International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2015, 7 (4), 128-139

iojes
www.iojes.net

International Online Journal of Educational Sciences

ISSN: 1309-2707

The Examination of the Secondary School Students' Levels of Psychological Well-Being in Terms of Some Variables

Ünal TÜRKÇAPAR[1]

1Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam UniversitySchool of Physical Education and Sports

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 03.06.2015
Received in revised form 17.08.2015
Accepted 12.08.2015
Available online 12.09.2015

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the secondary school students' psychological well-being in terms of some variables. The quantitative survey method was used in this study. Study group in this research consists of 381 students who are studying in private and state schools in during the 2014-2015 academic year. The data was collected by using "Personal Information Forms", developed by the researcher. Also to determine the psychological well-beingof the students, the 42-items version of "Psychological Well-Being Scales" (PİOÖ) which was developed by Ryff (1989), revised by Ryff and Keyes (1995), and adapted by Akın et al. (2012) was used. To analyze the data obtained from this study, various inferential analyses tests such as T test, (Kruskal Wallis), LSD, (Scheffe), U test and ANOVA were used ($p<0.05$).According to the results gathered from the research, in terms of gender, only in the autonomysub-dimension there is a significant difference in favor of males; in terms of socioeconomic variable, there is a significant difference against those who has low socioeconomic levels; in terms of the variants of attitudes of family, there is a significant difference in favor of those whose parents withdemocratic attitude; in terms of academic achievement, there is a significant difference in favor of high academic achievement for those whose psychological well-being is high; in terms of health variables, there is a significant difference in favor of thosewho reported health was important to them; in terms of groups' doing sports, exercise and etc. variables, there is a significant difference in favor of those who do sports and exercise.

© 2015 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:
Psychological well-being, secondary school, sport

Introduction

For most of the people, health and happiness are the most important goalsin life. Faced with lots of crises in ones life, the basic problem of the individual is to overcome those crises and adapt the new situations. In this process an individual can be harmed emotionally, socially, and psychologically and each time the person adapts, they are met with a new crisis. During these challenges, the individual will continue to learn and develop themselves. This process plays a critical role in determining a person's well being and ability to function in society.

[1] Corresponding author's address:Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University
Telephone:05056266887
Fax:0344 280 21 90
e-mail:turkcaparunal@hotmail.com
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2015.04.010

© 2015International Online Journal of Educational Sciences (IOJES) is a publication of Educational Researches and Publications Association (ERPA)

What is known as a good healthy life in daily language, the concept of well-being, is expressed as "subjective well-being" (Diener, 2000), "psychological well-being" (Ryff, 1989; Ryff- Keyes, 1995), "happiness" (Lyubomirsky- Lepper, 1999),"health and happiness" (Pargament, 2005), or "quality of life" (Frisch et all., 1992). In psychological studies it is generally labelled as "mental health" or "psychological health" (Diener et al., 2003; Seligman, 2002). Considering with the psychological functioning approach, well-beingfocuses on living life fully and deeply to retrieve satisfaction and conceptually it refers to the "psychological well-being" (Deci & Ryan; 2008). Psychological well-being is a multidimensional concept, which makes difficult to define it and prevent it to be clearly defined (Akın, 2009).

In every timeperiod, various ideas and perceptions were created about humans' well being based on the paradigms belonging to that period. For example, Erikson explained well-being with his psycho-social theory by emphasizing the necessary tasks that an individual has to do in each his or her age. Mashlow's self actualization theory is alsoa good example of this. Despite those theories, there is no clear conclusion about this topic and they just give information about their respective time periods. Although there is a controversy on what well-being is, in general it can be said that it is related to psychological health (Tanhan, 2007). In every era, concerning with the people's well-being, different ideas, perceptions revealed connected with the information for that period (Ekşioğlu, 2011).

Individual's well-being is defined as having self-control, high self-esteem and optimistic attitude (Block & Kremen, 1996), happiness, individual's satisfaction with life and the level of self-actualization(Diener, 1984); positive attitude towards one's self-respect or one's future and being strong emotionally (Bonanno, 2005; Connor, 2006), reduce the depressive symptoms and their well being level (Gençöz ve Özlale, 2004).

