

# Family Functioning on Family Quality of life Among College Students

<sup>1</sup>Abel Gitimu Waithaka, <sup>2</sup>Adrienne Boudrey

<sup>1,2</sup>Human Ecology Department, Youngstown State University, Ohio USA

---

**Abstract:** The focus of this study is to investigate family functioning on family quality of life among college students. The study used three scales, Family Functioning Scale (FFS) with 20 items, Family Quality of Life scale (FQOL), with 16 items and Perpetual Indicators of Family Life Quality with 35 items. A total of 182 undergraduate students participated in the study with an average age of 18-56 years. The sample of the study was made up of 46 (25%) males and 136 (75%) females' participants. Data was collected in a classroom setting during class time in spring 2018 in a university college. The findings indicate participants who had low social support scored lower on the family functioning scale in the area of Intimacy and parenting style, but higher in conflict . Participants who were not satisfied with their quality of life scored lower in family interaction and parenting and emotional well- being . On the perpetual indicators of family life quality, participants who received low social support scored lower in love, status, services, information, goods, and money.

**Keywords:** Social Support, Family Function, Family Interaction, Parenting Style, Intimacy.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The family is recognized as the foundation of society, and has an irreplaceable place in human life. It is in the way that the family functions that allows individuals to begin to receive satisfaction in life, by performing their functions effectively, and grow up into productive members of the society (Nazli, 2001). Families are thought of as the first institution in society where human relationships protect and support without any external reward. The purpose and importance of family functioning is to teach their children how to effectively function in society (Roelfse & Middleton 1985).

Every human spends the majority of their life in a family. Behavioral scientist and psychologist believe that people are affected by the way their family functions, having a direct effect on the way they think and behave (Sanchez, 2010). Families are considered healthy when its members, are functioning properly in their roles, and the members of the family relate to each other in a positive manner (Bradshaw, 1995). Children need a happy and healthy environment that will teach them how to function in their homes and in society. However, families are not always happy as disagreements are normal and will occur especially when people live in close proximity with each other (Park & Buriel 1998). However, it is the responsibility of the adults to model love and forgiveness in the home and to reassure their children that although conflict will occur, their family is a secure base that they can leave but also return to in the time of need (Park & Buriel 1998). The quality of life of the college students is important because they are valuable to the society (Mostafai, 2010; Storrie et al, 2010). The quality of life is based on the perception of the individual's satisfaction with the various levels of his or her life (Kaplan & Ries, 2007).

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Family is not only the basic unit of society, but also an important place for individual physical and mental growth. A family is made up of the various members in the family. And simultaneously, it affects the growth of every member, of the family and plays a pivotal role in the normal operation process of social development. Therefore, family function is molded by the characteristics of the family itself and depends on the social demand. The concept of family functioning, which embodies the characteristics of the family exist as a system, has been proposed by scholars since the 1970s (Dai & Wang, 2015). During the first years of their life children are being affected by the relationship that they have with their

mother and father. In a secure attachment, the child senses the parents as a secure base from which to venture and return to for safety (Bialby 2006). Family is the first institution that has been created to fulfil the needs of the natural human, specifically the need of social life and need of human interaction (Amato & Sobolewski, 2001).

Family functioning is the pattern in which family members relate and interact with each other daily (Minuchin, 1974). The dimensions of family functioning are emotional bonding, power structures and acquisition of competences, and the changes that occur throughout their lifespan (Olson et al.1989). According to the circumplex model cohesion, flexibility and communication are key. Cohesion is how family members bond emotionally, flexibility is how leadership is expressed and implemented, and communication allows facilitate it to occur (Olson & Gorall, 2006). Families who communicate well are able to make the necessary changes in cohesion and flexibility. Olson and Gorall (2006) claim that when families are able to strike a balance between cohesion and flexibility they function well. Dysfunction occurs when cohesion and flexibility are out of balance, these patterns make up family function whether positive or negative, varying levels of cohesion and flexibility are associated with different parenting styles (Olson & Gorall, 2006). Parenting styles are defined as the actions, the mindset, and morals parents use to decide how they will interact with their children (Musser, 1983). It is the psychological construct that represent the typical standards that parents use while raising their children. Most parents will develop their style of parenting from a combination of concepts, however as their children mature and develop these styles may evolve (Trishala & Kiran, 2015).

Diana Baumrind, a clinical and developmental psychologist known for her research on parenting styles on her research acknowledges three parenting styles based on two dimensions, 1) "Parental responsiveness", how parents respond to their children's needs. 2) "Parental Demandingness" the way the parents expect their child to respond in a more mature manner. From those two dimensions she distinguished three parenting styles; they are the authoritarian, the authoritative and the permissive (Baumrind, 1967). Maccoby and Martin (1983) expanded the parenting styles to authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful, these four styles were a combination of acceptance and responsiveness on one side and demand and control on the other.

Parents who use the authoritarian parenting style, work to shape, and control the actions of their children according to set standards. This style of parenting is restricting and punitive. Parents demand that the children conform and comply with their rules and directive. The parent and child has little to no dialogue between them. The authoritarian parent is not flexible and does not respond to the needs of the child as they are very stringent. There is no explanation for rules or the limits that have been set, however they must be followed. Physical punishment is often used, as well as yelling and scolding (Baumrind, 1967).

The authoritative parenting style is considered the most balanced. This style of parenting is very aware of their child's needs and those needs are met, however the parents of this style also have high demands. The authoritative parent is firm, but flexible when situations arise. This parenting style focus is always on the child, the children are held to high standards, with responsibility and a level of maturity according to their age. The parents are tuned to the child's feelings, and, they teach their children to manage their emotions as they are constantly aware of what the child needs and how they are feeling. Although the children have limits and parents maintain control, the children are permitted to venture out. When punishment is given, the child is aware of why it is happening and knows that the punishment is consistent with the negative behavior, authoritative parents separate the child from the behavior and forgiveness is always given (Baumrind, 1967). As a result, these children are often times, Independent, self-reliant, happy, capable and successful (Baumrind, 1967).

Indulgent parents also known as permissive, non-directive and lenient parents. This style of parenting place very few demands on their children in regard to their behavior, they respond well to their needs and the desires of their children (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). "Permissive parents are non-traditional, do not require mature behavior, allow considerable self-regulation and avoid confrontation" (Maccoby & Martin 1983). Permissive parents allow their children to make their own decisions. Children of permissive parents have little control over their actions and want to have things their way, however they are open to learning and can accept losing. The children are very seldom punished for their negative behavior, and there are very few rules (Maccoby & Martin 1983).

