# The Role of Social Support and Lifestyle in Pre-Service Teachers' Psychological Well-Being

**Fahri SEZER**[1]

Balikesir University

**Abstract**

The main purpose of this study was to explore the predictive utility of demographic, social and lifestyle variables in psychological well-being. The participants were 410 pre-service teachers in Turkey. Three research instruments were utilized in the current study: Psychological Well-Being Scale, Lifestyle Inventory and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. Both social support and lifestyle variables accounted for the additional variance in psychological well-being above and beyond the effects of demographic variables. Purpose in life was best predicted by being-married; lifestyle variables made the most contribution to autonomy; and social support-friend were found to be the best predictor of positive relations with others. It seems that demographic, social support and lifestyle variables play a differential role in psychological well-being.

**Keywords:** Psychological well-being, social support, lifestyle

[1] Ph.D., Balikesir University Necatibey Faculty of Education, Balikesir, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0002-3092-7275

**Correspondence:** fahrisezer@balikesir.edu.tr

## Introduction

Psychological well-being can be defined as "the ability to develop, maintain, and appropriately modify interdependent relationships with others to succeed in achieving goals" (Johnson & Johnson, 1996). It is about happiness, feeling good, positive emotions, functioning effectively, possessing a sense of life's aim and how well life is going on (Huppert, 2009). Ryff (1989) proposed six psychological well-being domains: (1) self-acceptance, (2) positive relationships with others, (3) autonomy, (4) environmental mastery, (5) purpose in life, and (6) personal growth. Self - acceptance can be defined as having positive attitudes towards self and accepting. Positive relations with others can be characterized as sincerity, trust in relationships, empathy, satisfaction and having close relationships. People high in autonomy are independent, persist long in the face of obstacles and social pressures and evaluate self based on their personal standards. Environmental mastery can be defined as people's ability to choose and create environment which fit their personal values and to possess control over the external world. Purpose in life can be characterized as a sense of meaning of life, present and past time. In addition to having life goals, these people also have the ability to comprehend these goals. Personal growth can be characterized as improving one's potential and viewing self as growing and expanding.

Ryff (1989) found that demographic factors accounted for low levels of variance (range= 3% to 24%) in the psychological well-being domains. Among demographic variables, only finance predicted autonomy and accounted for 3% of its variation. On the other hand, three variables (finance, health and age) significantly predicted environmental mastery and accounted for 24% of its variation. Being married predicted self-acceptance and purpose in life, being male was a predictor of positive relations with others and personal growth. Andrew and Withey (2012) and (Argyle, 1999) found that demographic and socioeconomic factors accounted for around 10% of variation in psychological well-being.

Personality also plays an important role in the prediction of psychological well-being. For example, one study found that when demographic variables were controlled, Extraversion and Openness made a contribution to predict positive affect, Neuroticism and Openness predicted negative affect, and, Neuroticism and Extraversion significantly predicted affect balance (Gutierrez, Jimenez, Hernandez, & Puente, 2005). McCrae and Costa (1991) indicated that Extraversion and Neuroticism result in positive and negative effect, respectively.

In addition to demographic, socioeconomic and personality factors, factors such as lifestyle (Witmer, Sweeney, & Myers, 1993), social support (Masini & Barrett, 2008), physical exercise (Hassmen, Koivula, & Uutela, 2000), and Internet on social involvement (Kraut, Patterson, Lundmark, Kiesler, Mukophadhyay, & Scherlis, 1998) seem to be associated with psychological well-

being. The current study focused on the predictive utility of lifestyle, social support and demographic variables (gender, marital status) in psychological well-being.

Kern and Cummins (1996) classified people into 5 groups in terms of their lifestyle: (1) Control-oriented, (2) Perfection-oriented, (3) Appreciation-oriented, (4) Self-esteem-oriented, (5) Expectation- oriented. Control-oriented individuals are influential, powerful, and persuasive; persist in their ideas and like managing and controlling other people's activities. Those with a perfection-oriented lifestyle are neat, organized, meticulous, pay attention to details and try to do everything perfect. Appreciation-oriented individuals are sincere, social, loyal, and sensitive to others' feelings and needs and avoid breaking their hearts and help to mend them when they can. Those with self-esteem life styles tend to have a strong belief in their capabilities to overcome life's challenges. Expectation-oriented individuals are hardworking, competitive and ambitious and make a lot of efforts to attain their goals.

A number of studies established a significant relationship between lifestyle and psychological well-being (e.g., Burrell Adams, Durand, & Castro, 2006: Hermon & Hazle, 1999). Using the Wellness Evaluation of Lifestyle scale developed by Witmer et al. (1993), Hermon and Hazler (1999) explored the relationship between college students' (Midwestern United States university) perceived psychological well-being and the quality of their lives on 5 dimensions and found that students' ability to self-regulate, identity with work, and friendships made the most contribution to psychological well-being. Burrel et al. (2006) investigated the relationship between military lifestyles and psychological well-being and found a negative relationship between foreign residence and psychological well-being.

Social support plays an important role in psychological well-being since it may act as a mediator of life stress (Cobb, 1976; Wang, Shukla, & Shi, 2021). A number of researchers explored the predictive utility of social support in psychological well-being. For example, in one study with 220 lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) adults over 50-years old, support from friend made a significant contribution to the prediction of higher mental quality of life and lower depression, anxiety, and internalized homophobia while support from family did not (Masini & Barrett, 2008). Rook (1984) found that negative social outcomes were more consistently and more strongly associated with well-being than positive social outcomes. Winefield et al. (2008) study revealed that community-living adults' psychological well-being was related to their level of life stress; and more importantly, that adding social support to the regression equation after life stress doubled the explained variance in psychological well-being.

