



CY-ICER 2014

A Research Of Relation Between Undergraduates' Recognising Parent Attitudes With Psychological Well-Being

Kasım TATLILIOĞLU*

Bingol University

Abstract

Psychological well-being, a person's life goals, whether it is aware of the potential, involves the quality of relationships with other people. The subjective well-being, an individual's cognitive assessment of life associated with the presence of positive emotions and negative emotions can be defined as the absence of. In this research, the relationship between parent attitudes that undergraduates recognize and their state of well-being is examined.

© 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of CY-ICER 2014.

Keywords: Undergraduate; parent attitude; psychological well-being; democratic attitude; authoritarian attitude.

1. INTRODUCTION

recently, the research related to mental health mostly has been seen with in lack of psychological sings like mental health, anxiety, depression etc. and they approached to the incident in this aspects. However, this kind of approach could not sufficiently explain the being well, well-being and the other concepts. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines the health with not only illness and malformation but also with individual's a complete well-being form in the aspects of physical, mental and social (Tanhan; 2007; Özen, 2010). Some researchers and in various publications, although the psychological well-being, subjective well-being, happiness, life satisfaction, emotional well-being and well-being are not the exactly the same but they are used associating with each other (Gülaçtı, 2009; Cenkseven & Akbaş, 2007). Even though the concept of psychological well-being was first put forward by Bradburn in 1960s, the concept of psychological well-being that Bradburn had addressed is closer to the concept of subjective well-being. Psychological well-being has been defined in various ways. Ryff (1995), defined the psychological

* Corresponding author. Kasım TATLILIOĞLU Tel.: +0532 8756483

E-mail address: kasımtatl@gmail.com

well-being as “positive self-perception, good relationship with people, environmental dominance, autonomy, the meaning of life and emotions in the direction of healthy development” ; Keyes & Ryff's Smott (2002), defined it as “related to an individual's life purpose whether it is aware of the potential and the quality of communication established with other people” ; Ryff & Keyes (1995), defined it as “the person himself and his history, the capacity of growth and development, the purpose of its life tendency and meaningfulness, the dominations to the its life and the outside world, and finally a holistic assessment with the independence of the psychological functioning which regarding the independence” ; Myers and Diener (1995), defined it as “the presence of positive emotions, lack of the negative emotions and life satisfaction” ; Bradburn (1969) and Diener (1984), defined it as “if the person is aware of his life purpose and his potential and the quality of relationship with other people”. According to Dislen (2010), has a strong relationship with concept of self-realization, self-worth, self-confidence, self-esteem and self-efficacy.

Subjective well-being is a different case then psychological well-being. Diener (2001); Diener, 1984) defines the subjective well-being as a “positive mental health”; Myers (2000), defines it as a subjective evaluation in the field of individual's life cognitive and emotional aspects”; Myers (2000), Myers and Diener (1995); Lucas, Diener & Suh (1996), have seen the subjective self-being as an assessment related with an individual's life and a result of the emotional response to the events. Many researchers have agreed on the consensus that subjective well-being is a complex matter with cognitive dimensions in addition to emotional dimensions (Dilmaç & Bozgeyikli, 2009; Yavuz, 2006).

Psychological well-being model has been developed by Ryff (1995, 1989a, 1989b); Jung (1993) had seen it as “formulation of individuation”, Roger(1961), had seen it as “view of the fully functioning person”; Allport (1961), had seen it as “conception of maturity”; Maslow (1968), had seen it as “conception of self-actualization”; Buhler (1935), had seen it as a “basic life tendencies”; and Jahoda (1958) had seen it as a “ positive criteria of mental health” (Akt: Çeçen & Cenkseven, 2007; Cenkseven & Sarı, 2009; Gürel: 2009). Ryff (1989a, 1989b); Ryff ve Keyes (1995); Ryff, Magee, Kling & Wing (1999); Synder & Lopez (2002); Keyes, Smotkin ve Ryff (2002), adopted "*Multidimensional Psychological Well-Being Model*". These dimensions are given below:

Self-accept: According to Ryff (1989a, 1989b, 1995), and Ryff and others (1999), being an important feature of positive psychological function self-accept is putting on individual's himself a positive attitude. According to Akin (2008), self-accept is the self-actualization, being in function at the top-level, having positive attitudes towards individual's himself, thinking positive things about past and current cases and accepting the all positive and negative features.

