



## Predicting Social Anxiety and Subjective Well-Being Preservice Teachers through Doing Sports

Ezgi Samar<sup>1</sup>

Fehmi Çalık<sup>2</sup>

Emin Yaşar<sup>3</sup>

Cuma Ece<sup>4</sup> 

Murat Şen<sup>5</sup>

Betül Şen<sup>6</sup>

Mihrab Bilir<sup>7</sup>



(✉ Corresponding Author)

<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7</sup> Sakarya University of Applied Disciplines, School of Physical Education and Sports, Turkey.

<sup>1</sup>Email: [ezgi\\_samar36@hotmail.com](mailto:ezgi_samar36@hotmail.com) Tel: +90507 587 78 01

<sup>2</sup>Email: [fcalik@sakarya.edu.tr](mailto:fcalik@sakarya.edu.tr) Tel: +90533 729 37 70

<sup>3</sup>Email: [emingaziantep@hotmail.com](mailto:emingaziantep@hotmail.com) Tel: +905069940052

<sup>4</sup>Email: [cumaece@hotmail.com](mailto:cumaece@hotmail.com) Tel: +90532 541 21 23

<sup>5</sup>Email: [murats@subu.edu.tr](mailto:murats@subu.edu.tr) Tel: +90264 295 09 60

<sup>6</sup>Email: [betmur54@gmail.com](mailto:betmur54@gmail.com) Tel: +90264 295 09 60

<sup>7</sup>Email: [mihrab.bilir@gmail.com](mailto:mihrab.bilir@gmail.com) Tel: +90531 558 49 84

### Abstract

In the study, it is aimed to research the social anxiety and subjective well-being of preservice teachers through doing sports. A total of 450 pre-service teachers majoring in various teaching areas including science Turkish, English, Elementary Mathematics and Primary School teaching at a state university in the Southeastern Anatolia Region participated in the study. The data were collected via a Personal Information Form, Social Anxiety Scale, and Subjective Well-Being Scale. T-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used when compared the independent groups, Tukey's test was used for comparison of differences. The Pearson correlation test was tested for the relation between continuous data. When based on gender, the scores of female participants of social anxiety and value lessness are significantly different. When based on age, subjective well-being scores of 23 years and older participants are significantly high. Generally, subjective well-being scores of pre-service teachers who do sports are significantly high while their value lessness scores are significantly low. In the comparison of participants at the age of 23 and younger with reference to doing sports, subjective well-being scores of participants doing sports was significantly higher than those of the ones not doing sports. However, it was detected that their scores of social anxiety, social aversion and being criticized did not differ significantly with reference to doing sports. It was detected that there was no significant difference in comparison of scores subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, value lessness and being criticized belonging to participants at the age of 24 and older with reference to doing sports. In this study, found that subjective well-being scores of those who did not do sports were lower than those who did sports. In addition, it has been determined that the total points of social avoidance, worthlessness and social anxiety do not differ among those who do sports and do not.

**Keywords:** Social anxiety, Subjective well-being, Pre-service teachers, Doing sports, Sports, Social Aversion.

**Citation** | Ezgi Samar; Fehmi Çalık; Emin Yaşar; Cuma Ece; Murat Şen; Betül Şen; Mihrab Bilir (2019). Predicting Social Anxiety and Subjective Well-Being Preservice Teachers through Doing Sports. Asian Journal of Education and Training, 5(2): 316-323.

#### History:

Received: 25 January 2019

Revised: 4 March 2019

Accepted: 12 April 2019

Published: 20 May 2019

**Licensed:** This work is licensed under a Creative Commons

Attribution 3.0 License 

**Publisher:** Asian Online Journal Publishing Group

**Contribution/Acknowledgement:** All authors contributed to the conception and design of the study.

**Funding:** This study received no specific financial support.

**Competing Interests:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

**Transparency:** The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study was reported; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

**Ethical:** This study follows all ethical practices during writing.

### Contents

1. Introduction .....	317
2. Method .....	317
3. Findings .....	318
4. Discussion and Results .....	321
References .....	322

