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The aim of the study was to discover the correlation between social physique anxiety levels and narcissism levels of the students of the school of the physical education and sports. A total of 308 students who studied at different academic departments of the school of the physical education and sports of Mustafa Kemal University participated in the study. In the study, Social Physique Anxiety Scale which was designed by Hart et al., adapted into Turkish by Mülazimoğlu and Aşçı (2006) was used to determine the Social Physique Anxiety level of students. The SPAS is a 12-item self-report inventory designed to measure the construct of SPA. It is a 5-point Likert type scale with items such as “I am comfortable with the appearance of my physique/figure.” Hart et al. found adequate construct validity, test-retest reliability (alpha = .82), and internal consistency (alpha = .90). The second instrument used in this study is Narcissistic Personality Inventory NPI which was designed by Dr. Ames et al. and adapted into Turkish by Atay. For the analyses of the data; Portable IBM SPSS Statistics v20 package program was used. “Spearman Correlation” analysis was employed to determine whether or not there was a correlation between social physique anxiety and narcissism. As a result, it was found out that there was significant correlation between Social Physique Anxiety level and Narcissistic Personality Inventory in terms of sub-dimension scores. It was noted that as the level of Social Physique Anxiety level increased their narcissism levels decreased.
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INTRODUCTION

The term narcissism is derived from Narcissus in Greek mythology that falls in love with his own image reflected in a pool of water and wasted his life watching this beautiful face reflected. According to the mythology; a despised lover of Narcissus, whose name was Ameinius, committed suicide with a sword. Ameinius’ evenge prayer was heard by a nymph, Nemesis. Using her power; she made Narcissus to fall in love with himself but on one condition: “Because he never loved anyone, he fell in love with himself”. One day, Narcissus bends down to drink water, sees his own image on water in a pool and falls in love with himself. He spends rest of his life longing
for this beloved. Believing that only death can save him from this pain; Narcissus at last ends his life by stabbing himself with a dagger (Ratay, 2003; cited by Atay, 2010).

Narcissism is a part of psychoanalytic discoveries; as such, it is inevitable phase of early human development. Babies see their self-love in the looking, words, caress of their mothers. It is the first phase of self-acceptance and self-love, later on it provides precursors of loving others and feeling of alterity. These early relations with objects are the psychic growth factors. Children identify themselves with what their mothers give. Narcissism of the children is marked by their parents’ narcissism (Morelli and Couderc, 2011).

In daily use, narcissism does not have positive connotations. According to Crompton (2010), narcissism is neither a concept nor a diagnosis. For Crompton, narcissism is an approach that helps us to recognize dimensions that define our personality. In other words, narcissism depicts a natural character among the people. We all need some amount of narcissism, selfishness and self-regarding so that we can do anything, feel better and make ourselves accepted. However, these characteristics are extremely and inevitably dominant in some people, which indicates a problem. Attractiveness of narcissism uncovers our narcissistic dispositions. People with strong narcissistic characteristics are those who are unhappy and have difficulty leading a family life (Crompton, 2010).

In the study of Pulver and Van der Waals conducted in 1911 and 1960, they took the term narcissism as one that connotates sexual perversion. In later studies, including the early childhood growth in the definition they discussed the term as a libidinal investment in memory, a kind of personal relations and a synonym of self-esteem (Akhtar and Thompson, 1982; cited by Atay, 2010).

The most significant feature of narcissism is that self (which includes the individual wholly as a perceived psychological and physical entity existing outside world: personality) is exceptionally protruded and interest in others reduces. Being examined scientifically, narcissism is seen both as a pathological and normal term. Yet, intensification of self-importance and increased self-interest—as much as to require a psychiatric treatment—result in pathologic narcissism and a personality disorder. Pathologic narcissists cannot love themselves and look down on themselves (Evren, 1997; cited by Timuroğlu, 2005). Someone with a narcissistic character identifies himself as follows:

"I show myself outside as one who has high self-confidence and strength, can do everything, is large-minded and is rather self-confident. Yet, internally, I always feel I behave wrong, I am not self-confident and fear looking into others’ eyes. I am always thinking of what if someone sees inside myself and understands how unconfident I am. I am stuck in the idea that I am naked and a tiny, insignificant piece of me is left if my mask slips. Then, I am very afraid of being abandoned, unimportant and boring person (someone not inspiring any interest) (Wardetzki, 2010).