Positive Relations with Others: According to Ryff (1989a, 1989b); Ryff (1995); Ryff & Singer (1996), the positive relations with others is to develop the relationship based on intimate and trust to other people, behaving empathetic and compassionate against them and being aware of responsibilities towards to other people. Adler, Rogers and other theorists expressed that needs of a warm and loving relationship is a part of human nature (Özen, 2010). According to Lachman (2004); Makus and others (2004), between the middle-aged Americans, there is strong consensus about that between well-being and having positive relationship with others (parents, spouse and children) has a significant relationship (Akt: Santrock, 2011).

Environmental Domination: According to Ryff and friends (1999), environmental domination is the ability to editing the environment to himself or himself to the environment in order to eliminate the psychological and physical needs and regulate individual's environment itself. According Doğan (2012), environmental domination can effectively take advantage of the its environment in accordance with the individual's demands and needs and uses the possibilities as needed.

Purpose of Life: People always naturally want to know in which society they are in, need to be known and feel that they are the members of that community. According the Ryff (1989a; 1989b), the purpose of life is to have the sense of purposefulness and a direction in this life. According to Fromm (2003), being aware of person's own consciousness helps to that person realizes the time span of the past, present and the future; According to Frankl (1994), the fundamental basis of the human being is to sense of meaning.

Individual Development: According to Ryff and his friends (1999), individual development is the positive reviews related to the past life and the individual himself. According to Rogers, individual development is an intrinsic motive and it has the highest level of psychological functionality. Individuals to achieve their potentials is to use them properly and evaluate the self-development.

Autonomy: Ryff (1989a, 1989b), explains the autonomy with concepts such as “ make their own decisions, freedom, internal focus of control, individualization and the internal regulation of behaviour”. On the other hand, Ryan (1993), indicates that individual himself doesn't have to feel to behave and think according to social tradition,

to make a decisions through their own internal mechanism without being dependent on the others and being needed for their approval, to regulate their own behaviour and being able to live without being dependent on social structure. According to Christopher (1999), the meaning and the structure of the autonomy may vary from culture to culture and individuals are grown more autonomous in western cultures. Recently, social psychologists started to show interest in the factors which affects peoples well-being cases (Clare, 1983; akt: Yeşiltepe, 2011).

Method

Participant

Research was conducted on university students who were 119(56%) female and 95(44%) male on a total of 214 are studying in different departments of Bingol University in 2011-2012 academic year. 92 of the participants are first grade, 80 of them are second grade and 42 of them are third grade students. 40 of the participants in field crops, 37 of them in literature, 32 of them in theology, 65 of them in philosophy, 21 of them in sociology and 19 of them are studying in the department of horticulture.

Measures

In this research, data collection tool was applied with Personal Information Form developed by Bacanlı (1997), and Psychological Well-being Scale developed by Ryff's (1989a, 1989b).

Socio-Economic Level Scale:

In the form of personal information, in order to demonstrate socio-economic status of the participant students who joined to this research Socio-Economic Status Scale which was developed by Bacanlı (1997), was ranked with eliminating some unsuitable items and included some updated items for the purpose of research.

Scale of Psychological Well-Being: As a data collection tool was used with Cenkseven (2004), which developed by Ryff (1989), and Scale of Psychological well-being Scale developed by Akın (2008), and used in his work called Validity and Reliability. Ryff (1989), has developed this scale aims to measure the level of their psychological well-being and its scale was based on multi-dimensional structural model. Scale of Psychological Well-Being takes the example of psychological well-being model uses the scale based on with total 84 which size of each of six sub-dimensions and consisting of 14 items. The lowest score is 84 and the highest score is 504 which can be taken from the scale. This measuring tool is a scale based on to giving information about self- report of person and measures the properties of the structure of psychological well-being. This scale has the six way rating with (1) strongly disagree, (2) Somewhat disagree, (3) Very few disagree, (4) Very little agree, (5) Mildly agree, (6) Totally agree and approximately half of items which has a place on each sub-scale are coded reverse.

