



(ISSN: 2587-0238)

Yılmaz, F. & Kiran, B. (2023). Investigation of university student's subjective social status perceptions according to family belonging, psychological birth order and gender, *International Journal of Education Technology and Scientific Researches*, 8(23), 1614-1635.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.35826/ijetsar.631>

Article Type (Makale Türü): Research Article

INVESTIGATION OF UNIVERSITY STUDENT'S SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL STATUS PERCEPTIONS ACCORDING TO FAMILY BELONGING, PSYCHOLOGICAL BIRTH ORDER AND GENDER

Fehime YILMAZ

Specialist Psychological Counsellor, Mersin, Turkey, fehimeyilmaz1@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-7761-6629

Binnaz KIRAN

Prof. Dr., Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey, besen@mersin.edu.tr

ORCID: 0000-0002-9027-2872

Received: 09.02.2023

Accepted: 18.08.2023

Published: 01.09.2023

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to examine university students' perceptions of subjective social status according to their family belonging, gender, and psychological birth order. This research is a descriptive study based on relational screening model. The universe of the research was be the students attending 4-year faculties of Mersin University in the 2020-2021 academic year. The sample was selected using a easily accessible sampling method. 384 female and 217 male Mersin University students participated in the research. Data collected online via Google Forms. "Subjective Social Status Scale", "Family Belonging Scale" and "White-Campbell Psychological Birth Order Inventory" were be used with the personal information form as data collection tool in the research. In the analysis part of the study; Firstly, Shapiro-Wilks or Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test were be applied depending on the size of the sample while checking the normality assumptions and it was observed that the data showed normal distribution. Therefore, parametric analysis methods were used in our study. According to the findings of the research, while subjective social status scale scores differ statistically significantly according to gender and family belonging level, they do not differ according to psychological birth order and whether parents are together or not. However, it was found that the interaction effect of the variables did not cause significant differentiation. It has been observed that male university students have higher subjective perceptions of social status than females. It was determined that the subjective social status perception of university students with low level of family belonging was lower than those with medium and high level of family belonging. In addition, a positive and statistically significant relationship was found between the subjective perception of social status and the level of family belonging and the first child and the youngest child sub-dimension, and a negative relationship between the middle child and the only child sub-dimension. As a result of the research, it is recommended to organize appropriate awareness trainings and seminars about the relevant variables, to support university students by working on the relevant variables, and to examine the relationship between subjective social status and different variables in our country.

Keywords: Subjective social status, family belonging, psychological birth order, gender.

INTRODUCTION

Universities are an important factor in the production and transfer of knowledge and the entry of individuals into professional business life. Starting university represents an important transition for many students. Especially with the end of adolescence, it represents a positive process with great opportunities and many important changes. (Tao, Dong, Pratt, Hunsberger, & Pancer, 2000). These changes offer a new social status to university students. Although it is important how other members of the society perceive the students' new social status, it is more important how they perceive themselves in the social structure they are in. The perception of individuals' own position in the social order is explained by the concept of subjective social status (Şahin & Nasır, 2019). Subjective social status has a great impact on how people perceive their environment and relationships with other people, and life events, these events and relationships (Manstead, 2018). In addition, subjective social status is a psychological phenomenon that is part of the need to belong.

The concept of belonging is above the social relations of individuals. Belonging is an important concept for individuals to gain strength in the face of both social and psychological problems and develop their skills to cope with these problems (McConnel, Shoda & Skulborstad, 2012). The family is the first environment where individuals gain the awareness of belonging and meet the need for belonging. A sense of family belonging is necessary for individuals to protect their mental health and increase their well-being. (Choenarom, Williams & Hagerty, 2005). In addition, it is predicted that the psychological birth order in the family is also effective in the subjective social status perceptions of individuals.

University students are in potential actions such as being successful in classes, joining student societies or making friends in order to maintain this social status they have gained by starting university. In this study, informations about university student's subjective social status, family belonging and psychological birth order is given below.

Subjective Social Status

Individuals are part of the societies they belong to. For this reason, each individuals have an unique "place" in society. This place show that individual's status (Türkay, Mumcu, Kusan, Aydın & Güngöz, 2018). The status that occurs as a result of the effect of social components can change according to the life periods of individuals and the environment they are in. Especially in youth period, social status has an important role in psycho-social and structural functions (Sweeting & Hunt, 2014).

There are two types of social status. The ascribed status; It is the status determined by factors that are not of individuals or groups own choice, such as age, gender, or race. The achieved status is; It is determined by factors based on their own choices, such as the education of individuals (Turner, 2000). In addition, Turner (2000) also mentions a second status distinction: subjective status, which depends on what individuals perceive themselves, and objective status, which depends on external references. Subjective social status is concerned with

individuals' perceptions of their own position in the status hierarchy (Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006; Ostrove, Adler, Kupperman, & Washington, 2000). Subjective social status is part of the sense of belonging to something, therefore it is a psychological phenomenon.

Subjective social status is also associated to the individual's perception of his/her place in the socioeconomic structure (Singh-Manouxa, Adler & Marmota, 2003). Buccioli, Cavasso, and Zarri (2015), state that individuals are closely related to their personality traits. Diemer, Mistry, Wadsworth, Lopez, and Reimers (2013) define subjective social status as an individual's evaluation of his/her relative social position compared to other members of society. Subjective social status is a more comprehensive measure of personal position that explains the various variations neglected by objective social status (Cohen, Alper, Doyle, Adler & Treanor, 2008; Diemer et al., 2013). Moreover, the concept of subjective social status is a measure of a one's relative situation. (Sakurai, Kawakami, Yamaoka, Ishikawa & Hashimoto, 2010).

According to Manstead (2018), subjective social status affects the way individuals perceive their relationships with their environment, others and life events. Operario, Adler, Williams (2004), emphasized that individuals' physical health, age and gender are important determinants in the development of the subjective perception of social status. In addition, the choices and subjective well-being of individuals are also important in the perception of subjective social status (Buccioli et al., 2015). An important variable thought to be concerned with the subjective social status in this study is family belonging. Information about family belonging is given below.

Family Belonging

Family strengthens both the individual and the society in which he/she lives. The family is the first and most intense structure where the need for belonging is met. In other words, the family is the environment where the sense of belonging, which strengthens people psychologically and socially, develops (McConnell et al., 2012). The sense of belonging of individuals begins in the family by taking the surname of the family and learning its norms or expectations. Confidence, self-respect and self-sufficiency that is formed and met within the family arises when the need for belonging is met (Kizmaz, 2006).

