1994). Although religiosity is examined within this framework, those beliefs are needed to be investigated. It is anticipated that the more people justify the system, the more they carry on non-material beliefs.

Hypothesis#5: Although the relationship between religious/spiritual coping and religiosity is apparent, there is no study looking at the relationship between superstitious beliefs and religious/spiritual coping to the best of our knowledge.

As mentioned before, it is known that there are very close links between religiosity and supernatural powers; due to the fact that supernatural powers may remind people God and religion, especially in Turkish culture. Thus, it is expected that people who evolves religious/spiritual coping strategies will justify the supernatural powers and spirituality, and reject belief in the superstitions.

Hypothesis#6: In addition, it is expected that the more individuals' being religious, the more they believe in supernatural powers and spiritualism. In contrast, it is also expected that people who are religious tend to believe in superstitions less than people who are not religious at all.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

In this section, the scales were used for the assessment of relationship between non-material beliefs and other psychological variables; namely, locus of control, general system justification, religious/spiritual coping and religiosity besides demographics. In addition, hypothetical scenarios related to belief tendencies are explained. Finally, scale construction details and type of analysis used for the data set are illustrated.

2.1 Development of NMBS

Thirty seven-item Non-Material Belief Scale is used, which was constructed in a separate study, for the present study. After interviews, as a preliminary study, with a sample of 29 participants, a scale that measures non-material belief tendencies was developed. The scale includes three subscales differentiated according to their contents, categorizations done by interviewees and factor analyses, which are namely supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitious beliefs.

2.1.1 Pilot Study I: Interviews

2.1.1.1 Participants

29 interviewees (17 females and 12 males), with a mean age of 39.35 (18 to 57) participated in the semi-structured interviews. 1 interviewee was not able to understand and answer questions and that interview was omitted. The interviewees were randomly selected in terms of their age and education, but socioeconomic status (SES) of the participants were taken into consideration; 13 of them were from low-status, 6 of them were from middle-status and 10 of them were from high-status groups. Interviewees were selected with the care of being from different levels of socio-economic statuses

due to the fact that there might be a possibility of differences in terms of non-material beliefs.

SES of the participants was assessed according to Turkish Statistical Institute Household Surveys (TUİK, 2012). According to this survey, interviewees who were unemployed or who earned less than 1500₺ a month were classified as low-status groups. Interviewees who earned between 1500₺ and 3500₺ a month were classified to be in middle-status groups, and lastly, interviewees who earned 3500₺ and above in a month were classified as high-status groups. By the way, their education levels were also taken into consideration. That is, interviewees who from different educational levels or backgrounds were chosen.

The professions of the participants were as follows: 1 research assistant, 2 university students, 1 stock-purchase staff, 1 foreign trade staff, 2 service personnel, 1 petroleum engineer, 1 cleaning staff, 3 civil servants, 5 housewives, 1 judge, 1 clerk, 3 lawyers, 1 retiree, 1 communication service worker, 1 environmental engineer, 1 pharmacist, 1 doctor, 1 businessman, and 1 high school student. The professions of the interviewees were generally different from each other. In order to reflect different segments of society, group heterogeneity was tried to be provided. Participants' demographics are presented in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2 Demographic Information of Interviewees

Variable	Frequency(#)	Percentage (%)
Education		
Illiterate	2	6,90
Primary School	5	17,24
High School	4	13,79
Institution of Higher Education	4	13,79
University	10	34,48
Graduate School	4	13,79
Income Level		
Unemployed	8	27,59
≤ 800 ₺	2	6,90
801-1500 ₺	3	10,34
1501-2000 ₺	3	10,34
2001-2500 ₺	3	10,34
2501-3000 ₺	0	0,00
3001-3500 ₺	0	0,00
3501-4000 ₺	2	6,90
≥ 4001 ₺	8	27,59
Political View		
Left-Wing	15	51,72
Right-Wing	9	31,03
Others	5	17,24

2.1.1.2 Procedure

Prior to the interviews, the participants were given voluntary participation forms, on which the aim of the study and contact numbers were present. In addition, they were informed that the interviewees' voices will be recorded. None of the participants opposed. Then, they were also informed that no information is required for their identity and institution they work for during the study, and information obtained from them will be used for the present study and related scientific publications. Emphasized topics and questions asked to the participants were as follows in the Table 2.3:

Table 2.3 Emphasized Topics and Questions of the Interview

Have you ever heard about superstitious beliefs, supernatural power and spiritualism? What do they mean? What do these beliefs imply to you? Could you give some examples?*

(Examples of superstitious beliefs: Evil eye, fortune-telling, luck, magic)

(Examples of supernatural power: horoscopes, jinns, fairies and angels)

(Examples of spiritualism: reincarnation, treatment with bioenergy, aura and telepathy)

Do you believe in superstitious beliefs, supernatural power and spiritualism? Are there any people around you who believe in those beliefs? Could you give some examples that are present around you?

Have those beliefs ever affected or directed your relationships and behaviors?

Why do you think others carry those beliefs? Did you observe any examples that affect their lives?

On the basis of these beliefs, have you ever faced with any experience that changed or influenced your life deeply?

What kinds of aspects affect the formation of your beliefs?

Does religion has an effect on these beliefs?

*If participants could not give any examples, these examples are reminded.

The questions above were asked to all participants. None of the participants bothered because of the voice recording; and all 29 interviewees' voiced were recorded via voice recording device. However, since the interviews were semi-structured; they were asked some extra questions when necessary.

2.1.1.3 Analysis

7 questions were directed to the participants for the interview part of the present study which were about supernatural powers, spiritualism, and superstitious beliefs (see Appendix A for Turkish version of the semi-structured interview questions). According to responses of the interviewees, all beliefs were extracted. The aim of the

interviews, in fact, was to reach as much beliefs as possible from many people and understand the fundamentals and impacts behind those beliefs of people to construct a valid and reliable scale, which will be applied to participants to compare with demographics, locus of control orientations, general system justification tendencies and religious/spiritual coping strategies of people. Furthermore, inter-rater reliability was also assessed. The researcher of the thesis examined 20 % of the interviews after a two week time interval again, and almost all beliefs that are extracted were the same. In addition, another social psychology master student examined all interviews and found 91.25 % correspondence of beliefs with regard to reciprocal examination of the interviews.

2.1.2 Pilot Study II: Reliability and Validity of the Constructed Scale

2.1.2.1 Method

The final scale is consisted of the certain themes that are extracted from interviews. There were 37 items, 18 of which represent supernatural powers, 9 of which represent spiritualism, and finally 10 of which represent superstitious beliefs (see Appendix B for Non-Material Belief Scale). Participants evaluated each item on a 5-Point Likert scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree".

2.1.2.2 Procedure

Reliability and validity issues are very important for a scale construction, from which the researcher wants to verify the certainty of the scale whether it measures desired points and gives reliable results (Clark & Watson, 1995). In order to assess reliability and validity, a pilot study was conducted with 117 participants (78 females and 39 males) via web-based survey. None of participants gave up the survey. They were provided demographic information form, 42 items extracted from interviews, and 26 items of Turkish version of Tobacyk's PBS-R (Revised Paranormal Scale) which is translated to Turkish from English by Dag (1999) (See Appendix C for the PBS-R Scale), in order to make comparison and assess validity.

2.2.2.3 Analyses and Results

Firstly, the data obtained were checked in terms of accuracy and missing data for statistical verification via Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Then, responses to 42 items were put into a factor analysis with Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation. KMO and Bartlet's test gave the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy as .89, which means that factorability assumption was met.

Initial factor solution gave ten factors, but scree-plot and total variance explained gave the signs that there might be 5 factors; because factor loadings were quite scattered and loaded weakly in patches.

Moreover, parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) with Monte Carlo research (Watkins, 2000) with 100 replications was also conducted. As a result of parallel analysis, there were 4 factors, Eigen values were between 2.25 and 1.86 which was the cut point of the Eigen values.

Then, three, four and five factor solutions were examined, using both varimax and oblimin rotations of the factor loading matrix. The three factor solution, which explained 54% of the variance, was preferred because of its previous theoretical support. Moreover, the Eigen values became straight on the scree-plot after three factors. Fourth and consecutive factors were difficult to interpret and their loadings were poor. There was little difference between the varimax and oblimin solutions, thus varimax solution was chosen. During several steps, five items were excluded because one of them did not contribute to a simple factor structure, the others correlated less with other items and alpha if item deleted was higher than when included. Total scale reliability, that is Cronbach Alpha, increased .90 to .92.

The item "Bazen yaşadığım anı daha önce yaşamış hissine kapılırım (dejavu)" did not load on any factor and was excluded. The items "Fal baktırmam", "Fala inanmam", "Şans diye bir şey yoktur " and "Öldükten sonra dünyaya tekrar farklı bir kişi olarak geleceğime inanırım" were excluded also because they were difficult to be classified theoretically and they decreased the total variance explained and Cronbach Alpha values of the factors. In addition, they were similar items that may give same meaning.

In the last form of the factor analysis, factor loadings ranged from .32 to .88. The initial Eigen values showed that the first factor explained 14.6 % of the variance, the second factor 2.7 % of the variance, and a third factor 2.5 % of the variance. First factor included eighteen items, second factor included nine items and finally third item included ten items. The factor loading matrix for this final solution is presented in Table 2.4.

Some items like "Tanrı'nın/Allah'ın varlığına inanırım", "Ölümden sonra başka bir hayatın (ahiret) olduğuna inanırım", "Doğaüstü güçlerin varlığına inanırım", "Cinlerin ve perilerin varlığına inanırım" or "Büyünün varlığına inanırım" loaded to first factor. Since the items are generally about belief in God or extraordinary forces, it is named as 'Supernatural Powers'. The internal consistency of the factor was above fair (α = .86).

Some items like "El ve düşünce gücüyle insanların ne düşündüğü anlaşılabilir (Reiki)", "Altıncı his diye bir şeyin varlığına inanırım", "Burçlara göre tanımlanan karakterlere inanırım", "İnsanın bedeninin dışına çıkıp ruhu ile seyahat edebildiğine inanırım" or "Mevcut yaşamımın öncesinde farklı yaşamlarımın olduğuna inanırım" loaded to second factor. Since the items are generally about belief in spirits and metaphysical existences, it is named as 'Spiritualism'. Although first and second factors are seem to be related, they are not equivalent. The reason is that, supernatural powers are perceived as God-related in Turkey, majority of which is Muslim. On the contrary, for example, spiritualism includes such item as "Mevcut yaşamımın öncesinde farklı yaşamlarımın olduğuna inanırım", which is namely reincarnation; which is strongly rejected by some people who identify themselves as Muslims. Different interpretations are present but, the dominant view is as presented. . The internal consistency of the factor was above fair (α = .85).

Lastly, third factor included some items like "Uğursuzluk getiren eşyalara ya da ritüellere inanırım (ayna kırma, kara kedi görme, merdiven altından geçme vb.)", "Nazar değdiren kişilerden uzak durmaya çalışırım", "Batıl inançlar beni rahatlattığı için uygularım" or "Batıl inançlara inanmam", which are apparent signals of the superstitious beliefs as literature also suggests. Due to the fact that it is named as 'Superstitions'. The internal consistency of the factor was fair enough (α = .74). In

addition, some items of the NMB scale were reverse coded. Higher scores indicate higher tendency to carry non-material beliefs.

Further, there were four items that loaded at both three factors. Their categorizations were done through theoretical convenience. Firstly, the item "Nazara inanırım" loaded to Factor 1 (.61) and Factor 3 (.49). It was put under Factor 3, since evil-eye is generally studied within superstitious beliefs in order not to controvert the literature. Then two items which are "Doğaüstü güçler hakkında konuşulması beni tedirgin eder" and "Rüyalardan geleceğe yönelik işaretler aldığım için etkilenirim", loaded to Factor 1(.49 and .46, respectively) and Factor 3 (.34 and .34, respectively), again. Both items are included in the first factor, since they are more related with the rest items of Factor 1, and they "are also about supernatural powers. Lastly, the item "Fala inandığım için fal baktırırım" is loaded both to Factor 2 (.47) and Factor 3 (.36). Fortune-telling is generally related to superstitions, in the light of literature; because of that it is put under the third factor. However, it is an essential point that the difference between switched factors was not great, indeed. Moreover, those items were not omitted because they are critical items reflecting the factor structure.

After assessing the final version of the constructed scale, validity of scale was examined. Firstly, in order to determine convergent validity of the scale, correlation of the variables in the same factor units was examined and the items within factor units were all correlated significantly (see Table 2.5 for supernatural powers, Table 2.6 for spiritualism and Table 2.7 for superstitious beliefs). In other words, items were all correlated with each other significantly ($p < .01$, $p < .05$) and convergent validity was assessed.

Secondly, discriminant validity was examined. In order to ensure the scale's discriminant validity, correlation between items which belonged to different factor units has to be low and insignificant. When correlations of items between inter-factors examined, some of the items were not correlated with some other items from another subscale, which is desired. On the other hand, some items were correlated with other items which belongs to another factor, which is not desired. Thus, it may be inferred that discriminant validity is partially satisfied.

Moreover, concurrent validity was examined, which requires a comparison with another scale. For the present study, the constructed scale was evaluated against one other scale called Revised Paranormal Belief Scale (PBS-R, Tobacyk's which is translated to Turkish from English by Dag, 1988), which is apparently reliable and valid. Correlations between all three factors, supernatural powers *(r = .83, p < .01)*, spiritualism *(r = .79, p < .01)*, superstitious beliefs *(r = .60, p < .01)* and PBS-R were all significant. Additionally and more importantly, the correlation between the total scale and PBS-R was also significant *(r = .85, p < .01)*.

Lastly, 4 items of the NMBS were reverse coded; due to the fact that individuals who get higher scores indicate that they are more inclined to carry on non-material beliefs.

Table 2.4 Results of Factor Analysis Performed on Items of Non-Material Beliefs Scale

Items	Factor 1: Supernatural Power	Factor 2: Spiritualism	Factor 3: Superstitions
	Factor Loadings		
(Meleklerin ve şeytanın varlığına inanırım)	**.876**		
(Doğanın üstünde bir güç yoktur)	**-.866**		
(Ölümden sonra başka bir hayatın (ahiret) olduğuna inanırım)	**.844**		
(İnsanların öldükten sonra ruhlarının var olduğuna inanırım)	**.797**		
(Cinlerin ve perilerin varlığına inanırım)	**.750**		.315
(Tanrı'nın/Allah'ın varlığına inanırım)	**.692**		
(Büyünün varlığına inanırım)	**.678**		
(Yaşayan insanların da ruhlarının olduğuna inanırım)	**.632**	.420	
(Doğaüstü güçlerin varlığına inanırım)	**-.614**		
(Büyü diye bir şey yoktur)	.611		**.490**
(Nazara inanırım)			
("Ne ekersen, onu biçersin" , "Etme bulma dünyası" gibi sözler bence doğrudur)	**.606**		
(Mucizelere inanırım)	**.594**	.349	.374
(İnançları gerçekleştiren bir ruhani düzen olduğuna inanırım)	**.582**	.424	
(İyi düşünürsen iyi olur gibi))	**.549**		.466
(Türbeler ve ziyaret yerlerinin olumlu etkilerine inanırım)	**-.496**		
(Her türlü ruhani inanca karşı şüpheci yaklaşırım)	**.483**	.376	.349
(Bazı rüyaların geleceği gösterdiğine inanırım)			
(El ve düşünce gücüyle insanların ne düşündüğü anlaşılabilir (Reiki))		**.737**	
(İnsanların bedenlerinde, kendi enerjilerini yönlendiren çakralar olduğuna inanırım)	.342	**.709**	
(Uzaktaki insanlarla herhangi bir araç olmadan iletişim kurulabilir)		**.659**	
(İnsanın bedeninin dışına çıkıp ruhu ile seyahat edebildiğine inanırım)	.396	**.650**	
(El ve düşünce gücüyle insanlar tedavi edilebilir (Biyoenerji tedavisi))		**.621**	
(Altıncı his diye bir şeyin varlığına inanırım)	.337	**.616**	
(Bazı insanların sezgileri çok kuvvetlidir)		**.578**	
(Burçlara göre tanımlanan karakterlere inanırım)		**.516**	
(Fala inandığım için fal baktırırım)		.472	**.361**
(Mevcut yaşamımın öncesinde farklı yaşamlarımın olduğuna inanırım)		**.451**	
(Uğursuzluk getiren eşyalara ya da ritüellere inanırım (ayna kırma, kara kedi görme, merdiven altından geçme vb.))			**.744**
(Nazar değdiren kişilerden uzak durmaya çalışırım)	.332		**.730**
(Batıl inançlar beni rahatlattığı için uygularım)			**.709**
(Nazar değecek korkusuyla bazı şeyleri paylaşmaktan kaçınırım)	.		**.698**
(Uğur getiren eşyalara ya da ritüellere inanırım (at nalı, renkler, sayılar, günler vb.))	400		**.629**
(Şans ya da şanssızlık bir kaderdir)	**.335**		**.574**
(Doğaüstü güçler hakkında konuşulması beni tedirgin eder)			.496
(Rüyalardan geleceğe yönelik işaretler aldığım için etkilenirim)	**.342**		.457
(Batıl inançlara inanmam)	-.334		**-.414**
(Bir şey yaptıktan sonra kötü bir şey olmuşsa tekrar yapmamaya çalışırım)			**.324**
Eigenvalues	14.6	2.7	2.5
Reliability (Cronbach Alpha)	.82	.82	.78
% of Explained Variances	25.61	14.1	13.85

Total Alpha = .92

% of Total Explained Variance = 53.56

Table 2.5. Correlations between the Items of Supernatural Powers

	v24	v16	v42	v29	v23	v28	v14	v30	v13	v17	v41	v26	v33	v25	v34	v21	v18	v22
v24	-																	
v16	-,769**	-																
v42	,842**	-,690**	-															
v29	,837**	-,729**	,795**	-														
v23	,843**	-,688**	,690**	,695**	-													
v28	,794**	-,651**	,743**	,739**	,735**	-												
v14	,645**	-,629**	,564**	,570**	,610**	,561**	-											
v30	,686**	-,612**	,783**	,829**	,549**	,591**	,501**	-										
v13	-,549**	,478**	-,450**	-,515**	-,493**	-,446**	-,551**	-,392**	-									
v17	,680**	-,610**	,613**	,618**	,659**	,589**	,571**	,509**	-,509**	-								
v41	,558**	-,493**	,607**	,515**	,446**	,590**	,433**	,474**	-,370**	,440**	-							
v26	,624**	-,513**	,590**	,616**	,609**	,607**	,512**	,534**	-,435**	,584**	,581**	-						
v33	,627**	-,512**	,643**	,633**	,504**	,588**	,517**	,610**	-,372**	,546**	,545**	,552**	-					
v25	,643**	-,454**	,630**	,600**	,552**	,600**	,475**	,464**	-,417**	,493**	,454**	,678**	,429**	-				
v34	-,418**	,402**	-,444**	-,369**	-,352**	-,315**	-,344**	-,351**	,367**	-,303**	-,257**	-,374**	-,402**	-,333**	-			
v21	,532**	-,421**	,483**	,548**	,464**	,485**	,555**	,450**	-,520**	,532**	,318**	,543**	,434**	,534**	-,434**	-		
v18	,477**	-,358**	,339**	,367**	,481**	,462**	,418**	,290**	-,259**	,444**	,332**	,399**	,328**	,502**	-,049	,378**	-	
v22	,416**	-,322**	,341**	,429**	,398**	,439**	,425**	,330**	-,377**	,404**	,263**	,449**	,336**	,435**	-,317**	,799**	,413**	-

Table 2.6 Correlations between the Items of Spiritualism

	V36	V40	V38	V39	V35	V27	V19	V20	V31
V36	-								
V40	,604**	-							
V38	,548**	,425**	-						
V39	,533**	,537**	,579**	-					
V35	,774**	,645**	,468**	,324**	-				
V27	,438**	,470**	,429**	,480**	,349**	-			
V19	,423**	,535**	,253**	,368**	,358**	,486**	-		
V20	,283**	,461**	,265**	,392**	,318**	,468**	,366**	-	
V31	,239**	,159	,313**	,182*	,189*	,351**	,112	,250**	-

*Correlations significant at the .05 level (2-Tailed)

**Correlations significant at the .01 level (2-Tailed); N=117

Table 2.7 Correlations between the Items of Superstitious Beliefs

	v5	v3	v10	v6	v4	v2	v7	v8	v1	v15
v5	-									
v3	,607**	-								
v10	,177	,106	-							
v6	,453**	,324**	,359**	-						
v4	,758**	,590**	,197*	,528**	-					
v2	,453**	,454**	,246**	,453**	,467**	-				
v7	,219*	,270**	,296**	,591**	,318**	,461**	-			
v8	,509**	,457**	,044	,443**	,473**	,273**	,327**	-		
v1	-,310**	-,336**	-,234*	-,399**	-,300**	-,261**	-,349**	-,434**	-	
v15	,309**	,367**	,126	,190*	,308**	,382**	,267**	,303**	-,057	-

**Correlations significant at the .01 level (2-Tailed); N=117

2.1.3 Discussion of the Pilot Studies I & II

In the qualitative part of the present study, attitudes and classifications of the non-material beliefs for a Turkish sample were examined. In order to understand people's non-material belief tendencies and how beliefs are categorized by them, a semi-structured interview was made with 29 interviewees, who are from low, middle and high socioeconomic statuses and from different occupations.