Psychologically healthy people respect everyone's goals and emotions and they also have a social interest. They are individuals who are not afraid of where they are and the negativities of the situations (Lindzey, 1973; as cited in Gülaçtı, 2009). According to psychologically well-being individuals, balancing the feelings of inadequacy without exaggeration it with upmanship and being able to develop a way of life approved by society are important for psychological health (Ewen, 2003; as cited in Anli, 2011).

The questioning of "what is thegood life" and "the will to have a good life" started the debates on psychological well-being. These debates and assessments also caused a controversy on how to use the concepts related with positive psychological health based on psychological well-being. In some research, as a consequence of various perspectives, concepts such as psychological well-being, subjective well-being, happiness, life satisfaction, emotional well-being and being well have frequently been used interchangeably and their well being compared with one another caused a controversy. Even though theseconcepts are related to each other in emphasizing on positive psychological health, they are different in their approaches to well-being (Dost, 2006). It has been accepted that there are two basic paradigms on which the differences in these concept interpretations are based. One of them is the concept of "eudaimonic" focusing on pragmatism and the other one is the concept of "hedonic" based on pleasure (Keyes, Shmotkin & Ryff, 2002; Ryan & Deci, 2001).

Huppert, Baylis and Keverne (2004) presented a new concept related with well being and described it as a positive and sustainable situation which enables individuals, communities and nations to grow and develop. This means that the concept of well being which reflects positive psychological, physical and social situations, accures at the individual level. Positive psychological stuations can be exemplified with emotions like happiness and satisfaction; with attitudes like generousity and empathy; or with cognitive processes like mental competence, interest, and motivation. The positive social situations are comprised of fulfilling social

bonds and loving relationships, and the positive physical situations are described with aliveness and physical competence.

Psychology is not just an area where the pathology is studied, but also is an area where individual strengths and virtues are also studied (Selingerman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Ryff (1989a) has criticized the first studies on well-being for their relying on random results and their lack of theoretical structure. It is concluded that this study is important for its contribution to the literature of positive psychology in our country and for studying a relatively new concept in the field of positive psychology in our country when it is considered that there are a few studies in our country depending on Ryff's (1989a) approach which is evaluated in the positive psychology literature. In addition, in terms of clarifying our knowledge about what is good, studies being done in positive psychology are thought to be important when considered that understanding the meaning of what is being sick is not enough to understand what is being well.

Method

Thisresearch paper is a descriptive study which aims to investigate the psychological well-being levels of secondary school students. The population of the research comprised 381 students (184 in private schools, 197 in public schools) in Kahramanmaraş province. Methodology of this research is survey research method.

Instrument

The data was collected by using the “Personal Information Forms”, developed by the researcher to determine students’ demographic features. This form was constructed to gatherinformation about age, gender, socio-economic level, grade, studying area of study, parental attitude and academic success. Also to determine the psychological well-being of the participants, the 42-items version of "Psychological Well-Being Scales" (PİOÖ) which was developed by Ryff (1989), revised by Ryff and Keyes (1995), and adapted by Akın, Demirci, Yıldız, Gediksiz, and Eroğlu (2012) was used.

The scale,measuring the features of the well-being construct and based on the individuals’ information about themselves, wascomprised of six subscales each of which had 7 items (Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, and Self-Acceptance). The measure contains a total of 84 items (14 per subscale) which are measured on a Likert scale ranging from “1 strongly disagree” to “6 strongly agree”.The highest possible score on the scale is 294 and the lowest is 42. Higher scores indicate that individual has the features that was assesses by the sub-scale. In addition, the scale provides a total score of well being. The items of the scale such as 3., 5., 8., 10., 13., 14., 15., 16., 17., 18., 19., 23., 26., 27., 30., 31., 32., 34., 36., 39., and 41. are coded reverse.

Data Analysis

In this research, to analyze the data collected from the study group and to determine which tests should be used while comparing the independent variables in pairs or in groups, we tryed to determine whether the data was parametric or non-parametric. To analize parametric data, two independent groupssample t test and for more than othertwo groups the one-way ANOVA were used. To analyze nonparametric data theKruskal–Wallis test was used. To determine the cause of the variance LSD, Scheffe and U tests were used.The P value is statistically significant at an alpha level of 0.05 ($P<0.05$).

Results

The findings obtained in the research are presented in the tables below.