## 1. Introduction

It is an undeniable fact that the importance of sport is gradually increasing in terms of emotional and social harmony at the present time as well as its physical benefits. In this context, sport can be defined as a process which integrally wraps human life, organizes and makes it easier and appeals to emotions such as excitement and overcoming (Ozturk, 2007). Sport describes a concept helping the individual to socialize since it gives a feeling of personal and social identity and group affiliation as well as it is a complement of a number of physical activities (Kucuk and Koc, 2004). When the mentioned complement is taken into account, sports science is related to lots of sciences concerning human. Sport, a multidisciplinary science, is closely associated with psychology. Thanks to developments in sports psychology, one of the most studied subjects in recent years have become sport and identity (Room, 2014). In this period when we experience the era of communication, social anxiety interestingly confronts us as a big problem. Anxiety is simply defined as sadness, perturbational thought, and sorrow. In psychology, it is defined as mope or uneasiness shaped by fear or expectation of danger or mischance which is thought to befall (Budak, 2013). Anxiety can be generally defined as a state of uneasiness or irrational fear which springs in human as a reflection of any fear of danger (Manav, 2011). Recently, the rate of non-adaptation to society has spiked up regardless of educational level. Social anxiety is a social interaction problem affecting daily life, academic activities largely and coming together with worries of personality assessment and criticism (Ceylan, 2011). The Ministry of Health defines social anxiety as a mental disease because of which people have an extreme atychiphobia in society, abstain from many social behaviors because of worries of being disgraced or have to do overanxiously and adaptation of human in society is destroyed to the highest degree (Ministry of Health, 2008). If people experience social anxiety, they are in the tendency to relationship breakdown with other people (Oztürk *et al.*, 2005). This compliance problem creates a problem in himself/ herself and leads to unhappiness. Sport is all important in terms of both physical development and mental and social health of the individual (Güclü, 2000).

Teaching is defined as a special profession of expertness that undertakes government's duties concerning education and training in the 43rd article of Basic Law of National Education with number 1739. In addition to being a special profession of expertness, it has changed into a grueling profession via the effect of the education system. Nowadays, teachers have to cope with attitudes and behaviors of parent-student-society apart from the worry of guiding to teaching and learning. This present situation where students and parents are strong has increased social anxiety of teachers and pre-service teachers and affected their social lives. There are also some other qualities about a good life and mental health but the domain of subjective well-being concentrates on the individual's self- assessment in relation to his/her life (Tuzgöl-Dost, 2007). According to Türkdoğan and Duru (2012) it is seen that everybody's sense of happiness springs in an idiocratic way when it is thought that the concept of subjective well-being is based on a self-assessment. In parallel with a variety about what will enable human to experience subjective well-being at a higher level, it has grown difficult to expect a variety of approaches suggested about what experiential resources of subjective well-being are to moot systematic and extensive ideas. When it is thought that preservice teachers will raise next generations, their subjective well-being has importance with regard to not only themselves but also the whole society. A member of a profession whose subjective well-being is high and basic needs are met experiences positive feelings frequently and negative feelings rarely. Such a teacher is happier, more competent and has qualities that will set a model for his/her students (Gundogdu and Yavuzer, 2012). Well, what are the effects of sport on anxiety and behaviors in the context of subjective well-being? Sports activities not only have an important function in an individual's development healthily but also contribute in terms of social and emotional development. These activities make abilities such as creativeness and leadership functional and develop personality characteristics such as being contentious, determined, agreeable, productive, strong-minded, respectful and insightful toward others, obeying the rules, collaborating, behaving independently, self-disciplining and being hardworking and assiduous (Terzi, 2011). Factors affecting attitudes are specified as the ones related with culture (gender, idols, different interests), the ones related with society ( family, sport experiences, level of ability, relations with peers, previous experiences about physical education and perceptions about sport) and the ones related with school (effect of teacher) (Kangalgil *et al.*, 2006). The study conducted to evaluate the social anxiety and subjective well-being of preservice teachers who will lay the foundations of society and its results were viewed.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. The Research Model

Since quantitative research anticipate that results related to semantic richness provided by numbers will be shared, quantitative data which have been obtained during the research provides acceptable and reliable consequences, and besides, it enables that the research can safely be shared (Cohen *et al.*, 2000). In this research, quantitative data which is about the contribution made by social anxiety and subjective well-being to the professional life have been acquired and interpreted owing to the fact that quantitative research is a scientific approach which based existence of knowledge on deduction. In the study is a descriptive study in the survey model. Besides survey method is defined as a type of research based on data acquired from a sample chosen among society population in order to determine the reality of events and facts in related circumstances within a fixed time (Arseven, 1993).