Through conducting an extensive literature review on the causes and consequences of psychological well-being, Huppert (2009) concluded that positive mood states made a contribution to attention (e.g. seeing the big picture), cognitive process (e.g. producing new ideas, thinking creatively

and flexibly) and physical health. Psychological well-being is highly influenced by people's early environments and external circumstances; however, actions and attitudes may have a bigger impact. Other researchers found that social support (Alimoradi et al., 2014; Malkoç & Yalçın, 2015), lifestyle (Harrison, 1982; Kilpatrick & Trew, 1985; Nishita, 2000; Sezer, Aktan, Tezci, & Erdener, 2017), marital status (Bennett, 2005; Gove et al., 1983; Wilson, & Oswald, 2005), gender (Roothman et al., 2003; Kuyumcu, 2012) personality (Argyle & Lu, 1990), social ties (Fuller-Iglesias, 2015), mindfulness (Brown & Ryan, 2003), Internet on social involvement (Kraut et al., 1998), parent and peer attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987)  were associated with psychological well-being. Psychological well-being is an important factor that enables the individual to manage situations such as helping him / her to pursue his / her goals, personal development and build quality relationships with others. It is important to determine the level of lifestyle adopted by the individual and to predict the level of perceived social support, and to determine the relationship between these variables and psychological well-being.

It is clear from these studies that psychological well-being plays an important role in human functioning and is associated with many factors. As it is impossible to examine the role of all of these factors in psychological well-being in one study, I specifically chose the role of demographic variables, social support and lifestyle for two main reasons: (1) the joint predictive utility of these three variables in psychological well-being did not seem to have received attention in the literature. (2) Examining the role of both an internal variables (life style, gender and marital status) and external influence (social support) in psychological well-being in one study enables to see which variable serve as more powerful predictor.

The current study was guided by Adler's Theory of Individual Psychology. Adler (2013) defined the lifestyle as a concept that reflects the organization of personality, which includes the meaning that individuals give to the world and to themselves, their fictional ultimate goals, and the emotional, cognitive and behavioral strategies they use to achieve the goal (Rule, & Bishop, 2006).

According to this theory, work, love/intimacy and social life the three life tasks with which every person must deal with and try to find solutions (Adler, 2013). Adler distinguished four basic types of life style: (1) the ruling type, (2) the getting type, (3) the avoiding type, (4) the socially useful type.  People with ruling type tend to be aggressive, dominant and have high energy. Those with getting type seem to lack energy, be sensitive and dependent people who rely on energy of others. Avoiding people tend to escape life's problems and have low energy. Socially useful people tend to be healthy and have a great deal of social interest and activity (Gentry et al., 1980; Stoltz & Kern, 2007; Adler, 2013; Erdener, Sezer, & Tezci, 2017a; Erdener, Sezer, & Tezci, 2017b).

This theory emphasizes the importance of lifestyle in the development of personality and states that people's lifestyle develops as a result of their interaction with environment (e.g. spending

time with parents, using computers, watching TV). These interactions, in turn, shape their personality in cognitive, behavioral and affective domains and may affect their behavior and psychological well-being. Consistent with this, in a study with Turkish students found that (Sezer & İşgör, 2017) the lifestyles of individuals are related to their internet usage habits and purposes. Another study on Turkish pre-service teachers found that individuals with high lifestyle focused on control, excellence, satisfaction, expectation and self-esteem had higher levels of self-regulatory learning strategies (Tezci et al., 2015). These findings and Adler's theory clearly indicate a relationship between lifestyle and psychological well-being.

Unlike life-style, the selection of social support as a predictor variable of psychological well-being is not grounded in theory. Rather, it is based on research studies which suggest a relationship between social support and psychological well-being. Many studies conducted since the 1970s (Zimet et al., 1988) have that adequate social support is an important source in dealing with the individuals' psychological problems such as  general psychological stress and emotional problems, anxiety, fear and loneliness, depression, violent behavior and drug addiction (DuRant et al., 1994; Colarossi & Eccles, 2003; Demaray et al., 2005; Holt & Espelage, 2005; Erdogan & Stuessy, 2022; Sezer, Erdener, & Tezci, 2019). Thus, it can be hypothesized that social support can play a pivotal role in the individuals' psychological well-being.

Guided by Adler's Theory and other studies, the current study examines the role of life style and social support on different aspects of psychological well-being. Although many researchers examined the predictors of psychological well-being (Rook, 1984; Kilpatrick, & Trew, 1985; Ryff, 1989; Roothman et al., 2003), I failed to identify any study which combined demographic, internal and external variables to predict psychological well being. The current study was conducted to fill this gap in the literature. Thus, it makes a unique contribution to the literature by showing which type of factor plays a pivotal role in understanding individuals' level of psychological well-being.

Three research questions were addressed:

1. Are lifestyle, social support and psychological well-being significantly related to each other?

2. What is the relative contribution of gender, marital status, lifestyle, social support on psychological well-being?

3. Does lifestyle make a significant contribution to predict psychological well-being above and beyond the effects of gender, marital status and social support?

**Method**

Correlational survey research model was conducted in this study. The relationships between variables and to find out any change are presented by correlational survey studies. As such, this research design was preferred to explore the predictive utility of demographic, social and lifestyle variables in psychological well-being (Karasar, 2011).

### Participants

At the time of data collection, the researcher of this study was serving as the instructor of the course "Guidance" for a number of departments. As part of the curriculum, he taught the topic of psychological well-being in one week. A total of 550 students were enrolled in this class but 455 of them attended this class. After finishing this topic, he talked about his study and its importance for the field of guidance. He also mentioned how filling out the research instruments would contribute to their knowledge of well-being. Then, he left the classroom. In order to ensure confidentiality, those willing to participate in the study filled out the research instruments without indicating their name and submitted to the research assistant. Thus, convenience sampling was used to collect data for the current study.