Belonging, which is a strong and inevitable feeling in human nature; It is defined as a psychological and strong need to be a member of a group (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Brown & Sacco, 2017). If individuals do not have a sense of belonging, they cannot clearly define themselves (Barr, Budge, & Adelson, 2016). Belonging is a necessary need for people to exist, just like security, protection and shelter, and is satisfied by the individual's inclusion in a group or society (Levett-Jones, Lathlean, Maguire, & McMillan, 2007). This need felt by individuals is universal and exists in all cultures (DeWall, Deckman, Pond, & Bonser, 2011). Belonging is different from being in a group (Appleton, Christenson, Kim & Reschly, 2006). Belonging is not passive participation in these groups, but a strong psychological bond to that group (Mallinckrodt & Wei, 2005).

The sense of belonging is the basic element of the social and emotional bonds of individuals, and it improves their problem-solving and coping skills by helping individuals gain strength both socially and psychologically and in the face of problems. Social relationships are a reinforcer of the bond of belonging and contribute to the socialization process by giving individuals the ability to empathize. This indicates that the sense of belonging has an impact on the social relations of individuals (McConnel, Shoda & Skulborstad, 2012).

The sense of belonging starts with family belonging and continues as social belonging. King and Boyd (2016) defined family belonging as positive bonds and feelings, such as parents' understanding, caring for and spending time with their children, causing individuals to feel like they belong to the family they have. A sense of family belonging provides individuals with problem solving and coping skills, protects individuals' mental health (Choenarom, Williams & Hagerty, 2005), helps individuals gain strength against problems and problems, and develops problem-solving skills (Hagert, Williams, Coyne & Early, 1996) and reduces the feeling of loneliness (Güneş, 2016). Psychological birth order is another variable that is thought to be related to individuals' subjective perceptions of status.

Psychological Birth Order

Birth order is an important factor affecting individuals' position in their families and their psychological development (Marjoribanks, 2003). Birth order is a certain fact of the existence of children and its existence in society and is thought to affect the adult personality as well (Shulman & Mosak, 1977). According to Adler; the oldest child and the next children born in the same family grow up in different environments (Melillo 1983; Shulman & Mosak 1977). These differences are caused by factors such as parental attitudes, parents' readiness for parenthood or not (Stewart, 2004). Adler argues that there is a relationship between the personality traits of individuals and their birth order, and that first child, middle child, the youngest child, and only child show different personality traits from each other (Çakır & Şen, 2012).

There are two types of birth order. The first is the actual birth order and the second is the psychological birth order. Actual birth order defines that individuals are born chronologically (Eckstein, Aycock, Sperder, McDonald, Wiesner, Watts & Ginsburg, 2010). Psychological birth order can also be called perceived birth order (Fatima & Ashraf, 2018).

Characteristics can be listed by psychological birth order that first child; satisfactory/regulatory, middle child; outcast/uncared-for, the youngest child; lovable/convincing, only child; carefully cared for. The actual birth order of individuals and the psychological birth order they have may be the same or different from each other. Psychological birth order; It is how individuals perceive and position themselves within their families. This perception is affected by factors such as age, gender, number of parents, death, divorce, or having a stepmother or father (Campbell, White, & Stewart, 1991). Adler also emphasized the situation in which individuals were born

and how they interpreted this situation, not the order in which they were born (Eckstein et al., 2010). Psychological birth order has an effect on the lifestyles of individuals and is more effective in personality development than the actual birth order (Gfroerer, Gfroerer, Curlette, White & Kern, 2003).

There are 4 psychological birth orders: first child, middle child, the youngest child and only child (Campbell, White & Stewart, 1991). The first child, who is the one who receives the most attention and is pampered, strives to be reliable and hardworking after his sibling is born (Çakır & Şen, 2012). The highest expectation in the family is against the first child. For this reason, first child receives the most criticism (Geçtan, 2012). The child with the greatest desire to be a leader is the first child (Stewart, 2004). Middle children display a "poor me" attitude and argue that the world is an unjust place (Çakır & Şen, 2012). Middle children, who play the role of mediator in the family, generally think that they are wronged and deceived (Doron, 2009). They perceive themselves in competition with the first child (Stewart, 2004). They have less sense of belonging than children in other positions (Eckstein et al., 2010). The youngest children are those who are not taken seriously in the family, have an egocentric attitude, and feel inadequate because of the thought that their older siblings are stronger (Çakır & Şen, 2012; Gençtan, 2012) and they are described as rebellious (Zweigenhaft and Ammon, 2000). The only children are prone to develop insecure personality traits because they are more shy in expressing their feelings and thoughts (Stewart, 2004). The only child grows up alone unlike other birth orders. Although this situation creates a disadvantage in the development of behaviors that comply with social norms (Geçtan, 2012), family responsibilities and attitudes towards emotional intimacy have developed (Spitze & Logan, 1991). Obert and Stewart (2003) argued that while defining individuals, only one of these 4 birth orders can be used, or more than one birth order category can also be used (Cited by Doğru Çabuker, Epli, Balcı Çelik & Vural Batik, 2020).

When the literature on the variables is reviewed, it has been seen that family belonging and subjective social status are not considered together at all, but separately, together with many same variables such as career, substance and smoking, life satisfaction, well-being and happiness level (Açikel, Gülel, & Daşbaş, 2019; Autin, Douglass, Duffy, England & Allan, 2017; Bazzian, Rajaeis & Afsar, 2014; Feng, Su, Yang, Xia & Su, 2017; Gök & Kocayörük, 2019; Haught, Rose, Geers & Brown, 2015; Reitzel, Buchanan, Nguyen, & Ahluwalia, 2014; Russell & Odgers, 2019; Slaten & Baskin, 2013; Yeter, 2019; Zorotovich, Johnson & Linn, 2016). It is predicted that the variables of family belonging, psychological birth order and subjective social status will be related to each other because of working together with the same variables and obtaining consistent results. It is thought that this study will be an original study conducted in Turkey and will contribute to the literature, since no study has been found in the literature review that deals with psychological birth order and family belonging together with subjective social status.

Purpose of the Research

Families meet the care, protection, attachment, relationship building, social and economic needs of individuals. Subjective social status is how an individual perceives themselves in the social hierarchy and begins to develop within the family. Therefore, in this research, it was intended to examine whether the subjective perceptions of social status of university students differ according to their family belonging, psychological birth order and gender. In accordance with this purpose, it is aimed to answer the following questions

1. Does the subjective social status perception of university students differ according to their level of family belonging and gender?
2. Does the subjective social status perception of university students differ according to their level of family belonging and psychological birth order?
3. Is there a relationship between university students subjective social status perception, family belonging levels and psychological birth order?