Interviews helped to understand how people define and perceive supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitions. If participants were not able to give answers, some examples were reminded in the light of the literature. Moreover, the reasons why they carry out such beliefs were also extracted from the interviews. In addition, they gave examples to each belief, which varied from person to person. The causes of their commitment to these beliefs were also expressed by the interviewees.

2.1.3.1 Supernatural Powers

Some of the interviewees said that they have not heard anything about supernatural powers. On the other hand, interviewees who have heard about supernatural powers, could not define them. However, some interviewees indicated that they did not know supernatural powers, but when examples were reminded, it was understood that they knew, in fact. That is, name of the concept of "supernatural powers" did not sound familiar to people. They were known generally by the interviewees who have middle and high socioeconomic statuses and who are well-educated. Some definitions made by interviewees as follows:

Quote 1:

Supernatural powers are the metaphysical abilities which are beyond the human physiology in our heads.	*Doğaüstü güçler kafamızdaki insan fizyolojisinin ötesinde metafizik yeteneklerdir.*

Quote 2:

As a material presence, there is not only human; apart from this physical presence, I think there is another world. This may be my definition. Apart from us, there may be supernatural powers that we cannot see and hear.	*Sadece maddi bir varlık olarak insan değil de, onun haricinde başka bir dünyanın da olduğunu düşünüyorum mesela. Bu benim tanımım olabilir. Bizim haricimizde görüp duyamadığımız doğaüstü güçler de olabilir işte.*

Quote 3:

I think that supernatural powers are things that are fabricated in our society thus far.	*Doğaüstü güçler de bu zamana kadar bize toplumumuzda uydurulmuş şeyler diye düşünüyorum.*

Quote 4:

Supernatural powers are the people who have different powers than ordinary people, such as mind reading.	*Doğaüstü güçler normal sıradan insanlardan daha farklı güçlere sahip olan insanlar, mesela düşünce okuma gibi.*

Quotes which are above reflect the representative knowledge of people about supernatural powers. Some of the interviewees claimed that supernatural powers are irrational, like superstitious beliefs. Some others claimed that there are different forces above humans. In addition, some of them claim that supernatural powers belong to people, other than other forces.

In Turkey, which is a mostly Muslim country, people give the example of God for supernatural powers. In addition, jinns, angels and Satan were also highlighted by the interviewees. Heaviness (karabasan) and miracles were also mentioned. In addition, some interviewees stated that they see fortune-tellers as having supernatural powers.

2.1.3.2 Spiritualism

Among three beliefs, supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitious beliefs, the least known belief was stated to be as spiritualism by interviewees. More than half of interviewees said that they did not know spiritualism. The rest said that they have heard

but, only a few of them could define the spiritualism. In case of participants' not hearing spiritualism, Turkish word "öte-âlemcilik" was also used. The greatest majority reflected relevance with after-life. Some definitions that are made by interviewees are presented below:

Quote 5:

"The existence of the souls…"	*"Ruhların varlığı…"*

Quote 6:

"Spiritualism of course, is it not related to the afterlife. Isn't it so? I believe that there is the afterlife. This is the narrative of the Islamic religion anyway. In all religions i.e., Christianity, Judaism, there is belief in the afterlife, I believe so."	*"Öte alemcilik tabi canım, öbür dünya ile ilgili değil mi? Öbür dünya var tabi inanıyorum. Bu islam dininin anlatısıdır zaten. Bütün dinler yani, Hristyanlık, Musevilik olsun, öbür dünyaya inanç vardır, ben inanıyorum yani."*

Quote 7:

"I have heard but I do not really care, because they bother me…"	*"Duydum ama pek ilgilenmiyorum çünkü beni rahatsız ediyor onlar"*

After examples were given, such as reincarnation, bioenergy treatment, telepathy and aura, some of the interviewees claimed that they knew the issue; whereas, some others claimed that they had never heard of it. Moreover, the idiom "you reap what you sow" was mentioned by interviewees; which may be related with the karma philosophy. Although none of the interviewees mentioned about karma, some of them have the vision of it, which paralleled with the view that is supported by karma philosophy.

There is an important point that should be taken into consideration: Spiritualism was generally known by interviewees who have middle and high socioeconomic statuses and who are well-educated.

2.1.3.3 Superstitious Beliefs

Firstly, all interviewees indicated that they all heard about superstitious beliefs. Most of the interviewees gave answers for the definition of superstitious beliefs focusing on similar issues. Some examples are provided below:

Quote 8:

Superstitious beliefs are helpful for me to understand situations that I cannot explain.	*Batıl inançlar doğruluğuna inandığım, neden-sonuç ilişkisini açıklayamadığım durumlar için yardımcıdır.*

Quote 9:

I think they come from epic culture which is unrealistic and exaggerated by people. When people try to explain things that are tried to be attributed to some other things caanot be explained when they are questioned. Obviously, as I mentioned before, they come from oral literature of people living in the culture. I did not see them anywhere in written sources.	*Gerçekçiliği olmayan, insanların abarttığı destansı kültürden geldiğini düşünüyorum. Açıklandığı zaman çok bir temele oturtulmaya çalışılan şeyler, batıl inancın sebebi sorgulandığı zaman açıklanamıyor. Açıkçası, biraz önce de dediğim gibi kültürde yaşayan insanların sözlü edebiyatından geldiğini düşünüyorum. Yazılı kaynaklarda olduğunu görmedim.*

Quote 10:

Probably these are the things that one creates in his her own mind, and they may be untrue or unproven.	*Herhalde kişinin kendi beyninde oluşturduğu şeyler, hani gerçekliği olmayan ya da gerçekte ne olduğu ispatlanmamış kavramlar olabilir.*

Quote 11:

Superstitious beliefs are the things that people believe to relieve themselves.	*Batıl inançlar, insanların kendilerini rahatlatmak için inandığı şeyler.*

It may be said that people generally think that superstitious beliefs do not have a positive contribution materially, however still people believe in them, as they are functional and help people to relieve themselves from worry.

Turkey is a rich country with respect to superstitious beliefs. When Turkish sample is examined deeply, it can be seen easily that there are various, even numbers of superstitious beliefs. For example, evil-eye, fortune-telling (e.g. coffee-fortune, tarot), magic, luck, auspicious and inauspicious things, goods, days, clothes, and events etc…

Seeing a black cat which is also a universal belief, withholding knife or scissors from hand to hand, putting scissors open, and passing under the stairs some kind of examples that are believed to bring bad luck or jinx in Turkey, as retrieved from interviews. Moreover, horseshoes are believed to bring good luck. For instance in some regions of Turkey, people believe that there should not be any wedding between two religious festivals which are Sacrifice and Ramadan, otherwise, it would bring jinx or bad luck. If one does not put out her/his cigarette, she/he would not be able to find someone to marry. In addition, when a bird craps to one's head, s(he) should play a lottery, due to the belief that it will bring luck to her/him. As seen from the examples above, even cause and effect relationships are established via superstitious beliefs (see also Quote 12).

Quote 12.

For example, I make totem while watching games. I constantly change my seat. For example, one can sleep with her his hairclip so that it may bring luck. Someone else constantly wears the same necklace which is believed to bring auspiciousness. Particularly, while I am watching Fenerbahçe matches, I make totem. If we concede a goal, I definitely change my seat.	*Mesala totem yaparım maç izlerken. Koltuk değiştiririm sürekli. Atıyorum tokanız, onla yatarsınız. Uğurlu gelir. Başka birisi sürekli aynı kolyeyi takar uğur getirdiğine inanır. Fenerbahçe maçlarını izlerken özellikle totem yaparım. Gol yediysek kesinlikle oradan kalkarım.*

Since people may see superstitious beliefs functional, they have been maintained for years. After examples were given, such as evil-eye, fortune-telling, magic and luck, all of the interviewees claimed that they were aware of such beliefs. There is an important point that should be taken into consideration: Superstitious beliefs were known by all

interviewees, but followed generally by interviewees who reported to have lower socioeconomic statuses and who are less-educated.

2.1.4 Conclusion of the Pilot Studies I & II

The answers to the question "What kinds of aspects affect the formation of your beliefs" were similar among believers of supernatural powers. For example, believers of supernatural powers claimed that such beliefs are supported by religion, hadiths and Quran; and that there is a God who created the universe and ordered to believe. Moreover, some believers of supernatural powers stated that superstitions stem from not reading and understanding Quran. Some other believers of supernatural powers indicate that they do not believe in superstitious beliefs but they follow, because those beliefs relieve them and they perceive some beliefs as a way of therapy, i.e. fortune-telling.

On the other hand, non-believers of all three beliefs claimed that these beliefs are irrational and nonsensical. People carry out such beliefs because of illiteracy, ignorance, psychological relaxation, upbringing styles, domination of fear, economic conditions, using religion as an exploitation tool, societal and environmental effects, and system's concealing natural responses and obsessions etc.

Furthermore, religious interviewees have established the relevance between religion and supernatural powers; whereas, skeptics and non-religious people saw all three types of beliefs as irrational and related with each other.

In conclusion, believers and non-believers think differently and examining those beliefs with other social psychological variables with the constructed non-material belief scale will be very beneficial to understand people's belief tendencies with respect to belief tendencies of believer and non-believers.

2.1.5 Limitations

Although the present qualitative study enlightened us from several aspects, there are also some limitations. Firstly, when interviewees could not remember any examples, they were given four examples for each belief topic. Because of that they might feel restricted with those examples and other examples might not come to their minds. Secondly, some of the examples that were given to interviewees in the light of literature categorization were categorized by interviewees differently. For example, when evil-eye was given as an example of superstitious beliefs, one of the interviewees said that it should not be categorized as superstition. According to him, it should be classified as supernatural power. So, another study (Pilot II) is pursued after construction of the non-material belief scale to check for possible loadings, in order to being categorizations of beliefs clearer. Then, in this web-based pilot study, there were 117 participants. Since the aim of the pilot study was to understand Turkish people's belief categorization and examine reliability and validity issues, there might be more participants.

2.2 Main Study

2.2.1 Participants

There were 608 Turkish people, who participated in the present study through Internet, but 2 participants' ages were under 18. For this reason, those 2 participants were excluded from the present study. 62.04 % of 608 participants were females, 37.62 % of them were males. In addition, only 2 participants indicated own gender as other, which corresponds to 0.33 % of the total participants in the present study (N_{female} = 376; N_{male} = 228; N_{other} = 2). Female participants' ages ranged from 18 to 62 (M = 26.89, SD = 6.70), male participants' ages ranged from 18 to 68 (M = 28.62, SD = 8.87), and other participants' ages were 20 and 21 (M = 20.50, SD = .70).

Furthermore, demographic forms indicated that the majority of the participants had middle socioeconomic status. 206 participants (34 %) stated that their monthly income level is between 0-1000 TL, 104 participants (17.2 %) stated that they earn between 1001-2000 TL; who can be categorized as low-income level participants. 174 participants (28.7 %) indicated that they earn between 2001-3000 TL and 56

43

participants (9.2 %) stated that they earn between 3001-4000 TL, who can be categorized as middle-income level participants. Lastly, 66 participants (10.9 %) stated that they earn 4000 TL or above a month. They may be categorized as high-income individuals. However, only 93 participants (15.3 %) indicated their socioeconomic status level as low and 46 participants (7.6 %) categorizes their socioeconomic level as high. The rest 467 participants (77.1 %) claimed that they belong to middle-class. Since the participants were mainly university or graduate students, they generally have no income sources. Accordingly, the majority of participants may be said to belong to middle-class, economically.

Religiosity levels of the participants were also different from each other. 6 participants (1 %) indicated that they are *very religious*, and 129 participants (21.3 %) were *religious*, 155 participants (25.6 %) were *somewhat religious*. In addition, 110 participants (18.2 %) stated that they are *not at all religious* and 206 participants (34 %) were *certainly not religious*.

Participants' education levels, marital statuses and religion orientations were also different from each other. See Table 2.1 for the details.

Table 2.1 Demographic Information of the Participants

Variables	Frequency (#)	Percentage (%)
Education		
Primary School	15	2.3
High School	32	5.3
Institution of Higher Education	11	1.8
University	349	57.4
Graduate School	199	32.7
Marital Status		
Single	480	78.9
Married	119	19.6
Widow	2	.3
Divorced	5	.8
Religion		
Muslim	421	69.4
Other	15	2.5
None	170	28.1

2.2.2 Measurement Instruments

In the present study, Non-Material Beliefs Scale (NMBS), which was developed in a separate/pilot study by the author and her advisor for the present study, Locus of Control Scale (LOCS) (Rotter, 1966), General System Justification Scale (GSJS) (Kay & Jost, 2003) and Religious/Spiritual Coping Scale (RCOPE) (Pargament et. al., 1998) and Demographic Information Form were used to collect data from participants. A detailed examination of the proposed scales is presented below.

2.2.2.1 Non-Material Beliefs Scale (NMBS)

Non-material beliefs have been the choice of many researchers so far. There are lots of scales about those beliefs all across cultures. Yet, those scales are generally culture-specific, although used within different cultures. Some are revised and added extra items. For example, although Dag (1999), developed Turkish version of Revised Paranormal Belief Scale (PBS-R), (Tobacyk, 1988; Tobacyk, 2004; Tobacyk &

Milford, 1983). Revised Paranormal Belief Scale (PBS-R) covers different kinds of beliefs but there are still some uncovered prevalent beliefs that are not included in this scale. For this reason, a scale was developed on the basis of interviews in order to reach as much beliefs as possible.

2.2.2.2 Locus of Control Scale (LOCS)

The 29-item LOCS was developed by Rotter (1966) in order to determine the position of individuals' generalized control expectations on the internality and externality continuum (Dağ, 1991; 2002) and has been widely used. All 29 items consisted of two forced-choice options. Participants were to choose one options from two, for all 29 items.

The original LOCS developed by Rotter (1966) has 23 items consisted of two forced-choice options, with the total of 46. However, 6 of 29 items of Turkish version of LOCS are found to be inoperative but used not to affect participants' other answers (Dağ, 1991; 2002). That is there are 58 items in the total scale. The choices of 23 items which are related to external LOC are given 1 point. Thus, the scores ranged from 0 to 23 points and higher points indicated more external LOC tendencies.

The reliability coefficients were found between of .65 and .79, and again in various samples the test-retest reliability coefficients were reported between .49 and .83 (Rotter, 1966). The LOC scale was adapted to Turkish by Dag (See Appendix D), who found the test-retest reliability coefficient .83.

2.2.2.3 General System Justification Scale (GSJS)

The GSJS was developed by Kay and Jost (2003), in order to examine individuals' predispositions to justify the general system in which they live. This scale consists of 8 items which are 5-point Likert-type scale (1: Strongly Disagree, 5: Strongly Agree; α= .87). Items are used for assessing general system justification tendencies such as "In general, you find society to be fair", "Everyone has a fair shot at wealth and

happiness" or "Society is set up so that people usually get what they deserve" (See Appendix E for other items of the GSJS).

2 items of GSJS were reverse coded, because their meanings stayed different from other items' meaning. The GSJS was adopted to Turkish by Göregenli (2004; 2005). Reliability and validity issues were also examined by Göregenli (2004; 2005) and GSJS was found to be reliable (α= .71). In addition, some items of the GSJS were reverse coded. Then, higher scores indicate higher general system justification.

2.2.2.4 Religious/Spiritual Coping Scale (Brief RCOPE)

Pargament (1997) thinks that religious coping is important to understand outcomes of major life events and for this reason, he developed the original RCOPE with his friends (Pargament et. al., 1998). RCOPE originally has 14 items with a 4-point Likert-type scale (0: Not at All, 3: A Great Deal; α= .87 for the positive religious coping items, α= .78 for the negative religious coping items). The short form of the RCOPE was adapted to the Turkish culture by Ekşi (2001). The scale is consisted of two factors: positive and negative religious coping. Reliability of positive religious coping items was calculated as .64, and negative religious coping items as .63; overall scale reliability was .69 (Ekşi, 2001). The adopted version of the RCOPE is consisted of 14 items. In addition, 7 negative items of the Brief RCOPE scale which consists of two factors: positive religious coping and negative religious coping, were reverse coded. Then higher scores indicate higher religious coping (See Appendix F for Brief RCOPE).

2.2.2.5 Demographic Information Form

Demographic information form includes variables like age, gender, education level, income level, occupation, socioeconomic status indication (low, middle or high), religion, sect, and religiosity level (See Appendix G for Demographic Information Form).