Of the 455 students, 90% decided to take part in the study. The participants consisted of 410 pre-service teachers (67% female, 33% male). Of these participants, 335 (81%) were single, and 75 (19%) married. These participants were chosen from classes in which the researcher of the current study served as the instructor. Due to the nature of education classes, the majority of the participants were female.

### Research Instruments

Three research instruments were utilized in the current study: Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff, 1989), Lifestyle Inventory (Kern & Cummins, 1996) and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Zimet et al., 1988). In addition, the participants were asked to indicate their gender and marital status for demographic information.

Developed by Ryff (1989) and adapted into Turkish by Cenkseven (2014), "Psychological Well-Being Scale" was used in the current study to measure the participants' level of psychological well-being in 6 dimensions: Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life and Self-Acceptance. Each dimension consisted of 14 items. Some of the items included "I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus" (Autonomy), "People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others" (Positive Relations with Others), "Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them" (Purpose in Life).

Using a sample of 475 Turkish university students, Cenkseven (2014) provided evidence for the validity of the scale through examining item-total item correlations for each item. In addition, Cronbach's alpha value was reported to be 0.93 for the overall scale. Test re-test correlation value was found to be 0.84. These results provided evidence for the validity and reliability of the scale.

The participants indicated their level of agreement with each item on a 6- point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Negatively written items were reversed scored to yield a summated score for each dimension with higher scores indicating higher mastery in that area in their life and lower scores reflecting lower mastery. The participants' possible scores in each dimension ranged from 14 to 84.

"Lifestyle Inventory" was originally developed by Kern and Cummins (1996) and consisted of 35 items. This scale was and adapted into Turkish by Ozpolat (2011) Using a sample of 362 university students, Ozpolat (2011) provided evidence for the construct validity through conducting exploratory factor analysis. However, 10 items removed from the original scale as a result of the analysis. Cronbach's alpha value was reported to be .93 for the overall scale.

The Turkish version of this scale (Ozpolat, 2011) was used in the current study consisted of 25 items and 5 dimensions: control, perfectionism, appreciation, self-respect, and expectations. Each dimension consisted of 5 items. Some of the items included "I especially try to avoid hurting people" (Appreciation), and "My life seems to be full of disappointments" (self-esteem).

The participants indicated their level of agreement with each item on a 5- point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Negatively written items were reverse scored to yield a summated score for each dimension. The participants' possible scores in each dimension ranged from 5 to 25 with higher scores indicating more preference of the respective lifestyle.

The 12-item Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Zimet et al., 1988) was used to measure the level of the support that participants receive from others. This scale was adapted into Turkish by Eker et al. (2001) using a sample of 150 people from a large hospital, these researchers provided evidence for the construct validity through conducting exploratory factor analysis. Cronbach's alpha value was reported to be 0.89 for the overall scale.

The scale consisted of 3 dimensions (special person, family and friend). Each dimension contained 4 items. Some of the items included "There is a special person who is around when I am in need" (Special Person), "My family really tries to help me" (Family), "I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows" (Friends). The participants indicated their level of agreement with each item on a 7- point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). All of the items were

positively worded. Scores in each dimension ranged from 4 to 28 with higher scores reflecting higher perceived social support.

The instruments used in the research were abbreviated in the finding as follow; Lifestyle Inventory (LS), Psychological Well-Being (PWB) and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (SS).

**Data Analysis**

This is a correlational study that employed a hierarchical linear regression model. Data analysis started with exploring the reliability of the research instruments as measured by Croncbach's Alpha. Then, descriptive statistics were calculated regarding each dimension of the research instruments. Skewness and Kurtosis were used as indicators for checking multivariate normality. Correlation analysis was conducted to examine interrelationships among variables of interest. Finally, two types of regression analysis (hierarchical and stepwise) were conducted to examine the predictive utility of the variables on each domain of psychological well-being.

In the hierarchical regression analysis, predictor variables were entered into the regression equation in the following order: demographic variables (gender, marital status), three social support variables as a block and five lifestyle variables as a block. This analysis enabled to examine if social support and five lifestyle variables account for unique variance in different domains of psychological well-being when the effects of demographic variables were controlled. The p value of $R^2$ change was examined to determine statistical significance.

All the predictor variables were regressed on each domain of psychological well-being in the stepwise regression. Instead of entering social support and lifestyle variables as a block, they were treated as individual predictor variables. This analysis enabled to examine which variables make a significant contribution to the equation predicting psychological well-being domains.

**Result**

The Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.75 to 0.92 for each variable. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the dependent and predictor variables. All of the mean values of social support dimensions were more than 20, which indicated a relatively high social support. The mean values of the lifestyle variables ranged from 16.17 to 19.40 with pleasing had the highest mean score. Among the psychological well-being domains, the mean value of the personal growth was the highest. All of the skewness and kurtosis values were within the desired range of between -2 to +2, which indicated multivariate normality.

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics**

| Variables | Mean | SD | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SS Family | 23.20 | 5.824 | -1.478 | 1.678 |
| SS Friend | 21.71 | 6.351 | -1.040 | 0.292 |
| SS Special person | 20.16 | 7.291 | -0.680 | -0.785 |
| LS Control | 16.17 | 3.585 | -0.172 | -0.023 |
| LS Perfection | 19.35 | 2.965 | -0.412 | -0.138 |
| LS Pleasing | 19.40 | 3.206 | -0.606 | 1.039 |
| LS Self-esteem | 16.26 | 3.156 | 0.077 | -0.238 |
| LS Expectation | 17.02 | 3.448 | -0.065 | -0.012 |
| PWB Positive Relations with Others | 59.72 | 11.458 | 0.386 | -0.720 |
| PWB Autonomy | 55.63 | 8.703 | 0.342 | -0.250 |
| PWB Environmental Mastery | 57.74 | 8.976 | 0.294 | -0.125 |
| PWB Personal Growth | 60.36 | 9.474 | 0.276 | -0.597 |
| PWB Purpose in Life | 58.56 | 10.849 | 0.422 | -0.639 |
| PWB Self-Acceptance | 56.32 | 9.564 | 0.490 | -0.302 |

Table 2 presents the interrelationships among the variables of the current study. While gender was found to be significantly correlated with two dimensions of psychological well-being in favor of males, marital status was significantly correlated with all dimensions of psychological well-being. Marital status had the highest correlation with purpose in life ($r = 0.26$, $p < 0.01$).