Table1. Analysis on the research group according to the gender variable (t-test)

Sub Dimensions	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Autonomy	Female	193	29.96	6.12	-2.377	.018*
	Male	188	31.43	5.91		
Environmental Mastery	Female	193	30.63	6.20	-1.572	.117
	Male	188	31.63	6.22		
Personal Growth	Female	193	31.89	6.47	-1.004	.316
	Male	188	32.55	6.39		
Positive Relations with Others	Female	193	34.04	7.42	.716	.474
	Male	188	33.49	7.61		
Purpose in Life	Female	193	33.03	6.70	-.024	.981
	Male	188	33.04	7.03		
Self-Acceptance	Female	193	30.73	6.84	-1.736	.083
	Male	188	31.88	6.08		
Psychological well being (Total)	Female	193	190.31	28.47	-1.286	.199
	Male	188	194.06	28.40		

**p<0.05*

According to table 1, it was observed that only in autonomy sub-dimension of the psychological well being, there is a statistically significant difference in average scores of the participants in favor of males(t=-2.377; p<0.05).

Table2. Analysis on the research group according to the socio-economic level (Kruskal Wallis)

Sub Dimensions	Socio-economic level	N	Mean	SD	X^2	p	Diff. U test
Authonomy	1. Low	16	27.75	7.19	10.309	.006*	1<2,3 2<3
	2. Middle	199	29.94	5.83			
	3. High	166	31.87	6.00			
Environmental Mastery	1. Low	16	26.75	4.80	11.057	.004*	1<2,3
	2. Middle	199	31.00	6.05			
	3. High	166	31.71	6.39			
Personal Growth	1. Low	16	30.00	5.73	2.312	.315	
	2. Middle	199	32.09	5.98			
	3. High	166	32.59	6.98			
Positive Relations with Others	1. Low	16	30.06	9.08	9.311	.010*	1<2,3
	2. Middle	199	33.05	7.44			
	3. High	166	34.99	7.24			
Purpose in Life	1. Low	16	29.00	6.15	9.073	.011*	1<2,3
	2. Middle	199	32.60	6.76			
	3. High	166	33.95	6.87			
Self-Acceptance	1. Low	16	27.06	7.49	13.542	.001*	1<2,3 2<3
	2. Middle	199	30.58	6.58			
	3. High	166	32.57	6.00			
Psychological well being (Total)	1. Low	16	170.62	29.39	18.812	.000*	1<2,3 2<3
	2. Middle	199	189.28	28.18			
	3. High	166	197.69	27.36			

*p<0.05

According to table 2, it was observed that except from Personal Growth (X^2=2.312; p>0.05) sub-dimension of the Psychological well being;there is a statistically significant difference in between average scores of the participants in Authonomy (X^2=10.309; p<0.05), Environmental Mastery (X^2=11.057; p<0.05),

Positive Relations with Others (X^2=9.311; p<0.05), Purpose in Life (X^2=9.073; p<0.05), Self-Acceptance (X^2=13.542; p<0.05) and Psychological well being (Total)(X^2=18.812; p<0.05).The U test, which was done to identify the source of the difference, showed that there is a statistically significant difference against those who has Low socio economic Level and the higher the socio economic level, the higher psychological well being will be.

Table3. Analysis on the research group according to the effects of parental attitude (ANOVA)

Sub Dimensions	Parental Attitude	N	Mean	SD	F	p	Diff.LSD
Authonomy	1. Irrelevant	28	31.03	7,05	2.568	.000*	4<2
	2. Democratic	92	31.97	6,05			
	3. Authoritative	76	30.96	5,22			
	4. Conservative	185	29.89	6,14			
Environmental Mastery	1. Irrelevant	28	27.85	5,45	7.687	.000*	1<2,3,4 3<2 4<2
	2. Democratic	92	33.44	5,98			
	3. Authoritative	76	30.64	6,62			
	4. Conservative	185	30.67	5,95			
Personal Growth	1. Irrelevant	28	31.57	6,20	4.110	.007*	1<2 3<2 4<2
	2. Democratic	92	34.23	6,39			
	3. Authoritative	76	31.35	6,71			
	4. Conservative	185	31.67	6,20			
Positive Relations with Others	1. Irrelevant	28	31.64	6,78	4.292	.005*	2>1,3
	2. Democratic	92	35.66	7,70			
	3. Authoritative	76	31.96	7,17			
	4. Conservative	185	33.90	7,45			
Purpose in Life	1. Irrelevant	28	31.25	7,79	2.112	.098	
	2. Democratic	92	34.44	7,42			
	3. Authoritative	76	32.73	6,18			
	4. Conservative	185	32.73	6,61			
Self-Acceptance	1. Irrelevant	28	28.60	4,28	3.800	.010*	2>1,3,4
	2. Democratic	92	32.91	6,48			
	3. Authoritative	76	30.73	6,22			
	4. Conservative	185	31.14	6,73			
Psychological well being (Total)	1. Irrelevant	28	181.96	22,38	6.443	.000*	1<2 3<2 4<2
	2. Democratic	92	202.68	28,93			
	3. Authoritative	76	188.39	27,88			
	4. Conservative	185	190.02	28,06			