To Twenge and Campbell (2010), in addition to discipline and education; another factor that incites narcissism is the mass media that presents celebrities as an ideal human model. Mass media programs demonstrate other dimensions of narcissism as materialism, extreme-competitiveness, self-exhibitionism obsession, quest for fame and exploitation of others for one’s own interest (Twenge and Campbell, 2010).

For Lasch (1979), each culture produces different models of child raising and socialization in line with criteria of that culture (cited by Crompoton, 2010). Using narcissism for the first time in psychology, Ellis (1898) described it as a condition in which sexual emotions experienced especially by women are orientated towards self-admiration (cited by Atay, 2009).

The German summary of Ellis’ article translated by Nacke in 1899 referred to narcissism, which drew the attention of Freud (Atay 2009). In the article published by Freud in 1910, he mentioned narcissism in the deep note and wrote his article on narcissism four years later. In his article, Freud discussed narcissism as a period of sexual development. In 1931, Freud defined narcissism as a personality type (Timuroğlu and İşcan, 2008).

Jones used pathologic narcissism term and defined psychological narcissism with such characteristics as over-appraisal of one’s own power and knowledge, strong fantasies, inability to be open to new knowledge, over-ambitiousness on being loved, praised and awards and not valuing others’ time (cited by Atay, 2009).

Throughout history and today, it has been important for people to have such characteristics as being fit, healthy and having muscular body and to leave good impressions on others. For people, being beautiful is associated with positive values while being ugly by negative values; which is supported by mass media and the imposed ideal body designs change people’s feelings and ideas, and affect their body perceptions (Yaman et al., 2008).

Social physique anxiety—being one of the concepts relating with one’s anxiety over physical appearance—is identified as anxieties and tensions about how one’s physical appearance is evaluated by others (Hart et al., 1989). Those who want to leave positive impressions on others organize their behaviors accordingly (Çepikkurt and Coşkun, 2010).

According to Russel (2002); people’s social physique anxiety increases when they think that others make negative evaluations on their physical images. Women experience social physique anxiety more than men. However, it is seen that men also undergo pressures of social physique anxiety, too (cited by Çepikkurt and Coşkun, 2010).

Social physique anxiety includes two subtitles: one is one’s body image dissatisfaction and the other one is expectation of negative evaluation about physical appearance by others. These two situations lead to social
anxiety among individuals (Doğan et al., 2011; Çepikkurt and Coşkun, 2010).

It is important not only how people perceive their own bodies but also how others perceive them. People want to leave positive impressions on others and accordingly organize their behaviors. Yet, some people are more worried about it than others. The anxiety that emerges when one’s physical appearance is evaluated by others is called social physique anxiety (SPA) (Hart et al., 1989). Russell (2002) argues that SPA occurs among the individuals as a result of the belief that others evaluate their physical appearance negatively. Women experience social physique anxiety more than men and anxiety experienced by them affects their behaviors (Davison and McCabe, 2005).

Today, it is noted that there is an increasing social pressure on men about the fact that they too should have and keep a certain body shape (Olivardia, 2001). When the written resources are examined, it is seen that there is a negative correlation between social physique anxiety and body image. In other words, people’s anxiety about physical appearance reduces as their satisfaction with their bodies increases while their anxiety about physical appearance increases as their satisfaction with their bodies reduces (Frederick and Morrison, 1996; Hausenblas and Mack, 1999; Krane et al., 2001; Mülazimoğlu and Aşçı, 2006).

One of the methods used by people to shape their body and to get the optimal and ideal body structure is physical activity and exercises (Altınbaş and Aşçı, 2005). With participation in physical activities, individuals acquire the chance to achieve both healthier bodies and new images. Besides, people can feel more positive feelings about their bodies. Many studies conducted suggest that those who are engaged in sports are more satisfied with their body images as compared with those who are not (Aşçı, 2004; Aşçı et al., 1993; Çök, 1990; Huddy et al., 1993; Mülazimoğlu and Aşçı, 2006).

Also, in situations where individuals who do sports are evaluated by others in comparison with those who do not sports, it is seen that these individuals who do sports feel less anxiety (Eklund and Crawford, 1994; Hausenblas and Mack, 1999; Mülazimoğlu and Aşçı, 2006). In the study of Davis (1992), eating behaviors of elite female athletes and non-athlete female individuals were compared in terms of whether or not they were satisfied with their body images and weights and it was found out that female athletes had abnormal eating behaviors and were more anxious about their body images and weights.