### 2.2. Population

A total of 450 pre-service teachers majoring in various teaching areas including science Turkish, English, Elementary Mathematics and Primary School teaching at a state university in Southeastern Anatolia Region participated in the study. %42 of the participants is female and %58 of them is male. The data were collected in October 2016.

### 2.3. Data Collection Tools

In the study, it is used the Personal Information Form that the researcher prepares to define some personal characteristics of the participants. In addition, it's used Social Anxiety Scale and Subjective Well-Being Scale to define the levels of their social anxiety and subjective well-being.

### 2.4. Personal Information Form:

There are 4 questions to pre-service teachers; the 1st question for gender, the 2nd question to age, the 3rd question to departments of education at university and 4th question to do sports.

### 2.5. Social Anxiety Scale:

It is used the Social Anxiety Scale which is developed by Palancı and Ozbay (2001). It's used the 5 related scales of SCL-90, Rathus assertiveness inventory and social introversion and subtest of MMPI for the validity of criterion. The matters are formed with three factors at the result of analysis to construct validity. The factor analysis was carried out via SPSS FACTOR (SPSS 10.0/WINDOWS). In the factor analysis carried out, factorability was examined by different methods. For reliability calculations, the Cronbach Alpha value calculated within-test consistency method is .89. The test Likert type has a five-point rating in the range 0-4. The increase in the scores shows that the SK level has increased (Palancı, 2004).

### 2.6. Subjective Well-Being Scale

The scale of subjective well-being with 46 items is developed by Tuzgol-Dost (2005). The scale tests subjective well-being levels by determining the frequency and intensity of positive and negative feelings. The subjective well-being scale is composed of statements of positive and negative feelings and judgments regarding living quarters. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient .93; test-retest reliability coefficient was found to be r: .86 (Tuzgol-Dost, 2005).

### 2.7. Scoring of Subjective Well-Being Scale

The answering system is in the form of five points Likert scale organized for each statement as "Completely Suitable (5)", "Mostly Suitable (4)", "Partly Suitable (3)", "Slightly Suitable (2)" and "Not Suitable At All (1)". The score of each item varies between 5 and 1. 26 of scale items are negative statements. They are 2nd, 4th, 6th, 10th, 13th, 15th, 17th, 19th, 21st, 24th, 26th, 28th, 30th, 32nd, 35th, 37th, 38th, 40th, 43rd, and 45th items. The negative statements are scored reversibly. While the lowest score is 46 in the scale, the highest score is 230 and a high score means that subjective well-being level is high (Tuzgol-Dost, 2005).

### 2.8. Gathering the Data (Process)

After obtaining permissions, the implementation of gathering data equipment for the research is completed by the help of particular instructors and implemented by researchers just before the beginning of the lesson. Necessary directions about the aim of research and the filling of material are given before the implementation. Gathering data material is filled by the voluntary students. After checking the incomplete and incorrect ones, valid and acceptable 450 survey forms were coded to the computer software for evolution. The filling of the scales by the students lasts approximately 30-40 minutes.

### 2.9. Data Analysis

SPSS 10.0 statistical packaged software was used for data assessment and finding computed values. For comparison of obtained data, independent samples t-test and variance analysis (ANOVA) were used. Also, Tukey's test, one of multiple comparison tests, was used to determine from which group the variance stemmed. The detection of relation among continuous data was tested via the Pearson correlation test. Error performance was determined as  $p < 0,05$  in this study.

## 3. Findings

The findings regarding analyses made in accordance with the purpose of the research were stated below.

**Table-1.** The comparison of participants' scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, valuelessness and being criticized on the basis of gender.

Variables	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Subjective Well-Being	Female	190	147,61	22,561	1,417	0,126
	Male	260	153,02	19,912		
Social Anxiety (Total)	Female	190	17,335	20,113	2,282	0,049*
	Male	260	23,658	19,191		
Social Aversion	Female	190	15,58	9,112	1,894	0,053
	Male	260	14,42	8,563		
Valuelessness	Female	190	15,12	8,547	2,338	0,045*
	Male	260	15,03	8,452		
Being Criticized	Female	190	14,89	8,435	1,239	0,255
	Male	260	15,69	7,619		

Note: \*  $p < 0,05$ .