*p<0.05

According to table 3, it was observed that, except from sub-dimension of the Purpose in Life ($F_{(3.377)}$=2.112; p>0.05), there is a statistically significant difference in between parental attitude and the sub-dimension of thePsychological well being; Authonomy($F_{(3.377)}$=2.568; p<0.05), Environmental Mastery (F(3,377)=7,687; p<0.05), Personal Growth ($F_{(3.377)}$=4.110; p<0.05), Positive Relations with Others($F_{(3.377)}$=4.292; p<0.05), Self-Acceptance($F_{(3.377)}$=3.800;p<0.05) and Psychological well being (Total)($F_{(3.377)}$=6.443; p<0.05).The U test, which was done to identify the source of the difference, showed that there is a statistically significant difference in favour of those who has Democratic Parental Attitude and the students who believe that their families have a democratic attitude towards them has a higher psychological well being level.

Table 4. Analysis on the research group according to the academic success (ANOVA)

Sub Dimensions	Academic Success	N	Mean	sd	F	p	Diff. Scheffe
Authonomy	1. Low	37	30.02	6.76	2.787	.063	
	2. Middle	280	30.41	5.89			
	3. High	64	32.29	6.17			
Environmental Mastery	1. Low	37	29.40	6.51	3.266	.039*	1<3
	2. Middle	280	31.02	6.15			
	3. High	64	32.59	6.14			
Personal Growth	1. Low	37	28.67	5.80	9.173	.000*	1<2,3
	2. Middle	280	32.22	6.33			
	3. High	64	34.25	6.40			
Positive Relations with Others	1. Low	37	32.40	8.79	1.643	.195	
	2. Middle	280	33.65	7.22			
	3. High	64	35.09	7.87			
Purpose in Life	1. Low	37	28.83	5.21	8.806	.000*	1<2,3
	2. Middle	280	33.27	6.80			
	3. High	64	34.45	7.11			
Self-Acceptance	1. Low	37	28.83	7.30	5.419	.005*	1<3
	2. Middle	280	31.20	6.38			
	3. High	64	33.15	6.03			
Psychological well being (Total)	1. Low	37	178.18	30.32	8.503	.000*	1<2,3 2<3
	2. Middle	280	191.80	27.23			
	3. High	64	201.84	29.47			

*p<0.05

According to table 4, it was observed that, except from sub-dimensions such as Authonomy (F(2.378)=2.787; p>0.05) and Positive Relations with Others(F(2.378)=1.643; p>0.05), there is a statistically significant difference in between Academic Success and the sub-dimension of the Psychological well being; Environmental Mastery (F(2.378)=3.266; p<0.05), Personal Growth (F(2.378)=9.173; p<0.05), Purpose in Life (F(2.378)=8.806; p<0.05), Self-Acceptance(F(2,378)=5,419; p<0.05) and Psychological well being (Total)(F(2.378)=8.503; p<0.05). The Scheffe test, which was done to identify the source of the difference, showed that there is a significant difference in favour of the students who has a high academic success level.

Table 5. Analysis on the research group according to the value physical health (ANOVA)

Sub Dimensions	Value Physical Health	N	Mean	sd	t	p
Authonomy	Yes	242	31.08	5,79	1.678	.094
	No	139	30.00	6,46		
Environmental Mastery	Yes	242	31.50	6,27	1.562	.119
	No	139	30.47	6,10		
Personal Growth	Yes	242	32.71	6,05	1.980	.048*
	No	139	31.37	6,99		
Positive Relations with Others	Yes	242	34.55	7,28	2.694	.007*
	No	139	32.41	7,73		
Purpose in Life	Yes	242	33.56	6,52	1.985	.048*
	No	139	32.12	7,34		
Self-Acceptance	Yes	242	32.03	6,41	2.933	.004*
	No	139	30.02	6,45		
Psychological well being (Total)	Yes	242	195.46	26,23	3.015	.003*
	No	139	186.42	31,26		