Davis also emphasized that athletes who are normally thinner than average people want to be much thinner, are not satisfied with their bodies and go on diets more than those who are of normal weight, non-athletes (Çepikkurt and Coşkun, 2010).

In light of the literature information above mentioned, the aim of the study was to explore the correlation between social physique anxiety levels and narcissism levels of the students of the school of the physical education and sports.

METHOD

Population sample

The population of the study was composed of the students who studied at the schools of the Physical Education and Sports of the Turkish universities.

The sample of the study was composed of a total of 308 students who were recruited with random sampling method and who studied at the school of the Physical Education and Sports of Mustafa Kemal University; 124 being female university students (40.3%) and 184 male university students (59.7%).

Data collection tool

Personal information form

The participants were given a personal information form designed by the researcher that addressed information about participants’ age, gender, academic department, number of brothers and sisters, parental status, place of residence, employment status, status of sports- doing and sportive branches.

Social Physique Anxiety Scale (SPAS)

In the study, Social Physique Anxiety Scale (SPAS) which was designed by Hart et al. (1989) and adapted into Turkish by Mülazimoğlu and Aşçı (2006) with 12 items and consisting of two subscales (Body Image Dissatisfaction BID and Expectation of Negative Evaluation ENE) was used. The items are responded with a 5 point likert scale. The lowest score is 12 while the highest score is 60. As the scores obtained from the scale increase, so does one’s anxiety over own appearance. In the two-factor structure, the scale’s test-retest correlation coefficient was 0.80 for factor 1 and factor 2 among the female students while it was 0.76 for factor 1 and 0.77 for factor 2 among the male students. Test-retest correlation coefficient of the total scale was 0.88 among the female students and 0.71 among the male students. In the two-factor structure, internal consistency coefficient was 0.77 for factor 1 and 0.69 for factor 2 among the female students while it was 0.75 for factor 1 and 0.68 for factor 2 among the male students. In the one-factor structure, internal consistency coefficient was 0.81 among the female students while 0.77 among the male students (Mülazimoğlu and Aşçı, 2006).

Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI)

Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) was developed in 1979 by Raskin and Hall and was consisted of 220 statements. Later, it was transformed into a scale of 54 items after internal consistency analyses were performed. Raskin and Terry removed some of the items as a result of item and factor analyses and Narcissistic Personality Inventory was designed with 40 items. The inventory was clustered into 7 subscales: exhibitionism, superiority, authority, entitlement, self-sufficiency, exploitativeness and vanity (Atay, 2009).

However, Ames et al. from the University of Columbia designed the final version of Narcissistic Personality Inventory with 16 questions in 2006. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Atay in 2009.
Thus, language and cultural equivalency of the scale was achieved and necessary reliability and validity tests were performed. In the first study done after Atay’s pilot implementation, scale’s Cronbach’s Alpha value was calculated as 0.57. Due to low reliability value, four statements which were detected to be negatively perceived and made no contribution to the scale were revised after correlation of each factor with the scale was examined. In the measurements done after the revision, scale’s Cronbach’s Alpha value increased to 0.652. As in the English form of NPI, questions in the Turkish form were also distributed to 6 factors: exhibitionism, superiority, authority, entitlement, self-sufficiency, exploitativeness (Atay, 2009). Total score of the NPI ranges between 0 and 16; while factor/subscale scores change between 0 and 2 in authority; 0 and 3 in exhibitionism; 0 and 3 in exploitativeness; 0 and 2 in entitlement; 0 and 3 in self-sufficiency; 0 and 3 in superiority. High scores indicate higher level of narcissism (Atay, 2009).

**Analyses of the data**

For the analyses of the data, Portable IBM SPSS Statistics v20 package program was used. One sample “Kolmogorov-Smirnov” test was employed in order to know whether or not the data followed a normal distribution and it was seen that the data did not follow a normal distribution. Later on, Anova-Homogenity of variance test was used in order to know whether or not the data were homogenous and it was seen that the data were not homogenous. Following this initial analysis, it was decided to use non-parametric test methods for the statistical analyses of the data and “Spearman Correlation” analysis was employed to determine whether or not there was a correlation between social physique anxiety and narcissism.

