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Abstract

In the present research, the relationships among parental control, parental warmth, parental education, parental income, gender and age with adolescents’ subjective well-being was analyzed. The participants were 643 adolescents from 14 to 19 years of age, of whom 58% were females and 42% were males. Results indicated that parental income was associated with high life satisfaction while adolescents’ age was positively related to negative affect. While parental warmth predicted life satisfaction and positive affect, parental control did not. Negative affect was predicted by both paternal and maternal warmth and paternal control. Findings suggest that parental warmth has important implications for adolescents’ well being whereas parental control plays a restricted role.
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Introduction

Adolescence is a period in which important development occurs and many developmental tasks have to be accomplished to have a positive sense of well-being. In this stage of life, youth is required to act in accordance with social roles, engaging with peers and members of the opposite sex and to accomplish the requirements of schooling and making important decisions regarding their future career. Adolescents’ happiness or well-being appears to be very important during this period of life because happy transition from adolescence into adulthood can help to cope with later negative life events.

Subjective well-being is a multidimensional construct that includes cognitive and affective components (Diener, 1984). According to Diener (1984) subjective well-being has three components: life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect. The cognitive component refers to life satisfaction and the emotional component refers to positive and negative affect (Diener, 1998). In other words, subjective well-being reflects individual’s appraisal of his/her life. These appraisals may be primarily cognitive (e.g. life satisfaction) as well as affective, consisting of pleasant or unpleasant emotions.
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Life satisfaction has been defined as an overall, cognitive evaluation of the quality of an individual’s life in general or with important, specific domains such as satisfaction with work, marriage, school and other life areas (Diener, 1994). Past studies on life satisfaction among adolescents found that life satisfaction was related to satisfaction with family, self, friends, school and living environment (Dew & Huebner, 1994). The global life satisfaction of adolescents is associated with positive family relations (Rask, Astedt-Kurki, & Laippala, 2002). Positive affect is one of the emotional component of subjective well-being and reflects positive emotional states such as joy, interest, excitement, confidence and alertness. According to some researchers, positive affectivity is quite consistent across various situations and contexts (Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003; Carr, 2004; Snyder & Lopez, 2002). As a source of positive affect while some research results highlight the importance of social factors like interpersonal relationships, the number of close friends and relatives and contact with these peoples (Snyder & Lopez, 2002; Watson, 2002), others (e.g. Clark and Watson, 1999) indicate that positive affectivity is highly heritable. Negative affect reflects an individual mood as is irritable, easily distressed and prone to rage. Negative affect composed of negative emotional states such as anger, fear, sadness, guilt, contempt and disgust (Kail & Cavanaugh, 2007).

Adolescent well-being is affected by several factors, including biological, physical, psychological and social factors. Some personal resources like hope (Argyle, 2001), self-efficacy (Suldo & Shaffer, 2007), self-esteem (Hewitt, 1998) and assertiveness (Seligman, 2002) and some personality traits (e.g. Extraversion) (Gilman, 2001; Huebner, 1991) affect adolescents’ subjective well-being positively. Some research results showed that age, gender, education and socioeconomic status influence happiness and life satisfaction (Myers & Diener, 1995; Triandis, 2000). Studies examining gender differences among boys and girls showed that there is a marked gender difference in well-being with boys reporting higher positive self-esteem, lower negative self-efficacy, less unhappiness compared to girls. Thus in adolescence, girls’ well-being is significantly lower than boys’ well-being (Bergman & Scott, 2001; Quatman & Watson, 2001). Different from these findings, Natvig, Albreksten and Qvarnstrom (2003) found no significant difference between boys and girls with respect to their reported degree of happiness. At the country level analysis, individuals living in wealthy countries are happier than individuals living in poor countries (Diener & Diener, 1995). Research results do not support the notion that young people are more satisfied than older people (Compton, 2005). It can be said that findings about the effect of demographic variables on well-being is inconsistent and still need to be invastigated within different cultures.

Additionally, family relationships and parenting behaviors of mother and fathers affect adolescents’ well-being. During adolescence although much energy is devoted to peer relationships, parents still continue to be important figures in adolescents lives (Erwin, 1993). In the past, although detachment from parents and the development of independence from parents have been strongly emphasized in psychology literature, at the present day a more balanced view is maintained by focusing on the attachment bonds between parent and adolescent (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). Findings on parenting have consistently shown that adolescents’ perceptions of their parent’s parenting behaviors to be very important to the behavioral and emotional development of teens (e.g., Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005; Khaleque & Rohner, 2002). Parental warmth and parental control are thought to very important dimensions of parenting that affect well-being of adolescents or children (Conger et al., 1993; Kurdek & Fine, 1994; Barber, 1996; Barber & Harmon, 2002).