All social support variables (Special Person, Family, Friends) were found to be significantly correlated with all of the dimensions of psychological well-being. The highest correlation was found to be between friend and positive relations with others ($r = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$). Family and autonomy had the lowest correlation ($r = 0.14$, $p < 0.01$).

Among the lifestyle variables, perfection was found to be correlated with five dimensions of well-being. Control and self-esteem were significantly correlated with four and two dimensions of psychological well-being, respectively. Control-oriented lifestyle appeared to be negatively correlated with self-acceptance, positive relationship with others, purpose in life and personal growth. While self-esteem-oriented lifestyle was positively related to purpose in life, it negatively correlated with self-acceptance. Pleasing and expectation-oriented lifestyles were not significantly correlated with any dimension of psychological well-being.

**Table 2. Interrelationships among Variables (N=410)**

| Variable | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demographic Variables | 1.Gender | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2.Marital Status | 0.11* | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Social Support | 3.Family | -0.04 | 0.00 | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4.Friend | -0.05 | -0.01 | 0.53** | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5.S.Person | -0.11* | 0.02 | 0.41** | 0.62** | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lifestyle | 6.Control | -0.06 | -0.15** | -0.18** | -0.14** | -0.08 | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7.Perfection | -0.12* | -0.05 | 0.19** | 0.27** | 0.35** | 0.22** | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | 8.Pleasing | -0.20** | 0.00 | 0.16** | 0.17** | 0.14** | 0.17** | 0.37** | - | | | | | | | | |
| | 9.Self-esteem | -0.14** | -0.12* | -0.12** | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.38** | 0.20** | 0.40** | - | | | | | | | |
| | 10.Expectation | -0.11* | -0.20** | -0.05 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.55** | 0.36** | 0.30** | 0.41** | - | | | | | | |
| Psychological Well-Being | 11.Self acceptance | 0.14** | 0.17** | 0.22** | 0.24** | 0.21** | -0.22** | 0.19** | -0.05 | -0.16** | -0.03 | - | | | | | |
| | 12.Positive Relations | 0.08 | 0.23** | 0.16** | 0.33** | 0.20** | -0.19** | 0.02 | 0.08 | -0.02 | -0.03 | 0.64** | - | | | | |
| | 13.Autonomy | 0.02 | 0.15** | 0.14** | 0.23** | 0.23** | -0.09 | 0.18** | -0.07 | -0.02 | 0.07 | 0.62** | 0.53** | - | | | |
| | 14.Environmental Mastery | 0.10* | 0.22** | 0.18** | 0.23** | 0.24** | -0.13 | 0.22** | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.68** | 0.65** | 0.47** | - | | |
| | 15.Purpose in Life | 0.20** | 0.26** | 0.20** | 0.18** | 0.15** | -0.15** | 0.16** | 0.04 | 0.19** | -0.03 | 0.73** | 0.67** | 0.53** | 0.73** | - | |
| | 16.Personal Growth | 0.02 | 0.12* | 0.23** | 0.25** | 0.22** | -0.15** | 0.11* | 0.02 | -0.08 | 0.03 | 0.66** | 0.64** | 0.61** | 0.64** | 0.73** | - |

*p < 0.05,  ** p < 0.01

Table 3 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis for variables predicting self-acceptance. Demographic variables accounted for 4% of variation in self-acceptance. Social support variables accounted for an additional 8% above and beyond demographic variables and lifestyle variables accounted for an additional 8% of variation in self-acceptance above and beyond demographic variables and social support variables. As presented in table 2 before, all of the social variables were significantly correlated with self-acceptance; nevertheless, none of them made a significant contribution to predicting self-acceptance in the regression equation when they were used in conjunction with demographic and lifestyle variables (see Model 3). This result suggested that lifestyle variables were more powerful predictor variables of self-acceptance than the social support variables.

**Table 3. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Self-Acceptance**

| Model/Predictor | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Gender | 0.11* | 0.13** | 0.12* |
| Marital Status | 0.15** | 0.15** | 0.15** |
| 2.Social Support- Family | | 0.12* | 0.08 |
| Social Support- Friend | | 0.11 | 0.09 |
| Social Support- Special Person | | 0.11 | 0.04 |
| 3. Lifestyle- Control | | | -0.22 |
| Lifestyle- Perfection | | | 0.21** |
| Lifestyle-Pleasing | | | -0.11** |
| Lifestyle-Self-esteem | | | -0.08 |
| Lifestyle- Expectation | | | 0.13* |
| $R^2$ | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.20 |
| F for change in $R^2$ | 8.99** | 11.79** | 7.76** |

Table 4 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis for variables predicting positive relations with others. Demographic variables accounted for 5% of variation in positive relations with others. Only marital status was a predictor of positive relations with others, however. Social support variables accounted for additional 12% of variation in positive relations with others above and beyond demographic variables. Nevertheless, only social support-friend made a significant contribution to the regression equation. Lifestyle variables accounted for only 2% of variation in positive relations with others above and beyond demographic and social support variables and only lifestyle-control made a significant but negative contribution to the regression equation. As model 3 indicates, social support-friend emerged as the most powerful predictor of positive relations with others followed by marital status.