The relationship between the parent and child is beneficial and influential. The parental style is important because it shapes how the child sees themselves and the world. Healthy self-esteem, worth, appropriate thinking and healthy behavior are the results of a positive parent child relationship (Shamrock, 2005). Researchers have found that a child's

academic success, cognitive development, the ability to manage their emotion, and adjustment comes from a positive relationship with parents (Davidov, & Grusec, 2006; Denham, Workman, Cole, Weissbrod, Kendziora, Zahnaxler, 2000; Laible, 2004; Pettit & Spera, 2005). Davies, Cummings and Winter (2004) suggest that the way children behavior are the results of their parent's parenting style (Johnson, Kent, & Leather, 2005; Nair & Murray, 2005; Steele, Nesbit –Daly, Daniel &Forehand, 2005).

Health is defined by the World Health Organization as “a state of complete physical, mental, and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease” (World Health Organization, 1948). Quality of life is the individual's view of his or her life based on their culture and morals in relation to their hopes and dreams within their social structure. Its concept is affected by the physical health, mental state, independence, personal relationships and ability to manage the varying components of the environment (WHOQOL Group, 1998). Therefore, the definition of quality of life is based on our mental state that has been influenced by childhood experiences, personality and our goals (Orley et al, 1998). Social psychological research indicates that early parenting effects mental health later in life (Gotlib et al., 1988; Mc Kinney et al., 2011; Parker et al., 1979; Rogers, 1996). Bowlby (1988), states the attachment between parent and child will affect the mental health of the person as an adult.

Most of the research on parental behaviors suggests that parents who are actively involved in their children's education have children who are more motivated in school and achieve at higher levels (Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994; Englund, Luckner, Whaley, & Egeland, 2004). One promising avenue for improving young people's educational prospects is parental educational and engagement in educational lives of their children, which has been linked to stronger academic outcomes for children (Jeynes, 2007; Hill and Tyson, 2009; Zhan and Sherraden, 2011).

Parental support can come in different ways such as parents supporting their children emotionally and also financially assisting them to achieve their goals (Chao, 2012; Lee et al., 2014). Parental support may determine how well students handle various forms of stress that come with attending college. Many studies have shown that social support from either parents or friends or romantic relationships have caused a decrease in symptoms that are internalized (Lee et al., 2014; Schraedley et al., 1999; Zhao, Kong & Wang, 2013; Zhou, Zhu, Zhang & Cai, 2013). These internalizing symptoms may cause the student to be depressed, anxiety and withdraw from social activity, hence negatively affect their wellbeing (Lee et al., 2014; Telzer & Fuligni, 2013).

Support from parents during the student's early years as well as in college may prevent the student from internalizing symptoms by equipping them with the necessary tools such as self-esteem that will help them to handle these situations on their own (Chao, 2012; Colarossi & Eccles, 2000; Lee, Dickson, Conley, & Holmbeck, 2014, Rueger, Malecki, & Demaray, 2010). However, the support that student receives, and the effects of that support may be different for men and women (Rueger et al. 2010).

A recent meta-analysis determined that college students who are receiving support from their parents and feel secure in their relationship with their parents do better in advanced levels of motivation in the area of academics. They experience less stress and participate less in unsafe behavior (Mattanah, Lopez & Govern, 2011). Bernier, Larose, Boivin and Soucy (2004) reported that students who have an insecure attachment with parents experience a difficulty in academics and adjusting to college during their first year. According to Zautra, Hall, and Murray (2010) resilience is the ability to adapt or adjust to difficult situations. Resilience helps the individual handle situations that result in positive results (Zautra, Hall, and Murray (2010). Optimism and resilience work together when faced with stressful situations (Carver, Scheier, & Segerstrom, 2010).

Self-efficacy is a person's belief and confidence that they have the skills necessary to obtain the goals that they have set for themselves (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy is also shown to have good results in the area of academics (Mavis, 2001; Vrugt, Oort, & Zebera, 2010; Carroll et al, 2008, Hsich, Sullivan & Guerra, 2007), and it anticipates student's motivation and learning as well as affect their quality of life (Schunk, 1989). Research shows that self-efficacy and quality of life positively affect the other and it also has a negative effect as well-being (Mukhtar & Hashim, 2010).

## 2.1. Social Exchange theory

The social exchange theory is based on cost and rewards, to receive the most rewards for lowest cost possible whether material or non-material as well as in relationships with significant others (Adams, 1965; Blau, 1964). Social exchange is an agreement in which two or more individuals engage in to trade or exchange goods and services that neither cannot

obtain or manufacture themselves (Emerson, 1972). The theory of social exchange is one of the most important components that allow us to study and understand human behaviors and the dynamics of their relationships (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

The ability to establish positive relationships with others is essential for the development of humans (Larsen, Sandberg, Harper, & Bean, 2011; Murphy, 2011; Rhoades, Stanley, Markman, & Ragan, 2012). Interpersonal relationships was labelled as one of the leading issues of health and wellbeing (Bair –Merritt, Ghazarian, Burrell, & Dugan, 2012; Carpenter & Stacks, 2009; Halpern-Meekin, Manning, Giordano, & Longmore, 2013; Levendosky, Lambert, & Yalch, 2012; Smith, Elwyn, Ireland, & Thornberry, 2010; Yarnell & Neff, 2013). Overwhelming empirical evidence show that when there are issues and problems in these relationships although they are bound by legal ties, it results in individuals exhibiting negative behaviors and psychological challenges (Diez et. al., 2009; Renner, 2009; Salven & O' Leary, 2013).

Although many young adults move away from home to attend college or to start a family and have a home of their own, those who are having a difficult time living on their own return to live with their parents. Many young adults return for various reasons, either because of divorce or because of not being married, or having children and not being married, financial difficulties and many other diverse reasons. However, those who leave home prematurely either because of joining the military, college, job, marriage or issues with family members usually will return home (Cobb-Clark, 2008; Da Vanzo & Goldscheider, 1990; Glick & Lin, 1986; Goldscheider & DaVanzo, 1989; Messineo & Wojtkiewicz, 2004; White, 1994). The level of the exchange between parent and adult child may affect their relationship. Adult children will have to rationalize if the cost of living with their parents outweighs the benefits of living with their parents (Aquillino & Supple, 1991; Seltera, Laub, & Bianchi, 2012). Parents who are now free to enjoy their empty nest may not be happy about their adult children's return (Aquillino & Suppe, 1991). The adult child needs come before the parents across the life span of the child regardless of what cause the coresidency (Choi, 2003; Grundy, 2005; Smits, Van Gaalen, Mulder, 2010; Spaere & Avery, 1993; Ward, Logan & Spitze, 1992).