Baumrind (1980) identified two independent dimensions of parenting. The first dimension, parental demandingness has been characterized as involving the use of direct confrontation and monitoring, patterns of firm and consistent discipline, and high maturity demands. The second dimension, parental responsiveness has been characterized as involving affective warmth, cognitive responsiveness, attachment and bonding, unconditional acceptance, involvement, and reciprocity (Baumrind, 1980; Maccoby & Martin (1983). Steinberg et al. (1994) stated that parental
demandingness and parental responsiveness reflect the degree of control and warmth that parents use. Parental control has been defined as the amount of supervision that parents exercise, the decisions parents make about their children’s activities and friends, and the rules parents hold for their children. Barber (1996) has made an important distinction between psychological control and behavioral control. According to Barber, parents who use behavioral control attempt to regulate behavior through disciplinary strategies and supervisory functions. On the other hand, parents who use psychological control attempt to shape behaviors by using some techniques such as guilt or anxiety induction, love withdrawal, personal attacks, and restriction of verbal interaction (e.g., Barber & Harmon, 2002; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989). While parental psychological control emphasises regulation of emotions, opinions, and feelings, behavioral control emphasises the regulation of behavior and activities without taking adolescents’ own thoughts into consideration (Barber, 1996). The second dimension of parenting is parental warmth which has been defined as the expression of interest in children’s activities and friends, involvement in children’s activities, expression of enthusiasm and praise for children’s accomplishments, and demonstration of affection and love (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Barber, 1996; Amato & Fowler, 2002).

In general, parental warmth is thought to be positively associated with subjective well-being (Conger et al., 1993; Kurdek & Fine, 1994). Parental warmth and involvement have been found to be associated with positive results in terms of parent–child relationship and children’s emotional development and psychological adjustment (Baumrind, 1991; Gray & Steinberg, 1999; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). These findings indicate that the level of warmth that children perceive from their parents influence their well-being; children who feel loved and accepted are much more happier (Gray & Steinberg, 1999). Although influence of parental warmth on child outcomes is clear, links between parental control and child outcomes seem to be depend on cultural factors (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007) and the type of control (behavioral or psychological). In Western cultures, parental control is viewed as negative parenting behaviors and implies lack of parental warmth (Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Duriez, & Goossens, 2006) and studies showed that parental control in these cultures associated with negative outcome. For example, a study on Belgian adolescents found that parental psychological control was associated with loneliness and relational aggression in adolescents (Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Goossens, Duriez, & Niemic, 2008). Similarly, high levels of parental psychological control are associated with depression (Barber, 1996), low self-esteem (Ge, Best, Conger, & Simons, 1996; Garber, Robinson, & Valentiner, 1997) and low self-confidence (Conger, Conger, & Scaramella, 1997).

However, the meaning of control in non-western cultures is not the same as in the West’s. For non-Western cultures, like Turkey’s, parental control is common and accepted, children perceive it normal, not as lack of parental warmth (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1970). For example, in the adoption study of “Parental Bonding Instrument” to the Turkish culture by Kapçı and Küçüker (2006) items under control dimension in the original instrument were placed under warmth as a dimension. This resulted showed that parents’ control appears to be part of parental warmth. In addition, although there are numerous studies emphasizing that parental control restricts autonomy development of adolescents (Maccoby and Martin 1983; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989), some studies in Turkish culture did not indicate negative association between parental control and autonomy development of adolescents (Özdemir, 2009). Although moderate levels of behavioral parental control are thought to be protective against harmful and delinquent behaviors among adolescents (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983), it is still an unknown issue how parental control affects Turkish adolescents’ well-being.