When Table 1 is reviewed, in comparison of participants' scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized on the basis of gender, there is a significant difference in items of social anxiety and valuelessness whereas a significant difference is not ascertained in the other items.

**Table-2.** The comparison of items of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized concerning female participants in regard to doing sports.

Variables	Doing Sports	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Subjective Well-Being	Doer	50	157,61	23,561	1,518	0,052
	Non-Doer	140	153,02	20,911		
Social Anxiety (Total)	Doer	50	35,76	22,143	1,582	0,095
	Non-Doer	140	38,97	20,791		
Social Aversion	Doer	50	15,18	9,761	0,894	0,063
	Non-Doer	140	14,64	8,785		
Valuelessness	Doer	50	10,21	7,552	1,837	0,053
	Non-Doer	140	9,03	7,374		
Being Criticized	Doer	50	13,73	7,435	1,739	0,072
	Non-Doer	140	14,78	7,879		

Note: \* p<.05.

When Table 2 is reviewed, in comparison of female participants' scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized in regard to doing sports, a significant difference is not determined in any items.

**Table-3.** The comparison of items of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized concerning male participants in regard to doing sports.

Variables	Doing Sports	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Subjective Well-Being	Doer	70	167,98	20,391	2,498	0,042*
	Non-Doer	190	163,56	21,211		
Social Anxiety (Total)	Doer	70	36,26	20,176	-1,338	0,089
	Non-Doer	190	38,94	19,463		
Social Aversion	Doer	70	14,98	9,885	-1,783	0,073
	Non-Doer	190	13,55	8,129		
Valuelessness	Doer	70	9,12	6,578	2,548	0,043*
	Non-Doer	190	7,03	7,381		
Being Criticized	Doer	70	13,73	7,874	-1,476	0,062
	Non-Doer	190	12,87	7,811		

Note: \* p<.05.

When Table 3 is reviewed, in comparison of male participants' scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized in regard to doing sports, there is a significant difference in the items of subjective well-being and valuelessness whereas there is no significant difference in the other items.

**Table-4.** The comparison of items of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized concerning participants at the age of 23 and below in regard to doing sports.

Variables	Doing Sports	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Subjective Well-Being	Doer	95	177,66	20,507	1,418	0,047*
	Non-Doer	280	173,52	19,211		
Social Anxiety (Total)	Doer	95	39,92	19,236	-1,306	0,105
	Non-Doer	280	39,99	19,463		
Social Aversion	Doer	95	13,99	8,112	-1,083	0,773
	Non-Doer	280	14,55	8,791		
Valuelessness	Doer	95	9,18	7,578	-1,561	0,079
	Non-Doer	280	9,73	7,388		
Being Criticized	Doer	95	14,73	6,874	-1,49	0,102
	Non-Doer	280	12,94	7,036		

Note: \* p<.05.

When Table 4 is reviewed, in comparison of 23-year-old and younger participants' scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized in regard to doing sports, there is no significant difference in the other items whereas there is only a significant difference in the item of subjective well-being.

**Table-5.** The comparison of items of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized concerning participants at the age of 24 and older in regard to doing sports.

Variables	Doing Sports	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Subjective Well-Being	Doer	25	157,89	23,578	1,774	0,053
	Non-Doer	50	161,52	18,902		
Social Anxiety (Total)	Doer	25	31,56	19,292	0,315	0,705
	Non-Doer	50	34,28	20,482		
Social Aversion	Doer	25	13,06	8,601	0,209	0,744
	Non-Doer	50	12,84	7,883		
Valuelessness	Doer	25	8,18	6,137	0,806	0,337
	Non-Doer	50	9,44	7,888		
Being Criticized	Doer	25	11,78	6,224	-1,49	0,343
	Non-Doer	50	12,39	6,772		

Note: \* p<.05.

When Table 5 is reviewed, in comparison of 24-year-old and older participants' scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized in regard to doing sports, there is no significant difference in any items.

**Table-6.** The comparison of items of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized concerning participants who are preservice teachers at the department of Turkish teaching in regard to doing sports.