2.2.3 Procedure

The necessary ethical permission from the Ethical Committee in Middle East Technical University (METU) was obtained before the study was conducted. Also, voluntary participation form was placed at the very beginning of the survey in addition to the aim of the study and contact numbers were present there. They were also informed that no information is required for their identity and institution they work for during the study, and information obtained from them will be used for present study and related scientific publications.

Web-based questionnaire was announced by events and sharing in Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn. The link which directed participants to the web page questionnaire was provided. Web-based questionnaire begins with the information about research topic, researcher, voluntary participation, confidentiality and anonymity. In addition, contact information of the researcher was provided for possible further questions of participants. The questionnaire was presented as all sections are included in different pages in order to facilitate the filling out the survey.

Data were collected through http://www.surveey.com web site. The questionnaire administration adjusted for not allowing participants to save their responses until they answer all the questions, which were presented automatically by the web site. Then, all participants completed the survey without any missing data.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

For the analyses of the raw data, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program was used. First, preliminary data screening is conducted to deal with outliers. There were only three outliers which did not exceed the critical value too much. Because of this reason, it was decided to keep these three outliers. Since data were collected from Internet and the questionnaire was adjusted for answering all questions; there were no missing values. In addition, data were examined for normality, linearity and homoscedasticity assumptions, which were met. Predictor variables were also examined for multicollinearity problem and none of independent variables' VIF values were greater than 10 and tolerance values less than .02. Thus, there was no problem about multicollinearity.

Throughout the result chapter, descriptive information of the present study variables is presented first. Secondly, correlations among the study variables are examined. Then, gender differences are presented. Lastly, main analyses of the present research study regarding the research questions and hypotheses are exhibited.

3.1 Descriptive Statistics Regarding Study Variables

After examining assumptions mentioned above, descriptive statistics of the data was examined. Mean and standard deviation of the all variables are given in Table 3.1. The mean of RCOPE was found as 2.90 ($SD = .46$), the mean of GSJ scale was found as 3.98 ($SD = .59$), and the mean of LOC scale was found as 11.21 ($SD = 4.46$), While SUP subscale have higher mean ($M = 3.68$, $SD = .77$) compared to SP ($M = 3.34$, $SD = .87$) and SN ($M = 3.01$, $SD = 1.04$); the mean of overall NMB scale was found as 3.27 ($SD = .81$). In addition, mean of income level of the participants was found 2.56 ($SD = 1.33$), which reflects that most of the participants are in the middle-income level.

Then, the mean ages of participants was found as 1.84 (SD = .83), which gives signs that the present sample is consisted of mostly young people. Lastly, the mean of religiosity levels was found as 3.63 (SD = 1.18), which means the overall sample was moderately religious.

Table 3.1 Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Gender	1	3	1.38	.49
Age	1	6	1.84	.83
Income Level	1	5	2.46	1.33
Religiosity Level	1	5	3.63	1.18
RCOPE[a]	1.86	3.93	2.90	.46
GSJ[a]	1.13	5.00	3.98	.59
LOC[a]	.00	23.00	11.21	4.32
SUP[a]	1.40	5.50	3.68	.77
SP[a]	1.00	6.00	3.34	.87
SN[a]	1.17	5.89	3.01	1.04
NMB[a]	1.54	5.73	3.27	.81

Note: [a] = ("RCOPE = Religious/Spiritual Coping, GSJ = General System Justification, LOC = Locus of Control, SUP = Superstitious Beliefs, SP = Spiritualism, SN = Supernatural Powers, NMB = Non-Material Beliefs); N = 606.

3.2. Gender Differences

In order to assess whether there are any gender differences among study variables, Independent Samples t-test was conducted. Result indicated that females and males significantly differ in their scores regarding non-material beliefs and its subscales namely supernatural powers (SN), spiritualism (SP) and superstitious beliefs (SUP). Contrary to expectations, male participants had significantly higher scores than females on all three subscales SN (M_{male} = 3.19, SD_{male} = 1.10; M_{female} = 2.90, SD_{female} = .99; $t(602)$= -3.39, $p < .01$), SP (M_{male} = 3.51, SD_{male} = .92; M_{female} = 3.24, SD_{female} =

.82; $t(602)= -3.76$, $p < .001$) and SUP ($M_{male} = 3.90$, $SD_{male} = .72$; $M_{female} = 3.55$, $SD_{female} = .77$; $t(602)= -5.44$, $p < .001$) of non-material belief scale (NMBS) and in NMB overall ($M_{male} = 3.16$, $SD_{male} = .84$; $M_{female} = 3.46$, $SD_{female} = .77$; $t(602)= -4.49$, $p < .001$) as well. On the other hand, female participants are found to get significantly higher scores than male participants with respect to locus of control (LOC), which indicates that female participants tended to have more external locus of control due to the fact that higher scores of locus of control scale indicated external locus of control.

In addition, female and male participants did not significantly differ with regard to general system justification, religious/spiritual coping and their religiosity levels. Table 3.2 summarizes the details about gender differences among study variables.

Table 3.2 Gender Differences Among Study Variables

Variables	Females		Males		F
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
NMB[a]	3.16	.77	3.46	.84	5.803*
SN[a]	2.90	.99	3.19	1.10	8.477**
SP[a]	3.24	.82	3.51	.92	6.509*
SUP[a]	3.55	.77	3.90	.72	.319*
LOC[a]	11.82	4.20	10.20	4.31	1.643*
GSJ[a]	4.01	.58	3.9	.62	.329
RCOPE[a]	2.93	.47	2.86	.44	2.017
Religiosity Level	3.59	1.19	3.68	1.17	.242

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

Note: [a] = ("RCOPE = Religious/Spiritual Coping, GSJ = General System Justification, LOC = Locus of Control, SUP = Superstitious Beliefs, SP = Spiritualism, SN = Supernatural Powers, NMB = Non-Material Beliefs); N = 606.

3.3 Correlations among the Study Variables

In order to examine correlations among study variables, Pearson two-tailed correlation analysis was used. Variables were namely, gender, education level, age, income level, religiosity level, RCOPE (Religious/Spiritual Coping), GSJ (General System Justification), LOC (Locus of Control), NMB (Non-Material Beliefs) which has three subscales: SN (Supernatural Powers), SP (Spiritualism) and SUP (Superstitious Beliefs).

The correlation matrix of the present study variables is given in Table 3.3. Firstly, gender was revealed to have significant positive relationship with locus of control ($r = .18$, $p < .01$), and significant negative relationship with age ($r = -.85$, $p < .05$), income level ($r = -.13$, $p < .05$), NMB ($r = -.17$, $p < .01$) and its subscales SUP ($r = -.20$, $p < .01$), SP ($r = -.15$, $p < .01$) and SN ($r = -.12$, $p < .01$).

Secondly, education level was significantly and positively correlated with income level ($r = .21$, $p < .01$), religiosity level ($r = .23$, $p < .01$), GSJ ($r = .33$, $p < .01$), SUP ($r = .14$, $p < .01$), SN ($r = .14$, $p < .01$), and overall NMB ($r = .15$, $p < .01$). On the other hand, education level was significantly and negatively related to age ($r = -.16$, $p < .01$) and RCOPE ($r = -.15$, $p < .01$).

Thirdly, age was positively and significantly correlated with income level ($r = .36$, $p < .01$); negatively and significantly correlated with GSJ ($r = -.14$, $p < .01$) and LOC ($r = -.16$, $p < .01$).

Fourthly, religiosity was found to have significant negative relationships between GSJ ($r = .51$, $p < .01$), NMB ($r = .65$, $p < .01$) and its subscales SUP, SP and SN ($r = .38$, $p < .01$; $r = .30$, $p < .01$; $r = .75$, $p < .01$; respectively). Although the correlations seem to be positive, higher scores of religiosity indicate lower scores of religiosity. In addition, religiosity was found to have significant positive relationships between RCOPE ($r = -.73$, $p < .01$) and LOC ($r = -.17$, $p < .01$).

Then, RCOPE was found to be significantly and positively correlated with LOC ($r = .15$, $p < .01$) and significantly and negatively correlated with GSJ ($r = -.45$, $p < .01$), NMB ($r = -.58$, $p < .01$) and its subscales SUP ($r = -.33$, $p < .01$), SP ($r = -.25$, $p < .01$)

as expected. However, SN (r = -.69, p < .01) was also negatively correlated with RCOPE, which was contrary to expectations.

Lastly, there was a significant and positive relationship between GSJ and NMB (r = .38, p < .01). Interestingly, there was no significant correlation between GSJ and LOC.

Table 3.3 Correlations between Study Variables

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.Gender		-											
2. Education Level		-.050	-										
3. Age		-.85*	-.164**	-									
4. Income Level		-.131*	.211**	.359**	-								
5. Religiosity Level		-.023	.232**	-.020	-.003	-							
6.RCOPE[a]		-.061	-.149**	-.014	.035	-.735**	-						
7.GSJ[a]		-.071	.331**	-.140**	-.015	.513**	-451**	-					
8.LOC[a]		.181**	-.006	-.157**	-.134**	-.174**	.151**	.044	-				
9.SUP[a]		-.205**	.139**	-.033	.060	.380**	-.335**	.215**	-.402**	-			
10.SP[a]		-.146**	.076	.023	.056	.306**	-.252**	.205**	-.226**	.616**			
11.SN[a]		-.120**	.144**	.064	.071	.755**	-.691**	.433**	.302**	.614**	.577**	-	
12. NMB[a]		-.167**	.146**	.037	.075	.651**	-.586**	.380**	-.352**	.805**	.783**	.936**	-

Note [a] = *("RCOPE = Religious/Spiritual Coping, GSJ = General System Justification, LOC = Locus of Control, SUP = Superstitious Beliefs, SP = Spiritualism, SN = Supernatural Powers, NMB = Non-Material Beliefs)*

* p < .05   ** p < .01

3.4 Main Analyses

All scales and subscales namely NMBS (SN, SP, and SUP), LOCS, GSJS and RCOPE administered to participants were evaluated as separate continuous variables. In order to assess whether there are any predictions of independent variables (Socio-Demographic Variables, LOC, GSJ, RCOPE and religiosity levels) of the outcome variable, namely non-material beliefs, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted.

3.4.1 Socio-Demographic Variables: Age, Income Level and Education Level

In order to assess whether there are differences within subscales and socio-demographic variables, univariate ANOVA (6x3 for age, 8x3 for education level and 5x3 for income level) analyses were conducted for non-material beliefs (NMB) and all three subscales: supernatural powers (SN), spiritualism (SP) and superstitious beliefs (SUP), separately. Results indicated that there was no difference between different age, income and education level groups in terms of NMB and its subscales; SN, SP and SUP.

Then, those socio-demographic variables, namely age, education level and income level were put into hierarchical multiple regression analysis in the Step 1 in order to control these demographic variables and to see how much variability there is in the outcome variable by these variables Age and income level were not significant in the first step, while education level ($\beta = .149$, $p < .001$) contributed uniquely significantly to the regression model, which indicated that educated individuals tended to believe non-material beliefs more than less educated individuals. Since this is a really interesting finding, it is discussed in detail in the discussion part. However, in the subsequent steps, education level lost its significance. Those three variables contributed to the overall model significantly, $R^2 = .026$, (adjusted $R^2 = .021$), $\Delta R^2 = .026$, which indicated controlled variables explained and accounted for 2.6 % of the variation in NMB, $F (3, 602) = 5.278$, $p < .01$.

3.4.2 Predictability of Locus of Control

After controlling socio-demographic variables, one of the independent variables locus of control (LOC) was regressed in the second step. Based on Step 2, LOC did contribute to the overall relationship with the dependent variable, $F(1, 601) = 83.648$, $p<.001$. LOC ($\beta = -.351$, $p < .001$) was found to be significantly and in contrast to expectations, negatively predicted NMB. That is, people who had low scores of LOC, (high internal locus of control), tended to carry on NMB more, $R^2 = .145$, (adjusted $R^2 = .139$), $\Delta R^2 = .119$, which indicated LOC explained and accounted for 11.9 % of the variation in NMB. None of controlled variables were significant in the second step. In addition, with the controlled variables, it accounted for 14.5 % of the variation in the outcome variable.

3.4.3 Predictability of General System Justification

In the Step 3, the second independent variable, general system justification (GSJ) was added to the regression analysis. After controlling age, income level and education level and LOC, the results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis showed that at Step 3, after including GSJ, the model was significant, $F(1, 600) = 115.492$, $p < .001$, which means GSJ predicted the belief in NMB significantly positively, in line with the expectations. In fact, individuals who have high GSJ ($\beta = .396$, $p < .001$) scores tended to believe NMB much more than who have lower scores of GSJ as expected, $R^2 = .277$, (adjusted $R^2 = .277$), $\Delta R^2 = .138$, which indicated that GSJ had a unique effect of 13.8 % of the variation in NMB. LOC's contribution was higher in the third step comparing to second step ($\beta = -.362$, $p < .001$) and it was still significantly and negatively predicted NMB. Moreover, with the controlled variables and LOC, GSJ explained 27.7 % of the variance in NMB.

3.4.4 Predictability of Religious/Spiritual Coping

The third independent variable, religious/spiritual coping (RCOPE) was added to the Step 4 of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis. Again, none of the controlled

variables contributed significantly to NMB in the fourth step. After controlling socio-demographich variables, LOC,GSJ and including RCOPE, the results of hierarchical regression analysis showed that at Step 4, the model was significant again, F (1, 599) = 174.232, $p < .001$, which means RCOPE ($\beta = -.462$, $p < .001$) predicted the outcome variable, namely NMB, significantly negatively. Indeed, these results showed that individuals who have high RCOPE scores, which means the use of religious/spiritual coping strategies highly, tended to believe NMB less than who have lower scores of RCOPE , $R^2 = .444$, (adjusted $R^2 = .439$), $\Delta R^2 = .162$; that is, RCOPE explained and accounted for 16.2 % of the variation in NMB. Furthermore, RCOPE explained 44.4% variance in the outcome variable, NMB. Particularly, LOC's ($\beta = -.284$, $p < .001$) and GSJ's ($\beta = .183$, $p < .001$) contributions were lower than the previous steps but their contributions were still significant in the Step 4.

In addition, in the direction of the Hypothesis 5, subscales Supernatural Powers (SN), Spiritualism (SP) and Superstitious Beliefs (SUP) of the NMB was examined separately in additional hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Firstly, SN was taken as the dependent variable; age, income level and education level were also controlled, and predictor variables would not change, LOC, GSJ, RCOPE and religiosity levels. In the Step 1, controlled variables were regressed and in the Step 2, Step 3, Step 4 and Step 5, LOC, GSJ, RCOPE and religiosity were regressed respectively (See Table 3.5). The overall model with all variables was significant and a good percentage of variance explained in SN, $R^2 = .647$, (adjusted $R^2 = .643$); F (1, 598) = 166.822, $p < .001$ That is, 64.7% of the variance in SN was explained by the controlled variables and predictor variables. The prediction of RCOPE with regard to SN was examined. RCOPE predicted SN significantly and negatively ($\beta = -.577$, $p < .001$), contrary to expectations.

Secondly, in another hierarchical multiple regression analysis, second subscale of the NMB, which is SP, was taken as the dependent variable; age, income level and education level were again controlled, and predictor variables LOC, GSJ, RCOPE and religiosity levels regressed in the Step 2, Step 3, Step 4 and Step 5 respectively. The overall model with all variables was significant and of variance explained in SP, $R^2 = .133$, (adjusted $R^2 = .123$); F (1, 598) = 11.241, $p < .01$ That is, 13.3 % of the variance

in SP was explained by the controlled variables and predictor variables. In order to examine whether hypothesis 5 of the present study will be accepted or rejected, the prediction of RCOPE with regard to SP was examined. RCOPE, along with the controlled variables, predicted SP significantly and negatively (β = -.159, $p < .001$), contrary to expectations (See Table 3.6 for details).

Lastly, in the last hierarchical multiple regression analysis, SUP, the third subscale of the NMB, was taken as the dependent variable; age, income level and education level were again controlled, and predictor variables LOC, GSJ, RCOPE and religiosity levels regressed in the Step 2, Step 3, Step 4 and Step 5, respectively. The overall model with all variables was significant and of variance explained in SUP, $R^2 = .279$, (adjusted $R^2 = .271$); $F(1, 598) = 13.645$, $p < .001$, which means 27.9 % of the variance in SUP was explained by the controlled variables and predictor variables. RCOPE ($\beta = -.227, p < .001$), predicted SUP significantly and negatively. Hence, people who used religious/spiritual coping strategies tended not to believe in superstitions, as expected (See Table 3.7 for details).

3.4.5 Predictability of Religiosity Level

In the Step 5, last predictor, religiosity level was added to the regression model in order to examine the relationship between it and dependent variable, NMB. After controlling socio-demographic variables, LOC, GSJ and RCOPE, Religiosity level ($\beta = .413, p < .001$) had a significant unique contribution to the model $F(1, 598) = 85.104$, $p<.001$ and explained 6.9 % variance in the NMB, $R^2 = .514$, (adjusted $R^2 = .508$), $\Delta R^2 = .069$. Furthermore, with the controlled variables and previous independent variables, religiosity level explained 51.4% variance in the outcome variable, NMB. There is a positive relationship between religiosity levels of individuals and their belief in NMB, ($\beta = .413, p < .001$); that is, people who were religious tended to believe in NMB much more than who were not religious. On the other hand, none of controlled variables were significant again. However, the previous independent variables, namely LOC ($\beta = -.246, p < .001$), GSJ ($\beta = .094, p < .01$) and RCOPE ($\beta = -.209, p < .001$), were still significant at the Step 5, but their contribution were lower compared to previous steps.

In addition, in order to test Hypothesis 6, subscales of the NMB scale were examined separately. First, SN was taken as dependent variable and age, income level and education level were also controlled. Predictor variables' sequence were the same, LOC, GSJ, RCOPE and religiosity levels were regressed and in the Step 2, Step 3, Step 4 and Step 5, respectively (See Table 3.5). The overall model with all variables was significant and 64.7 % variance was explained in SN, $R^2 = .647$, (adjusted $R^2 = .123$); $F(1, 598) = 166.822$, $p < .01$. After looking at the overall model, the prediction of religiosity levels with regard to SN was examined. Religiosity level predicted SN significantly and positively ($\beta = .492$, $p < .001$), which is consistent with the expectations.

Secondly, SP was taken as dependent variable and age, income level and education level were controlled again in the Step 1. Predictor variables' sequence were the same, LOC, GSJ, RCOPE and religiosity levels were regressed and in the Step 2, Step 3, Step 4 and Step 5, respectively (See Table 3.6 for detailed information). The overall model with all variables was significant and 13.3 % variance was explained in SN, $R^2 = .133$, (adjusted $R^2 = .123$); $F(1, 598) = 11.241$, $p < .01$. After looking at the overall model, the prediction of religiosity levels with regard to SN was examined. Religiosity level predicted SN significantly and positively ($\beta = .200$, $p < .01$), as expected.