It has been consistently claimed that young people are leaders of the future and if their levels of well-being are high, they can function at a higher level and all of society can benefit from that (Diener & Diener, 1995). Also, determining predictors of well-being among adolescents can help parents, educators and researchers identify strategies to raise adolescent well-being. Although several studies examined well-being among university students (Doğan, 2006) and the relationships between parenting styles and subjective well-being of university students (Tuzgöl
Dost, 2006, 2007, 2010), there are few studies focusing on high school students’ subjective well-being (e.g. Eryılmaz, 2010) and on the relationship between parental control and adolescent adjustment (e.g. Kindap, Sayıl, & Kuru, 2008). Also, there are no prior studies to our knowledge that have examined the associations between parental warmth, parental control and adolescents’ subjective well-being in Turkey. Thus, the present study aimed to investigate how well maternal warmth, paternal control, maternal warmth, paternal control, gender, age, parental education and parental income predict the dimensions of subjective well-being (positive affect, negative affect, life satisfaction) among Turkish adolescents.

Method

Participants
A total of 643 (373 girls and 270 boys) adolescents participated in this study whose mean age was 16.24 years (SD = 1.03). The participants were enrolled in three high schools in Ankara and of these 32% were from the ninth, 35% were from the tenth and 33% were from the eleventh grade. The parents of the participants were from different education levels; 33% of the mothers and 18% of the fathers have primary school education degree; 12% of mothers and 15% of fathers have secondary school education degree; and 28% of mothers and 27% of fathers have high school degree. Frequency of fathers (40%) having higher education were higher than that of the mothers (27%). This numerical evidence indicates that fathers tended to be more educated than mothers. Most of the participants were living with their two biological parents (92%) and others from divorced or single parent families.

Measures

Demographics
Adolescents were asked to complete a background questionnaire, which included information about, gender, age, parental education and parental income. Parental education was assessed on a scale on which 1 = no formal education, 2 = elementary school education, 3 = secondary school education, 4 = high school education, and 5 = higher education. Participants rated their parents’ income through a single item: “From the following options, please select an annual income of your family.” The following response options were provided: “1= 650.00 TL or less,” “2= 650.00 to 1.500.00 TL,” “3= 1.500.00 to 2.500.00,” “4= 2.500.00 to 3.500.00,” and “5= 3.500.00+.”

Parental Warmth and Control
Parental warmth and control were assessed via the 22-item “Perceived Parenting Styles Scale” (Sümer & Güngör, 1999). This scale was used to investigate perceived parental warmth (e.g., “She/he supports me in dealing with my problems.” and “She/he always talk to me in a comforting way.”) and perceived parental control (e.g., “She/he wants to control everything I do.”, “She/he doesn’t forgive me if I disobey her/his rules.”). Participants are asked to indicate the level of agreement with each item once for mother and once for father on a scale from 1 (not true at all) to 4 (entirely true). Cronbach’s alpha reliability statistics for warmth and control were α = .81 to .79 for mothers and α = .91 to .90 for fathers, respectively (Güngör, 2000).

Subjective Well-being
Cognitive component of subjective wellbeing, life satisfaction, was assessed via “The Satisfaction With Life Scale” (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). This is a 5-item scale to assess life satisfaction. This scale was adapted to Turkish by Köker (1991). An example from items is: “In most ways, my life is close to my ideal, and I am satisfied with my life”. The items are rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale that ranges from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree). The SWLS has high internal consistency, with the Cronbach’s alpha values ranging between .89 and .79.

Positive and Negative Affect was assessed through the “Positive and Negative Affect Scale developed in USA (Watson, Clark, & Tellegens, 1988). This scale was adapted to Turkish by Gençöz (2000). This scale includes ten positive emotions, and also ten negative emotions. Responses are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale that ranges from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely
agree). The internal consistency of the scale for positive emotions is .86, and also for negative emotions is .83 (Gençöz, 2000).

Procedure

Data were collected during class time by the researcher. The objective of the study was explained to the students. Students anonymously completed the questionnaires; they did not need to disclose any personal information such as their name or date of birth. Also, no information about student responses was given to teachers or parents as clearly stated on the questionnaires; the students were also informed that their responses would only be used for research purposes. Participation was completely voluntary and consent to participate was obtained from each student. Completion of all questionnaires took approximately 35 minutes.

Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was used to predict positive affect, negative affect and life satisfaction separately. More specifically regression analysis were used to examine whether the life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect is predicted by adolescents’ age, gender, parental income and parental education as well as whether the parental warmth and control predict life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect after controlling for the effects of adolescents’ age, gender, parental income and parental education.