METHOD

Research Design

This research was effectuated out as a descriptive research based on the relational screening model for the purpose of examining whether the subjective social status of university students differ according to their family belonging levels, gender, psychological birth order.

Population and Sample

The general population of this research is university students in Turkey. The population of the research consist of university studying in 4-year faculties at Mersin University. The sample group is; It consisted of 601 students studying at Mersin University and selected by easily accessible sampling method. Of the participants, 384 (63.89%) were female and 217 (36.11%) were male. 31 students (5.16%) in the preparatory class, 208 (34.61%) in the first grade, 151 (25.12%) in the second grade, 95 (15.81%) in the third grade, 116 (19.30%) in the fourth grade is studying.

Data Collection Tools

In this study, three scales were applied, namely Subjective Social Status Scale, White-Campbell Psychological Birth Order Inventory and Family Belonging Scale. The data were collected online via Google Forms, during the period when universities were closed during the pandemic. It is limited to 1 answer in order to prevent one person from filling it out more than once. In case of any unanswered questions in the scales, the option to answer is obligatory was chosen.

Subjective Social Status Scale

The "Scale of Subjective Social Status" developed by Sweeting et al. was adapted into Turkish by Türkay, Mumcu, Kusan, Aydın, and Güngöz (2018). It is a decimal likert type scale and as the scores collected increase, the

perception of subjective social status also increases. To calculate the internal consistency of the Subjective Social Status Scale, it was concluded that the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients (.72) were sufficient for each factor of the scale and for the whole scale. The scale has 2 sub-dimensions and 7 items. While there are 4 items (popular, successful, attractive and respected) in the first sub-dimension, the perception of academic achievement, there are 3 items (power, sports and troublesome) in the second sub-dimension, the perception of sports among peers (Türkay, Mumcu, Kusan, Aydın & Güngöz, 2008). 2018). In this study, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the internal consistency reliability of the Scale of Subjective Social Status was calculated as 0.72.

Family Belonging Scale

It was developed by Mavili, Kesen and Daşbaşı (2015) to determine the belonging of individuals to their families. It is a five-point Likert type scale. It has two sub-dimensions, namely self belonging and family belonging. There are 13 positive and 4 negative items in the scale. 5th, 7th, 9th and 12th items are negative items. They are scored in reverse. When the inversion is finished the sum of 1st, 3rd, 4th, 6th, 7th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 17th items includes the “sub-dimension of self-belonging”; The sum of the 2nd, 5th, 8th, 9th, and 16th questions measures the “family belonging sub-dimension”. The sum of both sub-dimensions gives the family belonging level score of the individuals. As the score obtained from the scale increases, family belonging also increases (Mavili, Kesen & Daşbaşı, 2014).

The internal consistency coefficient of the whole scale was found to be 0.94 according to the Cronbach Alpha test. Cronbach Alpha is 0.93 for the sub-dimension of self belonging and 0.82 for the sub-dimension of family belonging. The test-retest reliability of the scale was calculated and the Correlation Coefficient was found as 0.84 ($p < 0.01$). The scale has 2 sub-dimensions and 17 items. There are 12 items related to the sub-dimension of self-belonging and 5 items related to the sub-dimension of family belonging (Mavili, Kesen & Daşbaşı, 2014). In this study, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the internal consistency reliability of the Scale of Family Belonging was 0.94 for the sub-dimension of self-belonging, 0.80 for the sub-dimension of family belonging, and the total score was 0.93.

White-Campbell Psychological Birth Order Inventory

The “White-Campbell Psychological Birth Order Inventory” was developed by Campbell, White, and Stewart in 1991. It was adapted into Turkish by Kalkan (2005). The Psychological Birth Order Inventory was developed to determine the psychological birth order of individuals. The scale, which was answered as “yes” and “no”, consists of 42 items. The scoring system is separate for men and women. It has 4 sub-dimensions: “First Child (Satisfactory/Regulatory)”, “Middle Child (Outcast/Uncaared-for)”, “The Youngest Child (Lovable/Convincing)” and “Only Child (Carefully Cared For.)”. Sub-dimensions have an unequal number of items. The raw scores obtained are converted into standard scores. The highest score determines the psychological birth order of person (Kalkan, 2005).

The reliability of the scale was calculated with the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient and the results were; For women, the 1st subscale is .79, the 2nd subscale is .86, the 3rd subscale is .82, and the last subscale is .74, while for men the 1st subscale is .65, the 2nd subscale is .75, the 3rd subscale is .68, and the last subscale is .74. It was found to be .82. According to the results of the adaptation study; the inventory was found to have an acceptable level of validity and reliability (Kalkan, 2005). In this study, the internal consistency coefficients for women were .68 for the 1st subscale, .88 for the 2nd subscale, .64 for the 3rd subscale, and .82 for the last subscale. Internal consistency coefficients for men were .70 for the 1st subscale, .83 for the 2nd subscale, .65 for the 3rd subscale, and .75 for the last subscale.

Data Analysis

First of all, the normality analyzes of the data obtained from 601 people were made. "Kolmogorov-Smirnov" and "Shapiro-Wilk" tests were first performed to examine the normal distribution of the data. Then, "Skewness (skewness)" – "Kurtosis (kurtosis)" values of the variables were examined. These values were found to be between -0.99 and 1.13. The range of these values between +1.5 and -1.5 in the data groups is considered acceptable for the normal distribution of the data (Cooper Cutting, 2010). Since the data were normally distributed, two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether there was a difference in Subjective Social Status mean scores according to family belonging level, gender and psychological birth order. Family Belonging Scale total scores were converted to standard scores (z). Then, a relative evaluation was made and standard scores above -1/2 were determined as low, $\pm 1/2$ standard scores as medium, and above +1/2 standard scores as high level of family belonging. The significance level was taken as .05 when interpreting whether the findings were significant or not. Descriptive statistics regarding the variables are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics on Variables

Variables	Min.	Maks.	Avg.	Sd	Skewness	Kurtosis
SSS Total	12.00	70.00	41.72	9.34	-0.21	0.03
FBS Total	17.00	85.00	65.28	13.28	-0.99	0.73
First Child	0.00	1.00	0.71	0.23	-0.62	-0.31
Middle Child	0.00	1.00	0.25	0.29	1.13	0.18
Youngest Child	0.00	1.00	0.47	0.26	0.13	-0.71
Only Child	0.00	1.00	0.41	0.28	0.38	-0.81

Ethics Committee Permission

Ethics Committee approval dated 29.12.2020 and decision number 039 was obtained from Mersin University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee for this study.