Variables	Doing Sports	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Subjective Well-Being	Doer	31	167,83	13,369	0,946	0,453
	Non-Doer	82	161,88	19,662		
Social Anxiety (Total)	Doer	31	30,56	19,741	-0,399	0,717
	Non-Doer	82	32,38	23,487		
Social Aversion	Doer	31	12,47	8,722	0,905	0,746
	Non-Doer	82	12,22	10,333		
Valuelessness	Doer	31	8,55	7,017	0,346	0,538
	Non-Doer	82	11,19	7,559		
Being Criticized	Doer	31	13,78	6,174	-0,963	0,442
	Non-Doer	82	12,86	12,773		

Note: \* p<.05.

When Table 6 is reviewed, in comparison of scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized belonging to participants who are preservice teachers at the department of Turkish teaching in regard to doing sports, there is no significant difference in any items.

**Table-7.** The comparison of items of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized concerning participants who are preservice teachers at the department of English teaching in regard to doing sports

Variables	Doing Sports	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Subjective Well-Being	Doer	25	167,13	15,364	1,946	0,044*
	Non-Doer	56	163,44	19,604		
Social Anxiety (Total)	Doer	25	30,16	20,845	-0,694	0,617
	Non-Doer	56	31,29	19,583		
Social Aversion	Doer	25	11,47	8,501	0,905	0,546
	Non-Doer	56	12,63	9,728		
Valuelessness	Doer	25	7,42	7,442	-0,346	0,699
	Non-Doer	56	5,19	6,187		
Being Criticized	Doer	25	13,17	9,803	-0,764	0,661
	Non-Doer	56	13,86	8,744		

Note: \* p<.05.

When Table 7 is reviewed, in comparison of scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized belonging to participants who are preservice teachers at the department of English teaching in regard to doing sports, there is a significant difference in the item of subjective well-being whereas there is no significant difference in the other items.

**Table-8.** The comparison of items of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized concerning participants who are preservice teachers at the department of elementary mathematics teaching in regard to doing sports.

Variables	Doing Sports	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Subjective Well-Being	Doer	28	157,06	16,781	-0,846	0,056
	Non-Doer	55	143,12	17,552		
Social Anxiety (Total)	Doer	28	38,16	20,488	-0,794	0,534
	Non-Doer	55	43,29	19,176		
Social Aversion	Doer	28	14,33	8,655	0,327	0,862
	Non-Doer	55	15,61	10,728		
Valuelessness	Doer	28	10,47	7,442	-1,402	0,375
	Non-Doer	55	7,84	6,187		
Being Criticized	Doer	28	15,17	8,447	-1,782	0,461
	Non-Doer	55	13,87	8,903		

Note: \* p<.05.

When Table 8 is reviewed, in comparison of scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized belonging to participants who are preservice teachers at the department of elementary mathematics teaching in regard to doing sports, there is no significant difference in any items.

**Table-9.** The comparison of items of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized concerning participants who are preservice teachers at the department of primary school teaching in regard to doing sports.

Variables	Doing Sports	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Subjective Well-Being	Doer	59	163,06	19,653	-0,146	0,554
	Non-Doer	114	157,87	19,552		
Social Anxiety (Total)	Doer	59	39,76	21,348	1,794	0,103
	Non-Doer	114	42,39	19,703		
Social Aversion	Doer	59	13,11	8,131	-2,049	0,027*
	Non-Doer	114	15,42	8,402		
Valuelessness	Doer	59	9,42	5,339	-0,492	0,677
	Non-Doer	114	7,96	6,306		
Being Criticized	Doer	59	15,88	7,184	1,208	0,581
	Non-Doer	114	17,13	6,222		

Note: \* p<.05.

When Table 9 is reviewed, in comparison of scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized belonging to participants who are preservice teachers at the department of primary school teaching in regard to doing sports, there is a significant difference in the item of social aversion whereas there is no significant difference in the other items.

**Table-10.** The comparison of items of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized concerning all the participants in regard to doing sports.