**FINDINGS**

In Table 1, distribution of the participants was given in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics. It was seen that 124 of the participants were female students (40.3%) while 184 of them were male students (59.7%). 55.8% of the group (n=172) were composed of those aged 21-23 years while 30.5% of the group (n=94) were composed of those aged 18-20 years. 105 of the students (34.1%) studied at sports management department, 73 students (23.7%) studied at the teaching department of physical education and sports, 68 students (22.1%) studied at training department and 62 students (20.1%) studied at recreation department. 8 students (2.6%) were the only child in the family, 39 students (12.7%) had one sister or brother, 61 students (19.8%) had two brothers and/or sisters, 86 students (27.9%) had three brothers and/or sisters and 114 students (37%) had ≥ four brothers and/or sisters. 242 of the participant students (78.6%) were not employed while 66 students (21.4%) were employed (part-time jobs, public sector, private sector, other). When the places of residents of the students were investigated, 245 students (79.6%) resided in student homes, dormitories and other places while 63 students resided with their families and relatives. Mothers and fathers of 267 students (86.7%) were alive and stayed together while mothers and fathers of 23 students (8.4%) were separated or divorced and 18 students (5.8%) lost their mothers or fathers. 199 of the participant students (94.6%) participated in sports regularly (jogging-running, basketball, swimming, tennis, volleyball, football, gymnastics, other) whereas 109 (35.4%) students did not participate in sports.

Table 2 demonstrated the distribution of the scores obtained from the subscales of Social Physique Anxiety Scale SPAS and Narcissistic Personality Inventory NPI by the students of the physical education and sports. It was found out that the students’ SPAS-Body Image Dissatisfaction BID score was 10.12±3.63 while SPAS-Expectation of Negative Evaluation ENE score was 19.56±6.81. The participant students’ Social Physique Anxiety Scale-SPAS total score was 29.68±8.06. When the participants were examined in terms of NPI-subscals, their scores were 1.05±0.75 for authority, 1.07±0.88 for exhibitionism, 1.44±0.88 for exploitativeness, 0.73±0.77 for entitlement, 1.59±1.01 for self-sufficiency, 0.94±0.84 for superiority; respectively. The participant students’ Narcissistic Personality Inventory NPI total score was 6.83±2.62.

In Table 3, students’ test results of Spearman Correlation performed to determine the correlation between Social Physique Anxiety levels and narcissism levels were presented. Although there was no significant correlation between Social Physique Anxiety levels and narcissism levels of the students in terms of total scores, there were significant correlations in terms of subscales.

It was discovered that there was a weak, negative and significant correlation between SPAS-Body Image Dissatisfaction BID and NPI-exploitativeness [r (308) = -0.232; p<0.01]. It was noted that as the level of Body Image Dissatisfaction increased their exploitativeness levels decreased but as the level of Body Image Dissatisfaction decreased their exploitativeness levels increased; which was regarded as a normal outcome for the narcissist individuals.

It was noted that a very weak, positive and significant correlation existed between SPAS-Body Image Dissatisfaction and NPI-entitlement[r (308) = 0,167; p<0,01]. In other words, depending on the increase or decrease in students’ body image dissatisfaction, their entitlement levels increased or decreased in parallel.

It was explored that a very weak, negative and significant correlation was found between SPAS-Expectation of Negative Evaluation ENE and NPI-exploitativeness [r (308) = -0.232; p<0.01]. In this regard; it may be interpreted that exploitativeness level of the students with high of Negative Evaluation was high; on the contrary; exploitativeness level of the students with low Expectation of Negative Evaluation was low.

It was found out that a very weak, positive and significant correlation existed between SPAS-Expectation of Negative Evaluation ENE and NPI-entitlement [r (308) = 0.145; p<0.05]. To put it differently, as the students’ Expectation of Negative Evaluation increased so did their
Table 1. Distribution of the students of the SPES in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics.