Results

Relationships between demographic variables, parenting dimensions and subjective well-being (SWB)

Pairwise Pearson correlation coefficients for all variables used in the present study are presented in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, age was significantly and negatively related to life satisfaction and positive affect and positively related to negative affect. In addition, parental education and income was significantly related to life satisfaction. As can be seen in Table 1, maternal and paternal warmth were significantly and positively correlated with life satisfaction and positive affect, negatively correlated with negative affect. Maternal and paternal control were significantly and negatively correlated with life satisfaction and positively correlated with negative affect.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gen: Gender, ME: mother education; FE: father education; PI: parental income; MW:
maternal warmth; MC: maternal control; PW: paternal warmth; PC: paternal control; LS: life satisfaction; PA: positive affect; NA: negative affect.

Gender: 0= girls, 1 = boys

*p< 0.05, **p< 0.01, *** p< 0.001.

Predictive relations between demographic variables, parenting dimensions and subjective well-being (SWB)

Separate multiple regressions were conducted to examine the extent to which age, gender, parental income and parental education, parental warmth and parental control predicted adolescents’ life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect.

Predicting life satisfaction

A multiple regression evaluated how well life satisfaction of adolescents is predicted by age, gender, parental income and parental education (Set 1), and how well the set of parenting measures (Set 2) predicts life satisfaction over and above age, gender, parental income and parental education. The first set of predictors, age, gender, parental income, parental education, accounted for a significant amount of the life satisfaction variability, $R^2 = .13$, $F (5, 637) = 18.48$, $p<001$. The results in Table 2 indicate that the first set of variables account for 13% of the variance in life satisfaction of adolescents and among these variables only parental income provide significant contributions towards the variance of life satisfaction. This result indicates that adolescents having higher parental income tended to have higher scores on the life satisfaction measure.

A second analysis was conducted to evaluate whether the four parenting measures (maternal warmth, maternal control, paternal warmth and paternal control) predicted life satisfaction over and above age, gender, parental income and parental education. The four parenting measures accounted for a significant proportion of the life satisfaction variance after controlling for the effects of age, gender, parental income and parental education, $R^2 \text{ change} = .14$, $F (4, 633) = 30.32$, $p<001$. The two parenting dimensions, parental warmth and parental control explained 14 % of the variance in life satisfaction of adolescents. As can be seen from the Table 2, while parental control were not significant predictor of life satisfaction, parental warmth was significant predictor of life satisfaction. These results suggest that adolescents who are the same age and gender and who have similar parental income and parental education are more likely to experience life satisfaction if they receive warmth from both mother and father.

Table 2.

Hierarchical regression analysis on life satisfaction by demographic variables and parental control (N=643)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$SE_b$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental income</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother education</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father education</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal control</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal control</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ $\Delta$ for model</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ for $R^2$ $\Delta$</td>
<td>18.48***</td>
<td>30.32*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender: 0= girls, 1 = boys.

***p<.001
Predicting the positive affect

A multiple regression evaluated how well positive affect of adolescents is predicted by age, gender, parental income, parental education (Set 1), and how well the set of parenting measures (Set 2) predicts positive affect over and above age, gender, parental income, parental education. The first set of predictors, age, gender, parental income, parental education, accounted for a significant amount of the positive affect variability, $R^2 = .02$, $F (5, 637) = 2.48$, $p<01$. The results in Table 3 indicate that the variables in the first set account for 2% of the variance in positive affect and among these variables only adolescents’ age was significant predictor of positive affect. This result indicates that older adolescents tended to have lower scores on the positive affect.

A second analysis was conducted to evaluate whether the four parenting measures (maternal warmth, maternal control, paternal warmth and paternal control) predicted positive affect over and above age, gender, parental income and parental education. The four parenting measures accounted for a significant proportion of the positive affect variance after controlling for the effects of age, gender, parental income, parental education, $R^2 \text{ change} = .06$, $F (4, 633) = 10.48$, $p<001$. Two parenting dimensions, parental warmth and parental control explained 6% of the variance in positive affect. As can be seen from the Table 3, while parental control were not significant predictor of positive affect, parental warmth were significant predictor of positive affect. These results suggest that adolescents who are the same age and gender and who have similar parental income and parental education are more likely to experience positive affect if they receive warmth from both mother and father.

Predicting the negative affect

The third multiple regression evaluated how well negative affect of adolescents is predicted by age, gender, parental income, parental education (Set 1), and how well the set of parenting measures (Set 2) predicts negative affect over and above age, gender, parental income, parental education. The first set of predictors, age, gender, parental income, parental education, accounted for a significant amount of the negative affect variability, $R^2 = .02$, $F (5, 637) = 3.04$, $p<01$. The results in Table 4 indicate that the first set of variables account for only 2% of the variance in
negative affect and among these variables only adolescents’ age significant predictor of negative affect. This result indicates that older adolescents tended to have higher scores on the negative affect.