## 2.2. Family Systems Theory

Family systems theory states that the members of the family are interdependent (Cox & Paley, 1997). In order to understand the family system, you have to study the family member as a whole and not just the individual members separate from the others (Whitechurch & Constantine, 1993). This theory is based on the understanding that all the members are connected to the other and that the interactions that happen between the members of the entire family (von Bertalanffy, 1968).

Structural family theorist (Minuchin, 1974) state that healthy family functioning requires that clear boundaries are set for all family members. When parents depend on their children to care for them the generational boundary has been crossed and the child then is placed in a role to be the parent to the parent and the child is not playing the role of their generation. Blos (1979) emphasizes the importance of adolescents going through the process of cutting their dependent ties with their parents to gain autonomy. When this process does not occur due to the adolescent parenting the parent or other family members it may cause the adolescent to engage in unhealthy behavior. In the family system parental monitoring is the one factor that will lead to risky behavior for adolescents (Barnes, Hoffman, Welte, Farrell, & Dintcheff, 2006; Li, Feigelman & Staton, 2000). Previous research shows that when parental monitoring is increased risky behavior in adolescents are decreased including sex and substance use (Byrnes, Miller, Chen, & Grube, 2011; Di Clemente, et al., 2001; Sieverding, Adler, Witt, & Ellen, 2005).

The family culture plays an important role in how families function and this would include normal day to day responsibilities. The responsibilities of family members in one household may impact another household differently. In families that identify as racial or ethnic, feel that it is necessary for children to have responsibilities in the home, it ensures harmony in the family (Kuperminc, et. al., 2009; Orellana, 2001). Also, in working class and poor families members are given responsibilities to assist other members of the family (Winton, 2003). In many cultures it is very natural for children to take on adult responsibilities (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Spark, 1973; Jurkovic, 1997). But when children are the responsible for the emotional well-being of their parent, concerns are raised as emotional caregiving of parents have greater negative results than other roles that children have in parenting (Earley & Cushway, 2002); Jukovic, Jessee & Goglia, 1991).

The purpose of this study was to find out if the function of the family affects the quality of life of college students. The function of the family is to interact and train children to be productive members of society. In the family unit the members are encouraged to grow into mentally and physically healthy individuals. The way parents respond to their children and the way parents expect their children to respond to them this is accomplished by the parenting styles. But more importantly the interactions with the adults in the lives of the children, help to create positive self-esteem and healthy behaviors or the opposite, causing the child to have difficulty interacting with others and more importantly having a negative self-image that will affect their quality of life. Poor self-esteem and self-efficacy makes it difficult for the child/college student to be successful in college as well as in personal relationships.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Participants

The data in this study was collected from undergraduate students at University College from various majors of study. The total number of participants in this study was 182, males 46 (25 %) and females 136 (75 %). The age of the participants in this study ranged from 18 years to 56 years. Each participant was informed that participation in this study was voluntary, confidential and anonymous.

#### 3.2. Research Questions

RQ-1 Is there a difference in family functioning on low and high social supported students?

RQ-2 Is there a difference in family functioning between those concerned and those satisfied financially?

RQ-3 Is there a difference between students with low and high social support on family quality of life?

RQ-4 Is there a difference in family quality of life between those concerned and those satisfied financially?

RQ-5 Is there a difference on perpetual indicators of quality of life between low and high social supported students?

RQ-6 Is there a difference on perpetual indicators of quality of life between those concerned and those satisfied financially?

#### 3.3. Materials

The study used three scales, family functioning scale (FFS) was created by Carver, & Jones, (1992). The scale has 20 item Likert-type questionnaire designed to examine satisfaction within one's family. The family quality of life scale (FQOL) was created by Hoffman, Marquis, Poston, Summers, & Turnbull, (2006). The scale is a 16-item assessment for quality of life. It assesses how students feel about their life in relation to other family members using a Likert rating scale from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. The perpetual indicators of family life quality scale (PIFQ), was created by Retting, (1983). The scale is 35 items using Likert-type questionnaires that assess respondent's perception regarding support received from family members.

#### 3.4. Procedure

Institutional Review Board (IRB) application for the study was approved. Investigator emailed professors at a State University in mid-western United States asking for permission to give survey during class time. Once professors agreed to allow data collection in their classroom, investigator took surveys and consent letters to the classrooms. Investigator passed out surveys and consent letters to the students and it took 10-15 minutes to complete the survey and the investigator collected all finished surveys. The data from all collected surveys were then individually entered into SPSS by investigator. All hard copies of the surveys were kept in the office of the principal investigator for several years before they are destroyed.

### 4. RESULT SECTION

RQ1. Is there a difference in family functioning on low and high social supported students?

**Table 1: Family functioning on low and high social supported students**

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intimacy	Low Support	67	47.0746	14.1456	1	6916.639	49.957	.00
	High Support	114	59.8772	10.1215	179	138.452		
	Total	181	55.1381	13.2705	180			

Conflict	Low Support	67	35.2388	9.13052	1	1788.798	22.036	.00
	High Support	114	28.7281	8.93862	179	81.177		
	Total	181	31.1381	9.52177	180			
Parenting Style	Low Support	67	30.9552	9.11282	1	1996.362	37.589	.00
	High Support	114	37.8333	5.96882	179	53.110		
	Total	181	35.2873	7.99412	180			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing the influence of low social support and high social support of participants on family functioning on intimacy, conflict and parenting style. A significance difference was found on intimacy ( $F(1, 179) = 49.957$ ), conflict ( $F(1, 179) = 22.036$ ), and parenting style ( $F(1, 179) = 37.589$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Tukey's was used to determine the nature of the differences between low and high social supported participants. The analysis revealed that on intimacy, low social supported participants scored lower ( $M = 47.075$ ,  $sd = 14.146$ ) than high social support participants ( $M = 59.877$ ,  $sd = 10.122$ ), on conflict, low social supported participants scored higher ( $M = 35.239$ ,  $sd = 9.131$ ) than high social support participants ( $M = 28.729$ ,  $sd = 8.939$ ), on parenting style, low social supported participants scored lower ( $M = 30.956$ ,  $sd = 9.113$ ) than high social support participants ( $M = 37.833$ ,  $sd = 5.969$ ).

RQ2. Is there a difference in family functioning between those concerned and those satisfied financially?