*p<0.05

According to table 5, it was observed that, except forAuthonomy (t=1.678; p>0.05) and Environmental Mastery (t=1.562; p>0.05) Sub Dimensions, there is a statistically significant difference in between Value Physical Health and the sub-dimension of the Psychological well being; Personal Growth (t=1,980; p<0.05), Positive Relations with Others(t=2.694; p<0.05), Purpose in Life (t=1.985; p<0.05), Self-Acceptance(t=2.933; p<0.05) ve Psychological well being (Total)(t=3.015; p<0.05).This significant difference is in favour of the students saying that I value my physicalhealth.

Table 6. Analysis on the research group according to the body gratification (ANOVA)

Sub Dimensions	Body Gratification	N	Mean	sd	F	p	Diff.Scheffe
Authonomy	1. Yes	193	31.02	5.66	1.980	.139	
	2. Partly	84	31.17	6.59			
	3. No	104	29.69	6.26			
Environmental Mastery	1. Yes	193	31.50	6.33	2.816	.061	
	2. Partly	84	31.77	5.78			
	3. No	104	29.91	6.25			
Personal Growth	1. Yes	193	32.83	5.91	1.881	.154	
	2. Partly	84	31.79	6.55			
	3. No	104	31.42	7.17			
Positive Relations with Others	1. Yes	193	35.12	7.05	8.353	.000*	3<1
	2. Partly	84	33.50	7.74			
	3. No	104	31.48	7.63			
Purpose in Life	1. Yes	193	33.66	6.50	1.658	.192	
	2. Partly	84	32.46	7.97			
	3. No	104	32.33	6.47			
Self-Acceptance	1. Yes	193	32.10	6.31	3.364	.036*	3<1
	2. Partly	84	30.90	6.64			
	3. No	104	30.13	6.57			
Psychological well being (Total)	1. Yes	193	196.27	25.37	5.463	.005*	3<1
	2. Partly	84	191.61	31.50			
	3. No	104	184.98	30.09			

*p<0.05

According to table 6, it was observed that, except forAuthonomy (F(2.378)=1.980; p>0.05), Environmental Mastery ($F_{(2.378)}$=2.816; p>0.05), Personal Growth ($F_{(2.378)}$= 1.881; p>0.05) and Purpose in Life ($F_{(2.378)}$=1.658; p>0.05) Sub Dimensions, there is a statistically significant difference in between Body Gratificationand the sub-dimension of the Psychological well being;Positive Relations with Others($F_{(2.378)}$=8.353; p<0.05), Self-Acceptance ($F_{(2.378)}$=3.364; p<0.05) andPsychological well being (Total) ($F_{(2,378)}$=5,463; p<0.05). The Scheffe test, which was done to identify the source of the difference, showed that there is a significant difference in favour of the students who gratify their body and whose psychological well being level is high.

According to table 7, it was observed that, except forEnvironmental Mastery ($F_{(2.378)}$=.487; p>0.05), Personal Growth ($F_{(2.378)}$=1.750; p>0.05) and Purpose in Life ($F_{(2.378)}$=2.324; p>0.05) Sub Dimensions Sub Dimensions, there is a statistically significant difference in between Doing Sports/Exerciseand the sub-dimension of the Psychological well being; Authonomy (F(2.378)=3.304; p<0.05), Positive Relations with Others ($F_{(2.378)}$=3.277; p<0.05), Self-Acceptance($F_{(2.378)}$=3.349; p<0.05) veandPsychological well being (Total) ($F_{(2.378)}$=3.729; p<0.05).The Scheffe test, which was done to identify the source of the difference, showed that there is a significant difference in favour of the students who do sports and exercise.