FINDINGS

In this part of the study, information about the findings obtained as a result of the analyzes is given.

Differentiation of Subjective Social Status Perception According to Gender and Level of Family Belonging:

The descriptive statistics results of university students' perception of subjective social status, whether they differ according to their level of family belonging and gender are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics Results of Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) Scores of University Students by Gender and Level of Family Belonging

Family Belonging	Gender	Subjective Social Status		
		Avg.	Sd.	N
Low	Female	36.68	10.15	72
	Male	41.37	9.92	46
	Total	38.51	10.28	118
Medium	Female	41.87	8.86	173
	Male	43.66	8.84	88
	Total	42.48	8.88	261
High	Female	41.05	8.80	139
	Male	45.02	8.83	83
	Total	42.54	9.00	222
Total	Female	40.60	9.27	384
	Male	43.70	9.13	217
	Total	41.72	9.34	601

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether the difference between the mean scores of the students from the Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) according to their gender and family belonging level was significant. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Two-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results of Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) Scores in terms of Gender and Family Belonging Level

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Squares	F	p
Gender	1516.11	1	1516.11	18.35	0.00**
Level of Family Belonging	1347.58	2	673.79	8.16	0.00**
Gender*Family Belonging	209.92	2	104.96	1.27	0.28
Error	49147.94	595	82.60		
Total	1098301.00	601			

* p<0.05, ** p<0.001

When Table 3 was examined, it was found that Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) scores differed statistically significantly according to gender [F (1, 595) = 18.35, p<0.001]. At the same time, it was found that the Subjective Social Status Scale scores differed significantly according to the level of family belonging [F (2, 595) = 8.16,

p<0.001]. However, it was found that the interaction effect of both variables did not lead to significant differentiation [F (2, 595) = 1.27, p = .281]. When the source of the gender difference was analyzed with the t-test, it was found that the Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) mean score of male university students (Mean = 43.70, Sd = 9.13) was significantly higher than the mean score of female students (Mean = 40.60, Sd = 9.27). According to this finding, male university students have higher subjective social status perceptions than females.

Table 4. Post-Hoc Test Results on the Differentiation of Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) Scores by Level of Family Belonging

Level of Family Belonging		Mean Differences	Standart Error	p
(I)	(J)	(I-J)		
Low	Medium	-3.967	1.008	0.00**
	High	-4.028	1.035	0.00**

* p<0.05, ** p<0.001

According to the results of the Bonferroni multiple comparison test, which was conducted to determine between which groups the difference in family belonging level was, the Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) score average of the participants with low family belonging level (Mean = 38.51, Sd = 10.28) was medium (Mean = 42.48, Sd = 8.88) and high (Mean = 42.54, Sd = 9.00) participants were significantly lower than the mean score. Accordingly, the subjective social status perception level of university students with a low level of family belonging is lower than those with a medium and high level of family belonging.

Differentiation of Subjective Social Status Perception According to Psychological Birth Order and Family Belonging Level:

The descriptive statistical results regarding whether university students' perceptions of subjective social status differ according to their family belonging levels and psychological birth order are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics Results of Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) Scores of University Students According to Psychological Birth Order and Level of Family Belonging

Family Belonging Level	Psychological Birth Order	Perception of Subjective Social Status		
		Avg.	Sd.	N
Low	First Child	39.28	9.82	54
	Middle Child	34.32	11.26	28
	Youngest Child	41.00	10.44	3
	Only Child	40.58	9.58	33
	Total	38.51	10.28	118
Medium	First Child	42.56	9.01	207
	Middle Child	43.00	8.83	15
	Youngest Child	41.55	9.44	11
	Only Child	41.96	8.07	28
	Total	42.48	8.88	261

High	First Child	42.34	9.16	179
	Middle Child	54.00	1.41	2
	Youngest Child	42.85	9.09	27
	Only Child	42.86	6.47	14
	Total	42.54	9.00	222
Total	First Child	42.06	9.21	440
	Middle Child	38.09	11.47	45
	Youngest Child	42.37	9.05	41
	Only Child	41.52	8.46	75
	Total	41.72	9.34	601

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between the mean scores of the students from the Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) according to their psychological birth order and family affiliation levels. Analysis results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Two-Way Analysis of Variance (Anova) Results of Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) Scores in terms of Psychological Birth Order and Level of Family Belonging

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p
Psychological Birth Order	87.12	3	29.04	0.34	0.79
Level of Family Belonging	719.90	2	359.95	4.26	0.02*
Psychological Birth Order * Family Belonging	756.81	6	126.13	1.49	0.18
Error	49792.81	589	84.54		
Total	1098301.00	601			

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01

When Table 6 was examined, it was found that Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) scores did not differ significantly according to psychological birth order [F (3, 589) = 0.34, p = 0.794]. Subjective Social Status Scale (SSS) scores were found to differ significantly according to the level of family belonging [F (2, 589) = 4.26, p = 0.015]. It was found that the interaction effect of both variables did not lead to significant differentiation [F (6, 589) = 1.49, p = 0.178].

The Relationship Between Level of Family Belonging, Psychological Birth Order and Perception of Subjective Social Status:

The relationship between university students' perception of subjective social status, family belonging levels and psychological birth order was examined by Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between SSS Total, Level of Family Belonging Total, and White-Campbell Psychological Birth Order Subscale Mean Scores

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.SSS Total	0.051	-					
2.FBS Total	-0.163**	0.170**	-				

3.First Child	0.061	0.146**	0.123**	-			
4.Middle Child	0.125**	-0.102**	-0.632**	-0.051	-		
5.Youngest Child	-0.143**	0.175**	0.433**	0.169**	-0.435**	-	
6.Only Child	0.077	-0.080*	-0.485**	-0.021	0.603**	-0.138**	-

P.S. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, SSS: Subjective Social Status. FBS: Family Belonging Scale

When Table 7 is examined, there is a positive correlation between SSS Total and FBS Total ($r = 0.170$, $p < 0.01$), First Child ($r = 0.146$, $p < 0.01$) and Youngest Child ($r = 0.175$, $p < 0.01$) sub-dimensions. A negative and statistically significant correlation was found between SSS Total and Middle Child ($r = -0.102$, $p < 0.01$) and Only Child ($r = -0.080$, $p < 0.05$) sub-dimensions. A positive and statistically significant relationship was found between the FBS Total and the First Child ($r = 0.123$, $p < 0.01$) and Youngest Child ($r = 0.433$, $p < 0.01$) sub-dimensions. A negative and statistically significant relationship was found between the Family Belonging Scale Total and the Middle Child ($r = -0.632$, $p < 0.01$) and Only Child ($r = -0.485$, $p < 0.01$) sub-dimensions.

CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

In this part of the study, the conclusion and discussion are given for the analysis of the subjective social status perception of university students according to family belonging and psychological birth order.

Discussion on the Differences in Perception of Subjective Social Status by Gender and Level of Family Belonging

The first findings obtained from this study showed that the subjective social status perception differed significantly according to both gender and family belonging level of individuals. However, when gender and family belonging were considered together, no significant difference was observed. According to the gender of individuals, it was seen that male university students have a higher subjective social status perception than female university students. When the concept of objective social status is examined, it is known that the gender of individuals is a social status point attributed to them by the society (Turner, 2000). At the same time, the gender of person plays an important role in the development of subjective social status perception, which is how individuals perceive their own status in the social hierarchy (Operario et al., 2004). Also, Bucciol et al. (2015) emphasized that gender has an effect on subjective social status.

Şahin and Nasır (2019) found that men have a higher subjective social status perception than women as a result of their study to examine the relationship between subjective and objective social status. Düren and Yalçın (2022), in their study with Syrian refugee adolescents and investigating how subjective social status affects internalization and externalization problems, concluded that female adolescent refugees have a higher perception of subjective social status than male adolescent refugees. Different from these studies, Güler, Türkay, and Çolakoğlu (2021) found that gender did not make a difference in their study in which they examined the subjective social status perception of sports high school students.

Another finding of this study is that the subjective social status perception of university students with low level of family belonging is lower than the subjective social status perception of university students with medium and high level of family belonging. After meeting the needs of belonging, individuals desire to meet their self-needs, including status (Kuşat, 2003). The sense of belonging of individuals is first resolved in the family (Aslantürk, Kesen & Daşbaşı, 2020).

Individuals who first experience the awareness of belonging in the family and meet the need for belonging then begin to develop self-confidence, self-efficacy and self-esteem (Kızmaz, 2006). If the individual's need for family belonging is resolved, they feel as a strong individual, their achievements increase and they have more positive emotions (Dere & Kılıç, 2016). It can be said that individuals' family, their sense of belonging to their families and gender are related to low or high perceived social status.

While no study was found in which family belonging and subjective social status variables were studied together, it was seen that both variables were studied separately and similar results were obtained with many variables such as career, substance and smoking, life satisfaction, well-being and happiness level (Autin, Douglass, Duffy, England & Allan, 2017; Feng, Su, Yang, Xia & Su, 2017; Gök & Kocayörük, 2019; Russell & Odgers, 2019; Zorotovich, Johnson & Linn, 2016). Considering these studies, it can be said that when the needs of family belonging and social status are met, the well-being and happiness levels of individuals will increase.

Discussion on the Difference of Subjective Social Status Perception by Psychological Birth Order and Level of Family Belonging

It was investigated whether the subjective social status perception differed according to the psychological birth order and family belonging level of university students. It was found that subjective social status levels did not differ according to psychological birth order, while differed according to family belonging levels. The interaction effect of both variables does not lead to a significant difference.

The psychological birth order often determines the position of members in the family. Gender, number of parents and divorce factors are important factors in the perception of birth order. At the same time, these factors are the reason why individuals perceive the actual and psychological birth order differently (Campbell, White, & Stewart, 1991).

Psychological birth order has also been examined many times according to the gender variable such as subjective social status and family belonging. Başaranoğlu (2011) in his study, which aims to examine the psychological birth order of university students and the expectation of social competence in relations with the opposite sex, according to gender; It has been determined that men perceive the psychological birth order of first children and youngest children at a higher rate than women.

Psychological birth order is an important determinant of the personality structures and self-perception that individuals develop, and more effective than the actual birth order (Campbell, White & Stewart, 1991; Çakır & Şen, 2012; Gfroerer, Gfroerer, Curlette, White & Kern, 2003; Lohman, Lohman & Christensen, 1985). In addition, psychological birth order has a significant impact on the adult life of individuals (Shulman & Mosak, 1977). In the study conducted by Dođru Çabuker, Epli, Balcı Çelik, and Vural Batık (2020) with university students, it was concluded that first child and the youngest child predicted the perception of positive identity and middle child and only child predicted the negative identity perception. Yılmaz (2019), in his study, wanted to examine the effect of psychological birth order on individuals' coping styles and self-esteem. It has been observed that there is a negative significant relationship between the psychological birth order of the first child, the only child and the youngest child and self-esteem. There was no significant relationship between psychological birth order and self-esteem of the middle child. The finding obtained from this study on whether the subjective social status differs according to the psychological birth order is the same as the result obtained with self-esteem.

It has been observed that psychological birth order have not been studied before with family belonging and subjective social status, it have been studied with variables that may be related. According to the results obtained by Kalkan and Odacı (2010), individuals' psychological birth order and their parental attachment patterns for observation purposes; There is a relationship between individuals' psychological birth order and their parental attachment patterns. In addition; It was also found that individuals' psychological birth order is a significant predictor of their parental attachment patterns. Considering all this information and studies, it can be said that individuals' subjective social status perceptions differ according to their psychological birth order and family belonging levels.

Discussion and Interpretation of the Findings on the Relationships between Family Belonging Level, Psychological Birth Order, and Subjective Social Status Perception

A relationship between university students' subjective social status perception, family belonging levels and psychological birth order was investigated. There is a positive relationship between subjective social status perception and family belonging and the first child and the youngest child, a negative relationship between the middle child and the only child. Middle children perceive themselves in competition with the first child (Stewart, 2004). They have less sense of belonging than children with other birth orders (Eckstein et al., 2010). Since only children are more shy in expressing their feelings and thoughts, they are prone to develop insecure personality traits (Stewart, 2004). An only child grows up alone, unlike other birth orders. Considering all these psychological birth order characteristics, the results obtained in the study; Findings of positive correlations between first and youngest child rank and family belonging and subjective social status, and negative correlation between middle and only child rank and family belonging and subjective social status are consistent. In other words, that information supports this finding of the study.