**Table 2: Family functioning between those concerned and those satisfied financially**

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intimacy	Concerned	114	51.7281	13.89804	1	3650.093	23.358	.000
	Satisfied	68	60.9853	9.69766	180	156.264		
	Total	182	55.1868	13.25017	181			
Conflict	Concerned	114	32.7544	9.51716	1	841.775	9.748	.002
	Satisfied	68	28.3088	8.90121	180	86.354		
	Total	182	31.0934	9.51458	181			
Parenting Style	Concerned	114	33.2632	8.54354	1	1227.894	21.488	.000
	Satisfied	68	38.6324	5.51498	180	57.144		
	Total	182	35.2692	7.97573	181			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing participants concerned financially and those satisfied financially on family functioning on intimacy, conflict and parenting style. A significance difference was found on intimacy ( $F(1, 180) = 23.358$ ), conflict ( $F(1, 180) = 9.748$ ), and parenting style ( $F(1, 180) = 21.488$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Tukey's was used to determine the nature of the differences between those concerned financially and those satisfied financially. The analysis revealed that on intimacy, those concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 51.728$ ,  $sd = 13.898$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 60.985$ ,  $sd = 9.698$ ), on conflict those concerned financially scored higher ( $M = 32.754$ ,  $sd = 9.517$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 28.309$ ,  $sd = 8.901$ ), on parenting style those concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 33.263$ ,  $sd = 8.544$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 38.632$ ,  $sd = 5.515$ ).

RQ3. Is there a difference between students with low and high social support on family quality of life?

**Table 3: Low and high social support on family quality of life**

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Low Support	67	20.0299	6.11003	1	1287.113	51.426	.000
	High Support	114	25.5526	4.22402	179	25.029		
	Total	181	23.5083	5.66041	180			
Parenting	Low Support	67	22.5821	5.66261	1	555.572	22.792	.000
	High Support	114	26.2105	4.45920	179	24.376		
	Total	181	24.8674	5.22750	180			
Emotional Wellbeing	Low Support	67	13.0896	4.07405	1	775.779	72.316	.000
	High Support	114	17.3772	2.70166	179	10.728		
	Total	181	15.7901	3.87013	180			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing the participants with low and high social support on family quality of life on family interaction, parenting and emotional wellbeing. A significance difference was found on family interaction ( $F(1, 179) = 51.426$ , parenting ( $F(1, 179) = 22.792$ , and emotional wellbeing ( $F(1, 179) = 72.316$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Tukey's was used to determine the nature of the differences between low social support and high social support participants. The analysis revealed that on family interaction, those with low social support scored lower ( $M = 20.030$ ,  $sd = 6.110$ ) than those with high social support ( $M = 25.553$ ,  $sd = 4.224$ , on parenting, those with low social support scored lower ( $M = 22.582$ ,  $sd = 5.662$ ) than those with high social support ( $M = 26.211$ ,  $sd = 4.459$ , on emotional wellbeing those with low social support scored lower ( $M = 13.090$ ,  $sd = 4.074$ ) than those with high social support ( $M = 17.377$ ,  $sd = 2.702$ ).

RQ4. Is there a difference in family quality of life between those concerned and those satisfied financially?

**Table 4: Family quality of life between those concerned and those satisfied financially**

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Concerned	114	22.1754	6.03419	1	562.29	19.371	.00
	Satisfied	68	25.8088	4.07122	180	29.028		
	Total	182	23.5330	5.65456	181			
Parenting	Concerned	114	23.4825	5.73798	1	599.87	24.945	.00
	Satisfied	68	27.2353	3.01299	180	24.048		
	Total	182	24.8846	5.21821	181			
Emotional Wellbeing	Concerned	114	14.7632	4.12268	1	312.21	23.499	.00
	Satisfied	68	17.4706	2.65122	180	13.286		
	Total	182	15.7747	3.86496	181			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing participants concerned financially and those satisfied financially on family quality of life on family interaction, parenting and emotional wellbeing. A significance difference was found on family interaction ( $F(1, 180) = 19.371$ , parenting ( $F(1, 180) = 24.945$ , and emotional wellbeing ( $F(1, 180) = 23.499$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Tukey's was used to determine the nature of the differences between those concerned financially and those satisfied financially. The analysis revealed that on family interaction, those concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 22.175$ ,  $sd = 6.034$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 25.809$ ,  $sd = 4.071$ , on parenting, those concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 23.483$ ,  $sd = 5.738$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 27.235$ ,  $sd = 3.013$ , on emotional wellbeing those concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 14.763$ ,  $sd = 4.123$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 17.471$ ,  $sd = 2.651$ ).

RQ5. Is there a difference on perpetual indicators of quality of life between low and high social supported students?

**Table 5: Perpetual indicators of quality of life between low and high social supported students**

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Love	Low support	67	22.3433	8.50232	1	3155.926	44.742	.00
	High Support	114	30.9912	8.33746	179	70.537		
	Total	181	27.7901	9.36365	180			
Status	Low support	67	23.4478	11.70636	1	2093.505	32.685	.00
	High Support	114	30.4912	4.62820	179	64.051		
	Total	181	27.8840	8.67902	180			
Services	Low support	66	22.4697	7.88615	1	2905.556	42.302	.00
	High Support	114	30.8070	8.51015	178	68.686		
	Total	180	27.7500	9.19429	179			
Information	Low support	67	32.7612	12.94521	1	5963.668	50.159	.00
	High Support	114	44.6491	9.51104	179	118.895		
	Total	181	40.2486	12.30307	180			
Goods	Low support	67	26.4925	11.58156	1	928.874	10.087	.00
	High Support	114	31.1842	8.21779	179	92.089		
	Total	181	29.4475	9.83552	180			
Money	Low support	67	20.6716	7.78185	1	2054.463	42.540	.00
	High Support	114	27.6491	6.41346	179	48.295		
	Total	181	25.0663	7.70974	180			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing the participants with low and high social support on perpetual indicators of quality of life of love, status, services, information, goods and money. A significance difference was found on love ( $F(1, 179) = 44.742$ , status ( $F(1, 179) = 32.685$ , services ( $F(1, 178) = 42.302$ , information ( $F(1, 179) = 50.159$ , goods ( $F(1, 179) = 10.087$ , and money ( $F(1, 179) = 42.540$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Tuskey's was used to determine the nature of the differences between low social support and high social support participants. The analysis revealed that on love, those with low social support scored lower ( $M = 22.343$ ,  $sd = 8.502$ ) than those with high social support ( $M = 30.991$ ,  $sd = 8.337$ , on status, those with low social support scored lower ( $M = 23.448$ ,  $sd = 11.706$ ) than those with high social support ( $M = 30.491$ ,  $sd = 4.628$ , on services those with low social support scored lower ( $M = 22.470$ ,  $sd = 7.886$ ) than those with high social support ( $M = 30.807$ ,  $sd = 8.510$ ), on information, those with low social support scored lower ( $M = 32.761$ ,  $sd = 12.945$ ) than those with high social support ( $M = 44.694$ ,  $sd = 9.511$ , on goods, those with low social support scored lower ( $M = 26.493$ ,  $sd = 11.582$ ) than those with high social support ( $M = 31.184$ ,  $sd = 8.218$ , and on money those with low social support scored lower ( $M = 20.672$ ,  $sd = 7.782$ ) than those with high social support ( $M = 27.649$ ,  $sd = 6.413$ ).