Variables	Doing Sports	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	P
Subjective Well-Being	Doer	120	161,33	20,447	2,625	0,025*
	Non-Doer	330	156,92	21,518		
Social Anxiety (Total)	Doer	120	39,26	20,322	-1,873	0,061
	Non-Doer	330	36,73	18,837		
Social Aversion	Doer	120	13,32	8,384	1,049	0,604
	Non-Doer	330	15,68	9,433		
Valuelessness	Doer	120	9,21	5,701	-2,692	0,008*
	Non-Doer	330	9,96	6,574		
Being Criticized	Doer	120	15,71	7,365	-1,723	0,281
	Non-Doer	330	16,13	6,142		

Note: \*  $p < .05$ .

When Table 10 is reviewed, in comparison of all the participants' scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, valuelessness and being criticized in regard to doing sports, there is a significant difference in the items of subjective well-being and valuelessness whereas there is no significant difference in the other items.

#### 4. Discussion and Results

It is seen that some findings are supported whereas some are not when we discuss the findings obtained in this research on literature level. Although it was concluded in researches made by Gumus (2002) that social anxiety did not vary by gender, a significant difference was determined in terms of social anxiety (total) in this study. In a study conducted on university students by Izgiç *et al.* (2000) it was stated that the prevalence of social anxiety was %8,9 in females and % 7,1 in males. As well as studies presenting that social anxiety is seen more in females than males (Demir, 1997; Erözkan, 2007) there are also some studies presenting the opposite (Palancı, 2004; Kalkan, 2008). In parallel with social anxiety, scores of females were higher than those of males in terms of value lessness, and a significant difference was determined between them. It was detected in the research that female participants' scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, value lessness and being criticized did not differ significantly with reference to doing sports. Among the reasons of this situation, it can be thought that the families in our society are more concerned about the male, to educate them more comfortably, to enable them to obtain what they want more easily and to place them in a more valuable position than female.

In this study, it was determined that the scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social avoidance, worthlessness and criterion of the female participants did not show a significant difference according to the sporting situation. However, Cenkseven and Akbas (2007) observed that the subjective well-being of male and female differed as a result of their study on university students. At the same time, subjective well-being and worthlessness scores of the male who did sports were significantly higher than those who did not. Compared to female, males are able to obtain what they want more easily. Considering this situation, it is expected that the subjective well-being of male will be higher than female. In the study conducted, scores of subjective well-being and value lessness belonging to males doing sports was determined as significantly higher than those of the ones not doing sports. It is a very surprising result that a score of value lessness is so high. To research, this result may constitute the subject of another research. Also, it was detected that scores of social anxiety, social aversion and being criticized belonging to male participants did not differ significantly with reference to doing sports. In another study conducted by Dilmac and Bozgeyikli (2009) subjective well-being and decision-making styles were examined in terms of different variables by revealing the relationship between the subjective well-being and decision-making styles of teacher preservice, and as a result, there were significant differences in subjective well-being of teachers in the term of gender variables.

In the comparison of participants at the age of 23 and younger with reference to doing sports, subjective well-being scores of participants doing sports was significantly higher than those of the ones not doing sports. However, it was detected that their scores of social anxiety, social aversion and being criticized did not differ significantly with reference to doing sports. Similarly to our study, in the study conducted by Eryilmaz and Ercan (2011) it was concluded that there was a difference between the age variable and subjective well-being levels of the participants. In our study, subjective well-being levels of 14-17 year-olds and 26-45 years-old participants were found to be higher than the subjective well-being of participants aged 19-25. In addition, according to the study conducted by Caglayan-Tunc (2015) it was detected that there is no significant difference between the ages of 18-20 and 21-23 according to the age variable, when the social avoidance, to be criticized, worthlessness, total social anxiety and subjective well-being scores of the participants were compared according to their sports status (Caglayan-Tunc, 2015).

It was detected that there was no significant difference in comparison of scores subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, value lessness and being criticized belonging to participants at the age of 24 and older with reference to doing sports. In his study on 312 university students, Sahin (2011) found similar results to our study and found that the levels of subjective well-being of the students do not differ according to the age variable. In parallel with the result of our research, the research by Diener *et al.* (1999) examined factors of age and subjective well-being in the study conducted in the country. As a result of the study, positive effect decreased with increasing age while middling increases occurred in satisfaction with life with increasing age. In a study conducted on American, West European, East European, Asian and Latin American adults by Blanchflower and Oswald (2004) they found that subjective well-being bottomed out at middle ages and subjective well-being level of adolescents

and old aged adults was higher than those of middle-aged adults. For example, it has been found that the subjective well-being of the individuals in the 25- to 25-year age group significantly explains the personality traits of extraversion and emotional imbalance (Ilhan and Bacanlı, 2007). The reason for this is that young adults in this period are in an effort to be able to successfully overcome their developmental tasks in each area and to be able to overcome these tasks successfully and at the same time to be challenging and heavy.