The concept of belonging is a component of the concepts of relationship and attachment (Hill, 2006), and the need for attachment is met by the family (Duru, 2015). From this perspective, attachment is an important variable in terms of family belonging and psychological birth order, which is individuals' perception of their position in the family. İlik and Kesel (2019), in their study examining the relationship between attachment and family belonging, concluded that when the level of family belonging increases, the rate of obsessive attachment decreases. Ekşi, Sevim, and Kurt (2016) found a relationship between the two variables in their study to examine the level of prediction of attachment styles in terms of psychological birth order. Similarly, Kalkan and Odacı (2010) executed a research to examine the relationship between individuals' psychological birth order and attachment patterns to their parents, and they concluded that there is a significant relationship between individuals' psychological birth order and attachment patterns to their parents. In addition; It was also observed that individuals' psychological birth order is a significant predictor of their parental attachment patterns.

The career variable is also a variable that has been studied in many ways with subjective social status, family belonging and psychological birth order variables and gives similar results. Autin, Douglass, Duffy, England, and Allan (2017) found in their research that there is a relationship between subjective social status and career adaptation. In their study with young adults, Slaten and Baskin (2013) concluded that family belonging in young adults is significantly associated with difficulties in making decisions about their careers. Kırdök and Alibekiroğlu (2016) conducted a study to examine whether university students' psychological birth order and life satisfaction predict their efficacy expectations in career decisions. According to the consequences of the study; Life satisfaction, first and only child psychological birth order, career decision are predictors of competence expectation. However, the youngest and middle psychological birth order has no predictive power on career decision competence expectation. Herndon (2012) observed a significant relationship between sense of belonging and career decision self-efficacy, when concluding that there was a less significant relationship between psychological birth order and self-efficacy in career decision making.

Both in our country and in different countries, the variables of psychological resilience and life satisfaction have also been studied many times with the related variables and it has been observed that they have similar relations with each other. It is also among the information observed in the literature that individuals have low psychological resilience and life satisfaction when they cannot meet their belonging needs (Leary, Kelly, Cottrell, & Schreindorfer, 2013). In their study with delinquent boys, Açıkel Gülel and Daşbaşı (2019) found that as life satisfaction increases, family belonging increases, and as family belonging increases, life satisfaction increases. Oktan, Odacı, and Çelik (2014) examined the relationship between psychological birth order and psychological resilience, and it was observed that there was a significant relationship between psychological birth order and resilience. Zorotovich, Johnson, and Linn (2016) concluded in their study that there is a positive relationship between subjective social status and life satisfaction.

When all this information and studies are taken into consideration, the results obtained in our study were found to be compatible with the literature. For this reason, we can say that there is a relationship between the family belonging levels, psychological birth order and subjective social status of university students.

CONCLUSION

The results of this research, in which university students' subjective social status perceptions, family belonging levels, psychological birth order and gender are examined are given below.

- 1) Male university students have a higher subjective social status perception than female university students.
- 2) The subjective social status perception of university students with a low level of family belonging is lower than university students with a medium and high level of family belonging.
- 3) University students' subjective social status perceptions do not differ according to their psychological birth order.
- 4) A positive correlation was found between subjective social status perception and the psychological birth order first child and the youngest child, and a negative correlation was found between the middle child and the only child.
- 5) A positive relationship was found between family belonging and the first child and the youngest child in the psychological birth order, and a negative relationship between the middle child and the only child.

SUGGESTIONS

The sample of this research consisted of university students. In future research, it is possible to work with individuals from different age groups or disadvantaged groups, immigrants, etc. In addition, studies on cognitive flexibility, emotional flexibility, and psychological well-being can be done with these variables.

ETHICAL TEXT

"In this article, the journal writing rules, publication principles, research and publication ethics, and journal ethical rules were followed. The responsibility belongs to the authors for any violations that may arise regarding the article. "

Ethics Committee approval dated 29.12.2020 and decision number 039 was obtained from Mersin University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee for this study.

Author(s) Contribution Rate: First author's contribution rate is 50%, second author's contribution rate is 50%.

REFERENCES

- Açikel-Günel, E. & Daşbaşı, S. (2019). Relationship between family sense of belonging and life satisfaction of male children who dragged into crime. *Journal of Society and Social Work*, 30(3), 965-987. <https://doi.org/10.33417/tsh.622589>
- Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, white women. *Health Psychology*, 19(6), 586-592. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0278-6133.19.6.586>
- Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the student engagement instrument. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(5), 427-445. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.04.002>
- Aslantürk, H., Kesen, N. F., & Daşbaşı, S. (2020). Examination of family belonging of university students in terms of family related variables. *Journal of Society and Social Work*, 31(4), 1579-1598. <https://doi.org/10.33417/tsh.739505>
- Autin, K. L., Douglass, R. P., Duffy, R. D., England, J. W., & Allan, B. A. (2017). Subjective social status, work volition, and career adaptability: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 99, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2016.11.007>
- Barr, S. M., Budge, S. L., & Adelson, J. L. (2016). Transgender community belongingness as a mediator between strength of transgender identity and well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 63(1), 87-97. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000127>
- Basaranoglu, Y. (2011). Examining the relationship between the psychological birth order of university students according to gender and the expectation of social competence in relation to the opposite sex [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Çukurova.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>
- Bazzian, S., Rajaeis, Y., & Afsari, L. (2014). The inhibitör role of religious beliefs and family belonging in tendency towards smoking, addictive substance and alcohol consumption. *Journal of Family Psycholog* 1(1). 19-28. https://www.ijfpjournal.ir/article_245489.html?lang=en
- Brown, M., & Sacco, D. F. (2017). Greater need to belong predicts a stronger preference for extraverted faces. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 104, 220-223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.08.012>
- Buccioli, A., Cavasso, B., & Zarri, L. (2015). Social status and personality traits. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 51, 245-260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2015.10.002>
- Campbell, L., White, J., & Stewart, A. (1991). The relationship of psychological birth order to actual birth order. *Individual Psychology: Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research and Practice*, 47(3), 380–391. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1992-12455-001>