RQ6. Is there a difference on perpetual indicators of quality of life between those concerned and those satisfied financially?

**Table 6: Perpetual indicators of quality of life between concerned and satisfied financially**

		N	Mean	Std. Devt	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Love	Concerned	114	26.2895	10.76682	1	678.070	8.079	.005
	Satisfied	68	30.2794	5.47408	180	83.929		
	Total	182	27.7802	9.33869	181			
Status	Concerned	114	25.5351	7.94470	1	1684.335	25.533	.000
	Satisfied	68	31.8235	8.41275	180	65.968		
	Total	182	27.8846	8.65501	181			
Services	Concerned	114	25.4649	7.63339	1	1602.278	21.198	.000
	Satisfied	67	31.6269	10.25853	179	75.587		
	Total	181	27.7459	9.16888	180			
Information	Concerned	114	36.9737	13.15225	1	3324.828	24.995	.000
	Satisfied	68	45.8088	8.10059	180	133.019		
	Total	182	40.2747	12.27409	181			
Goods	Concerned	114	28.1140	11.93401	1	531.662	5.667	.018
	Satisfied	68	31.6471	3.44147	180	93.817		
	Total	182	29.4341	9.80999	181			
Money	Concerned	114	21.9035	7.41198	1	3072.705	72.486	.000
	Satisfied	68	30.3971	4.60739	180	42.390		
	Total	182	25.0769	7.68974	181			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing the participants concerned financially and those satisfied financially on perpetual indicators of quality of life of love, status, services, information, goods and money. A significance difference was found on love ( $F(1, 180) = 8.079$ , status ( $F(1, 180) = 25.533$ , services ( $F(1, 180) = 21.198$ , information ( $F(1, 180) = 24.995$ , goods ( $F(1, 180) = 5.667$ , and money ( $F(1, 180) = 72.486$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Tuskey's was used to determine the nature of the differences between participants concerned financially and those satisfied financially. The analysis revealed that on love concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 26.290$ ,  $sd = 10.767$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 30.279$ ,  $sd = 5.474$ ), on status, those concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 25.535$ ,  $sd = 7.945$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 31.824$ ,  $sd = 8.413$ ), on services those concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 25.465$ ,  $sd = 7.633$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 31.627$ ,  $sd = 10.259$ ), on information, those concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 36.974$ ,  $sd = 13.152$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 45.809$ ,  $sd = 8.101$ ), on goods, those concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 28.114$ ,  $sd = 11.934$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 31.647$ ,  $sd = 3.441$ ), and on money those concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 21.903$ ,  $sd = 7.412$ ) than those satisfied financially ( $M = 30.397$ ,  $sd = 4.607$ ).

## 5. DISCUSSION

The study showed a significant difference, in family functioning between participants who received low social support and those received high social support. These findings agree with previous research that noted permissive parents are non-traditional, do not require mature behavior, allow considerable self-regulation and avoid confrontation (Maccoby & Martin 1983). Permissive parents allow their children to make their own decisions. Children of permissive parents have



little control over their actions and want to have things their way, however they are open to learning and can accept losing. The children are very seldom punished for their negative behavior, and there are very few rules (Maccoby & Martin 1983). However, it is the responsibility of the adults to model love and forgiveness in the home and to reassure their children that although conflict will occur, their family is the secure base that they can leave but also return to in the time of need (Park & Buriel 1998).

On the difference in family functioning between those concerned and those satisfied financially. There was a significant difference found, those that were financially satisfied scored higher. Previous research on parental behaviors suggests that parents who are actively involved in their children's education have children who are more motivated in school and achieve at higher levels (Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994; Englund, Luckner, Whaley, & Egeland, 2004). One promising avenue for improving young people's educational prospects is parental educational engagement in educational lives of their children, which has been linked to stronger academic outcomes for children (Jeynes 2007; Hill and Tyson 2009; Zhan and Sherraden 2011).

The study showed significant results when comparing student quality of life between those with low social support and those with high social support. Those with low social support scored lower in the areas of family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being. Previous research agrees that the Quality of life is the individual's view of his or her life based on their culture and morals in relation to their hopes and dreams within their social structure. Its concept is affected by the physical health, mental state, independence, personal relationships and ability to manage the varying components of the environment (WHOQOL Group, 1998). Therefore, the definition of quality of life is based on our mental state that has been influenced by childhood experiences, personality and our goals (Orley et al 1998). Social psychological research indicates that early parenting affects mental health later in life (Gotlib et al., 1988; Mc Kinney et al., 2011; Parker et al., 1979; Rogers 1996). The effects that childhood experiences have had on the mental and physical wellbeing of adults have been scientifically examined since the early 20th century.

On family quality of life between those concerned and those satisfied financially indicated a significant difference with participants who were concerned about their finances scored lower in family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being. Previous research state that parents who use the authoritarian parenting style, work to shape, and control the actions of their children according to set standards. This style of parenting is strict restricting and punitive. Parents demand that the children conform and comply with their rules and directive. The parent and child have little to no dialogue between them. The authoritarian parent is not flexible and does not respond to the needs of the child as they are very stringent. There is no explanation for rules or the limits that have been set, however they must be followed. Physical punishment is often used as well as yelling and scolding (Baumrind, 1967).