Procedure and Data Analyses: All the participants joined to this research voluntary basis. The purpose of the research has been explained to all students who participated in this research. After having the collection of the obtained data which was administered to all participants of the scale has been uploaded to SPSS in the computer by coding. In the analysis of the obtained data IBM SPSS Statistics Program has been used. In this research, the statistical techniques such as descriptive statistics, analysis of Variance and LCD multiple comparison test have been used.

Results

The findings relating to the results obtained from the research have been shown in tables below:

Table 1: The descriptive statistics of the "Autonomy" rates perceived different paternal attitudes of the university students

Paternal attitudes	N	\bar{X}	Standard Deviation
Democratic	158	47,59	5,52
Dominant	28	46,20	5,64
Permissive	34	47,79	5,85
Unconcerned	1	43	-
Incoherent	4	46,41	5,56

Total	226	47,41	5,56
-------	-----	-------	------

Table 2: The analysis of variance Table regarding the comparison “Autonomy” rates perceived different paternal attitudes of the university students

Source of variance	Total of square	Sd	Average of square	F	P
Between groups	73,587	4	18,397	,589	,671
Intra-group	6905,143	221	31,245		
Total	6978,730	225			

As you can see in Table 1 above shows us the democratic, dominant, permissive, unconcerned and incoherent perceived paternal attitudes, the average of university students grades and their standard deviation; and the results of the one-way analysis of variance which were applied on these values can be seen in Table 2. It has been seen that there isn't any significant differences in the result of variance analysis which was done in order to determine the differences between averages of autonomy points about the perceived paternal attitudes of the university students ($F_{4,221} = ,589$, $p > .05$).

Table 3: The descriptive statistics grades of “Environmental Sovereignty” about perceived paternal attitudes of the university students

Paternal attitudes	N	\bar{X}	Standard Deviation
Democratic	158	49,54	7,24
Dominant	29	47,27	6,45
Permissive	34	50,88	6,40
Unconcerned	1	44	-
Incoherent	4	47,50	6,55
Total	226	49,38	7,03

Table 4: The analysis of variance Table regarding the comparison “Environmental Domination” rates perceived different paternal attitudes of the university students

Source of variance	Total of square	Sd	Average of square	F	P
Between groups	252,140	4	63,035	1,279	,279
Intra-group	10889,595	221	49,274		
Total	11141,735	225			

As you can see in Table 3 above shows us the democratic, dominant, permissive, unconcerned and incoherent perceived paternal attitudes, the average of university students grades and their standard deviation; and the results of the one-way analysis of variance which were applied on these values can be seen in Table 4. It has been seen that there isn't any significant differences in the result of variance analysis which was done in order to determine the differences between averages of environmental domination points about the perceived paternal attitudes of the university students ($F_{4,221} = 1,279$, $p > .05$).

Table 5: The descriptive statistics grades of “Personal Development” about perceived paternal attitudes of the university students

Paternal attitudes	N	\bar{X}	Standard Deviation
Democratic	158	51,76	7,50
Dominant	29	51,44	6,85
Permissive	34	53,70	6,52

Unconcerned	1	53	-
Incoherent	4	50,25	5,12
Total	226	51,99	7,23

Table 6: The analysis of variance Table regarding the comparison “Personal Development” rates perceived different paternal attitudes of the university students

Source of variance	Total of square	Sd	Average of square	F	P
Between groups	129,679	4	32,420	,615	,652
Intra-group	11649,317	221	52,712		
Total	11778,996	225			

As you can see in Table 5 above shows us the democratic, dominant, permissive, unconcerned and incoherent perceived paternal attitudes, the average of university students grades and their standard deviation; and the results of the one-way analysis of variance which were applied on these values can be seen in Table 4. It has been seen that there isn't any significant differences in the result of variance analysis which was done in order to determine the differences between averages of personal development points about the perceived paternal attitudes of the university students ($F_{4-221}=,615$, $p>.05$).