- Cardoso F. L., Ferrari E. P., Pereira R. G., Lima, L. C., Medeiros, T. E., Vieira, M. P., & Melo, G. F. (2016). Idiocentric and allocentric profile, gender schemas of self-concept, and subjective social status of judo athletes. *Arch Budo*, 12, 293-300. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318886879_Idiocentric_and_allocentric_profile_gender_schemas_of_self-concept_and_subjective_social_status_of_judo_athletes
- Choenarom, C., Williams, R. A., & Hagerty, B.M. (2005). The role of sense of belonging and social support on stress and depression in individuals with depression. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing* 19(1), 19-29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2004.11.003>
- Cohen, S., Alper, C. M., Doyle, W. J., Adler, N., & Treanor, J. J. (2008). Objective and subjective socioeconomic status and susceptibility to the common cold. *Health Psychology*, 27(2), 268–274. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.27.2.268>
- Çakır, K., & Şen, E. (2012). The effect of psychological birth order on the belief in a just world. *Journal of the Social Sciences Institute*, 32(1), 57-69. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/erusosbilder/issue/23766/253346>
- Dere, G., & Kılıç, E. (2016). A theoretical study on conflict management from organizational belonging perspective. *The Science Journal of Turkish Military Academy*, 26(2), 127-154. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344472015_AIDIYET_PERSPEKTIFINDEN_CATISMA_YONETIMI_UZERINE_KURAMSAL_BIR_CALISMA_A_THEORETICAL_STUDY_ON_CONFLICT_MANAGEMENT_FROM_THE_ORGANIZATIONAL_BELONGING_PERSPECTIVE
- DeWall, C., Deckman, T., Pond, R. S., & Bonser, I. (2011). Belongingness as a core personality trait: How social exclusion influences social functioning and personality expression. *Journal of Personality*, 79(6), 979-1012. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00695.x>
- Diemer, M. A., Mistry, R. S., Wadsworth, M. E., Lopez, I., & Reimers, F. (2013). Best practices in conceptualizing and measuring social class in psychological research. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 13(1), 77–113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12001>
- Doğru Çabuker, N., Epli, H., Balcı Çelik, S., & Vural Batık, M. (2020). Does psychological birth order predict identity perceptions of individuals in emerging adulthood? *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 12(5), 164-176. <https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2020.05.012>
- Duru, E. (2015). The psychometric properties of the general belongingness scale: A study of reliability and validity. *Turkish Psychological Counselling and Guidance Journal*, 5(44), 68-72. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tpdrd/issue/42746/515943>
- Düren, R., & Yalçın, Ö (2022). How does subjective social status affect internalizing and externalizing problems among Syrian refugee adolescents. *Curr Psychol* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03002-4>
- Eckstein, D., Aycock K.J., Sperder, M.A., McDonald, J., Wiesner, V., Watts, R.E, & Ginsburg, P. (2010). A review of 200 birth-order studies: lifestyle characteristics. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 66(4), 408-434. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265377647_A_Review_of_200_Birth-Order_Studies_Lifestyle_Characteristics

- Ekşi, H., Sevim, E., & Kurt, B. (2016). Psychological birth order and inferiority feeling as predictors of adult attachment style. *Elementary Education Online*, 15(3), 1054-1065. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ieo.2016.90300>
- Fatima, Z., & Ashraf, R. (2018). Psychological birth order, self-efficacy and achievement motivation in students. *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 6(6), 25-39. <http://www.idpublications.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Full-Paper-PSYCHOLOGICAL-BIRTH-ORDER-SELF-EFFICACY-AND-ACHIEVEMENT-MOTIVATION-IN-STUDENTS.pdf>
- Feng, D., Su, S., Yang, Y., Xia, J., & Su, Y. (2017). Job satisfaction mediates subjective social status and turnover intention among Chinese nurses. *Nursing and Health Sciences*, 19(3), 388–392. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12357>
- Franzini, L., & Fernandez-Esquer, M. E. (2006). The association of subjective social status and health in low-income mexican-origin individuals in Texas. *Social Science and Medicine*, 63(3), 788-804. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.01.009>
- Geçtan, E. (2012). *Psychoanalysis and Beyond* (15th Edition). Metis Publishing.
- Gfroerer, K. P., Gfroerer, C. A., Curlette, W. L., White, J., & Kern, R. M. (2003). Psychological birth order and the BASIS-A inventory. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 59(1), 31-41. <https://web.p.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=860f8d9b-c81a-48d0-a4a1-3e44fb1f5020%40redis>
- Gök, E., & Kocayörük, E. (2019). Association of parantel perceptions, family belonging and psychological needs with adolescents' subjective well-being. *The Journal of Family Psychological Counseling*, 2(2), 21-51. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/apdad/issue/51116/572190>
- Güler, Y. E., Türkay, H., & Çolakoğlu, T. (2021). Investigating of social status perceptions of sports high school student. *Journal of ROL Sport Sciences*, 2(1), 73-79. <https://doi.org/10.29228/roljournal.48583>
- Güneş, A. (2016). *Tutunma çabası: Aidiyet*. Timaş Publishing.
- Hagerty, B. M., Williams, R. A., Coyne, J. C., & Early, M. R. (1996). Sense of belonging and indicators of social and psychological functioning. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 10(4), 235-244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9417\(96\)80029-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9417(96)80029-X)
- Haight, H. M., Rose, J., Geers, A., & Brown, J. A. (2015). Subjective social status and well-being: The role of referent abstraction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 155(4), 356–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2015.1015476>
- Herndon, R. M. (2012). *The relationship of lifestyle and psychological birth order with career decision self-efficacy* [Unplished doctoral dissertation]. Georgia State University.
- Hill, D. L. (2006). Sense of belonging as connectedness. American Indian worldview and mental health. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 20(5), 210-216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2006.04.003>
- İlik, D., & Kesen, N. (2019). The relationship between attachment and family belonging in adolescents. *Pediatric Practice and Research*, 7(4), 116-120. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/pprjournal/issue/51342/668757>