**Table 4. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Positive Relations with Others**

| Model/Predictor | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Gender | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.07 |
| Marital Status | 0.22** | 0.22** | 0.21** |
| 2.Social Support- Family | | 0.03 | 0.04 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Social Support- Friend | | 0.36** | 0.34** |
| Social Support- Special Person | | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| 3. Lifestyle- Control | | | -0.16** |
| Lifestyle- Perfection | | | -0.06 |
| Lifestyle-Pleasing | | | 0.05 |
| Lifestyle-Self-esteem | | | 0.04 |
| Lifestyle- Expectation | | | 0.08 |
| R2 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.19 |
| F for change in R2 | 11.73** | 18.21** | 2.24* |

Results of the hierarchical regression analysis for variables predicting autonomy are presented in Table 5. Demographic variables accounted for only 2% of the variation in positive relations with others. Gender variable's was not found to be a significant predictor of autonomy in all of the three models. Social support variables accounted for an additional 7% of variation above and beyond demographic variables; however, social support-family did not make a significant contribution to the regression equation. Lifestyle variables accounted for an additional 6% of variation in autonomy above and beyond the demographic and social support variables. The lifestyle-pleasing variable emerged as the most powerful predictor of autonomy; however, its contribution to the regression equation was negative.

**Table 5. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Autonomy**

| Model/Predictor | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Gender | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Marital Status | 0.15** | 0.14** | 0.17** |
| 2.Social Support- Family | | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| Social Support- Friend | | 0.14* | 0.14* |
| Social Support- Special Person | | 0.14* | 0.07 |
| 3. Lifestyle- Control | | | -0.14** |
| Lifestyle- Perfection | | | 0.16** |
| Lifestyle-Pleasing | | | -0.21** |
| Lifestyle-Self-esteem | | | .05 |
| Lifestyle- Expectation | | | .16** |
| R2 | .02 | .09 | .15 |
| F for change in R2 | 4.51* | 9.71** | 5.47** |

As table 6 reveals, demographic variables accounted for 5% of the variation in environmental mastery. Social support accounted for an additional 8% of variation in environmental mastery above and beyond demographic variables. Only social support-special person dimension made a significant contribution to the regression equation, however. Lifestyle variables accounted for an additional 4% of variation in environmental mastery above and beyond demographic and social support variables. Lifestyle-perfection and lifestyle-expectation made a positive and significant contribution to the regression equation whereas the contribution of lifestyle-control was negative. None of the social support variables significantly predicted environmental mastery in model 3 whereas gender and marital status did.

**Table 6. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Environmental Mastery**

| Model/Predictor | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Gender | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.10* |
| Marital Status | 0.21** | 0.20** | 0.21** |
| 2.Social Support- Family | | 0.06 | 0.04 |
| Social Support- Friend | | 0.10 | 0.07 |
| Social Support- Special Person | | 0.16** | 0.10 |
| 3. Lifestyle- Control | | | -0.16** |
| Lifestyle- Perfection | | | 0.18** |
| Lifestyle-Pleasing | | | -0.02 |
| Lifestyle-Self-esteem | | | -0.05 |
| Lifestyle- Expectation | | | 0.13* |
| $R^2$ | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.17 |
| F for change in $R^2$ | 11.24** | 11.13** | 4.44** |

As Table 7 indicates, gender and marital status accounted for 9% of the variation in purpose in life and made a significant contribution to the regression equation in all of the three models. Social support variables accounted for an additional 5% of variation in purpose in life above and beyond demographic variables. However, only social support-family made a significant contribution to the regression equation. Lifestyle variables accounted for additional 6% of variation in purpose in life above and beyond demographic and social support variables. None of the social support variables served as a predictor in model 3. Lifestyle-self-esteem made a significant but negative contribution to the model. In addition, lifestyle-perfection made a positive contribution to the model.

**Table 7. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Purpose in Life**

| Model/Predictor | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Gender | 0.15** | 0.17** | 0.17** |
| Marital Status | 0.23** | 0.23** | 0.22** |
| 2.Social Support- Family | | 0.13* | 0.09 |
| Social Support- Friend | | 0.09 | 0.07 |
| Social Support- Special Person | | 0.05 | 0.01 |
| 3. Lifestyle- Control | | | -0.10 |
| Lifestyle- Perfection | | | 0.16** |
| Lifestyle-Pleasing | | | 0.05 |
| Lifestyle-Self-esteem | | | -0.18** |
| Lifestyle- Expectation | | | 0.09 |
| $R^2$ | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.20 |
| F for change in $R^2$ | 20.25** | 8.27** | 5.34** |

Table 8 presents the results of the regression analysis for variables predicting personal growth. Demographic variables accounted for only a 2% of variation in personal growth. Gender did not significantly predict personal growth in all of the three models. Social support variables accounted for an additional 7% of variation in personal growth above and beyond demographic variables in

model 2. Lifestyle variables accounted for an additional 3% of variation in personal growth above and beyond demographic and social support variables. None of the social support variables significantly predicted personal growth in model 3.

**Table 8. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Personal Growth**

| Model/Predictor | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Gender | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| Marital Status | 0.12* | 0.12* | 0.13** |
| 2.Social Support- Family | | 0.13* | 0.11 |
| Social Support- Friend | | 0.13* | 0.11 |
| Social Support- Special Person | | 0.09 | 0.06 |
| 3.Lifestyle- Control | | | -0.17** |
| Lifestyle- Perfection | | | 0.05 |
| Lifestyle-Pleasing | | | -0.05 |
| Lifestyle-Self-esteem | | | -0.05 |
| Lifestyle- Expectation | | | 0.17** |
| R2 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.12 |
| F for change in R2 | 3.12* | 11.63** | 2.62* |

Table 9 presents the results of stepwise regression analysis. Six variables predicted self-acceptance and collectively accounted for 18% of variation. Lifestyle-perfection emerged as the best predictor of self-acceptance. Three variables made a significant contribution to predict positive relations with others and social support served as the best predictor. Five variables emerged as significant predictor of autonomy and lifestyle-perfection were found to make the most contribution to the regression equation. Environmental mastery had six predictors with marital status as the most powerful predictor. Purpose in life was significantly predicted by five predictors. Like environmental mastery dimension, purpose in life was best predicted by marital status variable. Three variables made a significant contribution to predict personal growth but accounted for only 9% of the variation in this variable. None of the lifestyle variables significantly predicted personal growth.