The results on the perpetual indicators of the quality of life comparing students receiving low social support and those receiving high social support. Those receiving high support scored higher in the areas of love, status, services, information, goods and money. Previous research agrees that the authoritative parenting style is considered the most balanced. This style of parenting is very aware of their child's needs and those needs are met however the parents of this style also have high demands. The authoritative parent is firm but flexible when situations arise. This parenting style focus is always on the child, the children are held to high standards, with responsibility and a level of maturity according to their age. The parents are very in tuned to the child's feelings, and, they teach their children to manage their emotions they are constantly aware of what the child needs and how they are feeling. Although the children have limits and parents maintain control, the children are permitted to venture out. When punishment is given the child is aware of why it is happening and knows that the punishment is consistent with the negative behavior, authoritative parents separate the child from the behavior and forgiveness is always given (Baumrind, 1967). As a result, these children are often times, Independent, self-reliant, happy, capable and successful. Previous research also agree that individuals who have large support systems tend to take more risk financially than those who have very little support because they feel that if their plan fails they still have people that they can rely on (Hsee & Weber, 1999; Mandel, 2003).

On Perpetual indicators of quality of life between those concerned and those financially satisfied. Participants concerned financially scored lower in the areas of love, status, services, information, goods and money than those satisfied financially. Previous research agree and established conceptual models state that there is a connection between the parental financial hardships and the home environment, parenting styles and outcomes for children and teenagers (Conger et al. 1994; Elder 1974; Elder et al. 1985; McLoyd 1990, 1998). As well as the Family Stress Model (FSM) suggest that

when financial hardships are present and continual that families are likely to experience the hardship of their basic needs not being met, unpaid bills, that often times will lead to psychological and emotional distress. This type of financial pressure will result in marital conflict that will ultimately affect the consistency of the way they will be parenting their children (Jarrett et al. 2010; Dominguez and Watkins).

## 6. CONCLUSION

The results of the study showed that students who had low social support and concerned financially scored lower on family interaction, parenting, emotional well-being, intimacy and parenting style but scored higher in family conflict. Also students with low social support and concerned financially scored lower in love, status, services, information, goods, and money than students who had high social support, and satisfied financially.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Grote, N. K., & Clark, M. S. (2001). *Perceiving unfairness in the family: Cause or consequence of marital distress? Advance in Experimental Social Psychology* (vol. 2, pp. 267–299). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- [2] Amato, P. R., & Sobolewski, J. M. (2001). The effects of divorce and marital discord on adult children's psychological well-being. *American Sociological Review*, 66(6) 900-921
- [3] Aquilino, W. S., & Supple, K. R. (1991). Parent-child relations and parent's satisfaction with living arrangements when adult children live at home. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53(1), 13–27.
- [4] Asadi, M. K. (2017). The role of family health and psychological well-being in the prediction of the students' quality of life. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 8(1), 51-54
- [5] Bair-Merritt, M. H., Ghazarian, S. R., Burrell, L., & Duggan, A. (2012). Patterns of intimate partner violence in mothers at-risk for child maltreatment. *Journal of Family Violence*, 27(4), 287–294.
- [6] Bandura, A. (1977). Towards a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- [7] Barnes, G. M., Hoffman, J. H., Welte, J. W., Farrell, M. P., & Dintcheff, B. A. (2006). Effects of parental monitoring and peer deviance on substance use and delinquency. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 1084–1104.
- [8] Benner, A., Boyle, A., & Sadler, S. (2016). Parental Involvement and Adolescents' Educational Success: The Roles of Prior Achievement and Socioeconomic Status. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 45(6), 1053-1064.
- [9] Bernier, A., Larose, S., Boivin, M., & Soucy, N. (2004). Attachment state of mind: Implications for adjustment to college. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19, 783–806.
- [10] Berryhill, M. B., Soloski, K. L., Durtschi, J. A., & Adams, R. R. (2016). Family process: Early child emotionality, parenting stress, and couple relationship quality. *Personal Relationships*, 23(1), 23-41.
- [11] Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: Wiley
- [12] Blos, P. (1979). *The adolescent passage*. New York: International Universities Press
- [13] Boszormenyi-Nagy, I., & Spark, G. M. (1973). *Invisible loyalties: Reciprocity in intergenerational family therapy*. New York: Harper & Row
- [14] Bowlby J. A. (1988). *Secure Base: Clinical Applications of Attachment Theory*. Londra: Routledge; 1988.
- [15] Bradshaw, J. (1995). *Ailenizi Kefedin. İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi*
- [16] Byrnes, H. F., Miller, B. A., Chen, M.-J., & Grube, J. W. (2011). The roles of mothers' neighborhood perceptions and specific monitoring strategies in youths' problem behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40, 347– 360.
- [17] Carpenter, G. L., & Stacks, A. M. (2009). Developmental effects of exposure to intimate partner violence in early childhood: A review of the literature. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(8), 831–839.

- [18] Carroll, A., Houghton S., Wood, R., Unsworth, K., Hattie, J., Gordon, L., & Bowen, J. (2008). Self-efficacy and academic achievement in Australian high school students: the mediating effects of academic aspirations and delinquency. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32(4), 797-817.
- [19] Carver, M.D., & Jones, W. M. (1992). The family satisfaction scale. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 20, 71-84.
- [20] Carver, C.S., Scheier, M.F., & Segerstrom, S.C. (2010). Optimism. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30, 879-889.
- [21] Chao, R. C. (2012). Managing perceived stress among college students: The roles of social support and dysfunctional coping. *Journal of College Counseling*, 15, 5-21.
- [22] Choi, N. G. (2003). Coresidence between unmarried aging parents and their adult children: Who moved in with whom and why? *Research on Aging*, 25(4), 384-404.
- [23] Cobb-Clark, D. A. (2008). Leaving home: What economics has to say about the living arrangements of young Australians. *Australian Economic Review*, 41(2), 160-176.
- [24] Colarossi, L. G., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). A prospective study of adolescents' peer support: Gender differences and the influence of parental relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29, 661-678.
- [25] Conger, R. D., Conger, K. J., Elder, G. H, Jr, Lorenz, F. O., Simons, R. L., & Whitbeck, L. B. (1992). A family process model of economic hardship and adjustment of early adolescent boys. *Child Development*, 63, 526-541.
- [26] Conger, R. D., & Donnellan, M. B. (2007). An interactionist perspective on the socioeconomic context of human development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 175-199.
- [27] Conger, R. D., Ge, X., Elder, G. H, Jr, Lorenz, F. O., & Simons, R. L. (1994). Economic stress, coercive family process and developmental problems of adolescents. *Child Development*, 65, 541-561.
- [28] Cox, M. J., & Paley, B. (1997). Families as systems. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 243-267.
- [29] Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900
- [30] Dai, L.T. and Wang, L.N. (2015) Review of Family Functioning. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 3,134-141.
- [31] DaVanzo, J., & Goldscheider, F. K. (1990). Coming home again: Returns to the parental home of young adults. *Population Studies*, 44(2), 241-255.
- [32] Davidov, M., & Grusec, J. E. (2006). Untangling the links of parental responsiveness to distress and warmth to child outcomes. *Child Development*, 77, 44-58.
- [33] Davies, P. T., Cummings, E. M., & Winter, M. A. (2004) Pathways between profiles of family functioning, child security in the interparental subsystem, and child psychological problems. *Development and Psychopathology*, 16, 525-550
- [34] Denham, S. A., Workman, E., Cole, P. M., Weissbrod, C., Kendziora, K. T., & Zahnaxler, C. (2000). Prediction of externalizing behavior problems from early to middle childhood: The role of parental socialization and emotion expression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 23-45.
- [35] DiClemente, R. J., Wingood, G. M., Crosby, R., Sionean, C., Cobb, B. K., Harrington, K. et al. (2001). Parental monitoring: Association with adolescents' risk behaviors. *Pediatrics*, 107(6), 1363-1368.
- [36] Díez, S. U., Escutia, C. V., Pacheco, B. N., Martínez, M. S., Caracena, N. V., & Contreras, A. O. (2009). Prevalence of intimate partner violence and its relationship to physical and psychological health indicators. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 9(3), 411-427.
- [37] Dominguez, S., & Watkins, C. (2003). Creating networks for survival and mobility: Social capital among African American and Latin American low-income mothers. *Special Problems*, 50, 111-135.
- [38] Dural, G., & Yalcin, I. (2014). Research. Investigation of Relationship Between Parental Acceptance and Psychological Adjustment Among University Students. *Dusunen Adam: Journal of Psychiatry & Neurological Sciences*, 27(3), 221-232.