- Kalkan, M. (2005). Validity and reliability of the White-Campbell psychological birth order inventory. *Journal of Psychiatry Psychology Psychopharmacology*, 13(3), 169-174. <http://psikiyatridizini.net/viewarticle.aspx?articleid=5538>
- Kalkan, M., & Odacı, H. (2010). Psychological birth order and parental bonding: A study on preschool student teachers. *Education Sciences*, 5(3), 810-819. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/nwsaedu/issue/19823/212291>
- Kırdök, O., & Alibekiroğlu, P. B. (2016). An investigation of predictive power of psychological birth order and life satisfaction on career decision making self-efficacy in university students. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 9(47), 497-503. <https://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/articles/an-investigation-of-predictive-power-of-psychological-birth-order-and-lifesatisfaction-on-career-decision-making-selfeff.pdf>
- Kızmaz, Z. (2006). A theoretical approach to the roots of violence behaviors at schools. *Cumhuriyet University Journal of Social Science*, 30(1), 47-70. <http://eskidergi.cumhuriyet.edu.tr/makale/1362.pdf>
- King, V., & Boyd, L. M. (2016). Factors associated with perceptions of family belonging among adolescents. *Marriage and Family Journal*, 78(4), 1114-1130. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12322>
- Kuşat, A. (2003). The sense of "identity" as a system of values and Atatürk. *Erciyes Sivas University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 1(15), 45-61. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/erusosbilder/issue/23748/252999>
- Leary, M. R., Kelly, K. M., Cottrell, C. A., & Schreindorfer, L. S. (2013). Construct validity of the need to belong scale: Mapping the nomological network. *Journal of personality assessment*, 95(6), 610-624. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2013.819511>
- Levett-Jones, T., Lathlean, J., Maguire, J., & McMillan, M. (2007). Belongingness: A critique of the concept and implications for nursing education. *Nurse Education Today*, 27(3), 210-218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2006.05.001>
- Lohman, J. F., Lohman, T. G., & Christensen, O. (1985). Psychological position and perceived sibling differences. *Individual Psychology: Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research and Practice*, 53, 89-104. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/4bb7f110ba9a68bac71ea3bd99ad6b2d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1816606>
- Mallinckrodt, B., & Wei, M. (2005). Attachment, social competencies, social support, and psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(3), 358-367. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.3.358>
- Manstead, A. S. R. (2018). The psychology of social class: How socioeconomic status impacts thought, feelings, and behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 57(2), 267-291. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12251>
- Marjoribanks, K. (2003). Birth order, family environments, academic and affective outcomes. *Psychological Reports*, 92(3), 1284-1286. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2003.92.3c.1284>
- Mavili, A., Kesen, N. F., & Daşbaşı, S. (2014). Family sense of belonging scale: A study of developing a scale. *Journal of Social Policy Studies*, (33), 29-45. <https://doi.org/10.21560/spcd.19507>

- McConnell A. R., Shoda T. M., & Skulborstad H. M. (2012). The self as a collection of multiple self-aspects: Structure, development, operation, and implications. *Social Cognition, 30*(4), 380-395. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2012.30.4.380>
- Melillo, D. (1983). Birth order, perceived birthorder, and family position of academic women. *Individual Psychology: Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research and Practice, 39*(1), 57-62. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1984-20016-001>
- Oktan, V., Odacı, Ç., & Çelik, Ç. B. (2014). Investigating the role of psychological birth order in predicting resilience. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, (14)*1, 140-152. <https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2014.14.1-5000091506>
- Operario, D., Adler, N. E., & Williams, D. R. (2004). Subjective social status: Reliability and predictive utility for global health. *Psychology and Health, 19*(2), 237-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870440310001638098>
- Ostrove, J. M., Adler, N. E., Kupperman, M., & Washington, A. E. (2000). Objective and subjective assessments of socioeconomic status and their relationship to self-rated health in an ethnically diverse sample of pregnant women. *Health Psychology, 19*(6), 613-618. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0278-6133.19.6.613>
- Reitzel, L. R., Buchanan, T. S., Nguyen, N., & Ahluwalia, J. S. (2014). Associations of subjective social status with nondaily and daily smoking. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 38*(2), 245–253. <https://doi.org/10.5993/AJHB.38.2.10>
- Russell, M. A., & Odgers, C. L. (2019). Adolescents' subjective social status predicts day-to-day mental health and future substance use. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 1-13*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12496>
- Sakurai, K., Kawakami, N., Yamaoka, K., Ishikawa, H., & Hashimoto, H. (2010). The impact of subjective and objective social status on psychological distress among men and women in Japan. *Social Science and Medicine, 70*(11), 1832–1839. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.01.019>
- Shulman, B. H. ve Mosak, H. H. (1977). Birth order and ordinal position: two adlerian views. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 33*, 114-121. <http://www.carterandevans.com/storage/app/media/library/Adlerian-Theory/article-birth-order-and-ordinal-position.pdf>
- Slaten, D. C., & Baskin, W. T. (2013). Examining the impact of peer and family belongingness on the career decision-making difficulties of young adults: A path analytic approach. *Journal of Career Assessment Published, 22*(1), 59-74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072713487857>
- Singh-Manoux, A., Adler, N. E., & Marmot, M. G. (2003). Subjective social status: its determinants and its association with measures of ill-health in the Whitehall II study. *Social Science and Medicine, 56*(6), 1321–1333. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536\(02\)00131-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536(02)00131-4)
- Spitze, G., & Logan, J. R. (1991). Sibling Structure and Intergenerational Relations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*(4), 871. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352994>
- Stewart, A. E. (2004). Can knowledge of client birth order bias clinical judgment? *Journal of Counseling and Development, 82*(2), 167-176. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2004.tb00298.x>
- Sweeting, H., & Hunt, K. (2014). Adolescent socio-economic and schoolbased social status, health and well-being. *Social science and medicine, 121*, 39- 47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.09.037>

- Şahin, O., & Nasır, S. (2019). Investigation of the relationship between objective social status and subjective social status. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, 59(1), 143-156. <https://doi.org/10.26650/JECS2018-0013>
- Tao, S., Dong, Q., Pratt, M. W., Hunsberger, B., & Pancer, S. M. (2000). Social support: Relations to coping and adjustment during the transition to university in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 15(1), 123–144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558400151007>
- Turner, B. S. (2000). Status. Doruk Publishing.
- Türkay, H., Mumcu H. E., Kusan, O., Aydın A. D., & Güngöz, E. (2018). Adaptation of the subjective social status scale to Turkish. *Journal of the Human and Social Science Researches*, 7(4), 2391-2403. <https://toad.halileksi.net/sites/default/files/pdf/oznel-sosyal-statu-toad.pdf>
- Yeter, İ. S. (2019). *Predicting the happiness levels of university students according to family belonging and spiritual orientation* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Marmara.
- Yılmaz, B. (2019). *The effect of the psycholocical birth order on self-esteem and individuals' stress coping strategies* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Üsküdar.
- Zorotovich, J., Johnson, E. I., & Linn, R. (2016). Subjective social status and positive indicators of well-being among emerging adult college students. *College Students Journal*, 50(2), 624-635. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1121542>
- Zweigenhaft, R. L., & von Ammon, J. (2000). Birth Order and Civil Disobedience: A Test of Sulloway's "Born to Rebel" Hypothesis. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(5), 62-627. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540009600502>