In the last analysis, SUP was examined with regard to the prediction of religiosity levels (See Table 3.7). Control variables and predictor variables were regressed as in previous hierarchical multiple regression analyses. The overall model with all variables was significant and 27.9 % variance was explained in SN, $R^2 = .279$, (adjusted $R^2 = .271$); $F(1, 598) = 13.645$, $p < .01$. The predictability of religiosity levels with regard to SUP was examined. Religiosity level predicted SUP significantly and positively ($\beta = .201$, $p < .001$), contrary to expectations.

Table 3.4 Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Variables Predicting NMB[a]

Variables	β	t	*Sig.*	R^2	ΔR^2	F
Step 1				.026	.026	5.278
Age	.053	1.182	.238			
Income Level	.024	.542	.588			
Education Level	.149	3.507	.00			
Step2				.145	.119	83.648
LOC[a]	-.351	-9.146	.00			
Step 3				.283	.138	115.492
GSJ[a]	.396	10.747	.00			
Step 4				.444	.162	174.232
RCOPE[a]	-.462	-13.200	.00			
Step 5				.514	.069	85.104
Religiosity Level	.413	9.225	.00			

Note: [a] = *(*NMB = Non-Material Beliefs LOC = Locus of Control, GSJ = General System Justification, RCOPE = Religious/Spiritual Coping); *N* = 606

Table 3.5 Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Variables Predicting SN[a]

Variables	β	t	Sig.	R^2	ΔR^2	F
Step 1				.29	.29	5.897
Age	.086	1.939	.053			
Income	.007	.165	.869			
Education Level	.156	3.675	.00			
Step2				.113	.085	57.265
LOC[a]	-.295	-7.567	.00			
Step 3				.296	.252	156.382
GSJ[a]	.457	12.505	.00			
Step 4				.549	.252	334.778
RCOPE[a]	-.577	-18.297	.00			
Step 5				.647	.098	166.822
Religiosity Level	.492	12.916	.00			

Note: [a] = (SN = Supernatural Powers, LOC = Locus of Control, GSJ = General System

Justification, RCOPE = Religious/Spiritual Coping) ; N = 606

Table 3.6 Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Variables
Predicting SP[a]

Variables	β	t	*Sig.*	R^2	ΔR^2	F
Step 1				.008	.008	1.592
Age	.024	.534	.601			
Income Level	.032	.698	.486			
Education Level	.073	1.701	.089			
Step2				.057	.049	31.029
LOC[a]	-.224	-5.570	.00			
Step 3				.098	.041	27.487
GSJ[a]	.217	5.243	.00			
Step 4				.117	.019	13.026
RCOPE[a]	-.159	-3.609	.00			
Step 5				.133	.016	11.241
Religiosity Level	.200	3.353	.001			

Note: [a] = (SP = Spiritualism, LOC = Locus of Control, GSJ = General System Justification,

RCOPE = Religious/Spiritual Coping); $N = 606$

Table 3.7 Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Variables Predicting SUP[a]

Variables	β	t	*Sig.*	R^2	ΔR^2	F
Step 1				.021	.021	4.306
Age	-.029	-.648	.517			
Income	.044	.981	.327			
Education Level	.125	2.926	.004			
Step2				.186	.165	121.625
LOC[a]	-.412	-11.028	.00			
Step 3				.223	.038	29.011
GSJ[a]	.207	5.386	.00			
Step 4				.255	.039	31.816
RCOPE[a]	-.227	-5.641	.00			
Step 5				.279	.016	13.645
Religiosity Level	.201	3.694	.00			

Note: [a] = (SUP = Superstitious Beliefs, LOC = Locus of Control, GSJ = General System Justification, RCOPE = Religious/Spiritual Coping); $N = 606$

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The present study's aim was to investigate individuals' differences in carrying non-material beliefs (supernatural beliefs, spiritualism and superstitious beliefs) regarding locus of control, general system justification, religious/spiritual coping, religiosity and socio-demographic variables. In this chapter, main findings of the present study are discussed in the light of the literature and research questions along with the hypotheses presented. First, interpretations of research findings with respect to the literature and research questions will be presented. Second, limitations and suggestions for future research of the current study are mentioned. Finally, major contributions of the study are discussed.

4.1 General Evaluation of the Findings

4.1.1 Socio-Demographic Variables: Age, Income Level and Education Level

Results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated that levels of age, income and education were not significantly different in terms of scores of the non-material beliefs. However, when regressed in the first step of hierarchical regression analysis, these three variables predicted non-material beliefs significantly. Results indicated that only education level among 3 socio-demographic variables had significant unique contribution to the overall model, at step 1 only. In the subsequent steps, it lost its significant contribution.

Age is found to have power with regard to prediction some of non-material beliefs in some studies (e.g. Emmons & Sobal, 1981; Keinan 1994; Köktaş, 1993; Tobacyk, Pritchett & Mitchell, 1988), while in some studies age was not a significant predictor of the non-material beliefs (e.g. Blachowski, 1937; DeRidder, Hendriks, Zani, Pepitone, & Saffiotti, 1999). Gallup and Newport (1991) found that adults who are

younger than the age of 30 are having more superstitious beliefs than elder people. In addition, Emmons and Sobal (1981) claimed that age was the most powerful demographic variable with regard to paranormal belief.

In the present thesis; however, different age groups did not differ in terms of non-material beliefs and its subscales. The reason for this consequence may be that sample was generally consisted of young people. Having large numbers of young participants, may have prevented us from seeing the effect of age. In addition, if the present study had been conducted 20 years ago, or will be conducted within next 20 years, the results would probably be different because belief tendencies may differ by time. That is, since this is a study investigating some belief tendencies, the generation effect may have been concerned.

Income level is included in the analysis for the examining contribution to the socio-economic statuses of the participants. People who are from differen income levels did not differ significantly. Paul (2010) found that low-income level individuals will tend to carry on such beliefs much more than high-income level individuals. Furthermore, Emmons and Sobal (1981) found that unemployment rate is correlated with the some of the non-material beliefs; that is, unemployed people tended to carry some of the non-material beliefs much more than employed people. This might be case for the current study also but the majority of participants were university or graduate school students, and they did not have any job to earn money and most of participants indicated their socio-economic status as middle-class. This issue may have prevented us to see an income effect. In the future studies, this issue may be taken into consideration.

In addition, since the current study was done in Turkey, which is high on collectivism and power distance (Hofstede, 1984), in which people grow up with cultural codes; income level might not affect the belief tendencies. Because of that people's upbringing styles might be important to carry which beliefs to a certain age, even people earn much, and they might not elude themselves from these codes.

Lastly, in some of previous research studies, education level was found to be related with such beliefs. Frazer (1941) found that belief in superstitions decreases when

education level increases. In the present study, people who are from different educational backgrounds did not differ significantly in terms of NMB and its subscales SN, SP and SUP. This situation may be understood because of that the majority of participants were university or graduate school students. In the future studies, more heterogeneous sample may be used for the education effect. Moreover, since people might not be familiar to the concepts, conceptualizations might not be understood easily.

4.1.2 Gender Differences

Results of Independent Samples t-test indicated that females and males differed significantly in their scores of non-material beliefs (NMB) with all subscales namely supernatural powers, spiritualism, superstitious beliefs (SN, SP, SUP) and locus of control (LOC). Male participants had significantly higher scores in all subscales of the NMBS and the overall scale as well. On the other hand, female participants had higher scores than male participants in LOC, which means females were more inclined to have external locus of control as higher scores indicated more external locus of control tendencies.

In the first hypothesis, it was expected that females would believe in NMB much more than males. In contrast, males were found to believe in NMB and all three subscales more than females, unexpectedly. Although there are studies found that there are no gender differences (e.g. King et.al., 2007; Mowen & Carlson, 2003; Rogers, Davis and Fisk, 2009), there are some studies claims that males have higher scores than women with respect to non-material beliefs. For example, Mowen and Carlson (2003) found that males have more tendency to belief in fictional characters than women and Clarke (1991) found that males show higher scores in believing in UFOs. There may be several reasons for this finding. Firstly, the point in question is belief, and if it is assumed that there might not be evolutionary differences in such a topic, it may stem from social reasons. In general, women are found to carry such beliefs more than men (e.g. Gallup & Newport, 1991) but since present study was anonymous and data collected via web-based survey, male participants might answer the questions in a

relaxed manner. Secondly, there might be within gender differences due to SES differences, which could be studied by further analyses.

Then, women have always been despised in the history of humankind and they might be expected to carry paranormal, non-material or alike beliefs; which is a sort of stereotyping. Besides, in Turkey, women's socialization is generally among themselves; but there are alternative areas of men's socialization. Males may keep their non-material beliefs to themselves as to appear powerful. However, contrary to this framework, males in the present study were found to report more non-material beliefs than females; which could be due to the fact that the surveys were anonymous.

Furthermore, although the pilot studies were female-dominated with respect to number of participants and scale was validated with gender imbalance, the results showed that male participants had higher scores, still. Hence, it may be thougt about that female and male tendencies may be started to be differentiated. In the future studies, this possibility of differentiation may be taken into consideration.

Lastly, such a result might be explained with regards to Hofstede's Masculinity-Femininity dimension. Hofstede (1980), claims that men generally have ego goals, whereas women tend to have social goals; and the balance between those goals are related with the gender of the individual. Hofstede (1998) also indicates that biological differences stem from the gender differences but social differences stem from culture. It may be inferred that communication and expression styles of within cultures may also differ. For example, Wood (2005) claims that men communicate more conceivably than women. That is, men might generally express themselves abstractly. In this context, men might conceal their thougts and attitudes in such kind of beliefs context. Thus, within some kind of relationships, abstract talk may create boundries to knowing another intimately (Wood, 2005).

4.1.3 Predictability of Locus of Control

Results revealed that LOC predicted significantly but negatively NMB. To explain in detail, individuals who had higher scores of LOC tended to believe NMB much more

than who had lower scores of LOC. Higher scores of LOC were indicators of external LOC in terms of the LOCS's operation. It was expected to find that people who had external locus of control tendencies would have higher scores of NMB, since external locus of control is generally related with the luck, fate etc… What is more that findings in the literature also suggested that external LOC would be related to high levels of having NMB (e.g. Dag, 1999; Randall & Desrosiers, 1980; Tobacyk, Nagot & Miller, 1988; Scheidt, 1973) due to the fact that they both emphasize the importance of external factors to act or behave. Moreover, Belter and Brinkmann (1981) found that there is no correlation between locus of control and belief in God.

On the other hand, as mentioned before, Groth-Marnat and Pegden (1998) found internal locus of control related to superstitions positively. They claim that individuals stay away from things that are believed to bring bad luck and controlling it in the hands of them (Groth-Marnat & Pegden, 1998). That is, individuals believe that they may avoid from bad luck by carrying out superstitious rituals. Then, they may develop a variety of means of defense: since individuals may think that they can avoid bad luck or unpleasant events, they control their preferences or construct means or tools of defense. For example, if an individual believes in God, (s)he may believe that God will protect herself/himself in case of any danger. By believing in God, (s)he defends herself/himself against possible threats. To give another example, if an individual pulls her/his hair when s(he) sees a black cat, (s)he may want to believe that this ritual would protect herself/himself from the threat of inauspiciousness or would lead to psychological well-being.

In the current study, the issue may be same as the situation mentioned immediately above. People with internal locus of control may have thought that they have more control over event by believing in NMB. On the other hand, if the sample were consisted of people who were religious or very religious, the results might have shown the relatedness of external locus of control with non-material beliefs; but in the present study, this is not the case because the present sample generally consisted of participants who were not religious or not religious at all. In the present thesis, the researcher did not compare people who are religious and not religious. In the future studies, this issue may also be taken into consideration.

4.1.4 Predictability of General System Justification

As mentioned in the section of aims and hypotheses of the present study, it was expected that people who justify system would carry on non-material beliefs (NMB) much more than who do not justify the system. In accordance with the expectations, a positive correlation between NMB and general system justification (GSJ) which significantly predicted NMB, was found. To the best of our knowledge, no study in the literature examined the relationship between NMB and GSJ (Jost & Banaji, 1994).

Jost and Banaji (1994) adopted the term of "false consciousness" of the Marxist notion to the social psychology as "the ideas of the dominant tend to be the ideas of dominated". In fact, system may be said as a dominant structure and wants to sustain its powers by forcing people to obey its rules. One of the interviewees said that "*Those beliefs are the products of the primitive politics for the purpose of streamlining the societies*". One another stated that:

> *I think that religion has always been kept with mythological history; but today; as a phenomenon, it is tried to be kept by countries all over the societies. So, religion or those beliefs are not kept completely away from social politics or social life, or they are not something left to the conscience of the people themselves. On the contrary, they have been made important instruments of social arrangements or reconstructions. This is a product of a conscious effort.*

From these two quotes, it may be inferred that present status of religion and those beliefs may stem from the early times and maintained until today. That is, system continues to *prevail*. Then, the significant relationship between GSJ and NMB might not be something unexpected.

4.1.5 Predictability of Religious/Spiritual Coping

As mentioned before, although there are studies investigating the relationship between religiousness of individuals and their religious/spiritual coping strategies (Pargament, Koenig & Perez, 2000; Zinnbauer, Pargament & Scott, 1999), to the best of our knowledge, there is no study looking at the relationship between superstitious beliefs

and religious/spiritual coping to the best of our knowledge. It was expected that people who evolves religious/spiritual coping strategies will justify the supernatural powers (SN) and spirituality (SP), but reject belief in the superstitions (SUP). The reason for this hypothesis might be that people who develop and use religious coping strategy might establish a relationship between God and themselves, which may lead to feel themselves protected. Hence, they might prefer to be religious. Since the subscale of SN is related with the belief in God and other rituals done by supernatural powers, and SP is related closely with religion, it was expected that RCOPE will predict SN and SP positively, but SUP negatively. That is, when people use religious coping strategies, they tended not to carry beliefs of SN and SUP. In addition, RCOPE did not predict SP.

However, results indicated that as RCOPE scores of individuals' increase, belief in SN, SP and SUP decrease significantly. As expected, the negative relationship between SUP and RCOPE can be understood since religious people tend not to believe in superstitious beliefs. Interestingly, SN and SP were also negatively related to RCOPE. There may be several reasons for this result. To begin with, again, conceptualization may not be understood by participants. People might not relate supernatural powers with the belief in God. For example, participants might chose "strongly agree" for the item "I believe in God" but they might choose "strongly disagree" for the item "I believe in supernatural powers". When people read supernatural power in the questionnaire, God might not come to people's mind to question its existence but they might question other supernatural powers.

Besides the newly constructed NMBS, the Turkish version of the brief RCOPE has not been used widely in Turkish culture, since this topic started to be popular recently. In the future studies, it may be used to detect impacts of it. In addition, RCOPE might reflect the living of Christian culture and beliefs systems. For example it has an item like "*Dindar kardeşlerimin/dini kurumların beni terk etmesinden endişelenirim.*" which might not be an emphasis of Islamic culture. A detailed study may be done in the future studies for the Turkish version of the RCOPE.

4.1.6 Predictability of Religiosity

There are numerous research studies investigated the relationship between religiosity and superstitious beliefs. Gallup and Newport (1991) found that there is no relationship between superstitious beliefs and religion. Some other researchers found significant relationship between religiosity and extrasensory perception (Haraldsson, 1981), precognition and witchcraft (Tobacyk & Milford, 1983), belief in psychic healing and UFO (Clarke, 1991).

In sum, some studies found positive relationship between some specific non-material beliefs and some others found no relationship between those variables. In the last hypothesis, it was expected that religiosity of individuals would predict subscales of the non-material beliefs (NMB), namely, supernatural powers (SN) and spiritualism (SP) positively, and superstitious beliefs (SUP) negatively. The results revealed that religiosity level predicted all of three subscales of NMB which are SN, SP and SUP significantly and positively. There may be several reasons for the findings of the present study. Firstly, the subscales of the NMBS might not be understood clearly by the participants. The items that are related with religion or beliefs might be investigated per se. Moreover, in some studies, heaven, hell, angels, God and his presence and life after death is taken as determinants of religiosity (e.g. Orenstein, 2002). In the present thesis, these concepts were examined under the topic of supernatural powers. As mentioned before, conceptualizations might be more clearly defined and differentiated.

Secondly, perhaps, the results might reflect the reality. In fact, the relationship between non-material beliefs and religiosity has been a very controversial topic for years. As can be seen from the literature, there are varied claims saying that there is a positive relationship between religiosity and non-material beliefs or there is negative relationship between these variables. That is, some people may believe in non-material beliefs in order to substitute religious beliefs or some others may carry on non-material beliefs since they are both based on assumption of invisible presences.

On the other hand, Torgler (2007), found that as religiosity levels of people increases, they tend to believe in more superstitions. A positive relationship between religiosity

and superstitious or any other non-material beliefs might not be so surprising due to the fact that non-material belief systems violate scientific truths or they cannot be explained by sciences until this time (e.g. Killen, Wildman & Wildman, 1974).

Unlike the current results, literature shows a great deal of research studies about that superstitious beliefs would negatively be related to religiosity (e.g. Mowen & Carlson, 2003) or they are not related at all (e.g. Stanke, 2004). Furthermore, on the other hand, Allport and Ross (1967) evaluated religiosity under two different topics as intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity. If the present study would examine individuals' religiosity levels as intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity, then results might be different.

In sum, according to the results of present study, it might not be possible to differentiate people who are religious and believe in non-material beliefs. That is to say, an individual may be religious and believe in non-material beliefs, at the same time. These peculiarities might stem from individual differences.

4.2 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

Although the present study shed light on several topics which have been largely ignored by social psychologists, it has also some limitations. First of all, the sample is mainly consisted of highly educated and mainly young participants. Particularly, demographic variables might affect the other predictors. In the future studies, participants from different educational backgrounds and ages may be selected. Ornstein argues that (2002):

> *Most studies have produced results that are meagre in size; too many findings are based on student samples; religious variables have usually been examined without controlling for background characteristics that might show the results too spurious* (p. 303).

Since the topic of present thesis is about non-material and religious issues, the sample might be consisted of more participants from heterogeneous backgrounds. In future studies, this issue may be taken into consideration.

In addition, since the sample was consisted of people who are Turkish or who live in Turkey, the findings may not be generalized to other countries and cultures. The findings of the present study needs further validation in also other cultures and countries which may be more or less open to the belief in non-material beliefs.

Another limitation might be the quality of the constructed NMBS. All three subscales were confirmed to be reliable and valid after factor analysis and reliability analyses for NMBS. In addition, convergent, discriminant and concurrent validities were also examined. However, content validity was not examined. In the future studies, the validity of the constructed scale may be examined with similar but distinct features. Moreover, since the scale is developed and used for the first time, it should be examined with other predictors as well, in the future studies.

Then, although the developed non-material belief scale (NMBS) has three subscales, the items related with religion, God and supernatural powers may be examined separately in the future studies. Association of these beliefs may be misunderstood by participants as the results may have signaled.

There seem to be contradictory results between RCOPE and religiosity levels of participants. Religion may be one of the most important phenomenon of culture. Hence, there is a possibility that cultural practices likely to be intertwined with religious practices but the distinction of two concepts might not be clearly differentiated by participants. People might misinterpret the relationship between religious coping and religiosity. This issue may be taken into consideration in future studies.