Table 7: The descriptive statistics grades of “Positive relation with others” about perceived paternal attitudes of the university students

Paternal attitudes	N	\bar{X}	Standard Deviation
Democratic	158	50,96	8,54
Dominant	29	47,17	5,82
Permissive	34	52,23	6,96
Unconcerned	1	44	-
Incoherent	4	44,75	7,32
Total	226	50,53	8,11

Table 8: The analysis of variance Table regarding the comparison “Positive relations with others” rates perceived different paternal attitudes of the university students

Source of variance	Total of square	Sd	Average of square	F	P
Between groups	632,436	4	158,109	2,462	,046
Intra-group	14189,847	221	64,207		
Total	14822,283	225			

As you can see in Table 7 above shows us the democratic, dominant, permissive, unconcerned and incoherent perceived paternal attitudes, the average of university students grades and their standard deviation; and the results of the one-way analysis of variance which were applied on these values can be seen in Table 8. The LSD multiple comparison test results were done in order to determine the reason of these differences from which paternal attitudes and it has been seen that the difference between the grade averages of the participants who detect the democratic paternal attitudes ($\bar{X}=50,96$, $Ss=8,54$) and the grade averages of the participants who detect the dominant paternal attitudes ($\bar{X}=47,17$, $Ss=5,82$). According to this result, it is told that the participants with the perceived democratic paternal attitudes have more grades on the relation with others when its is compared to the participants who are dominant.

Table 9: The descriptive statistics grades of “Life Purposes” about perceived paternal attitudes of the university students

Paternal attitudes	N	\bar{X}	Standard Deviation
Democratic	158	48.84	6,34

Dominant	29	48,51	6,81
Permissive	34	50,32	5,15
Unconcerned	1	53	-
Incoherent	4	48,50	4,65
Total	226	49,03	6,19

Table 10: The analysis of variance Table Regarding the comparison “Life Purposes” rates perceived different paternal attitudes of the university students

Source of variance	Total of square	Sd	Average of square	F	P
Between groups	86,990	4	21747	,562	,691
Intra-group	8558,727	221	38,727		
Total	8645,717	225			

As you can see in Table 9 above shows us the democratic, dominant, permissive, unconcerned and incoherent perceived paternal attitudes, the average of university students grades and their standard deviation; and the results of the one-way analysis of variance which were applied on these values can be seen in Table 10. It has been seen that there isn't any significant differences in the result of variance analysis which was done in order to determine the differences between averages of life purposes points about the perceived paternal attitudes of the university students ($F_{4-221}=,562, p>.05$).

Table 11: The descriptive statistics grades of “Self-accept” about perceived paternal attitudes of the university students

Paternal attitudes	N	\bar{X}	Standard Deviation
Democratic	158	47,22	6,63
Dominant	29	45,55	6,89
Permissive	34	46,02	6,99
Unconcerned	1	47	-
Incoherent	4	43,25	6,13
Total	226	46,76	6,70

Table 12: The analysis of variance Table regarding the comparison “Self-accept” rates perceived different paternal attitudes of the university students

Source of	Total of square	Sd	Average of square	F	P
Between	144,407	4	36,102	,80	,527
Intra-group	9978,690	221	45,152		
Total	10123,097	225			

As you can see in Table 11 above shows us the democratic, dominant, permissive, unconcerned and incoherent perceived paternal attitudes, the average of university students grades and their standard deviation; and the results of the one-way analysis of variance which were applied on these values can be seen in Table 12. It has been seen that there isn't any significant differences in the result of variance analysis which was done in order to determine the differences between averages of self-accept points about the perceived paternal attitudes of the university students ($F_{4-221}=,800, p>.05$).