Table 7. Analysis on the research group according to the doing sports and exercise (ANOVA)

Sub Dimensions	Doing Sports and Exercise	N	Mean	sd	F	p	Diff. Scheffe
Authonomy	1. Yes	170	31.29	5.93	3.304	.038*	2<1
	2. Sometimes	87	29.27	6.37			
	3. No	124	30.86	5.89			
Environmental Mastery	1. Yes	170	31.30	6.31	.487	.615	
	2. Sometimes	87	30.55	6.39			
	3. No	124	31.29	6.01			
Personal Growth	1. Yes	170	32.31	5.92	1.750	.175	
	2. Sometimes	87	31.17	6.37			
	3. No	124	32.83	7.08			
Positive Relations with Others	1. Yes	170	34.24	7.17	3.277	.039*	2<1,3
	2. Sometimes	87	31.97	7.68			
	3. No	124	34.38	7.70			
Purpose in Life	1. Yes	170	33.87	6.57	2.324	.099	
	2. Sometimes	87	32.18	7.47			
	3. No	124	32.50	6.72			
Self-Acceptance	1. Yes	170	32.11	6.09	3.349	.036*	2<1
	2. Sometimes	87	29.93	6.12			
	3. No	124	31.15	7.13			
Psychological well being (Total)	1. Yes	170	195.14	25.37	3.729	.025*	1>2
	2. Sometimes	87	185.09	30.68			
	3. No	124	193.04	30.20			

*p<0.05

Conclusion and Discussion

In this study, it was observed that only in autonomy sub-dimension of the psychological well being, there was a statistically significant difference in average scores of the participants in favor of males. After examining the literature about this topic, it was seen that there is a controversy on the datas derived from the researches on searching the gender differences in psychological well being. In all of the researches done by Wood, Rhodes and Whelan (1989) about gender differences in psychological well being, it was concluded that females are happier than males and also they have more life satisfaction than males. In the research done by Haring, Stock and Okun (1984), they concluded those males are better than females. In addition to this, in psychological well being literature, there are some researches (Hori, 2010; Kirkcoldy, Furnham and Siefen, 2010; Timur, 2008; Wang and Sound, 2008; Tartakovsky, 2009; Tütüncü, 2012) showing no difference in gender variation.

In this research, it was observed that except forPersonal Growth sub-dimension of Psychological well being; there was a statistically significant difference in between the level of socio economic variable and the average scores of the participiants in Authonomy, Environmental Mastery, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, Self-Acceptance and Psychological well being. The U test, which was done to identify the source of the difference, showed that there is a statistically significant difference against those who has Low socioeconomic Level and the higher the socioeconomic level, the higher psychological well being will be. After examining the literature about this topic, it was seen that there are different conclusions on the data derived from the researchbased on the socio economic level. Cenkseven (2004) found that there is a significant difference in favour of university students who have high socio economic level when it comes to life satisfaction, Positive Relations with Others, Self-Acceptance and Psychological well being. Kaplan, Shema and Leite, (2008) found that there is a correlation between high socio-economic level and high

Environmental Mastery,Personal Growth, Purpose in Life, and Self-Acceptance. Hovewer, Biswas, Diener and Tamir (2004) emphasize that along with the increase in socio economic level wantings, goals and life standards increase, because of this people having high socio economis level were not observed to have the highest level of psychological well being. Easterlin (2003) explained that the increase in socio economic level and happiness level wereparalleluntil a specific periodof timebut this stop after some point.

According to the this study, it was observed that, except for sub-dimensions such as Authonomy and Positive Relations with Others,there is a statistically significant difference in between Academic Success and the sub-dimension of the Psychological well being; Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Purpose in Life, Self-Acceptanceand Psychological well being. The Scheffe test, which was done to identify the source of the difference, showed that there is a significant difference in favour of the students who have a high academic success level. After examining the literature we found some direct and indirect research related with differences in psychological well being and academic success. Howeverwe also found in our country some reseach about academic success predicting psychological well being. In that research, it was identified that health, socio economic statue and academic success are not the significant predictor of psychological well being (Cenkseven, 2004). In another researchpaper, it was found that satisfaction derived from academic success was a significant predictor of subjective well being but it was not a significant predictor of psychological well being (Cenkseven ve Akbaş, 2007). It can be tought that the students perceiving themselves academically successful can feel themselves better. In previous researches, it was emphasized that there is a positive correlation between academic success and subjective well being. In our research, it was found that the higher the preservice teachers' socio eceonomic level increase, their psychological well being level will also increase. Previously we mentioned that psychological well being and subjective well being are correlated but they were different concepts. The positive relationship between academic success and psychological well being can be explained by the relationship between psychological well being and subjective well being. Students with ahigh level of academic success being more autonomous, organization of the environment according to their goals, acceptance themselves, their self-awareness, determining goals for themselves and their being in a more advanced level in psychological well being were expected results of this study.