In addition, religiosity may be associated with wide-ranging thoughts and behaviors or attitudes with respect to a religion. There may be different attributions to religiosity by people, who define their religiosity levels differently. For example, an individual who defines herself/himself as not religious may go to salat el eid (bayram namazı) to observe and socialize with others. That is, the beliefs which are the products of culture may lead individuals to associate these beliefs with religion.

Furthermore, internal LOC was found to be related positively with non-material beliefs, contrary to expactations. But it should be taken into consideration that as the

content of non-material beliefs changes or enhances, the tendencies of people may also change. Accordingly, it may be said that representations of internal LOC may also be shifted. In the future studies, belief tendencies, its content and relationship with internal LOC may also be examined.

Moreover, participants were not asked to indicate their domicile; that is, whether they live in urban or rural. Since belief tendencies differ from urban to rural (e.g. Lundberg, Cantor-Graae, Kabakyenga, Rukundo & Östergren, 2004), more reliable and representative results would be obtained.

Lastly, participant were not asked their ethnic origin, political view, marital status and whether they have any handicap or not in the present study. Since those variables may also affect the belief tendencies of people, in the future studies those variables may also be studied with respect to tendency to have non-material beliefs.

4.3 Contributions

The present study has served important contributions to the literature from several aspects. First, to the knowledge of the author, this study is the most comprehensive one which brings numerous non-material beliefs in accordance with Turkish culture. Despite the fact that there are studies done by theologists, some members of faculty of education and medical doctors, in order to construct scales about non-material beliefs within Turkish culture (Arslan, 2010; Karaca, 2001; Oksal, Şenşekerci & Bilgin, 2006), the present one encompasses different sub-topics of the non-material beliefs in a total scale. Moreover, although some studies examine the relationship between some of non-material beliefs and locus of control (e.g. Dag, 1991; Scheidt, 1973; Stanke, 2004;), religious coping (e.g. Agorastos, Metscher, Huber, Jelinek, Vitzthum, Muhtz & Moritz, 2012), religiosity (e.g. Clarke, 1991; Stanke, 2004; Wain & Spinella, 2007) they tended to be from only one dimension of non-material beliefs. For example, some of these studies examine only superstitious beliefs, some of them only investigate paranormal beliefs.

Moreover, the present study contributed to the literature from a social psychological perspective. Individuals generally tend to carry non-material beliefs when they do not have any idea about some issues or events. That is, when they are not able to explain certain things, they may tend to believe in supernatural powers, spirituality or superstitions. Then, the fundemantals of these tendencies become important. Since social psychology investigates from both social and behavioral sides, it differs from other disciplines and constititutes a basic platform for other researchers.

Besides, the present study brought a new scale to the literature, which encompasses numerous non-material beliefs. The scale may be used for different research studies in the future. For example, as a result of inferences from the interviews, it may be said that some people think whatever they do will happen to themselves. It can be described as Karma and New Age philosophy. Although the New age and Karma philosophies were not observed in interviews, these beliefs could be seen from their speeches as embedded. On the other hand, this perception may also be studied with Just World Belief hypothesis which claims that world is just and people are responsible for their acts (Lerner, 1980). These two philosophies and Just World Belief may be examined together in the future studies, since they seem to be very relevant to each other.

Although there are numerous research studies about non-material beliefs in the literature, this topic is studied fewer in number within Turkish culture. The present study is aimed to explore the relationship between all specified non-material beliefs, namely, supernatural powers, spiritualism and superstitious beliefs, and some social psychological variables that are mentioned above.

In addition, to the best of our knowledge, this study is first one that examines the relationship between non-material beliefs and general system justification. It has made an important contribution to literature by giving cues about how people who carry non-material beliefs justify system.

REFERENCES

Aarnio, K., & Lindeman, M. (2007). Religious people and paranormal believers: Alike or different?. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *28*(1), 1.

Agorastos, A., Metscher, T., Huber, C. G., Jelinek, L., Vitzthum, F., Muhtz, C., & Moritz, S. (2012). Religiosity, magical ideation, and paranormal beliefs in anxiety disorders and obsessive-compulsive disorder: a cross-sectional study.*The Journal of nervous and mental disease*, *200*(10), 876-884.

Akçapar, Ş. (2006). Conversion as a migration strategy in a transit country: Iranian Shiites becoming Christians in Turkey. *Center for Migration Studies, 40*(4), 817-853

Allport, G. W. (1950). *The individual and his religion: a psychological interpretation.* New York; Macmillan.

Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *5*(4), 432.

Arslan, M. (2004). Kişilerin Batıl İnanç Kaygı Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, *2*(6).

Arslan, M. (2010). Paranormal inanç ölçeğinin Türkçe versiyonunun geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *İnönü Üniversitesi. İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23-40.

Atlasjet Flight 4203 (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved August 4, 2014, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atlasjet_Flight_4203

Ayati, S. M. R., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2013). The Quranic Bases of Magic Prevention in Islamic Jurisprudence. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research (3)*1215-1223

Ayhan, İ., & Yarar, F. (2005). Batıl İnançların Psikolojisi. *Editörden...*, 15.

Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Religion and psychology: Introduction to the special issue. *Psychological Inquiry*, *13*(3), 165-167.

Barthes, R. (1996). Çağdaş Söylenler, çev. *T. Yücel, Metis Yay., İstanbul*.

Bascom, W. (1965). The forms of folklore: Prose narratives. *Journal of American Folklore*, 3-20.

Belter, R. W., & Brinkmann, E. H. (1981). Construct validity of the Nowicki-Strickland locus of control scale for children. *Psychological Reports*, *48*(2), 427-432.

Benassi, V. A., Sweeney, P. D., & Dufour, C. L. (1988). Is there a relation between locus of control orientation and depression?. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, *97*(3), 357.

Benson, P., & Spilka, B. (1973). God image as a function of self-esteem and locus of control. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 297-310.

Bergin, A. E., Masters, K. S., & Richards, P. S. (1987). Religiousness and mental health reconsidered: A study of an intrinsically religious sample. *Journal of counseling psychology*, *34*(2), 197.

Bering, J. M., McLeod, K., & Shackelford, T. K. (2005). Reasoning about dead agents reveals possible adaptive trends. *Human Nature*, *16*(4), 360-381.

Beyer, P. (1994). *Religion and globalization* (Vol. 27). Sage.

Blackmore, S. (1990). The lure of the paranormal. *New Scientist*, *127*(1735), 62-65.

Blackmore, S., & Trościanko, T. (1985). Belief in the paranormal: Probability judgements, illusory control, and the 'chance baseline shift'. *British Journal of Psychology*, *76*(4), 459-468.

Woodall, J. (1996). *Borges: a life* (p. 112). BasicBooks.

Bourassa, S. C., & Peng, V. S. (1999). Hedonic prices and house numbers: The influence of feng shui. *International Real Estate Review*, *2*(1), 79-93.

Bourdieu, P. (1994). Structures, habitus, power: Basis for a theory of symbolic power. *Culture/power/history: A reader in contemporary social theory*, 155-199.

Braude, A. (2001). *Radical spirits: Spiritualism and women's rights in nineteenth-century America*. Indiana University Press.

Brugger, P., Landis, T., & Regard, M. (1990). A 'sheep-goat effect' in repetition avoidance: Extra-sensory perception as an effect of subjective probability?. *British Journal of Psychology*, *81*(4), 455-468.

Cameron, E. (2010). *Enchanted Europe* (pp. 78-130). Oxford.

Çarkoğlu, A., & Toprak, B. (2006). *Değişen Türkiye'de din, toplum ve siyaset*. TESEV.

Charet, F. X. (1993). *Spiritualism and the Foundations of CG Jung's Psychology*. Suny Press.

Chen, G. M. (2007). The impact of feng shui on Chinese communication. *China Media Research*, 3(4), 102-109.

Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological assessment*, *7*(3), 309.

Clarke, D. (1991). Belief in the paranormal: A New Zealand survey. *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*.

Dağ, İ. (1991). Rotter'in İç-Dış Kontrol Odağı Ölçeği (RİDKOÖ)'nin üniversite öğrencileri için güvenirliği ve geçerliği. *Psikoloji Dergisi*, 7 (26), 10-16.

Dag, I. (1999). The relationships among paranormal beliefs, locus of control and psychopathology in a Turkish college sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *26*(4), 723-737.

Dağ, İ. (2002). Kontrol odağı ölçeği (KOÖ): Ölçek geliştirme, güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, *17*(49), 77-90.

Darwin, C. (2003). The Descent of Man. 1871. *The Origin of Species and the Descent of Man*, 912-13.

De Oliveira, P., & Dambrun, M. (2007). Maintaining the status quo and social inequalities: Is stereotype endorsement related to support for system justification. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, *13*(9), 101-121.

Deism. (2014). *In The Encyclopedia Britannica.* Retrieved June 10, 2014, from http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/156154/Deism

Denton, W. (1871). *Is Spiritualism True?*.

DeRidder, R., Hendriks, E. , Zani, B. , Pepitone, A. , & Saffiotti, L. (1999). Additional cross-cultural evidence on the selective usage of nonmaterial beliefs in explaining life events. *European journal of social psychology*, *29*(4), 435-442.

Doğan, S., & Demiral, Ö. (2007). Kurumların başarısında duygusal zekânın rolü ve önemi. *Yönetim Ve Ekonomi*, *14*(1), 209-230.

Durkheim, E. (2012). *The elementary forms of the religious life*. Courier Dover Publications.

Ekşi, H. (2001) *Başa Çıkma, Dini Başa Çıkma ve Ruh Sağlığı Arasındaki İlişki Üzerine Bir Araştırma: Eğitim, İlahiyat ve Mühendislik Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Karşılaştırılması,* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Uludağ Üniversitesi).

Emmons, C. F., & Sobal, J. (1981). Paranormal beliefs: Functional alternatives to mainstream religion?. *Review of Religious Research*, 301-312.

Foucault, M. (1998). Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, Vol. 2: Aesthetics.

Freud, S. (1965). *Totem and taboo: some points of agreement between the mental lives of savages and neurotics*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Freud, S., & Strachey, J. (1985). *Civilization, society and religion: Group psychology, civilization and its discontents and other works*. A. Dickson (Ed.). Penguin Books.

Futrell, B. (2011). A Closer Look at the Relationship Between Superstitious Behaviors and Trait Anxiety. *Rollins Undergraduate Research Journal*, 5(2), 5.

Gaarder, J. (1996). Sophie's world–A novel about the history ofphilosophy. *New York: Berkley Publishing Group*, *1*, 996.

Gallup, G. H., & Newport, F. (1991). Belief in paranormal phenomena among adult Americans. *Skeptical Inquirer*, 15, 137–146.

Goode, E. 2000a. Two paranormalisms or two and a half? An empirical exploration. *Skeptical Inquirer* 23(1):29–35.

———. 2000b. *Paranormal beliefs: A sociological introduction*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Göregenli, M. (2005) *Şiddet Kötü Muamele ve İşkenceye İlişkin Değerlendirmeler Tutumlar ve Deneyimler: Diyarbakır Araştırması.* Diyarbakır Barosu Yayınları

Gorer, G., (1955). *Exploring English Character: A Study of the Morals and Behaviour of the English People*, London: Cresset Press.

Groth-Marnat, G., & Pegden, J. A. (1998). Personality correlates of paranormal belief: Locus of control and sensation seeking. *Social behavior and personality: An international Journal*, *26*(3), 291-296.

Harris, M. A. (2003). Religiosity and Perceived Future Ascetic Deviance and Delinquency among Mormon Adolescents: Testing the "This-Worldly" Supernatural Sanctions Thesis. *Sociological Inquiry*, *73*(1), 28-51.

Hiroto, D. S. (1974). Locus of control and learned helplessness. *Journal of experimental psychology*, *102*(2), 187.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. H. (Ed.). (1998). *Masculinity and femininity: The taboo dimension of national cultures* (Vol. 3). Sage Publications.

Holloway, J. (2000). Institutional geographies of the New Age movement.*Geoforum*, *31*(4), 553-565.

Horn, J. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 30*(2), 179–185.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, *78*(6), 891.

Irwin, H. J. (1993). Belief in the paranormal: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of the American society for Psychical research*, *87*(1), 1-39.

Irwin, H. J. (2007). The measurement of superstitiousness as a component of paranormal belief-some critical reflections. *European Journal of Parapsychology*, *22*(2), 95.

Irwin, H. J. (2009). *The psychology of paranormal belief: A researcher's handbook.* Univ of Hertfordshire Press.

Irwin, H. J., & Watt, C. A. (2007). *An introduction to parapsychology*. McFarland.

Irwin, H.J. (1992). Origins and functions of Paranormal: The role of childhood trauma and interpersonal control. *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research*, 86 (3), 199-208.

Jones, J. W. (1996). *Religion and psychology in transition: Psychoanalysis, feminism, and theology*. Yale University Press.

Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*(1), 1-27.

Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2009). *Social and psychological bases of ideology and system justification*. H. Thorisdottir (Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological bulletin*, *129*(3), 339.

Jost, J. T., Pietrzak, J., Liviatan, I., Mandisodza, A. N., & Napier, J. L. (2008). System justification as conscious and nonconscious goal pursuit. *Handbook of motivation science*, 591-605.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology*, *86*(1), 80.

Jueneman, F. B. (2001). The making of a myth. *Research & Development*, *43*, 9-10.

Karaca, F. (2001). Heteredoks inanç ve davranışlar ölçeği üzerine bir deneme. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, (15).

Kay, A. C., Gaucher, D., Napier, J. L., Callan, M. J., & Laurin, K. (2008). God and the government: testing a compensatory control mechanism for the support of external systems. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *95*(1), 18.

Kay, A. C., & Jost, J. T. (2003). Complementary justice: effects of" poor but happy" and" poor but honest" stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the justice motive. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *85*(5), 823.

Keinan, G. (1994). Effects of stress and tolerance of ambiguity on magical thinking. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *67*(1), 48.

Killen, P., Wildman, R. W., & Wildman, R. W. (1974). Superstitiousness and intelligence. *Psychological Reports*, *34*(3c), 1158-1158.

King, L. A., Burton, C. M., Hicks, J. A., & Drigotas, S. M. (2007). Ghosts, UFOs, and magic: positive affect and the experiential system. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *92*(5), 905.

Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2005). *Attachment, evolution, and the psychology of religion*. Guilford Press.

Köktaş, M. Emin (1993), *Türkiye'de Dini Hayat,* I. Baskı, İşaret Yayınları, İstanbul.

Köse, A., & Ayten, A. (2009). Bâtıl İnanç ve Davranışlar Üzerine Psikososyolojik Bir Analiz. *Dinbilimleri Journal*, *9*(3).

Lawrence, T., Edwards, C., Barraclough, N., Church, S., & Hetherington, F. (1995). Modelling childhood causes of paranormal belief and experience: Childhood trauma and childhood fantasy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *19*(2), 209-215.

Lawrence, T., Edwards, C., Barraclough, N., Church, S., & Hetherington, F. (1995). Modelling childhood causes of paranormal belief and experience: Childhood trauma and childhood fantasy. *Personality and Individual Differences*,*19*(2), 209-215.

Lerner, M. J. (1980). *The belief in a just world* (pp. 9-30). Springer US.

Levenson, H. (1973). Multidimensional locus of control in psychiatric patients. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *41*(3), 397.

Lewis, J. M., & Gallagher, T. J. (2001). The salience of Friday the 13th for college students [Electronic Version]. *College Student Journal, 35*(2), 216.

Lindeman, M., & Aarnio, K. (2007). Superstitious, magical, and paranormal beliefs: An integrative model. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *41*(4), 731-744.

Lundberg, P., Cantor-Graae, E., Kabakyenga, J., Rukundo, G., & Östergren, P. O. (2004). Prevalence of delusional ideation in a district in southwestern Uganda. *Schizophrenia research*, *71*(1), 27-34.

MacDonald, W. L. (1995). The effects of religiosity and structural strain on reported paranormal experiences. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 366-376.

Malinowski, B. M. (1954). Science and religion. *A23*.

Mardin, Ş. (1983). *Din ve ideoloji*. İletişim Yayınları.

Marks, D. (2002). *The psychology of the psychic* (2nd ed.). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

McCleary, R. M., & Barro, R. J. (2006). Religion and political economy in an international panel. *Journal for the scientific study of religion*, *45*(2), 149-175.

Moscovici, S. (1981). On social representations. *Social cognition: Perspectives on everyday understanding*, 181-209.

Mowen, J. C., & Carlson, B. (2003). Exploring the antecedents and consumer behavior consequences of the trait of superstition. *Psychology & Marketing*, *20*(12), 1045-1065.

Mueller, S. L., & Thomas, A. S. (2001). Culture and entrepreneurial potential: A nine country study of locus of control and innovativeness. *Journal of business venturing*, *16*(1), 51-75.

Nelson, G. K. (2013). *Spiritualism and society*. Routledge.

Newport, J. P. (1998). *The New Age movement and the biblical worldview: conflict and dialogue*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Norenzayan, A., & Hansen, I. G. (2006). Belief in supernatural agents in the face of death. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *32*(2), 174-187.

Oksal, A., Şenşekerci, E., & Bilgin, A. (2006). Merkezi Epistemolojik İnançlar Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *19*(2), 371-381.

Orenstein, A. (2002). Religion and paranormal belief. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *41*(2), 301-311.

Otis, L. P. & Alcock, J. E. (1982). Factors affecting extraordinary belief. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *118*(1), 77-85.

Pargament, K. I. (1997).*The psychology of religion and coping*. New York: Guilford Press.

Pargament, K. I., Koenig, H. G., & Perez, L. M. (2000). The many methods of religious coping: Development and initial validation of the RCOPE. *Journal of clinical psychology*, *56*(4), 519-543.

Pargament, K. I., Smith, B. W., Koenig, H. G., & Perez, L. (1998). Patterns of positive and negative religious coping with major life stressors. *Journal for the scientific study of religion*, 710-724.

Pargament, K.I. (1990). God help me: Towards a theoretical framework of coping for the psychology of religion. *Research in the Scientific Study of Religion*, 2, 195–224.

Paul, G. S. (2010). Religiosity tied to socioeconomic status. *Science*, *327*(5966), 642.

Pepitone, A. (1997). Nonmaterial beliefs: Theory and research in cultural social psychology.

Randall, T. M., & fsiers, M. (1980). Measurement of supernatural belief: Sex differences and locus of control. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *44*(5), 493-498.

Randall, T.M. (1990). Belief in the paranormal declines: 1977−1987. *Psychological Reports*, *66*, 1347−1351.

Rice, T. W. (2003). Believe it or not: Religious and other paranormal beliefs in the United States. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *42*(1), 95-106.

Rogers, P., Davis, T., & Fisk, J. (2009). Paranormal belief and susceptibility to the conjunction fallacy. *Applied cognitive psychology*, *23*(4), 524-542.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement: *Psychological Monographs: General & Applied 80*(1) 1966, 1-28.

Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. A. (1975). Who believes in a just world?. *Journal of social Issues*, *31*(3), 65-8

Scheidt, R. J. (1973). Belief in supernatural phenomena and locus of control. *Psychological Reports*, *32*(3c), 1159-1162.

Seyhan, B. Y. (2012). İnanç Tarzları ve Denetim Odağı Arasındaki İlişkiler/The Relations between Faith Styles and Locus of Control. *Toplum   Bilimleri Dergisi*, *6*(12), 143-162.

Shafer, G. (1990). The unity and diversity of probability. *Statistical Science*, 435-444.

Shtulman, A. (2013). Epistemic similarities between students' scientific and supernatural beliefs. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*(1), 199.

Simmel, Georg 1971. *On Individuality and Social Forms*. Edited by Donald Levine. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Skinner, B. F. (1948). 'Superstition'in the pigeon. *Journal of experimental psychology*, *38*(2), 168.

Spilka, B., & McIntosh, D. N. (Eds.). (1997). *The psychology of religion: Theoretical approaches*. Basic Books.

Stanke, A. (2004). Religiosity, locus of control, and superstitious belief. *Journal of Undergraduate Research*, *7*(1), 1-5.

Superstition. (2014). *In The New Oxford Dictionaries.* Retrieved June 10, 2014, from http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/superstition

Swami, V., Pietschnig, J., Stieger, S., & Voracek, M. (2011). Alien psychology: Associations between extraterrestrial beliefs and paranormal ideation, superstitious beliefs, schizotypy, and the Big Five personality factors. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *25*(4), 647-653.

Taburoğlu, Ö. (2011) *Kent Efsaneleri- Zamanımızın Batıl İnançları ve Takıntıları,* Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (2004). "Posttraumatic Growth: Conceptual Foundations and Empirical Evidence". *Psychological inquiry*, *15*(1), 1-18.

Thalbourne, M. (1982). *A Glossary of Terms Used in Parapsychology.* London: Heinemann.

Thalbourne, M. A. (1981). Extraversion and the sheep–goat variable: A conceptual replication. *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research*.

Tobacyk, J. (2004). A revised paranormal belief scale. International Journal of Transpersonal Studies, 23, 94–98.

Tobacyk, J., & Milford, G. (1983). Belief in paranormal phenomena: Assessment instrument development and implications for personality functioning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 1029–1037.

Tobacyk, J. J. (1988). *A Revised Paranormal Belief Scale*. Unpublished manuscript. Ruston, LA: Louisiana Tech University

Tobacyk, J. J. (1988). A revised paranormal belief scale. *Unpublished manuscript, Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA*.

Tobacyk, J. J., Nagot, E., & Miller, M. (1988). Paranormal beliefs and locus of control: A multidimensional examination. *Journal of personality assessment*, *52*(2), 241-246.

Tobacyk, J. J., & Wilkinson, L. V. (1990). Magical thinking and paranormal beliefs. Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 5, 255–264.

Tobaycyk, J., Pritchett, G., & Mitchell, T. (1988). Paranormal beliefs in late-adulthood. *Psychological Reports*, *62*(3), 965-966.

Topuz, İ. (2013). Gençlerde Normatif, Popüler ve Paranormal İnançlar Üzerine Bir Araştırma: SDÜ Örneği. İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 13.

Torgler, B. (2007). Determinants of superstition. *The journal of socio-economics*, *36*(5), 713-733.

Göregenli, M. (2004). Türkçeye uyarlama, geçerlik güvenirlik çalışması: Şiddet Kötü Muamele ve İşkenceye İlişkin Değerlendirmeler Tutumlar ve Deneyimler. (İzmir Araştırması) İzmir Barosu Yayınları.

Vyse, S. A. (1997). Believing in magic. *The psychology of superstition, Oxford University Press, New York*.

Wain, O., & Spinella, M. (2007). Executive functions in morality, religion, and paranormal beliefs. *International Journal of Neuroscience*, *117*(1), 135-146.

Wallston, B. S., Wallston, K. A., Kaplan, G. D., & Maides, S. A. (1976). Development and validation of the health locus of control (HLC) scale. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *44*(4), 580.

Watkins, M. W. (2000). Monte Carlo PCA for parallel analysis [computer software]. *State College, PA: Ed & Psych Associates*.

Weber, M., & Parsons, T. (1998). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. Roxbury Pub.

Wood, J. T. (2005). *Gendered Lives: Communication, Gender, and Culture (with InfoTrac)*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Wundt, W. M. (1862). *Beiträge zur theorie der sinneswahrnehmung*. Winter.

Yip, K. S. (2003). Traditional Chinese religious beliefs and superstitions in delusions and hallucinations of Chinese schizophrenic patients. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, *49*(2), 97-111.

Zinnbauer, B. J., Pargament, K. I., & Scott, A. B. (1999). The emerging meanings of religiousness and spirituality: Problems and prospects. *Journal of personality*, *67*(6), 889-919.

Zusne, L., & Jones, W. H. (1989). Anomalistic psychology: A study of magical thinking, *Psychology Press.*

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. Batıl inançlar, doğaüstü güçler ve spiritüalizm (öte-âlemcilik) konularını hiç duydunuz mu? Bunlar ne demektir? Size neyi çağrıştırıyor? Örnekler verebilir misiniz?

   *Hatırlanmadığı takdirde hatırlatılacak: (Spiritüalizm: Reenkarnasyon, biyoenerji tedavisi, aura, telepati gibi; Batıl: Nazar, falcılık, şans, büyü gibi; Doğaüstü: Burçlar, cinler, periler, melekler gibi) "

2. Kendiniz bu inançları taşır mısınız? Ya da çevrenizde bu inançlara sahip insanlar var mıdır? Örnekler verebilir misiniz?

3. Bu inançların ilişkilerinizi veya davranışlarınızı etkilediği ya da yönlendirdiği oldu mu?

4. Sizce başkalarının bu inançları taşımasında neyin etkisi vardır? Hayatlarını nasıl etkilediği konusunda gözlemleriniz var mıdır?

5. Bu inançlara dayanarak, hayatınızı derinden etkileyen veya değiştiren bir tecrübeniz oldu mu?

6. Bu inançlarınızın oluşmasında ya da oluşmamasında neyin etkisi olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

7. Bu inançlarınızda dinin etkisi var mıdır?

Appendix B: Non-Material Belief Scale

Aşağıdaki maddeleri dikkatle okuyup katılıp katılmadığınızı karşısındaki cetvelden yararlanarak belirtiniz.	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1. Meleklerin ve şeytanın varlığına inanırım.*					
2. Doğanın üstünde bir güç yoktur.					
3. Ölümden sonra başka bir hayatın (ahiret) olduğuna inanırım.					
4. İnsanların öldükten sonra ruhlarının var olduğuna inanırım.					
5. Cinlerin ve perilerin varlığına inanırım.					
6. Yaşayan insanların da ruhlarının olduğuna inanırım.					
7. Tanrının/Allah'ın varlığına inanırım.					
8. Büyünün varlığına inanırım.					
9. Büyü diye bir şey yoktur.*					
10. "Ne ekersen, onu biçersin" , "Etme bulma dünyası" gibi sözler bence doğrudur.					
11. Doğaüstü güçlerin varlığına inanırım.					
12. Mucizelere inanırım.					
13. Doğaüstü güçler hakkında konuşulması beni tedirgin eder.					
14. Bazı rüyaların geleceği gösterdiğine inanırım.					
15. İnançları gerçekleştiren bir ruhani düzen olduğuna inanırım (İyi düşünürsen iyi olur gibi)					
16. Türbeler ve ziyaret yerlerinin olumlu etkilerine inanırım.					
17. Her türlü ruhani inanca karşı şüpheci yaklaşırım.*					
18. Rüyalardan geleceğe yönelik işaretler aldığım için etkilenirim.					

19. El ve düşünce gücüyle insanların ne düşündüğü anlaşılabilir (Reiki).					
20. İnsanların bedenlerinde, kendi enerjilerini yönlendiren çakralar olduğuna inanırım.					
21. İnsanın bedeninin dışına çıkıp ruhu ile seyahat edebildiğine inanırım.					
22. Uzaktaki insanlarla herhangi bir araç olmadan iletişim kurulabilir.					
23. El ve düşünce gücüyle insanlar tedavi edilebilir (Biyoenerji tedavisi).					
24. Bazı insanların sezgileri çok kuvvetlidir.					
25. Burçlara göre tanımlanan karakterlere inanırım.					
26. Mevcut yaşamımın öncesinde farklı yaşamlar vardır.					
27. Altıncı his diye bir şeyin varlığına inanırım.					
28. Nazara inanırım.					
29. Fala inandığım için fal baktırırım.					
30. Uğursuzluk getiren eşyalara ya da ritüellere inanırım (ayna kırma, kara kedi görme, merdiven altından geçme vb.).					
31. Nazar değdiren kişilerden uzak durmaya çalışırım.					
32. Nazar değecek korkusuyla bazı şeyleri paylaşmaktan kaçınırım.					
33. Uğur getiren eşyalara ya da ritüellere inanırım (at nalı, renkler, sayılar, günler vb.))					
34. Şans ya da şanssızlık bir kaderdir.					
35. Bir şey yaptıktan sonra kötü bir şey olmuşsa tekrar yapmamaya çalışırım.					
36. Batıl inançlar beni rahatlattığı için uygularım.					
37. Batıl inançlara inanmam.*					

* These items were reverse coded, 1-18 items are about Supernatural Powers, 19-28 items are about Spiritualism and 28-37 items are about Superstitious Beliefs

Appendix C: Revised Paranormal Belief Scale (PBS-R)

Aşağıda **insanların bazı nedeni bilinmeyen -gizemli- olaylarla ve ilahi konularla ilgili düşüncelerini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlayan** ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Sizden bu ifadelerdeki düşüncelere ne ölçüde katıldığınızı belirtmeniz istenmektedir. Bunun için, her bir ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyunuz ve orada ifade edilen düşüncenin sizin düşüncelerinize uygunluk derecesini belirtiniz.

"Doğru" ya da "yanlış" cevap diye bir şey söz konusu değildir, yalnızca ifadelerin düşüncelerinize uygunluğu sorulmaktadır. İçtenlikle cevaplamanız beklentisiyle araştırmaya yardımcı olduğunuz için çok teşekkür ederiz.

	Hiç Uygun Değil	Pek Uygun Değil	Uygun	Oldukça Uygun	Pek Uygun
1. Bedenen öldükten sonra ruhun var olmaya devam ettiğine inanırım.					
2. Bazı insanların zihinsel güçlerini kullanarak eşyaları havaya kaldırma yetenekleri olduğuna inanırım.					
3. Kötülük getirmek için yapılan kara büyüye inanırım.					
4. Tanıdığım biriyle aramızdan geçen kara kedinin uğursuzluk getirdiğine inanırım.					
5. Ruhun bedenden ayrılarak seyahat edip dönebileceğine inanırım.					
6. Kurt adam hikâyeleri bence bir efsane değil, gerçektir.					
7. Bence yıldız falcılığı (astroloji) geleceği kesin olarak tahmin etmenin bir yoludur.					
8. Şeytanın varlığına inanıyorum.					
9. Bence eşyaların zihinsel güçle hareket ettirilebilmesi mümkündür.					
10. Büyücü kadınların (cadıların) gerçekten var olduklarına inanırım.					
11. Ayna kıran bir insanın uğursuzluklarla karşılaşacağına inanırım.					
12. Bence uyku ya da kendinden geçme (trans) hallerinde ruh bedenden ayrılabilir.					
13. Van gölünde gerçekten korkunç bir canavarın bulunduğuna inanıyorum.					
14. Bence yıldızname (horoskop) bir insana geleceğini kesin olarak söyler.					
15. Tanrının varlığına yürekten inanıyorum.					

16. Bir insanın düşüncelerinin eşyaların hareketlerini etkileyebileceğine inanırım.					
17. Bence bazı sihirli formül ve dualar kullanarak bir insana büyü yapmak mümkündür.					
18. "13" sayısının uğursuzluk getirdiğine inanırım.					
19. Ölen birinin ruhunun yeni doğan bir bedene girdiğine (reenkarnasyon) inanırım.					
20. Bence başka gezegenlerde yaşam vardır.					
21. Bazı falcıların (medyumların) geleceği kesin olarak tahmin edebildiklerine inanırım.					
22. Cennet ve cehennemin gerçekten var olduğuna inanıyorum.					
23. Bence başka bir insanın aklından geçirdiklerini okumak mümkündür.					
24. Büyücülük olaylarının gerçekten var olduğuna inanıyorum.					
25. Ölmüş kişilerle iletişim kurmanın mümkün olduğuna inanırım.					
26. Bazı insanların açıklanamayan bir şekilde geleceği doğru tahmin yeteneklerinin bulunduğuna inanırım.					

Appendix D: Locus of Control Scale

Aşağıdaki her soru için, iki seçenekten hangisi size daha doğru geliyorsa onu işaretleyiniz.

1.	a.	Ana-babaları çok fazla cezalandırdıkları için çocuklar problemli oluyor.
	b.	Günümüz çocuklarının çoğunun problemi, ana-babaları tarafından aşırı serbest bırakılmalarıdır.
2.	a.	İnsanların yaşamındaki mutsuzlukların çoğu, biraz da şanssızlıklarına bağlıdır.
	b.	İnsanların talihsizlikleri kendi hatalarının sonucudur.
3.	a.	Savaşların başlıca nedenlerinden biri, halkın siyasetle yeterince ilgilenmemesidir.
	b.	İnsanlar savaşı önlemek için ne kadar çaba harcarsa harcasın, her zaman savaş olacaktır.
4.	a.	İnsanlar bu dünyada hak ettikleri saygıyı er geç görürler.
	b.	İnsan ne kadar çabalarsa çabalasın ne yazık ki değeri genellikle anlaşılmaz.
5.	a.	Öğretmenlerin öğrencilere haksızlık yaptığı fikri saçmadır.
	b.	Öğrencilerin çoğu, notlarının tesadüfi olaylardan etkilendiğini fark etmez.
6.	a.	Koşullar uygun değilse insan başarılı bir lider olamaz.
	b.	Lider olamayan yetenekli insanlar fırsatları değerlendirememiş kişilerdir.
7.	a.	Ne kadar uğraşsanız da bazı insanlar sizden hoşlanmazlar.
	b.	Kendilerini başkalarına sevdiremeyen kişiler, başkalarıyla nasıl geçinileceğini bilmeyenlerdir.
8.	a.	İnsanın kişiliğinin belirlenmesinde en önemli rolü kalıtım oynar.
	b.	İnsanların nasıl biri olacaklarını kendi hayat tecrübeleri belirler.
9.	a.	Bir şey olacaksa eninde sonunda olduğuna sık sık tanık olmuşumdur.
	b.	Ne yapacağıma kesin karar vermek kadere güvenmekten daima iyidir.
10.	a.	İyi hazırlanmış bir öğrenci için, adil olmayan bir sınav hemen hemen söz konusu olamaz.
	b.	Sınav sonuçları derste işlenenle çoğu kez o kadar ilişkisiz oluyor ki, çalışmanın anlamı kalmıyor.
	a.	Başarılı olmak çok çalışmaya bağlıdır.

11.	b.	İyi bir iş bulmak, temelde, doğru zamanda doğru yerde bulunmaya bağlıdır.
12.	a.	Hükümetin kararlarında sade vatandaşta etkili olabilir.
	b.	Bu dünya güç sahibi bir kaç kişi tarafından yönetilmektedir ve sade vatandaşın bu konuda yapabileceği fazla bir şey yoktur.
13.	a.	Yaptığım planları yürütebileceğimden hemen hemen eminimdir.
	b.	Çok uzun vadeli planlar yapmak her zaman akıllıca olmayabilir, çünkü bir çok şey zaten iyi ya da kötü şansa bağlıdır.
14.	a.	Hiç bir yönü iyi olmayan insanlar vardır.
	b.	Herkesin iyi tarafı vardır.
15.	a.	Benim açımdan istediğimi elde etmenin talihle bir ilgisi yoktur.
	b.	Çoğu durumda, yazı-tura atarak da isabetli kararlar verilebilir.
16.	a.	Kimin patron olacağı, genellikle, doğru yerde ilk önce bulunma şansına kimin sahip olduğuna bağlıdır.
	b.	İnsanlara doğru şeyi yaptırmak bir yetenek işidir; şansın bunda payı ya hiç yoktur ya da çok azdır.
17.	a.	Dünya meseleleri söz konusu olduğunda, çoğumuz anlayamadığımız ve kontrol edemediğimiz güçlerin kurbanıyızdır.
	b.	İnsanlar siyasal ve sosyal konularda aktif rol olarak dünya olaylarını kontrol edebilirler.
18.	a.	Birçok insan rastlantıların yaşamlarını ne derece etkilediğinin farkında değildir.
	b.	Aslında 'şans' diye bir şey yoktur.
19.	a.	İnsan, hatalarını kabul edebilmelidir.
	b.	Genelde en iyisi insanın hatalarını ispat etmesidir.
20.	a.	Bir insanın sizden gerçekten hoşlanıp hoşlanmadığını bilmek zordur.
	b.	Kaç arkadaşınızın olduğu, ne kadar iyi olduğunuza bağlıdır.
21.	a.	Uzun vadede, yaşamınızdaki kötü şeyler iyi şeylerle dengelenir.
	b.	Çoğu talihsizlikler yetenek eksikliğinin, ihmalin, tembelliğin ya da her üçünün birden sonucudur.
22.	a.	Yeterli çabayla siyasal yolsuzlukları ortadan kaldırabiliriz.
	b.	Siyasetçilerin kapalı kapılar ardında yaptıkları üzerinde halkın fazla bir kontrolü yoktur.

23.	a.	Öğretmenlerin verdikleri notları nasıl belirlediklerini bazen anlayamıyorum.
	b.	Aldığım notlarla çalışma derecem arasında doğrudan bir bağlantı vardır.
24.	a.	İyi bir lider, ne yapacaklarına halkın bizzat karar vermesini bekler.
	b.	İyi bir lider herkesin görevinin ne olduğunu bizzat belirler.
25.	a.	Çoğu kez başıma gelenler üzerinde çok az etkiye sahip olduğumu hissederim.
	b.	Şans ya da talihin yaşamımda önemli bir rol oynadığına inanmam.
26.	a.	İnsanlar arkadaşça olmaya çalışmadıkları için yalnızdırlar.
	b.	İnsanları memnun etmek için çok fazla çabalamanın yararı yoktur, sizden hoşlanırlarsa hoşlanırlar.
27.	a.	Liselerde atletizme gereğinden fazla önem veriliyor.
	b.	Takım sporları kişiliğin oluşumu için mükemmel bir yoldur.
28.	a.	Başıma ne gelmişse, kendi yaptıklarımdandır.
	b.	Yaşamımın alacağı yön üzerinde bazen yeterince kontrolümün olmadığını hissediyorum.
29.	a.	Siyasetçilerin neden öyle davrandıklarını çoğu kez anlayamıyorum.
	b.	Yerel ve ulusal düzeydeki kötü idareden uzun vadede halk sorumludur.