**Table 9. Results of Stepwise Regression Analysis**

| Criterion and predictor | B | β | R2 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Acceptance | | | |
| Social Support-Friend | 0.25 | 0.16 | 0.06 |
| Lifestyle-Control | -0.55 | -0.21 | 0.09 |
| Lifestyle-Perfection | 0.80 | 0.25 | 0.13 |
| Gender | 2.34 | 0.11 | 0.15 |
| Marital Status | 3.10 | 0.14 | 0.17 |
| Lifestyle-Pleasing | -0.33 | -0.11 | 0.18 |
| Positive Relations with Others | | | |
| Social Support-Friend | 0.57 | 0.32 | 0.11 |
| Marital Status | 5.81 | 0.22 | 0.16 |
| Lifestyle-Control | -0.34 | -0.10 | 0.17 |
| Autonomy | | | |
| Social Support-Special Person | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.05 |
| Marital Status | 3.21 | 0.16 | 0.07 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lifestyle-Perfection | 0.52 | 0.18 | 0.09 |
| Lifestyle-Pleasing | -0.47 | -0.17 | 0.11 |
| Social Support-Friend | 0.21 | 0.15 | 0.13 |
| Environmental Mastery | | | |
| Social Support-Special Person | 0.19 | 0.16 | 0.06 |
| Marital Status | 4.28 | 0.20 | 0.11 |
| Lifestyle-Perfection | 0.55 | 0.18 | 0.13 |
| Lifestyle-Control | -0.47 | -0.19 | 0.15 |
| Gender | 1.92 | 0.10 | 0.16 |
| Lifestyle-Expectation | 0.29 | 0.12 | 0.17 |
| Purpose in life | | | |
| Marital Status | 5.68 | 0.22 | 0.07 |
| Social Support-Family | 0.27 | 0.15 | 0.11 |
| Gender | 3.70 | 0.16 | 0.13 |
| Lifestyle-Perfection | 0.72 | 0.20 | 0.16 |
| Lifestyle-Self Esteem | -0.55 | -0.16 | 0.18 |
| Personal Growth | | | |
| Social Support-Friend | .26 | 0.18 | 0.06 |
| Marital Status | 2.79 | 0.14 | 0.08 |
| Social Support-Family | .22 | 0.13 | 0.09 |

**Discussion**

The main purpose of the current study was to examine the predictive utility of demographic, social and lifestyle variables on psychological well-being. Results revealed that predictor variables accounted for 18% of variation in self-acceptance, 17% in positive relations with others, 13% in autonomy, 17% in environmental mastery, 18% in purpose in life and 9% in personal growth. Demographic variables alone accounted for small but significant percent of variation (range= 2% to 9%) in the psychological well-being indexes. Both social support and lifestyle variables accounted for additional variance in psychological well-being above and beyond the effects of demographic variables. Purpose in life was best predicted by being-married; lifestyle variables made the most contribution to autonomy; and social support-friend was found to be the best predictor of positive relations with others. Based on these results, it seems that demographic, social support and lifestyle variables play a different and unique role in psychological well-being.

To begin with, aligning with other studies (e.g., Ryff, 1989) demographic variables accounted for a small but significant portion of variation in psychological well-being indexes. While being married emerged as a significant predictor in all dimensions of psychological well-being indexes, being male predicted three (Environmental Mastery, Purpose in Life and Self-Acceptance) dimensions. More importantly, among all of the predictor variables, being married appeared to be a leading predictor of purpose in life. Studies have shown that individuals' having a happy marriages affects their life quality positively (Lawrence et al., 2019; Robles et al., 2014).

The correlation between social support variables and psychological well-being domains deserve attention. All of the social support variables were found to be significantly related to all of the psychological well-being domains. More importantly, they accounted for an additional and significant

portion of variation in all psychological well-being indexes above and beyond the effects of demographic variables. This finding was consistent with other studies (Taylor, 2011; Wilson et al., 2020; Winefield et al., 2008) which found that social support made a contribution to psychological well-being after controlling for other variables.

Consistent with the findings of other studies (e.g., Hermon & Hazler, 1999), lifestyle variables seemed to play an important role in understanding psychological well-being. More importantly, even when demographic and social support variables were controlled for, lifestyle variables accounted for significant and additional variation in psychological well-being domains. For example, when the variance associated with other variables were partialed out, all of the lifestyle variables significantly predicted self-acceptance and collectively accounted for an additional 8% of its variation. Among life style variables, perfection and control (avoiding type) seemed to be better predictor of psychological well-being than the other lifestyle variables. It is important to note that the contribution of control to the regression equations was negative. In the light of these data, it might be said that the lifestyle has a decisive role on psychological well-being.

The current study has three main limitations. First, due to the observational nature of the current study, the cause and effect relationship cannot easily be established. For example, the relationship between being married and psychological well-being seems to be controversial. While Diener (2000) indicated that people high in psychological well-being tend to get married, Zimmermann and Easterlin (2006) stated that getting married not being married is good for psychological well-being. Second, convenience sampling was used to collect data for this study, which prevented generalizations to other samples. Third, data was collected after a week of teaching the topic on psychological well-being. Thus, there is the possibility that responses may have been different if data had been collected prior to the lectures of psychological well-being in class.