A second analysis was conducted to evaluate whether the four parenting measures (maternal warmth, maternal control, paternal warmth and paternal control) predicted negative affect over and above age, gender, parental income and parental education. The four parenting measures accounted for a significant proportion of the negative affect variance after controlling for the effects of age, gender, parental income, parental education, $R^2$ change = .07, $F$ (4, 633) = 10.64, $p<.001$. Two parenting dimensions, parental warmth and parental control explained 7% of the variance in negative affect. As can be seen from the Table 4, while maternal control were not significant predictor of life satisfaction, maternal warmth, paternal warmth and paternal control were significant predictors of negative affect. These results suggest that adolescents who are the same age and gender and who have similar parental income, parental education are less likely to experience negative affect if they receive warmth from both mother and father and are more likely to experience negative affect if they receive control from fathers.

Table 4.

Hierarchical regression analysis on negative affect by demographic variables and parental control ($N=643$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE$b$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE$b$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental income</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother education</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father education</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal warmth</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal control</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal warmth</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal control</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ $\Delta$ for model</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ for $R^2$ $\Delta$</td>
<td>3.04*</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.64***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender: 0= girls, 1 boys.

***$p<.001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$.

Discussion

In this study, we examined the relationships between demographic variables (age, gender, parental income, parental education), two broad domains of parenting (parental control and parental warmth) and three domains of well-being (life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect).

Among all of the demographic variables, parental income was significant predictor of life satisfaction and age was significant predictor of positive and negative affect. Parallel with existing findings (Natvig et al., 2003; Tuzgöl-Dost, 2010) gender was not significant predictor of subjective well-being. Studies exploring associations between income and subjective well-being report different results. Parallel with the present finding, some studies reported significant positive correlations between subjective well-being and income (Diener & Oishi,
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2000; Eryılmaz, 2010; Frey & Stutzer, 2000; Tuzgöl-Dost, 2006, 2010). Diener et al. (1985) found that super-rich individuals were about 1 point higher on a 0 to 6 life satisfaction scale. In addition to these associations, some variables appear to moderate the effect of income on subjective well-being, such as nation (Adelmann, 1987; Diener & Oishi, 2000; Diener & Diener, 1995). For example it is indicated that the relation between income and subjective well-being is much stronger among underdeveloped nations (Diener and Oishi, 2000).

Several possible explanations can be suggested for the association among parental income and life satisfaction. Firstly, as can be seen in the literature correlations between income and SWB were stronger in poorer nations (Diener & Oishi; 2000; Diener & Diener; 1995). In these societies income differences are related to differences in meeting universal basic needs such as food and shelter, and as a result the effects of income on life satisfaction can be appear. Secondly when the parents’ income increase, it is more likely that children take part in different social activities. In their meta-analysis study Okun, Stock, Haring & Witter (1984) found that social activity is positively and significantly related to subjective well-being. Based on these result it can be said that adolescents from high SES families would be feel more satisfied with their life.

Regarding negative reletionship between age and positive affect; positive relationship between age and negative affect, there are also different findings in the literature. In the literature, paralel with these findings some studies found that younger adolescents subjective well-being higher than olders (Eryılmaz, 2010), some studies found that subjective well-being increase with age (Ryff, 1989). For the latter findings, researchers argued that emotion regulation is important determinant of well-being (e.g., Gross & John, 2003) and there is evidence that aging is associated with improvements in the capacity to regulate emotions (Gross et al., 1997). Decreased positive affect and increased negative affect with age might have to do with the fact that our sample consisted of high school students. As adolescents get older, they face many challenges that affect their happiness. Turkish high school students are in the preperation process of university entrance examination and face with it at the end of high school. When they get this exam they are more likely feel more anxious, experience more negative emotions.

Results of multiple regression analysis showed that after controlling for Adolescents’ age, gender, parental education and parental income, high parental warmth were associated with high life satisfaction and positive affect. In other words, high parental warmth predicted high life satisfaction and positive affect and low negative affect. These findings are consistent with prior findings suggesting that children who feel loved and accepted are happy and more confident (Gray & Steinberg, 1999; Wolfradt, Hemple, & Miles, 2003). Studies in Turkey also indicated that democratic paternal style tahat is higher in acceptance and warmth was associated with higher subjective well-being of university students (Tuzgöl Dost, 2006, 2010). Findings also indicated that high levels of parental warmth are related with greater self-esteem and lower depression and anxiety (Ge, Best, Conger, & Simons, 1996). Results of the current study and above mentioned studies supported the widely accepted view that the levels of warmth that parents show towards their children influence adolescents’ subjective well-being positively.