Appendix E: General System Justification Scale

Aşağıdaki maddeleri dikkatle okuyup katılıp katılmadığınızı karşısındaki cetvelden yararlanarak belirtiniz.	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1.Genel olarak, toplumu adil bulurum.					
2.Genel olarak, Türkiye'de politik sistemi gerektiği gibi işler.					
3.Türk toplumu baştan sona yeniden yapılandırılmalıdır.					
4.Türkiye dünyada yaşanılacak en iyi ülkedir.					
5.Türkiye'de uygulanan çoğu politika daha iyiye hizmet eder.					
6.Herkes zenginlik ve mutlulukta adil fırsatlara sahiptir.					
7.Toplumumuz her yıl daha kötüye gitmektedir.					
8.Toplum bir kez oluştuktan sonra genelde insanlar ne hak ederlerse onu elde ederler.					

Appendix F: Brief RCOPE

Bir sıkıntı yaşadığımda;	Hemen hemen hiç yapmam	Arada sırada yaparım	Orta derecede yaparım	Sıklıkla yaparım
1. Allah ile sıkı bir bağ kurmaya çalışırım.				
2. Böyle bir olayla Allah'ın bana nasıl güç vereceğini görmeye çalışırım.				
3. İyi bir kul olmadığım için cezalandırıldığımı hissederim.				
4. Bu işe şeytanın sebep olduğuna karar veririm.				
5. Allah'ın gücünden/ kudretinden şüpheye düşerim.				
6. Allah'tan sevgi ve şefkat dilerim.				
7. Allah'ın beni sevip sevmediğinden şüpheye kapılırım.				
8. Öfkemi gidermesi için Allah'tan yardım dilerim.				
9. Günahlarımın affedilmesini dilerim.				
10. Allah'ın beni yalnız bıraktığından endişelenirim.				
11. Planlarımı Allah'ın yardımıyla hayata geçirmeye çalışırım.				
12. Dindar kardeşlerimin/ dini kurumların beni terk etmesinden endişelenirim.				
13. Sorunlarımı dert edinmeyi bırakmak için kendimi dine veririm.				
14. Allah tarafından cezalandırılmayı hak edecek ne yaptığımı düşünürüm.				

Appendix G: Demographic Information Form

Yaşınız:

Yaşadığınız il:

Cinsiyetinizi belirtiniz:

1)Kadın

2)Erkek

3)Diğer

Eğitim Durumunuzu belirtiniz:

1)İlkokul

2)Ortaokul

3)Lise

4)Yüksekokul

5)Üniversite

6)Lisansüstü

Aylık gelir düzeyinizi belirtiniz:

1)0-1000 TL

2)1001-2000 TL

3)2001-3000 TL

4)3001-4000 TL

5)4000 TL ve üzeri

Mesleğiniz:

Kendinizi hangi sosyoekonomik statüye dâhil edersiniz? Aşağıdaki seçeneklerden birini seçiniz.

1)Düşük

2)Orta

3)Yüksek

Medeni durumunuzu belirtiniz:

1)Evli

2)Bekâr

3)Dul

4)Boşanmış

Herhangi bir dine mensup musunuz?

1)İslamiyet

2)Hristiyanlık

3)Musevilik

4)Diğer

5)Herhangi bir dine mensup değilim.

Herhangi bir mezhebe mensup musunuz?

1)Sünni

2)Alevi

3)Diğer

4)Herhangi bir mezhebe mensup değilim.

Kendinizi ne kadar dindar görürsünüz?

1)Çok dindarım

2)Biraz dindarım

3)Dindarım

4)Dindar değilim

5)Hiç dindar değilim

Appendix H: Turkish Summary

Eski çağlarda, bilim yeterince gelişmiş olmadığından, sayılara ve sayısal verilere çok fazla önem verilmemiştir. O zamanlarda iletişim araçları da oldukça kısıtlıydı. Öne sürülen teoriler iletişim zorluğundan dolayı dağılma ve yayılma imkânı bulamamış olabilirler. Böylelikle, determinizm doğaüstü ve ruhani güçler aracılığıyla elde edilmeye çalışılıyordu. Örneğin, yağmur, rüzgâr ya da deprem gibi doğa olaylarından sorumlu Tanrıların olduğu düşünülürdü. Fakat birçok yeni bilim dalının ortaya çıkmasıyla bu inançlar etkisini azaltmaya başlamıştır. Bilimin ve teknolojinin büyük atılımlarına rağmen, insanlar Tanrı, Şeytan, Melek ya da Cin gibi bazı olguların varlıklarını açıklayamadıkları için, günümüzde de bazı inançları taşımaya devam etmektedirler. Öte yandan, bazı bilim insanları bu tür inançların gündelik tesadüflerle nedensellik yanılsaması olduğunu düşünmektedirler (Blackmore, 1990; Brugger, Landis & Regard, 1990).

Doğaüstü varlıkların ve ruhani güçlerin varlığı bilimsel olarak açıklanmaması, bazı bilim insanlarının bu varlıkları reddetmesiyle ilişkilidir. Fakat her ne kadar bilimsel olarak açıklanmamış olsa da, birçok insanın bu tür inançları taşıdığı ve bunlardan etkilendiği (Lawrence, Edwards, Barraclough, Church & Hetherington, 1995) kolaylıkla görülebilmektedir. Görülmeyen, bütün soyut inançları kapsaması adına, Pepitone (1997) bu inançlara, material olmayan/manevi inançlar ismini vermiştir. Ayrıca Pepitone (1997), kültürel normların ve inançların sosyal psikologlar tarafından görmezden gelindiğini fakat incelenmesi gerektiğini düşünmektedir. Pepitone (1997), manevi inançları taşımada 3 adaptif fonksiyonun olduğunu belirtmektedir. İlk olarak, bu inançlar insanların temel ihtiyaçlarını karşıladığın ve Tanrı'ya inanmanın insanlara güç verdiğini belirtmektedir. İkinci olarak ise, insanların bu tür inançlar sayesinde bir araya geldiğini ve grup birliği oluşturduğunu düşünmektedir. Son olarak ise, bu tür inançların açıklanamayan yaşam olayları için nedensel yüklemelerle insanlara yardım edeceğini düşünmektedir. Bu bağlamda, manevi inançların sosyal psikolojik yönden açıklanması, hem insanların davranış ve tutumlarına ilişkin belli işaretler sunacak, hem

de literatüre katkı sağlayacaktır. Bu tezde manevi inançlar, doğaüstü güçler, ruhanilik ve batıl inançlar olmak üzere 3 ana başlıkta incelenmiştir.

Hemen hemen herkes, bilimin yeterince açıklayamadığı (Irwin & Watt, 2007) ya da bilimi ihlal ettiği söylenen (Goode, 2000a & 2000b) ruhani ve metafizik olguları duymuştur. Fakat doğaüstü ve paranormal inançları taşıyan insanların hepsinin bilimi inkâr ettiği söylenememektedir. Bu insanların daha ziyade dışsal denetim odağına sahip insanlar olduğu ya da sübjektif bir dünya görüşüne sahip olduğu söylenebilmektedir (Irwin, 1993). Ayrıca, literatürde paranormal ve doğaüstü inançlar, bazen birbirinin yerine kullanılmaktadır. Her maddi olmayan inancı paranormal inanç altında değerlendirmek tartışmalı bir konudur; çünkü kültürler, bunların uygulamaları ve ritüelleri birbirlerinden farklıdır. Örneğin bir inanç bazı insanlar tarafından saçma veya absürd görülebilirken, başkaları tarafından mantıklı ve normal görülebilmektedir; örneğin dünyada insanların çoğu belli dinlere mensupken, deistler gibi Tanrı'ya inanıp hiçbir dine mensup olmayan insanlar da vardır. Paranormal ve doğaüstü inançlar her ne kadar aynı şeyleri ima etse de, paranormal inanç kullanımı insanlarda negatif bir çağrışım yapabileceğinden, mevcut çalışmada doğaüstü güçler olarak ele alınmıştır. Ancak, araştırmacılar, ikisinin de insan gerçeklerinin ya da yeteneklerinin "*fiziksel yokluğu*" ile ilgili olduğu noktada buluşmaktadır. Bu durumda, "insanlar neden doğaüstü güçlere inanır?" sorusu sorulabilmektedir. Blackmore and Trościanko (1985) bu durumun arkasında iki neden olabileceğinden bahsetmektedir. İlk olarak, insanlar normal olan olayları paranormal olarak algılayabilmektedirler. İkincisi ise, insanlar olayların olma ihtimalini *"seçici unutma"* ile yanlış hatırlayabilmektedirler.

Sayısız inançlar veya ritüeller doğaüstü güçlere dâhil edilebilmektedir. Örneğin, bu niyetle Allah'a olan inanç, melekler, periler, cinler ya da Şeytan inancı gibi bazı dinlerin gerekli kıldığı inançlar en çok söz edilen örneklerdendir. Ahiret inancı da buna dâhil edilebilmektedir. Ayrıca, bazı insanlar da doğaüstü güçlere sahip olduğuna inanılmaktadır.

Özetle, insanların doğaüstü güçlere inanmaları için nedenleri vardır. Doğaüstü güçler, yukarıda tartışılan ve kültürden kültüre farklı sınıflandırılan nedenlerden ötürü, bireylerin çevreye adaptasyonlarının bir işareti olabilmektedir. Bu çalışma Türkiye örneklemindeki inanç eğilimlerini araştırmaktadır.

Mevcut çalışmada incelenecek diğer bir inanç da ruhaniliktir. İnsanlık tarihinin erken dönemlerinde, paganizm popüler bir doktrindi ve farklı düşünenler cezalandırılmakyatdı. Paganizmin, bazı ruhani yaratıklar ya da zorluklar ile başa çıkmak için onlara yardımcı olduğuna inanılıyordu. Fakat zamanla, insanların inanç biçimleri de değişmeye başlamıştır. Buradaki zaman kavramı birkaç yılı değil, binlerce yılı kapsamaktadır. Çünkü ideolojik birimlerden oluşan inanç sistemlerinin değiştirmesi gerçekten zordur ve değişeceği zaman ise yavaş bir değişim gösterme eğiliminde olmaktadırlar (Mardin, 1983). Denton (1871), ruhaniliği, ölen ruhlarla, duyarlı bir insan aracılığıyla, medyum, olan iletişim hali diye tanımlamaktadır. Bu tanımla, ruhanilik, sıklıkla karıştırılan ya da karşılaştırılan dinden ayırt edilebilmektedir. Ruhanilik genelde ruhlarla olan iletişimle ilgilenirken, din insanların hayat tarzları, yaşadığı coğrafya, kültürleri ve hatta dilleriyle ilgilenmektedir. Ayrıca, ruhanilik kendi başına bir olgu iken, dinin birçok türü vardır. Bu bağlamda, ruhanilik, din olgusunun bir fonksiyonu denebilmektedir (Zinnbauer, Pargament & Scott, 1999).

Dünya üzerinde de ruhaniliğin çeşitli örneklerine rastlanılabilmektedir. İnsanlar ve ruhlar arasındaki iletişim, iddiası en belirgin örnek olarak göze çarpmaktadır. Buna ek olarak, öldükten sonar ruhların yaşamaya devam ettiği inancı da mevcuttur. Bazı araştırmacılar, hayaletleri de bu kategori altında değerlendirmektedirler (Bering, McLeod & Shackelford, 2005). New Age akımı da genellikle ruhanilik ile anılmaktadır; bu inanca göre, hiçbir şey tesadüf değildir ve herkes her şeyin yaratılmasında rol almaktadır. Reenkarnasyon ve Karma inançları da ruhanilik örneklerinden sayılabilmektedir (Holloway, 2000). Buna ek olarak, insanlar bu tür inançların gerekçesiyle birbirleri ile ilişkileri içerisinde bulunabilmektedirler. Türkiye kültürü, din odaklı bir kültür olduğundan, çoğu insanın maneviyat ve din arasında bir bağlantı kurması beklenmektedir. Bu, insanların manevi inançları taşımasındaki nedenleri araştırmak için ek bir neden olabilmektedir.

Son manevi inanç olarak, batıl inançlar incelenmiştir. Batıl inançlar ilkellik ve cehalet göstergesi olarak görülse de (Juenemen, 2001), bu inançlarla birçok kültürde karşılaşmak mümkündür. Bu sebeple, batıl inançların yorumlanması çok önemli hale gelmektedir. Batıl inançların kültüre özgü olduğunu iddia eden birçok çalışma vardır, fakat öte yandan, bu inançların varlığının evrensel olduğu da bilinmektedir. İnsanların

maddi bir açıklama getiremediği ve güçsüz hissettiği durumlarda, bu inançlar insanları hayata bağlayabilmektedir. Bu eylemler ve inançlar kültürel yolla iletilebilmektedir veya pekiştirme yoluyla öğrenilmektedir ve genellikle belirsizlik koşullarında kullanılmaktadırlar (Zusne & Jones, 1989). İnsanlar tarafından, batıl inançların bazı fonksiyonları olduğu düşünülebilir: talihsizlik yaşamamak (örneğin siyah bir kedi görünce saçını çekmek), uğur ve şans getirmek (örneğin şanslı takılar), istenen bir sonuca ulaşmak, geleceği öngörmek (örneğin falcılık) vb. gibi örnekler verilebilir. Bu inançlar, tüm dünyada insanların eylemlerini etkileyebilmektedir ve mevcut çalışma da Türkiye insanının inanç eğilimlerini araştırmayı hedeflemiştir.

Denetim odağı, Rotter (1966) tarafından geliştirilmiş olup, bireylerin yaşadıklarının ortaya çıkış nedenleri konusunda sorumluluğu kime ve neye atfettikleri ile ilgili bir kavramdır. İçsel denetim odaklı bireyler yaşadığı olayların gelişmesinde ve ortaya çıkmasında kendilerinin belirleyici rol oynadığını düşünürken (duygular, kişilik gibi), dışsal denetim odaklı bireyler hiçbir rolleri olmadığına inanırlar (kader, şans gibi). İnançlar genelde bazı kişisel ve sosyal motivasyonlara dayandırabilmektedir. Bu bağlamda, denetim odağı bireylerin inançlara olan motivasyonlarını anlamak için uygun bir araç olabilir. Literatürdeki bulgular, dışsal denetim odaklı bireylerin, içsel denetim odaklı bireylere göre manevi inançları taşımada daha fazla eğilim gösterdiklerini belirtmektedir (Dag, 1999; Randall & Desrosiers, 1980; Scheidt, 1973; Tobacyk, Nagot & Miller, 1988). Aksine, Groth-Marnat ve Pegden (1998) içsel kontrol odaklı bireylerin batıl inançlara daha fazla inanma eğiliminde olduğunu ve bireylerin şanssızlık ve uğursuzluk getiren şeylerden uzak durarak bazı şeyleri kontrol edebildiklerini düşündüklerini ileri sürmektedirler.

Jost and Banaji (1994), sistemi meşrulaştırma kavramını öne sürmüş ve kişisel ya da grup çıkarları pahasına bile olsa mevcut düzenin meşrulaştırılması süreci olarak tanımlamışlardır. Jost ve Banaji (1994) ayrıca 'yanlış bilinç' adlı bir Marksist kavrama da atıfta bulunmuşlardır ve sosyal psikolojik bir form haline adapte etmişlerdir ve bunu "baskınların fikirlerinin, bastırılmışların fikirleri olma eğilimi" şeklinde ifade etmişlerdir. Bu bilinçli olmak zorunda değildir, aynı zamanda bilinçsizce de olabilmektedir. Batıl inançlar buna iyi bir örnek olarak gösterilebilir. Örneğin, bazı insanlar kötü bir şey duyduklarında tahtaya vururlar. Fakat tahtaya vurma eyleminin

sadece bilinçli bir şekilde yapıldığından söz edilemeyebilir; yani bu, çevrenin etkisinde kalmak sonucu yapılmış bir eylem olabilir. Bireyler yaşadıkları çevre tarafından domine edilebilirler. Yukarıda verilen literatür ışığında, sistemi meşrulaştırma ve manevi inançların ilişkili olacağı beklenmektedir.

Öte yandan dini/ruhani başa çıkmadan bahsedilecek olursa, her birey dini kendine göre yorumlamaktadır ve farklı yorumlamalar da farklı başa çıkma stratejilerini ortaya çıkarabilmektedir. Dini/ruhani başa çıkma (Pargament, 1997) son yıllarda çoğunlukla araştırmacıların dikkatini çekmektedir ve bireyler tarafından geliştirilen stratejilerden biri olarak kabul edilebilir. Pargament (1990) din ve başa çıkma olgularının üç şekilde bir araya gelebileceğinden bahsetmektedir: 1) din birçok şey için bir başa çıkma stratejisi olarak görülebilir; 2) başa çıkma süreci din tarafından şekillendirilebilir ve 3) din, başa çıkma sürecinden sonra şekillenebilir. Dindar olan insanların dini / manevi başa çıkma stratejilerini kullandığı düşünülürse, dini/manevi başa çıkma stratejilerini kullanan insanların aynı şekilde düşünmesi beklenebilir. Özetle, dini/manevi başa çıkma stratejileri, insanların doğaüstü güçlere ve ruhaniliğe olan inançlarını destekleyebilir ve batıl inançları taşımasını engelleyebilmektedir.

Dindarlık, inancı korumak adına din süzgecinden geçirilmiş bir olgu olarak kabul edilebilir. Allport (2004) insanların genellikle kriz dönemlerinde normal zamanlara kıyasla daha fazla dindar olma eğiliminde olduğunu iddia etmektedir. Ayrıca, Allport ve Ross (1967) dinin, bireylerin daha olgun hale gelmesinde katkısının olduğunu belirtmektedir. Bu bağlamda, dinlerin kitlelerce takip edilmesi ya da onlara inanılması anlaşılabilmektedir. Din ve dindarlık olguları materyal olmayan bir temelde olduğu için, bu değişkenler ve manevi inançlar arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmak faydalı olabilir.

Çalışmanın bağımlı değişkeni, manevi inançlar (doğaüstü güçler, ruhanilik, batıl inançlar) bağımsız değişkenleri ise denetim odağı, genel sistemi meşrulaştırma, dini/ruhani başa çıkma ve dindarlıktır.

Mevcut çalışmanın amacı, denetim odağı, sistemi meşrulaştırma, dini/ruhani başa çıkma ve dindarlık bağımsız değişkenlerinin manevi inançlar üzerindeki etkisini incelemektir. Bazı sosyodemografik değişkenler de göz önünde bulundurulmuştur. Hipotezler aşağıda belirtilmiştir:

1. Kadınların, erkeklerden daha fazla manevi inanca sahip olması beklenmiştir.

2. Yaşlıların gençlere, sosyoekonomik durumu düşük olanların yüksek olanlara ve eğitim derecesi düşük olanların yüksek olanlara kıyasla daha fazla manevi inanç taşıması beklenmiştir.