| Variable                  | Group                | F    | %    |
|---------------------------|----------------------|------|------|
| Gender                    | Female               | 124  | 40.3 |
|                           | Male                 | 184  | 59.7 |
|                           | Total                | 308  | 100.0|
|                           | 18-20                | 94   | 30.5 |
|                           | 21-23                | 172  | 55.8 |
| Age                       | 24-26                | 36   | 11.7 |
|                           | 27 ≥                 | 6    | 1.9  |
|                           | Total                | 308  | 100.0|
|                           | Teaching             | 73   | 23.7 |
|                           | Management           | 105  | 34.1 |
| Academic department       | Training             | 68   | 22.1 |
|                           | Recreation           | 62   | 20.1 |
|                           | Total                | 308  | 100.0|
|                           | One child            | 8    | 2.6  |
|                           | 1 brother/sister     | 39   | 12.7 |
| Number of brothers and sisters | 2 brothers and/ or sisters | 61     | 19.8 |
|                           | 3 brothers and/ or sisters | 86   | 27.9 |
|                           | 4 and more brothers and/ or sisters | 114 | 37.0 |
|                           | Total                | 308  | 100.0|
| Employment status         | No                   | 242  | 78.6 |
|                           | Part time            | 8    | 2.6  |
|                           | Public sector        | 3    | 1.0  |
|                           | Private sector       | 42   | 13.6 |
|                           | Other                | 13   | 4.2  |
|                           | Total                | 308  | 100.0|
|                           | With family          | 61   | 19.8 |
|                           | Student home         | 165  | 53.6 |
|                           | With relatives       | 2    | .6   |
| Place of residence        | At the dormitory     | 65   | 21.1 |
|                           | Other                | 15   | 4.9  |
|                           | Total                | 308  | 100.0|
|                           | Together             | 267  | 86.7 |
|                           | Mother died          | 2    | .6   |
|                           | Father died          | 16   | 5.2  |
| Parental status           | Separated            | 14   | 4.5  |
|                           | Divorced             | 9    | 2.9  |
|                           | Total                | 308  | 100.0|
|                           | Yes                  | 199  | 64.6 |
| Doing regular sports      | No                   | 109  | 35.4 |
|                           | Total                | 308  | 100.0|
|                           | Jogging-running      | 43   | 14.0 |
|                           | Basketball           | 28   | 9.1  |
|                           | Swimming             | 10   | 3.2  |
|                           | Tennis               | 22   | 7.1  |
| Sportive branch           | Volleyball           | 24   | 7.8  |
|                           | Football             | 50   | 16.2 |
|                           | Gymnastics           | 3    | 1.0  |
|                           | Other                | 19   | 6.2  |
|                           | Total                | 199  | 64.6 |
## Table 2. Descriptive statistics relating subscales of Social Physique Anxiety Scale and Narcissistic Personality Inventory

|                      | N  | Mean       | Std. Deviation | Minimum | Maximum |
|----------------------|----|------------|----------------|---------|---------|
| SPAS TOTAL           | 308| 29.6786    | 8.05583        | 12.00   | 58.00   |
| BID                  | 308| 10.1169    | 3.63380        | 5.00    | 23.00   |
| ENE                  | 308| 19.5617    | 6.81296        | 7.00    | 35.00   |
| Authority            | 308| 1.0455     | .74712         | .00     | 2.00    |
| Exhibitionism        | 308| 1.0747     | .88285         | .00     | 3.00    |
| Exploitativeness     | 308| 1.4416     | .88038         | .00     | 3.00    |
| Entitlement          | 308| .7338      | .76607         | .00     | 2.00    |
| Self-sufficiency     | 308| 1.5942     | 1.01498        | .00     | 3.00    |
| Superiority          | 308| .9448      | .84279         | .00     | 3.00    |
| NARCISSISM TOTAL     | 308| 6.8344     | 2.61825        | .00     | 14.00   |

SPAS: Social Physique Anxiety; BID: Body Image Dissatisfaction; ENE: Expectation of Negative Evaluation.