Parental control did not significantly predicted life satisfaction and positive affect but only paternal control was related to negative affect that is high paternal control predicted high negative affect. In the literature, parental control is linked with negative consequences. It is widely accepted that parents who use psychological control restricts their children outonomy development (Barber, 1996, 2002; Vansteenkiste, Zhou, Lens, & Soenens, 2005). Recent research findings indicated associations between psychological control and fear of failure (Elliot & Thrash, 2004) and maladaptive perfectionism (Soenens, Elliot, et al., 2005). Parental use of psychological control as perceived by the adolescent is also linked with depression, low self-confidence, low self-esteem, and low self-reliance both for boys and girls (Gray & Steinberg, 1999; Mills & Rubin, 1998; Pettit, Laird, Dodge, Bates, & Criss, 2001; Steinberget al., 1989). All these findings propose negative associations between psychological control and well-being,
but results of the current study is not consistent with these findings. This inconsistency may be attributed to the type of control measured in the present study and meaning of control for Turkish youths. In the present study parental control mainly refers to the parental rule setting, strict discipline and some form of psychological control. In deed, because we did not differentiate between behavioral and psychological control, it is less likely to expect negative results of parental control. Next, for the non-Western cultures, like in Turkey parental control is common and accepted, children perceive it normal, not as lack of parental warmth (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1970). One exception to this inconsistency between previous findings and this study’s finding was that high paternal control predicted high negative affect in this study. This finding would be related with the notion that control vary depending on whether it is perceived in the context of warmth or not. In Turkey mothers are perceived more close to their children, show more affectionate intimacy, acceptance and involvement than fathers (Sümer & Güngör, 1999; Yılmaz, 2000).

Also the standardized regression weights indicated that maternal warmth was stronger predictor of subjective well-being than paternal warmth relatively. Therefore fathers control with relatively low warmth would be perceived by adolescents more negatively. Although only paternal control was positively related to adolescent negative affect, the present findings underscore the role of parental warmth in the positive development of Turkish adolescents. The standardized regression weights showed that as predictors of well-being strength of parental warmth was higher than parental control. This result highlights the importance of warmth in parent-child relationship.

This study has certain limitations that may limit generalizations and suggestions for future research and practice. This study relies on self-reported opinions of the adolescents. Hence, the results reflect how the adolescents perceive their parents’ parenting behaviors. Therefore, the results of this study should be interpreted in light of this limitation. In future, studies different assessment techniques, such as parents’ reports, are required. Because the current study is cross-sectional it is difficult to make causal interpretations and statements regarding the effects of parenting over time. It is possible that having high positive affect and life satisfaction and low negative affect leads to positive parenting behaviors rather than being an outcome of it. Longitudinal research would offer a better understanding of the true nature of the association between parenting and its consequences for children.

Despite these limitations, findings of this study have important methodological implications for research on parenting and well-being, and practical implications for parenting intervention programs. In terms of methods, in future studies adolescents from a greater variety of socio-economic backgrounds and different provinces should be included to determine whether adolescents in different areas of Turkey experience parenting and subjective well-being differently. In the future, longitudinal studies could be conducted to examine long-term effects of parenting on subjective well-being during adolescent years and through adulthood. In order to better understand adolescent subjective well-being and how to increase adolescents’ levels of subjective well-being other variables that were not included in this study, such as self-esteem and dispositional factors, need to be investigated. Moreover, although it has been suggested that behavioral and psychological control have different effects on adolescent development (Barber, 1996), in the present study parental control was not differentiated as behavioral and psychological. So, in future studies parental behavioral and psychological control should be assessed in the same study.

In terms of the implications for practice, perceived warmth from mother and father were found to be an important source of adolescents’ well-being. It is therefore recommended that parents should show affectionate intimacy, acceptance, and involvement to their children. In addition, parental education programs and seminars given by counselors should focus on the effects of high warmth and low psychological control, because proper parenting affect adolescents’ subjective well-being positively and prepare them for adulthood (Park, 2004).
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