3. Dışsal denetim odağına sahip bireylerin, içsel denetim odağına sahip bireylere kıyasla daha fazla manevi inanç taşıması beklenmiştir.

4. Sistemi meşrulaştıran bireylerin, sistemi meşrulaştırmayan bireylere oranla daha fazla manevi inanca sahip olması beklenmiştir.

5. Dini/ruhani başa çıkma stratejilerini kullanan bireylerin doğaüstü güçlere ve ruhaniliğe inanma eğiliminin fazla, batıl inançlara olan eğiliminin ise daha az olması beklenmiştir.

6. Dindar bireylerin doğaüstü güçlere ve ruhaniliğe inanma eğiliminin fazla, batıl inançlara olan eğiliminin ise daha az olması beklenmiştir.

Çalışmada öncelikle manevi inançlar ölçeği oluşturmak amacıyla 29 kişiyle (17 kadın, 12 erkek) yarı yapılandırılmış mülakat yapılmıştır. İnanç eğilimlerinin farklılaşacağı düşünüldüğünden, görüşmecilerin farklı sosyoekonomik statülerden olmasına dikkat edilmiştir. Görüşmeler sonucunda belli inanç temaları çıkarılmıştır ve ölçek maddeleri belirlenmiştir. Hazırlanan ölçeğin geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik analizinin yapılması için 117 (79 kadın, 38 erkek) kişiden, internet üzerinden veri toplanmıştır. Katılımcılardan oluşturulan ölçek ve kıyaslama amacıyla Paranormal İnanç Ölçeği'ni doldurmaları istenmiştir. Yapılan faktör analizi sonucunda 3 faktör belirlenmiş ve bunlara sırasıyla doğaüstü güçler, ruhanilik ve batıl inançlar isimleri verilmiştir. 5 madde, hiçbir faktöre yüklenmediğinden ya da toplam varyansı düşürdüğünden çalışmadan çıkarılmıştır. Yapı ve uyum geçerliliğine bakılmış ve bunlar tesis edilmiştir. Ölçeğin son halinde 37 madde (Faktör 1: Doğaüstü güçler, 18 madde; Faktör 2: Ruhanilik, 9 madde; Faktör 3: Batıl inançlar, 10 madde) bulunmaktadır ve geçerliliği .92 olarak bulunmuştur.

Çalışmaya başlamadan önce Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi'nden gerekli etik izinleri alınmıştır. Oluşturulan ölçeğin geçerliliği ve güvenilirliği test edildikten sonra, yine internet üzerinden esas veri toplanmıştır. 608 katılımcı çalışmaya destek vermiştir fakat 2 katılımcının yaşı 18'den küçük olduğu için, bu katılımcılar çalışmadan çıkarılmıştır. Sonuç olarak, 376'sı kadın, 228'i erkek ve 2'si diğer olmak üzere 606

katılımcı çalışmaya destek vermiştir. Katılımcılardan mevcut çalışma için geliştirilmiş olan Manevi İnanç Ölçeği, Denetim Odağı Ölçeği (Rotter, 1996), Genel Sistemi Meşrulaştırma Ölçeği (Kay & Jost, 2003), Dini/Ruhani Başa Çıkma Ölçeği (RCOPE; Pargament et.al., 1998) ve demografik bilgi formunun doldurulması istenmiştir.

Öncelikle, cinsiyet farkına bakmak için bağımsız iki grup arası farkların t testi analizi kullanılmıştır. Farklı sosyo-demografik özelliklere sahip bireylerin manevi inançları taşımada farklılaşıp farklılaşmayacağına bakmak için ANOVA tabanlı istatistik analizi yapılmıştır. Denetim odağı, sistemi meşrulaştırma, dini/ruhani başa çıkma ve dindarlık bağımsız değişkenlerinin manevi inançları yordayıp yordamadığına bakmak için ise hiyerarşik regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır.

Sonuçlar bazı hipotezleri desteklemiştir, bazı sonuçlar da beklenenin aksi yönde çıkmıştır. İlk olarak, beklenenin aksine, erkeklerin kadınlara göre daha fazla manevi inanç taşıdığı görülmüştür. Literatürde kadınların erkeklere oranla bu inançları daha fazla taşıdığını belirten birçok çalışma olsa da (Cameron, 2010; Dag, 1999; Randall, 1990; Vyse, 1997), cinsiyet farkı bulamayan araştırmalar da mevcuttur (King et.al., 2007; Mowen & Carlson, 2003; Rogers, Davis and Fisk, 2009). Böyle bir sonucun elde edilmesinde birçok faktör rol oynamış olabilir. İlk olarak, genelde kadınların bu inançları daha fazla taşıdığı düşünülmektedir fakat mevcut çalışma anonim bir şekilde cevaplandırıldığından, erkek katılımcılar kendi görüşlerini yansıtacak seçenekleri rahatlıkla işaretleyebilmişlerdir. Cinsiyet içi farklılaşmalar da sonuçların bu şekilde çıkmasına etki etmiş olabilir. Ayrıca, insanlık tarihinde kadınlar sürekli hor görülmüş ve küçümsemeye maruz kalmışlardır. Bu tür inançlara inanmaları da bir zayıflık göstergesi olarak düşünülmüş olabileceğinden, bu konuda da bugüne kadar kalıp yargılara maruz kalmış olabilmektedirler. Bunula birlikte, özellikle Türkiye gibi bir toplumda kadınların ve erkeklerin sosyalizasyon süreçlerinin oldukça farklı olduğu söylenebilmektedir. Kadınlar yine kendi aralarında sosyalleşirken, erkekler için daha alternatif yollar söz konusudur. Erkeklerin kendilerini güçlü birer kahraman gibi göstermek istemeleri, bu tip inançları gizlemelerine sebep olabilmektedir. Daha önce de bahsedildiği gibi çalışmanın anonim olması, belki de erkekler açısından şaşırtan bir gerçekliği gözler önüne sermektedir.

Farklı yaş, eğitim ve gelir grupları arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır. Örneklemin çoğunlukla genç, lisans ya da lisansüstü mezunu olması yaş ve eğitim grupları arasında fark çıkmamasında etkili bir sebep olabilmektedir. Gelecek çalışmalarda daha heterojen bir örneklem kullanılması sonuçların doğrulayıcılığını arttıracaktır. Farklı gelir düzeyine sahip olan bireylerin birbirinden farklılaşmaması da birkaç sebeple açıklanabilir. Öncelikle, katılımcıların çoğu öğrenci olduğu ve gelir getirecek bir kaynakları olmadığı için, mevcut örneklem gelir düzeyi ile ilişkili olarak sağlıklı bilgiler vermeyebilir. Ayrıca, Türkiye kolektivizm ve güç aralığı değerlerinde yüksek bir ülke olduğu (Hofstede, 1984) ve insanlar genellikle dominant kültürel kodlarla yetiştirildikleri için, gelir seviyesinin yüksek ya da düşük olması sonuçları etkilememiş olabilir. Dolayısıyla, gelir insanların inanç eğilimlerini değiştirecek bir unsur olarak görülmemiştir.

Yüksek denetim odağı skorları dışsal denetim odağının göstergesidir. Beklenenin aksine, denetim odağı, manevi inançları negatif ve anlamlı olarak yordamıştır. Literatürdeki çoğu bulgu da bunun tersini göstermektedir; dışsal denetim odağı ile manevi inançlar arasında pozitif ilişkiler bulunmuştur (Dag, 1999; Randall & Desrosiers, 1980; Tobacyk, Nagot & Miller, 1988; Scheidt, 1973). Fakat Belter and Brinkmann (1981) bu ikisi arasında bir ilişki bulamamıştır. Öte yandan, Groth-Marnat ve Pegden (1998) batıl inançlar ve içsel denetim odağı arasında pozitif bir ilişki tespit etmiştir ve bireylerin kötü şans getirdiği düşünülen şeylerden uzak durmasıyla, kötü şansı kontrol edebilecekleri algısının oluştuğunu belirtmiştir. Mevcut çalışma için de aynı şey söz konusu olabilir. Örneğin, birey Tanrı'ya inanıyorsa, Tanrı'nın herhangi bir tehlike durumunda kendisini koruyacağına da inanabilmekte ve bu sayede olası tehditlere karşı kendisi savunacağını düşünebilmektedir. Ya da eğer birey kara kedi gördüğü zaman uğursuzluk getirmemesi için saçını çekiyorsa, bu ritüelin kendi istemiyle yapıldığı düşünülürse, kendi hareketleri üzerinde kontrol sahibi olduğunu düşündüğünden, bu birey içsel denetim odaklı denilebilmektedir.

Bilgilerimiz dâhilinde daha önce sistemi meşrulaştırma ve manevi inançlar arasındaki ilişki şu ana kadar incelenmemiş olmasına rağmen, beklenildiği gibi, sistemi meşrulaştırma, manevi inançları pozitif ve anlamlı bir şekilde yordamıştır. Yani, sistemi meşrulaştıran bireyler, manevi inançları taşımaya daha meyillidirler sonucu

elde edilmiştir. Sistemin, egemenliğini sürdürmek isteyen ve kurallarını dikte eden egemen bir yapı olduğu söylenebilmektedir ve bu bağlamda, inançlar da sistemin bir parçası olduğu için, bu sonuç beklenmiştir. Bunu yapılan bazı görüşmelerden de anlamak mümkündür. Bir görüşmecinin de belirttiği gibi din ve manevi inançlar sistemden bağımsız değildir:

> *Din her zaman mitolojik geçmiş üzerinden devam eder ama günümüzde toplumun ülkeler tarafından biraz daha bilinçli bir şekilde toplumun her tarafına yaşatılmaya çalışılan bir olgu olarak söylenebilir. Yani bu tamamen toplumsal siyasetten ya da toplumsal yaşamdan uzak tutulmaya çalışılan, ya da insanlar kendilerinin vicdanına bırakılmış bir şey değil. Tam tersine toplumsal düzenlemenin önemli bir aracı haline getirilmiştir. Bu bir bilinçli çabanın ürünüdür. Hatta günümüzde de birçok ülkede biliyorsunuz dini biçimli yönetimler vardır. Ve din artık, insan beyninin ürünü olan yasaların önüne geçirilmeye çalışılarak yönetim kanunları olarak yaşanmaya çalışılmaktadır.*

Bu durumda dinin ve manevi inançların çok eski çağlardan beri sürdürüldüğünü ve bugün bile uygulandığını söylemek yanlış olmaz. Yani, sistem hüküm sürmeye devam etmektedir ve böyle bir sonuç şaşırtıcı değildir.

Öte yandan, dini/ruhani başa çıkmanın, Tanrı ile birey arasında kurulan ilişki düşünülerek, doğaüstü güçleri ve ruhaniliği pozitif bir şekilde yordaması beklenmişti. Fakat beklenenin aksine, negatif bir şekilde yordamıştır. Bu sonuç birçok yönden değerlendirilebilir. İlk olarak, oluşturulan ölçekte doğaüstü güçler ve ruhanilik maddelerinin kavramsallaştırılması katılımcılar tarafından anlaşılmamış olabilir. Örneğin, Tanrı inancı, doğaüstü güçler altında değerlendirilmişti fakat katılımcılar Tanrı inancını bir doğaüstü güç olarak algılamamış ve diğer doğaüstü güçleri de reddetmiş olabilirler. Ruhanilik maddeleri de, Türkiye toplumunda pek yaygın olmadığı için, katılımcılar tarafından bilinmemiş ve anlaşılmamış olabilir. İleriki çalışmalarda ölçeğin yeniden düzenlenmesi, daha sağlıklı sonuçlar elde etmek için faydalı olabilir. Yeni oluşturulmuş ölçeğin haricinde, RCOPE ölçeği de Türkiye örneklemlerinde çok fazla test edilmemiş bir ölçektir ve genelde Hristiyanlık kültürünü ve inanç sistemini yansıtan maddeler içermektedir (Örneğin; "*Dindar kardeşlerimin/dini kurumların beni terk etmesinden endişelenirim.*"). RCOPE

ölçeğinin de ileriki çalışmalarda Türkiye toplumu için uygulanması faydalı olacaktır. Beklendiği üzere batıl inançlar ve dini/ruhani başa çıkma arasında negatif bir ilişki söz konusudur. Çünkü dini/ruhani başa çıkma stratejilerini kullanan bireylerin kendilerini batıl inançlardan ziyade Tanrı ile aralarındaki ilişkiye odaklamış olabilirler.

Son olarak, son hipotezde de belirtildiği üzere, bireylerin dindarlık seviyesinin doğaüstü güçleri ve ruhaniliği pozitif ve anlamlı, batıl inançları ise negatif ve anlamlı bir şekilde yordayacağı beklenmiştir. Beklendiği üzere, bireylerin dindarlık seviyesi doğaüstü güçleri ve ruhaniliği pozitif bir şekilde yordamıştır. Çünkü doğaüstü güçler ve ruhanilik, ölçekte de görüldüğü gibi Tanrı inancı ile ilgili bazı maddeler içermektedir. Literatürde de görüleceği gibi, bazı çalışmalar dindarlık ve manevi inançlar arasında pozitif, bazı çalışmalar ise negatif bir ilişkinin olduğunu iddia etmektedir. Yani, bazı insanlar her ikisi de görünmez varlıklar varsayımına dayandığı için dini inançlarının yerine manevi inançları koyuyor olabilir.

Mevcut sonuçların aksine, literatürde batıl inançların dindarlık ile negatif ilişkili (Möwen & Carlson, 2003) ya da ilişkisiz (örneğin Stanke, 2004) olduğu örnekleri yer almaktadır. Beklenenin tersine, bireylerin dindarlık seviyesi, batıl inançları da pozitif ve anlamlı bir şekilde yordamıştır. Torgler (2007), dindar insanların batıl inançlara daha fazla inandığını iddia etmektedir. Killen, Wildman ve Wildman, (1974) iki inancın da bilimsel olarak açıklanamadığı için, aynı şekilde değerlendirilmesi gerektiğini belirtmektedir. Buna ek olarak, diğer taraftan, Ross ve Allport (1967) dindarlığı içsel ve dışsal olmak üzere iki şekilde değerlendirmektedir. Bu çalışmada bireylerin dindarlık düzeyleri içsel ve dışsal olarak ayrı ayrı incelenseydi, sonuçlar daha farklı olabilirdi.

Bu çalışma, sosyal psikologlar tarafından büyük ölçüde göz ardı edilmiş bir konuya ışık tutacak olsa da, bazı kısıtlılıklar içermektedir. Öncelikle, örneklem yüksek eğitimli ve özellikle genç katılımcılardan oluşmaktadır. Özellikle, demografik değişkenler diğer bağımsız değişkenleri etkileyebileceğinden, gelecekteki çalışmalarda, farklı eğitim geçmişleri ve yaş aralıklarından katılımcılar seçilebilir. Ek olarak, katılımcılar Türk ya da Türkiyeli insanlardan oluştuğu için, bulguların diğer kültürlere genellenmesi mümkün olmayabilmektedir. Bu çalışmanın bulgularının diğer ülkelerden ve kültürlerden alınacak verilerle doğrulanması faydalı olacaktır. Başka bir

112

kısıtlılık ise oluşturulan ölçeğin kalitesi olabilir. Yapı ve uyum geçerliliği tesis edilmiştir fakat içerik geçerliliğine bakılmamıştır. Gelecek çalışmalarda bu durum göz ardı edilmemelidir.

Öte yandan katılımcıların dini/ruhani başa çıkma ve dindarlık düzeyleri arasında çelişkili sonuçlar var gibi görünmektedir. Din, kültürün en önemli olgularından biridir. Bu nedenle, kültürel pratikler ve dini uygulamalar iç içe geçmiş fakat bu iç içe geçme durumu katılımcılar tarafından ayırt edilmemiş olabilir. İnsanlar dini başa çıkma ve dindarlık arasındaki ilişkiyi yanlış anlaşılabilir olabilir. Bu durum gelecekteki çalışmalarda dikkate alınabilir.

Ayrıca, beklenenin aksine, içsel denetim odağı ve manevi inançlar arasında pozitif bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Fakat manevi inançların içeriği değiştikçe bireylerin bu inançlara olan eğilimlerinin de değişeceği göz ardı edilmemelidir. Bu bağlamda, içsel denetim odağı temsillerinin de değişmiş olması mümkün olabilir. Gelecek çalışmalarda bu temsillerin değişmiş olma ihtimali üzerinden çalışmak faydalı olabilir.

Katılımcılara kentte ya da kırsalda yaşadıkları sorulmamıştır. Bununla beraber, katılımcılara etnik köken, politik görüş, medeni durum ve herhangi bir engellerinin olup olmadığı da sorulmamıştır. İleriki çalışmalarda bu değişkenler de göz önünde bulundurulabilir çünkü inanç eğilimleri bu sosyo-demografik farklılıklara göre de değişebilmektedir.

Mevcut çalışma, çeşitli kısıtlılıklarına rağmen literatüre birçok açıdan katkı da sunmuştur. İlk olarak, mevcut çalışma, yazarın bilgisine göre, Türkiye kültürüne uygun birçok manevi inancı bir araya getiren en kapsamlı çalışmalardan biridir. Ayrıca, bu çalışma sosyal psikolojik açıdan literatüre katkıda bulunmuştur. Bireyler genellikle bir konu ya da durum hakkında fikri olmadığı zamanlarda manevi inançları taşımak eğilimindedirler. Bu sebeple, bu eğilimlerin anlaşılması önemli hale gelmektedir. Sosyal psikoloji hem sosyal hem davranışsal taraftan baktığı için diğer disiplinlerden farklılaşmaktadır ve diğer araştırmacılar için bir temel platform oluşturmaktadır. Mevcut çalışma, literatüre yeni bir ölçek de kazandırmıştır. Ölçek ileride farklı araştırmalar için kullanılabilir.

Literatürde manevi inançlar hakkında çok sayıda araştırma bulunmasına rağmen, bu konu Türkiye kültürü içinde sayıca az incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmada belirtilen tüm manevi inançlar, yani doğaüstü güçler, ruhanilik, batıl inançlar ve yukarıda değinilen bazı sosyal psikolojik değişkenler arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmak amaçlanmıştır.

Buna ek olarak, araştırmacının bilgisi dâhilinde, bu çalışma manevi inançlar ve genel sistemi meşrulaştırma arasındaki ilişkiyi inceleyen ilk çalışmadır ve manevi inançları taşıyan insanların sistemi nasıl meşrulaştırdıkları konusunda ipuçları vererek literatüre önemli bir katkı yapmıştır.

Appendix I: Tez Fotokopisi İzin Formu

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı: İslambay

Adı: Demet

Bölümü: Sosyal Psikoloji

TEZİN ADI: A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF NON-MATERIAL BELIEFS IN TURKISH SAMPLE: THE PREDICTIBILITY OF LOCUS OF CONTROL, SYSTEM JUSTIFICATION, RELIGIOUS/SPIRITUAL COPING AND RELIGIOSITY

TEZİN TÜRÜ: Yüksek Lisans ■   Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ■

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ■

3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ■

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