Lifestyle appeared to play an important role in psychological well-being. Thus, it is important for counselors to examine students' lifestyle to better understand their levels of psychological well-being. In addition, since individuals' lifestyle is shaped in early ages (Anderson & Golden, 1984), it is important to educate parents and future parents on how they can shape their lifestyle. This circumstance leads to the formation of other habits in life.

The current study revealed a relationship between perfectionist lifestyle and psychological well-being. Similarly, Hermon and Hazler (1999) found that a student's ability to self-regulate makes a contribution to psychological well-being. Hence, parents and future parents should learn how they provide their students with self-regulation skills such as concentrating, organizing social environment and being systematic.

Since psychological well-being influences how people live, think, function, and regulate their behavior, more research is needed in this area. The predictor variables accounted for around 20% of variation in psychological well-being, which indicated that 80% of variation was not explained. Future researchers may use other variables to predict psychological well-being. Through future research we will have a chance to learn why some people have high levels of psychological well-being while others do not.

The current study has a number of implications. The current study revealed that the social support that the individual perceives from the people around and the lifestyle are the two variables that seem to play an important role in psychological well-being. Thus, it is important for parents, educators and counselors to take into account both social support and lifestyle to understand why some students have positive psychological well-being and why some do not. Interventions that might change their lifestyle and giving them a feeling that they will get help when they encounter difficulties in life might enable them to have more positive well-being. This, in turn, may make them more happy, function more effectively, have a better sense of the aim of life and become more productive individuals. It is also important for school leaders to organize activities for students such as organizing a trip, going to theatre and other social activities. Involving students' in these activities enable them to socialize, make new friends and learn how to establish good friendships with others.

## References

Adler, A. (2013). *The practice and theory of individual psychology* (Vol. 133). Routledge-Trenc, Trubner & CO., Ltd.

Alimoradi, M., Asadi, H., Asadbeigy, H., & Asadniya, R. (2014). The study of links between social support and psychological problems among youth. *International Journal of Basic Sciences & Applied Research, 3*, 270-274.

Anderson Jr, W. T., & Golden, L. L. (1984). Lifestyle and psychographics: A critical review and recommendation. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *11*(1), 405-411.

Andrews, F. M., & Withey, S. B. (2012). *Social indicators of well-being: Americans' perceptions of life quality*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Argyle, M. (1999). Causes and correlates of happiness. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwartz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 353–373). Russell Sage Foundation.

Argyle, M., & Lu, L. (1990). The happiness of extraverts. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *11*, 1011–1017. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(90)90128-E

Armsden, G. C. & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment. Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolesence*, *16*(5), 427-454. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02202939

Bennett, K. M. (2005). Psychological wellbeing in later life: The longitudinal effects of marriage, widowhood and marital status change. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 20*(3), 280-284. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.1280

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(4), 822-848. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822

Burrell, L. M., Adams, G.A., Durand, D. B., & Castro, C. A. (2006). The impact of military lifestyle demands on well-being, army, and family outcomes. *Armed Forces & Society*, *33*(1), 43-58. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764206288804

Cenkseven, F. (2004). *An analysis of variables predicting the subjective and psychological well-being of university students*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), University of Cukurova.

Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, *38*(5), 300–314. https://doi.org/10.1097/00006842-197609000-00003

Colarossi, L. G., & Eccles, J. S. (2003). Differential effects of support providers on adolescents' mental health. *Social Work Research*, *27*(1), 19-30. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/27.1.19

Demaray, M. K., Malecki, C. K., Davidson, L. M., Hodgson, K. K., & Rebus, P. J. (2005). The relationship between social support and student adjustment: A longitudinal analysis. *Psychology in the Schools*, *42*(7), 691-706. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20120

Diener E. (2000). Explaining differences in societal levels of happiness: Relative standards, need fulfilment, culture and evaluation theory. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *1*, 41–78. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010076127199

DuRant, R. H., Cadenhead, C., Pendergrast, R. A., Slavens, G., & Linder, C. W. (1994). Factors associated with the use of violence among urban black adolescents. *American Journal of Public Health, 84*, 612–617. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.84.4.612

Eker, D., Arkar, H., & Yaldız, H. (2001). Factorial structure, validity, and reliability of revised form of the multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry, 12*(1), 17-25.

Erdener, M. A., Sezer, F., & Tezci, E., (2017a). Determination of Frequent Student Problems Areas in Middle Schools. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Erzincan Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 19*(2), 303-320., doi: 10.17556/Erziefd.304220 (Yayın No: 3639491)

Erdener, M. A., Sezer, F., & Tezci, E., (2017b). Liselerde Sık Karşılaşılan Öğrenci Problemleri. *Journal of Turkish Studies, 12*(14), 151-166., doi: 10.7827/Turkishstudies.11517 (Yayın No: 3611194)

Erdogan, N., & Stuessy, C. L. (2022). Applying an ecology metaphor in a mixed methods analysis of high school science program infrastructure. Journal of Education in Science, Environment and Health (JESEH), 8(1), 86 - 97. https://doi.org/10.21891/jeseh.1029468

Fuller-Iglesias, H. R. (2015). Social ties and psychological well-being in late life: The mediating role of relationship satisfaction. *Aging & Mental Health*, *19*(12), 1103-1112. https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2014.1003285

Gentry, J. M., Winer, J. L., Sigelman, C. K., & Phillips, F. L. (1980). Adlerian lifestyle and vocational preference. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, *36*(1), 80.