## Table 3. Correlation between social physique anxiety level and narcissism levels of the participants.

|                      | SPAS Total | BID | ENE | Authority | Exhibitionism | Exploitativeness | Entitlement | Self-sufficiency | Superiority | Narcissism Total |
|----------------------|------------|-----|-----|-----------|---------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|
| SPAS Total           | 1.000      |     |     |           |               |                  |             |                  |             |                  |
| BID                  | .490**     | .906** | .063 |            |               |                  |             |                  |             |                  |
| ENE                  | .114*      | .021 | .008 | .239**    | .214**        |                  |             |                  |             |                  |
| Authority            |           | -0.043 | .145 |           | .176**        | .080             | .176**      | .530**           |             |                  |
| Exhibitionism        |           | .254** | .157** | .060       | .101          | .272**           | .595**      |                  |             |                  |
| Exploitativeness     |           |       | .213** |           |              | .079             | .106        | .430**           |             |                  |
| Entitlement          |           |       |       | .079       | -.013         | .106             | .372**      |                  |             |                  |
| Self-sufficiency     |           |       |       |           |              | -.053            | .524**      |                  |             |                  |
| Superiority          |           |       |       |           |              | .118            | .523**      |                  |             |                  |
| NARCISSISM TOTAL     |           |       |       |           |              |                  |             |                  |             | 1.000            |

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), SPAS: Social Physique Anxiety, BID: Body Image Dissatisfaction, ENE: Expectation of Negative Evaluation

entitlement levels. On the contrary, as the students’ Expectation of Negative Evaluation decreased so did their entitlement levels.

It was discovered that a very weak, negative and significant correlation was found between SPAS-Expectation of Negative Evaluation and NPI-superiority[r (308) = 0.145; p<0.05]. Thus, it might be argued that superiority levels of the students with high Expectation of Negative Evaluation were low whereas superiority levels of the students with low Expectation of Negative Evaluation were high.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

It was found out that the participant students’ total score of Social Physique Anxiety Scale was 29.67±8.05, mean score of Body Image Dissatisfaction was 10.12±3.63 and mean score of Expectation of Negative Evaluation was 19.56±6.81. When the literature was examined, the study of Çepikkurt and Coşkun (2010) on dancer-students demonstrated that the participant students’ total score of Social Physique Anxiety Scale was 24.44±7.65, mean score of Body Image Dissatisfaction was 9.62±2.72 and mean score of Expectation of Negative Evaluation was 14.82±6.19 (Çepikkurt and Coşkun, 2010). The difference between our study and the study of Çepikkurt and Coşkun may be interpreted that dancer-students worried less about their physical image as compared to the SPES students, had higher level of physical self-confidence and were more satisfied with their physical image.

Again, another study done by Yaşarturk et al. on SPES
students indicated that the participant students’ total score of Social Physique Anxiety Scale was 27.00±7.96. The difference between the SPES students of two different universities may have resulted from the fact that these universities were located in different geographical regions and contained different natural and cultural structures (Yağırttürk et al., 2014).

In another study on Social Physique Anxiety of those who attended fitness centers, the participants’ mean score of Body Image Dissatisfaction was 14.61±3.60; which might mean that the participants were generally dissatisfied with their physical image. The participants’ mean score obtained from the second sub-scale was 13.82±5.32, which means that the participants’ expectation to be evaluated by others in terms of their physical image was not true. In general, it was told that the participants’ Social Physique Anxiety was not high (28.44±6.65) (Eren, 2012). It was seen that the findings of the study concurred with ours.

When narcissistic levels of the participants were evaluated in terms of subscales, their scores were 1.05±0.75 for authority, 1.07±0.88 for exhibitionism, 1.44±0.88 for exploitativeness, 0.73±0.77 for entitlement, 1.59±1.01 for self-sufficiency, 0.94±0.84 for superiority; respectively. The SPES students’ Narcissistic Personality Inventory total score was 6.83±2.62.

In a study undertaken by Tazegül on individual athletes, narcissistic levels of the athletes in terms of sportive branches were 7.21±2.58 for Boxing, 6.750±2.777 for greco-roman wrestling, 7.283±2.786 for weight lifting, 6.333±357 for freestyle wrestling, 6.533±2.849 for kick-boxing; respectively (Tazegül, 2013a). The fact that our study findings were higher than these individual sports – except weight lifting- was –we thought- because our study group was composed of SPES students of different sportive branches. In another study done by Tazegül on narcissism levels of female badminton players who actively played sports, it was reported that their Narcissistic Personality Inventory total score was 8.543±1.945 (Tazegül, 2013b).

The study of Elman and Mc Kelvie reported that footballers’ narcissism level was 19.4, basketballers’ narcissism level was 17.8 and non-athlete individuals’ narcissism level was 15.2 (Elman and Mc Kelvie, 2003). We were of the opinion that the most important reason that athletes had higher level of narcissistic scores might be that they had aesthetic and nice physics.