In the comparison of scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, value lessness and being criticized belonging to participants who are preservice teachers at the department of Turkish teaching in regard to doing sports, it was detected that there was no significant difference.

In the comparison of participants who are preservice teachers at the department of English teaching in regard to doing sports, subjective well-being scores of participants doing sports was determined significantly higher than those of the ones not doing sports. However, it was detected that there was no significant difference in scores of social anxiety, social aversion, value lessness and being criticized in regard to doing sports.

In comparison of scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, social aversion, value lessness and being criticized belonging to participants who are preservice teachers at the department of elementary mathematics teaching in regard to doing sports, it was detected there was no significant difference like the results of participants who are preservice teachers at the department of Turkish teaching.

In the comparison of participants who are preservice teachers at the department of primary school teaching in regard to doing sports, social aversion scores of participants doing sports were determined as significantly higher than those of participants not doing sports. However, it was detected that there was no significant difference in their scores of subjective well-being, social anxiety, value lessness and being criticized in regard to doing sports. In a study conducted by Yildirim *et al.* (2011) there were no significant differences in social anxiety levels among teacher candidates studying in different departments. In addition, Cetinkaya and Honca (2017) did not find any significant difference in the sub-dimensions of social anxiety measurements according to the participants' sections.

The scores of being criticized belonging to participants who did not do sports were determined as significantly higher than value lessness scores of the ones doing sports. Subjective well-being scores of the ones doing sports were determined as significantly higher than those of not doing sports. Besides, there was no difference in scores of social anxiety, social aversion and being criticized for the ones doing or not doing sports. When the results are evaluated, it may be told that the intrinsic satisfaction of the participants doing sports is higher than those of the ones not doing sports. It is seen that sports influences the level of social anxiety and subjective well-being positively. When it is thought that the participants raise the whole future of society, the importance of matter has increased a lot when not only participants but also the population that will be affected by them are taken into account. In his study, Caglayan-Tunc (2015). In his study, found that subjective well-being scores of those who did not do sports were lower than those who did sports. In addition, it has been determined that the total points of social avoidance, worthlessness and social anxiety do not differ among those who do sports and do not.

Suggestions according to research findings;

The number and quality of sports complexes in universities should be increased,

- 1- Sports awareness should be raised to all the university students and especially students in faculties of education
- 2- Sports activities should be prioritized and they should be turned into an inseparable part of life,
- 3- Assignment anxiety of preservice teachers should be minimized and it should be enabled them to spare some time to sport,
- 4- The number of sports educators who work in universities should be increased,
- 5- Sports classes should be made necessary particularly in faculties of education,
- 6- All the sports activities provided in universities should be free of charge.