- [39] Earley, L., & Cushway, D. (2002). The parentified child. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 7(2), 163–178.
- [40] Elder, G. H. J., Nguyen, T. V., & Caspi, A. (1985). Linking family hardship to children's lives. *Child Development*, 56, 361–375
- [41] Emerson, R. M. (1972). Exchange theory: Part 2. Exchange rules and networks. In J. Berger, M. Zelditch, Jr., & B. Anderson (Eds.), *Sociological theories in progress* (vol. 2, pp. 58–87). Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin
- [42] Englund, M. M., Luckner, A. E., Whaley, G. J. L., & Egeland, B. (2004). Children's achievement in early elementary school: Longitudinal effects of parental involvement, expectations, and quality of assistance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 723–730. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.96.4.723
- [43] Everri, M., Mancini, T., & Fruggeri, L. (2015). Family Functioning, Parental Monitoring and Adolescent Familiar Responsibility in Middle and Late Adolescence. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, 24(10), 3058-3066. doi: 10.1007/s10826-014-0109-z
- [44] Glick, P. C., & Lin, S-L. (1986). More young adults are living with their parents: Who are they? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48(1), 107–112.
- [45] Gotlib, I. H., Mount, J. H., Cordy, N. I., & Whiffen, V. E. (1988). Depression and perceptions of early parenting: A longitudinal investigation. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 152, 24–27.
- [46] Goldscheider, F. K., & DaVanzo, J. (1990). Coming home again: Returns to the parental home of young adults. *Population Studies*, 44(2), 241–55
- [47] Grolnick, W. S., & Slowiaczek, M. L. (1994). Parents' involvement in children's schooling: A multidimensional conceptualization and motivational model. *Child Development*, 64, 237-252
- [48] Grundy, E. (2005). Reciprocity in relationships: Socio-economic and health influences on intergenerational exchanges between third age parents and their adult children in Great Britain. *British Journal of Sociology*, 56(2), 233–254
- [49] Halpern-Meekin, S., Manning, W. D., Giordano, P. C., & Longmore, M. A. (2013). Relationship churning in emerging adulthood on/off relationships and sex with an ex. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 28(2), 166–188
- [50] Hamamci, Z., & Bagci, C. (2017). Analyzing The Relationship Between Parent's Irrational Beliefs and Their Children's Behavioral Problems And Family Function. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(3), 733-740. doi:10.21547/jss.292722
- [51] Hill, N. E., & Tyson, D. F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental Psychology*, 45, 740–763. doi:10.1037/a0015362.
- [52] Hoffman, L., Marquis, J., Poston, D., Summers, J. A., & Turnbull, A. (2006). Assessing family outcomes: Psychometric evaluation of the beach center family quality of life scale. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(4), 1069-1083.
- [53] Holt, L. J. (2014). Help seeking and social competence mediate the parental attachment-College student adjustment relation. *Personal Relationships*, 21(4), 640-654. doi:10.1111/pere.12055
- [54] Hsee, C. K., & Weber, E. U. (1999). Cross-national differences in risk preference and lay predictions. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 12, 165–179.
- [55] Hsieh, P., Sullivan, J. R., & Guerra, N. S. (2007). A closer look at college students: Self-efficacy and goal orientation [Abstract]. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 18(3), 454-476.
- [56] Jarrett, R. L., Jefferson, S. R., & Kelly, J. N. (2010). Finding community in family: Neighborhood effects and African American kin networks. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 41(3), 299–328
- [57] Jaynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 42, 82–110.