When the students’ Spearman Correlation test results were analyzed to determine the correlation between Social Physique Anxiety levels and narcissism levels; although there were no significant correlations between Social Physique Anxiety levels and narcissism levels of the students in terms of total scores, there were significant correlations in terms of subscales.

It was seen that there was a weak, negative and significant correlation between SPAS-Body Image Dissatisfaction of the students increased, their exploitativeness levels increased but as the level of Body Image Dissatisfaction decreased their exploitativeness levels increased; which is regarded as a normal situation for the narcissist individuals. Exploitativeness is considered one of the bad and unhealthy dimensions of narcissism (Atay, 2010). We thought that it was a normal behavior that narcissist individuals were less disturbed with their physical appearance but the increase in exploitativeness subscale was also an expected result.

It was found out that there was a very weak, positive and significant correlation between SPAS-Body Image Dissatisfaction and NPI-entitlement [r (308) = -0.167; p<0.01]. In other words, being in parallel with the increase or decrease in students’ body image dissatisfaction, their entitlement levels increased or decreased in parallel. Narcissist people adopt entitlement as a way to keep deprivation under control and believe that they deserve a special treatment and exaggerate their measures in order to keep inadequacy and insecurity feelings under control.

It was explored that a negative, weak, and significant correlation was found between SPAS-Expectation of Negative Evaluation and NPI-entitlement [r (308) = -0.232; p<0.01]. Accordingly, it may be concluded that exploitativeness level of the students with high expectation of negative evaluation was high; on the contrary; exploitativeness level of the students with low expectation of negative evaluation was low. The reason may be that although narcissist individuals seem to be self-confident, charismatic and persuasive, they in fact protect themselves against insecure situations and secure their positions through - so to say- devaluating, manipulating and exploiting others: in other words, it is another way to escaping from realities (Soyer et al., 1999).

It was detected that a very weak, positive and significant correlation existed between SPAS-Expectation of Negative Evaluation and NPI-entitlement [r (308) = 0.145; p<0.05]. In other words, as the students’ expectation of negative evaluation (anxiety) increased so did their entitlement levels; on the contrary; as the students’ expectation of negative evaluation (anxiety) decreased so did their entitlement levels. It may be suggested that students emphasized entitlement as a response to expectation of negative evaluation. Entitlement is a quality that prevents forgiving and with the argument of the scientists (Twenge and Campbell 2003; Hochwarter et al., 2007) who propose that entitlement is primarily associated with unsteady self-esteem, giving aggressive responses against threats and externalization of emotional reactions; it may be concluded that students perceive negative evaluation as a threat/aggression and thus develop a reactionary response.

It was discovered that a very weak, negative and significant correlation existed between students’ SPAS-Expectation of Negative Evaluation and NPI-superiority [r (308) = 0.145; p<0.05]. Accordingly, it might be suggested
that superiority levels of the students with high expectation of negative evaluation were low whereas superiority levels of the students with low expectation of negative evaluation were high. Superiority is one of the most dangerous dimensions of narcissism (Reidy et al., 2008). For Atay, people continue their superiority feelings so that they can overcome inferiority feeling especially when their glorious ego is threatened (Atay, 2010).

Gençtan argues that in narcissism, individuals’ self-perception weakens and is affected by the feedbacks from their inner status and environments (Gençtan, 1993). We were of the opinion that in our study findings; the fact that there was a correlation between SPAS-Body Image Dissatisfaction and SPAS- Expectation of Negative Evaluation supported the above-mentioned argument. In this sense, it may be thought that the meaning placed by the individuals on their physical image and their beliefs about what others think of their physical image play a key role in their narcissistic structure.

Findings indicating a correlation between SPAS subscales and narcissism are in line with the view arguing that narcissism is a protective shell developed by individuals to protect themselves (Kiraz, 2011).

The limitations of the study were that the findings obtained were relational rather than causal and self-rated and self-perception tools were used.

People generally wish to be evaluated well and positively by others. That is, they wish to have a satisfying and pleasant body image. Social physique anxiety of those without satisfying and pleasant body images increases; which in turn affects their life styles (Leary et al., 1999). Recently, the number of the studies on social physique anxiety has increased but those studies investigating the correlation between social physique anxiety and narcissism are rare. Therefore, it is recommended that conducting more studies with larger and different sample groups will be beneficial (Koparan et al., 2010).
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