According to the study, it was observed that, except from Authonomy and Environmental Mastery) Sub Dimensions, there is a statistically significant difference in between Value Physical Health and the sub-dimension of the Psychological well being; Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, Self-Acceptance and Psychological well being. This significant difference is in favour of the students saying that I value my physical health.

According to the study, it was observed that, except from Authonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth and Purpose in Life Sub Dimensions, there is a statistically significant difference in between Body Gratificationand the sub-dimension of the Psychological well being;Positive Relations with Others, Self-Acceptance and Psychological well being. The Scheffe test, which was done to identify the source of the difference, showed that there is a significant difference in favour of the students who gratify their body and whose psychological well being level is high.

According to the this reseach, it was observed that, except from sub-dimension of Purpose in Life, there is a statistically significant difference in between parental attitude and the sub-dimension of the Psychological well being; Authonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Self-Acceptance and Psychological well being.The U test, which was done to identify the source of the difference, showed that there is a statistically significant difference in favour of those who have a Democratic Parental Attitude and the students who believe that their families have a democratic attitude

towards them have a higher psychological well being level. After examining the literature we could not find any research about direct examination of psychological well being and parental attitudes. However, there are some researches which let us to think that parental attitudes relates with psychological well being indirectly. A significant differencewas found in subjective well being and parental attitude (Tuzgöl & Dost, 2006). According to this finding, students whose family has a democratic parental attitude have a higher level of subjective well being compared to those which have conservative or reserved parental attitude.After examining the research about life satisfaction and parental attitudes, it was found that the students' level of life satisfaction who perceiving their parents' attitude as "understanding – Democratic" is higher than those who perceiving their parents' attitude as "Irrelevant" and "Oppresive-Authoritative" (Çivitçi, 2009). The research in which comparisions were done according to parental attitude and decision making strategies, it was found that individual perceiving their parental attitudes as democratic are reasonable; individuals perceiving their parental attitudes as democratic and irrelevant are independent. The average scores of the indecisionness of the individuals, perceiving their parental attitudes as irrelevant, inconsistent and authoritative, are higher than other groups' scores (Erözkan, 2011). According to a study done by Kaya, Bozaslan and Genç (2012) it was found that academic success and problem solving skills of children, whose parents have democratic attitude, were high while their social anxiety was low. In addition to this, the opposite was found for student whose parents have inconsistent and irrelevant attitude. It was also found that academic success and social anxiety level of children, whose parents have Authoritative, were high, and problem solving skills of children, whose parents have Conservative attitude, were low.

References

Abbott, R., Ploubidis, G., Huppert, F., Kuh, D., & Croudace, T. (2010). An evaluation of the precision of measurement ofRyff's psychological well-being scales in a population sample. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(3), 357-373.

Akın, A. (2009). *The impacts of rational, emotional behavioral therapy oriented group counseling on psychological well-being and self-sensitivity*. Unpublished doctorate dissertation. Sakarya University Institute of Social Sciences: Sakarya.

Anlı, G. (2011). *Investigation of the relationship between psychological well-being and self-sabotage with various variables.* Unpublished MA dissertation. Sakarya University, Institute of Social Sciences, Sakarya.

Biswas-Diener, R., Diener, E. & Tamir, M.(2004). The psychology of subjective well-being. *Daedalus, 133*(2), 18-26.

Block, J. & Kremen, A., (1996). IQ and ego resiliency: Conceptual and empirical connections and separateness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 349-361.

Bonanno, G. A., (2005). Resilience in the face of potential trauma, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *14*(3), 135-138.

Cenkseven, F. (2004). *Investigation of the predictors of university students' subjective and psychological well-being*. Unpublished doctorate dissertation. Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.

Cenkseven, F. & Akbaş, T. (2007). Investigation of predictive variables of university students' subjective and psychological well-being. *The Journal of Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance, 27*, 43-65.

Çivitci, A. (2009). Life satisfaction in elementary school students: The roles of some personal and familial characteristics. *Uludağ University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 22*(1), 29-52.

Connor, K. M., (2006). Assessment of resilience in the aftermath of trauma. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *67*(2), 46-49.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Hedonia, eudaimonia, and well-being: An introduction. *Journal of Happiness Studies,* 9(1), 1-11.