## References

- Arseven, A.D., 1993. Field research method. Ankara: Gül Publishing House
- Blanchflower, D.G. and A.J. Oswald, 2004. Well-being over time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(7-8): 1359-1386. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0047-2727\(02\)00168-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0047-2727(02)00168-8).
- Budak, S., 2013. Dictionary of psychology. Ankara, İzmir: Science and Art Publications of Social Sciences.
- Caglayan-Tunc, A., 2015. The effect of sport to the levels of subjective well being and social anxiety. (Master Thesis). Selçuk University, Konya.
- Cenkseven, F. and T. Akbas, 2007. Investigation of the predictors of subjective and psychological well-being in university students. *Turkish Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance*, 3(27): 43-65.
- Cetinkaya, T. and A.A. Honca, 2017. An investigation of social anxiety levels of physical education and sports college students in terms of different variables, Inonu University. *Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences*, 4(2): 13-19.
- Ceylan, H., 2011. Prediction of social anxiety levels of university students. (Master Thesis). Ege University Institute.
- Cohen, L., L. Manion and K. Marrison, 2000. Research methods in education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 48(4): 446-446. Available at: 10.1111/1467-8527.t01-1-00157.
- Demir, T., 1997. Social phobia in children and adolescents: An epistemological study. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Istanbul University, Istanbul Medical Faculty, Istanbul.
- Diener, E., E.M. Suh, R.E. Lucas and H.L. Smith, 1999. Subjective wellbeing: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2): 276-302. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.125.2.276>.
- Dilmac, B. and H. Bozgeyikli, 2009. Examining the subjective well-being and decision-making styles of teacher candidates. *Journal of Erzincan Faculty of Education*, 11(1): 171-187.
- Erözkan, A., 2007. University students' rejection sensitivity and social anxiety levels according to some variables. *Selcuk University Social Sciences Institute Journal*, 17(1): 225-240.
- Eryılmaz, A. and L. Ercan, 2011. Examination of subjective well-being in terms of gender, age groups and personality characteristics. *Turkish Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance*, 4(36): 139-151.
- Güclü, M., 2000. Determining the problems and expectations of the university students in active sports (Example of Ankara Province). (PhD Thesis). Gazi University Institute of Health Sciences, Ankara.
- Gumus, E., 2002. The effect of social anxiety coping program on social anxiety levels of university students. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Ankara University Educational Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Gundogdu, R. and Y. Yavuzer, 2012. Investigation of subjective well-being and psychological needs of the faculty of education according to demographic variables. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Faculty of Education Journal*, 12(23): 115-131.
- Ilhan, T. and H. Bacanlı, 2007. Humor styles, personality properties and subjective well-being: A model experiment. *Educational Sciences and Practice Journal*, 11(1): 35-52.

- Izgiç, F., G. Akyüz, O. Doğan and N. Kuğu, 2000. The prevalence of social phobia in university students. *Journal of Anatolian Psychiatry*, 1(4): 207-214.
- Kalkan, N., 2008. The relationship between cognitive structures and social anxiety in adolescents cognitiv behavioural approach in terms of interpretation. (Unpublished Master Thesis). Marmara University, Istanbul.
- Kangalgil, M., D. Hünük and G. Demirhan, 2006. Comparison of primary, high school and university students' attitudes towards physical education and sports. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 17(2): 48-57.
- Kucuk, V. and H. Koc, 2004. The relationship between human and sport in psycho-social development process. *Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(1): 131-141.
- Manav, F., 2011. Concept of anxiety. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(9): 201-211.
- Ministry of Health, T.C., 2008. Educational guide for educators: Mental health modules. Ankara: T.C. Ministry of Health General Directorate of Health Education.
- Oztürk, A., H. Anılan, P. Girmen and I. Senturk, 2005. Social anxiety levels of traffic cops (Eskişehir Province Case). *Osmangazi University Journal*, 507(1): 3.
- Ozturk, A.S., 2007. The effect of sports on the socialization of orthopedic disabilities. (Master Thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Physical Education, Ankara.
- Palancı, M., 2004. A model study on social anxiety problems of university students. National Congress of Educational Sciences, Malatya, Turkey.
- Palancı, M. and Y. Ozbay, 2001. Social anxiety scale: Validity and reliability study. VI. National Psychological Counseling and Guidance Congress, Ankara, Turkey.
- Room, B., 2014. Investigation of optimism and aggression levels of students who do not and do not do sports in the 11-13 age group. (Master Thesis). Ondokuz Mayıs University, Institute of Health Sciences, Samsun.
- Sahin, G.N., 2011. The comparison of the levels of social supports, the subjective well being and self- disclosure of the students of university. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Dokuz Eylul University Institute of Educational Sciences, Izmir.
- Terzi, G., 2011. The comparison of self-acceptance levels of visually impaired students with and without active sports between the ages of 13-18. (Master Thesis Thesis) .Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Türkdoğan, T. and E. Duru, 2012. The role of meeting basic needs in predicting subjective well-being in university students. *Educational Sciences in Theory and Practice*, 12(4): 2429-2446.
- Tuzgol-Dost, M., 2005. Development of subjective well-being scale: Validity and reliability study. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 3(23): 103-110.
- Tuzgöl-Dost, M., 2007. Examining life satisfaction of university students according to some variables. *Pamukkale University Faculty of Education Journal*, 22(22): 132-143.
- Yıldırım, T., Y. Cırak and N. Konan, 2011. Social anxiety in teacher candidates. *Journal of İnönü University Faculty of Education*, 12(1): 85-100.