Discussion

When reviewing the literature on the concept of psychological well-being, the study of psychological well-being had been seen to be very little. Considering both the national and international literature, it has not been found the research which doesn't explain good enough the university students' psychological well-being. Many of variables effect on psychological well-being (Tatlılıoğlu, 2012). According the result of research which conducted by Kocayörük (2010), in case of psychological well-being of adolescents and winning this parents have a significant role during the adolescence; according to results of the research conducted by Aydın (1999), on university students

indicate positive effects on psychological well-being of students who perceived social support in family; according to Gençöz and Özkale (2004), appreciative and supportive social relationship and social support are effective on psychological well-being of individuals and feeling good about themselves; according to the result of the research done by Cirhinlioğlu (2006), styles of parents and lack of social support are effective on the psychological well-being of individuals and effected negatively; according to research findings done by Güler-Yavuz & Gazioğlu-İşmen (2008), on university students, the most important variables are that self-esteem effects positive feeling, psychiatric symptoms effect negative feeling and empathic tendency effects life satisfaction; according to result of research related to subjective well-being and five-factor personality features on university students, it has been found significant negative relationship between the neurotic personality trait and subjective well-being. It has been found significant positive relationship between personality traits such as extroversion, responsibility, humility and eager to experience. In this field, studies have shown the relation has positive effect on the secure relationship and secure attachment are associated with harmony and psychological well-being, developing the positive social relations, managing the emotions, arranging the emotions and dealing with the development tasks etc. (Elicker, Englund & Sroufe, 1992; Doyle & Markiewicz, 2005; Grossman & Grossman, 1991; Kobak, 1999; Srouf, Egeland, & Krautzer, 1990; akt: Kocayörük: 2010). In conclusion, the literature which is parallel within this study indicates that a democratic paternal attitudes has a significant effect on the psychological well-being. The research conducted on the psychological well-being is important to understand the etymology, development and results of the psychological disorders. Nowadays, besides lack of mental health and psychological problems, it has been emphasized the importance of having a positive psychological functions, feeling good himself and looking at the events and situations with the positive way.

References

- Akın, Ahmet (2008). *The Scales of Psychological Well-being: A Study of Validity and Reliability*. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice 8 (3), 721-750.
- Aydın, D. (1999). *Social network composition, social support and psychological well-being in first year METU students: A longitudinal investigation*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Braudburn, N. (1969). *The Structure Psychological Well-Being*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Cenkseven, F. (2004). *Examining the Predictors of Subjective and Psychological Well-Being of University Students*. Doctoral Dissertation, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.
- Cenkseven, F. & Akbaş, T. (2007). *Examining the Predictors of Subjective and Psychological Well-Being of University Students*. Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal, 3 (27), 43-65.
- Cenkseven, F. & Sari, M. (2009). *The Quality of School Life and Burnout as Predictors of Subjective Well-Being among Teachers*. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice 9 (3), 1223-1236.
- Christopher, J.C. (1999). *Suating Psychological Well-Being: Explopring The Cultural Roots of its Theory and Research*. Journal of Counseling & Development, 72 (2), 141-153.
- Cirhinlioğlu, F. G. (2006). *The Relationships among Shame Proneness, Religious Orientations, Self-Construals, Psychological Well-Being Within a University Student Group*. Doctoral Dissertation, Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Çeçen, R. & Cenkseven, F. (2007). *Psychological Well-Being In Predicting Loneliness Among University Students*. Çukurova Üniversitesi, The Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, 16 (2), 109-118.
- Deiner, E. (1984). *Subjective Well-Being*. Psychological Bulletin, Urbana-University of Illionis at Champaign, 95 (3), 542-575.
- Deiner, E. (2001). *Subjective Well-Being: The Science of Happiness and a Proposal for a National Index*. American Psychologist, 55 (1), 35-45.
- Dilmaç, B. & Bozgeyikli (2009). *A Research on Subjective Well-Being and Decision Making of Teacher Candiadates*. Erzincan University, The Journal of Education Faculty, 11 (1), 171-187.
- Dişlen, G. (2010). *Students' and Teachers' Perception On The Relationship Between Learner Autonomy And The Psychological Well Being The Elt Context*. Master's Thesis. Çukurova University, Institute Of Social Sciences, Adana.
- Doğan, T. (31 Ağustos 2012). *Psychological well-being and well-being therapy*. www.internetnews.com/psychological well-being.
- Doğan, T. (2013). *The Five Factor Personality Traits and Subjective Well-Being*. The Journal of Doğuş University, 14 (1), 55-64.
- Gençöz, T. & Özlale, Y. (2004). *Direct and İndirect Effects of Social Support on Psychological Well-Being*. The Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 32 (5), 449-458.
- Gülaçtı, F. (2009). *The Effect of Group Guidance Program Based on Social Skill Training on the Levels of Students' Social Skill, Subjective and Psychological Well-Being*. Doctoral Thesis, University, Institute of Social Sciences, Erzurum.
- Güler-Yavuz, Ç. & Gazioğlu-İşmen, A.E. (2008). *Subjective Well-Being, Psychiatric Symptoms and Some Other Characteristic Properties among the Students of Guidance and Psychological Counselling*. Dokuz Eylül University, The Journal of Buca Education Faculty, 23, 107-114.
- Gürel, A.G. (2009). *Effects of Thinking Styles and Gender on Psychological Well-Being*. Master Thesis. Middle East Technical University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Keyes, M.L.C. , Smotkin, D. & Ryff, D.C. (2002). *Optimizing Well-Being: The Empirical of Two Traditions*. Journal of Personality and School Psychology, 82 (6), 1007-1022.
- Kocayörük, E. (2010). *Pathways to Emotional Well-Being and Adjustment in Adolescence: The Role of Parent Attachment and Competence*. International online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2 (3), 719-737.