Diener, E, Scollon, C., (2003). Subjective well-being is desirable, but not the summum bonum. *University of Minnesota Interdisciplinary Workshop on Well-Being*. (October 23-25), Minneapolis.

Diener, E., (1984). Subjective Well-Being. *Psychological Bulletin*, *93*, 542–575.

Dost, M.T. (2006). Subjective well-being among university students. *Hacettepe University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, *31*, 188-197.

Easterlin, R. A. (2003). Explaining happiness. *Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences*, *100*, 11176-11183.

Ekşioğlu, H. (2011). *The relationship between the style of world vision ownership or belief and psychological well-being*. Unpublished MA Dissertation. Cumhuriyet University, Institute of Social Sciences, Sivas.

Erözkan, A. (2011). Attachment styles and decision making strategies of university students. The *Journal of International Avrasya Faculty of Social Sciences, 2*(3), 60-74.

Frisch, M. B., Cornell, J., Villanueva, M., Retzlaff, P.J., (1992).Clinical validation of the quality of life inventory: A measure of life satisfaction for use in treatment planning and outcome assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, *4*, 92-101.

Gençöz, T., Özlale, Y. (2004). Direct and indirect effects of social support on psychological well-being. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *32*(5), 449-458.

Gülaçtı, F. (2009). *The effect of the social skills training programme on university students' level of social skills, the subjective and psychological well-being*. Unpublished doctorate Dissertation. Atatürk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Erzurum.

Haring, M. J., Stock, W. A. & Okun, M. A. (1984). A research synthesis of gender and social class as correlates of subjective well-being. *Human Relations, 37,* 645–657.

Hori, M. (2010). *Gender differences & cultural contexts: psychological well-being in cross-national perspective*. Unpublished dissertation fort the degree of doctor of philosophy, Louisiana State University, Louisiana, USA.

Huppert, F. A., Baylis, N. & Keverne, B. (2004). Introduction: Why do we need a science of well-being. *Philosophical Transactions of Royal Society B*, *359*, 1331-1332.

Kaplan, G. A., Shema, S. J. & A Leite, C. M., (2008). Socio-economic determinants of psychological well-being: The role of income, income change, and income sources during the course of 29 years. *AEP, 18(*7), 531-537.

Kaya, A., Bozaslan, H. & Genç, G. (2012). The effect of the parents' attitudes on university students' problem-solving skills, social concerns and academic achievement. *Dicle University Ziya Gökalp Journal of the Faculty of Education, 18,* 208-225.

Keyes, C. L. M., Shmotkin, D., Ryff, C. D., (2002). Optimizing well-being: The emprical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(6), 1007- 1022.

Kirkcoldy, B., Furnham, A. F. & Siefen, R. G. (2010). The effects of gender on physical and psychological well-being and life satisfaction among an adult population. *International Journal of Child Health and Human Development, 3*(3), 307-320.

Lyubomirsky, S., Lepper, H. S., (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research, 46*, 137-155.

Pargament, K. I., (2005). Pain and Sweet: An Assessment of Cost and Benefits of religiosity, trans. A.U. Mehmedoğlu. *ÇÜİFD*, 5(1), 279-313.

Ryan, R. M.,& Deci, E. L., (2001). On happiness and human potentials: a review of research on hedonic and eudemonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52,* 141-166.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*(6), 1069–1081.

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*, 719–727.

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

Seligman, M. (2002). *Authentic Happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment.* New York: Free Press.

Selingman, M. E. P. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 5-14.

Tanhan, F. (2007). *The impacts of training to deal with death anxiety on the level of anxiety of death and psychological well-being.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation. Ankara University Institute of Education Sciences.

Tartakovsky, E. (2009). The psychological well-being of unaccompanied minors: A longitudinal study of adolescents immigrating from Russia and Ukraine to israel without parents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *19*(2), 177-204.

Timur, M. S. (2008). *The examination of factors that affect married individuals' psychological well-being levels who are in divorce process and not in divorce process*. Unpublished MA dissertation. Ankara University Institute of Education Sciences, Ankara.

Tuzgöl-Dost, M. (2006). Subjective well-being among university students, *Hacettepe University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 31*, 188-197.

Wang, C. C. & Sound, C. C. (2008). The role of generational status, self-esteem, academic self-efficacy, and perceived social support in college students' psychological weil-being, *Journal of College Counseling, 11*, 101-118.