Gove, W. R., Hughes, M., & Style, C. B. (1983). Does marriage have positive effects on the psychological well-being of the individual? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *24*(2), 122–131. https://doi.org/10.2307/2136639

Gutierrez, J.L.G., Jimenez, B.M., Hernandez, E.G., & Puente, C.P. (2005). Personality and subjective well-being: Big five correlates and demographic variables. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*, 1561–1569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.09.015

Harrison, G. A. (1982). Life-styles, well-being and stress. *Human Biology*, *54*(2), 193-202.

Hassmen, P. Koivula, N., & Uutela, A. (2000). Physical exercise and psychological well-being: A population study in Finland. *Preventive Medicine*, *30*(1), 17-25. https://doi.org/10.1006/pmed.1999.0597

Hermon, D. A. & Hazler, R. J. (2009). Adherence to a wellness model and perceptions of psychological well-being. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *77*(3), 339-343. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02457.x

Holt, M. K., & Espelage, D. L. (2005). Social support as a moderator between dating violence victimization and depression/anxiety among African-American and Caucasian adolescents. *School Psychology Review*, *34*(3), 309–328.

Huppert, F. A. (2009). Psychological well-being: Evidence regarding its causes and consequences. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, *1*(2), 137-164. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2009.01008.x

Johnson, G. J., & Johnson, W. R. (1996). Perceived over qualification and psychological well-being. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *136*(4), 435-445. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1996.9714025

Karasar, N. (2011). Scientific research methods. Nobel Press.

Kern, R.M., & Cummins, C. C. (1996). *Kern life style scale interpretation manual*. CMTI Press.

Kilpatrick, R., & Trew, K. (1985). Life-styles and psychological well-being among unemployed men in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *58*(3), 207-216. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1985.tb00196.x

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukophadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American psychologist*, *53*(9), 1017-1031. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.53.9.1017

Kuyumcu, B. (2012). Investigation of psychological well-being emotional awareness and expression of emotion of Turkish and English university students with respect to country and gender. *Erzincan University Education Faculty Journal*, *14*(2), 1-24.

Lawrence, E. M., Rogers, R. G., Zajacova, A., & Wadsworth, T. (2019). Marital happiness, marital status, health, and longevity. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *20*(5), 1539-1561. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-018-0009-9

Malkoç, A., & Yalçın, İ. (2015). Relationships among resilience, social support, coping, and psychological well-being among university students. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, *5*(43), 35-43.

Masini, B. E & Barrett, H.A. (2008). Social support as a predictor of psychological and physical well-being and lifestyle in lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults aged 50 and over. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, *20*(1-2), 91-110. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538720802179013

McCrae, R., & Costa, P. T. (1991). Adding Liebe und Arbeit: The full five-factor model and well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*(2), 227–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/014616729101700217

Nishita, Y. (2000). Diverse life-styles and psychological well-being in adult women. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology, 48*(4), 433-443. https://doi.org/10.5926/jjep1953.48.4_433

Özpolat, A.R. (2011). *Examination of predictors of living styles of university students*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Atatürk University.

Robles, T. F., Slatcher, R. B., Trombello, J. M., & McGinn, M. M. (2014). Marital quality and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin*, *140*(1), 140. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031859

Rook, K. S. (1984). The negative side of social interaction: Impact on psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*(5), 1097-1108. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.5.1097

Roothman, B., Kirsten, D. K., & Wissing, M. P. (2003). Gender differences in aspects of psychological well-being. *South African journal of psychology*, *33*(4), 212-218. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630303300403

Rule, W. R., & Bishop, M. (2006). *Adlerian lifestyle counseling: Practice and research*. Taylor & Francis.

Ryff, C.D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*(6), 1069-1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Sezer, F., Aktan, S., Tezci, E., & Erdener, M. A. (2017). The investigating of teachers' life styles and classroom management profiles in terms of some variables. *Turkish Studies*, 12 (33), 167-184. http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.12680

Sezer, F., Erdener, M. A., & Tezci, E., (2019). Educators' Awareness and Solutions Approaches Regarding Often Encountered Student Problems. The Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 45(1), 87-116.

Sezer, F., & İşgör, İ. Y. (2017). Life style and social support: The role of computer/internet use. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *9*(2), 356-369. https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2017.02.005.

Stoltz, K. B., & Kern, R. M. (2007). Integrating Lifestyle, the Therapeutic Process, and the Stages of Change. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 63(1), 32-47.

Taylor, S. E. (2011). Social support: A review. *The handbook of health psychology*, 189, 214.

Tezci, E., Sezer, F., Gurgan, U., & Aktan, S. (2015). A study on social support and motivation. *Anthropologist*, *22*(2), 284-292. https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2015.11891879

Wang, W., Shukla, P., & Shi, G. (2021). Digitalized social support in the healthcare environment: Effects of the types and sources of social support on psychological well-being. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *164*, 120503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120503

Wilson, C. M., & Oswald, A. J. (2005, May). *How does marriage affect physical and psychological health? A survey of the longitudinal evidence*. (IZA Report No. 1619). http://ftp.iza.org/dp1619.pdf

Wilson, J. M., Weiss, A., & Shook, N. J. (2020). Mindfulness, self-compassion, and savoring: Factors that explain the relation between perceived social support and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *152*, 109-568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109568

Winefield, H. R., Winefield, A. H., & Tiggemann, M. (2008). Social support and psychological well-being in young adults: The multi-dimensional support scale. *Journal of Personality Assesment*, *58*(1), 198-210. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5801_17

Witmer, J. M., Sweeney, T. J., & Myers, J. E. (1993). The wellness evaluation of lifestyle. [Manuscript submitted for publication]. Ohio University, Athens.

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N.W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*(1), 30-41. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(199111)47:6<756::AID-JCLP2270470605>3.0.CO;2-L

Zimmermann, A. C., & Easterlin, R. E. (2006). Happily ever after? Cohabitation, marriage, divorce, and happiness in Germany. *Population and Development Review*, *32*, 511–528. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2006.00135.x