- Lucas, R.E., Diener, E., Suh, E. (1996). *Discriminant Validity of Well-Being Measures*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 616–628.
- Myers, D.G., Diener, E. (1995). *Who is happy?*. Psychological Science, 6 (1), 10-17.
- Ozen, Y. (2010). *Personal Responsibility in the Context of Creating Subjective and Psychological Well-Being (A social Psychological Assesment)*. Dicle University, The Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, (2) 4, 46-58.
- Ryan, R. M. (1993). *Agency and Organization: Intrinsic Motivation, Autonomy, and the Self in Psychological Development*. J. E. Jacobs (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Developmental perspectives on motivation, 40, 1-56.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989a). *Happiness is Everything, or is it? Explorations on the Meaning of Psychological Well-Being*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57 (6), 1069- 1081.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989b). *Beyond Ponce de Leon and Life Satisfaction: New Directions in Quest of Successful Aging*. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 12, 35-55.
- Ryff, C.D. (1995). *Psychological Well-Being in Adult Life*. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4 (4), 99-104.
- Ryff, C.D. & Keyes, C.L.M. (1995). *The Structure of Psychological Well-Being Revisited*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69 (4), 720-728.
- Ryff, C. D. & Singer, B. (1996). *Psychological Well-Being: Meaning, Measurement, and Implications for Psychotherapy Research*. Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 65, 14-24.
- Ryff, C.D., Magee, J.W., Kling, C.K., Wing, H.E. (1999). *Forging Macro-Micro Linkages in the Study of Psychological Well-Being*. The Self and Society in Aging Processes. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Santrock, J. W. (2011). *Life-Span Development*. (13th edition). Galip Yüksel (Translate Ed.). Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Synder, C.R. & Lopez, S.J. (2002). *Handbook of Positive Psychology*. Oxford University Press.
- Tanhan, F. (2007). *The Effects of Coping with Death Anxiety Education Programme on Death Anxieties and Psychological Well-Beings*. Doctoral Thesis. Ankara University, Institute of Education Sciences, Ankara.
- Tatlılioğlu, K. (2012). *A Research Of Relation Between University Students' Psychological Well Being With The Number of Brothers*. Turkish Studies, 7 (4), 2857-2873.
- Yeşiltepe, S.S. (2011). *Investigation Of Teacher's Martial Adjustment Terms Of Psychological Well Being And Some Of Variables*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.