- [58] Johnson, G., Kent, G. & Leather, J. (2005) Strengthening the parent– child relationship: A review of family interventions and their use in medical settings. *Child Care, Health and Development*, 31, 25–32
- [59] Jurkovic, G. J., Jessee, E. H., & Goglia, L. R. (1991). Treatment of parental children and their families: Conceptual and technical issues. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 19, 302–314.
- [60] Jurkovic, G. J. (1997). *Lost childhoods: The plight of the parentified child*. New York Brunner/Mazel, Inc:
- [61] Kaplan, R. M., & Ries, A. L. (2007). Quality of Life: Concept and Definition. *COPD: Journal Of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease*, 4(3), 263-271.
- [62] Kuperminc, G. P., Jurkovic, G. J., & Casey, S. (2009). Relation of filial responsibility to the personal and social adjustment of Latino adolescents from immigrant families. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23(1), 14–22.
- [63] Lee, C., Dickson, D. A., Conley, C. S., & Holmbeck, G. N. (2014). A closer look at self-esteem, perceived social support, and coping strategy: A prospective study of depressive symptomatology across the transition to college. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 33, 560–585.
- [64] Li, X., Feigelman, S., & Stanton, B. (2000). Perceived parental monitoring and health risk behaviors among urban low-income African American children and adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 27(1), 43–48. doi:10.1016/S1054-139X(99)00077-4.
- [65] Lili., Danping , Z., & Liang , H. (2016). Social support style affects financial risk-taking behavior : A cross cultural study . *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 44(8), 1305-1314. doi:10.2224/sbp.2016.44.8.1305
- [66] Laible, D. J., Carlo, G., & Roesch, S. C. (2004). Pathways to self-esteem in late adolescence: The role of parent and peer attachment, empathy, and social behaviours. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27, 703–716.
- [67] Larsen, C. D., Sandberg, J. G., Harper, J. M., & Bean, R. (2011). The effects of childhood abuse on relationship quality: Gender differences and clinical implications. *Family Relations*, 60(4), 435–445.
- [68] Levendosky, A. A., Lannert, B., & Yalch, M. (2012). The effects of intimate partner violence on women and child survivors: An attachment perspective. *Psychodynamic Psychiatry*, 40(3), 397–434
- [69] Mandel, N. (2003). Shifting selves and decision making: The effects of self-construal priming on consumer risk-taking. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30, 30–40.
- [70] Manzeske, D. P., & Stright, A. D. (2009). Parenting Styles and Emotion Regulation: The Role of Behavioral and Psychological Control During Young Adulthood. *Journal of Adult Development*, 16(4), 223-229. doi: 10.1007/s10804-009-9068-9
- [71] Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent–child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4 Socialization, personality, and social development* (4th ed., pp. 1–101). New York: Wiley.
- [72] Mattanah, J. F., Lopez, F. G., & Govern, J. M. (2011). The contributions of parental attachment bonds to college student development and adjustment: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58, 565–596
- [73] Mavis, B. (2001). Self-efficacy and OSCE performance among second year medical students [Abstract]. *Advances in Health Sciences Education: theory and Practice*, 6(2):93-102.
- [74] McLoyd, V. (1990). The impact of economic hardship on black families and children: Psychological distress, parenting, and socioemotional development. *Child Development*, 61, 311–346.
- [75] McLoyd, V. C. (1998). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. *American Psychologist*, 53, 185–20
- [76] McKinney, C., Milone, M. C., & Renk, K. (2011). Parenting and late adolescent emotional adjustment: Mediating effects of discipline and gender. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 42,463– 481.
- [77] Messineo, M. J., & Wotkiewicz, R. A. (2004). Coresidence of adult children with parents from 1960 to 1990: Is the propensity to live at home really increasing? *Journal of Family History*, 29(1), 71–83.

- [78] Minuchin, S. (1974). Families and family therapy. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [79] Moore II, L. E., & Shell, M. D. (2017). The Effects of Parental Support and Self-Esteem on Internalizing Symptoms in Emerging Adulthood. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological*
- [80] Murphy, L. M. (2011). Childhood and adolescent violent victimization and the risk of young adult intimate partner violence victimization. *Violence and Victim*, 26(5), 593–607
- [81] Mukhtar, F., & Hashim, H. A. (2010). Relationship among depression, self-efficacy, and Research, 13, 299-310. Retrieved from <http://www.pain-initiative-un.org/doc> quality of life among students in medical and allied health sciences.
- [82] Nair, H., & Murray, A. D. (2005). Predictors of attachment security in preschool children from intact and divorced families. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 166, 245–263.
- [83] Nazlı, S. (2001). Aile Danışmanlığı. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık
- Olson, D. H., & Gorall, D. M. (2006). Faces IV and the circumplex model. Minneapolis, MN: Life Innovations
- [84] Olson, D. H., Russell, C. S., & Sprenkle, D. H. (1989). Circumplex model: Systematic assessment and treatment of families. New York, NY: Haworth Pres.
- [85] Orellana, M. F. (2001). The work kids do: Mexican and Central American immigrant children's contributions to households and schools in California. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(3), 366–389.
- [86] Orley, J., Saxena, S., & Herrman, H. (1998). Quality of life and mental illness. Reflections from the perspective of the WHOQOL. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 172, 291–293.
- [87] Paat, Y. (2013). Relationship Dynamics and Healthy Exchange across the Family Life Cycle: Implications for Practice. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 23(8), 938-953. doi:10.1080/10911359.2013.777008
- [88] Padmaja, G., Tiamongla, Rana, S., Vanlalhruii, C., & Mohapatra, S. (2015). Do differences in place of living and gender affect the self-efficacy and quality of life of university students? *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 6(10), 953-957.
- [89] Parke, R. D., & Buriel, R. (1998). Socialization in the family: Ethnic and ecological perspectives. In N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.) & W. Damon (Series Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, Emotional, and Personality Development*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- [90] Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L. B. (1979). A parental bonding instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 52, 1–10.
- [91] Renner, L. M. (2009). Intimate partner violence victimization and parenting stress: Assessing the mediating role of depressive symptoms. *Violence Against Women*, 15(11), 1380–1401. doi: 10.1177/1077801209346712
- [92] Rettig, K.D., Danes, S. M. & Bauer, J. W. (1991). Family life quality: Theory and assessment in economically stressed farm families. *Social Indicators Research*, 24, 269-299.
- [93] Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., Markman, H. J., & Ragan, E. P. (2012). Parents' marital status, conflict, and role modeling: Links with adult romantic relationship quality. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 53(5), 348–367
- [94] Rodgers, B. (1996). Reported parental behaviour and adult affective symptoms. 1. Associations and moderating factors. *Psychological Medicine*, 26, 51–61
- [95] Roelfse, R., Middleton, M. (1985). The family functioning in adolescence questionnaire: A Measure of Psychosocial Family Health during Adolescence. *Journal Adolescence*, 8, 33-45.
- [96] Rueger, S., Y., Malecki, C. K., & Demaray, M. D. (2010). Relationship between multiple sources of perceived social support and psychological and academic adjustment in early adolescence: Comparisons across gender. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39, 47–61.

- [97] Salween, J. K., & O'Leary, K. D. (2013). Adjustment problems and maladaptive relational style: A mediational model of sexual coercion in intimate relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(10), 1969–1988.
- [98] Sanchez, B. (2010). *How to Build a Happy Family*. Shepherds Voice Publications, Inc., Philippines.
- [99] Sang, J., Cederbaum, J. A., & Hurlburt, M. S. (2014). Parentification, Substance Use, and Sex among Adolescent Daughters from Ethnic Minority Families: The Moderating Role of Monitoring. *Family Process*, 53(2), 252-266. doi:10.1111/famp.12038
- [100] Santrock, J. W. (2005). *Adolescence* (10th ed). New York: McGraw Hill.
- [101] Sartaj, B., & Aslam, N. (2010). Role of Authoritative and Authoritarian Parenting in Home, Health and Emotional Adjustment. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 20(1), 47-66.
- [102] Schraedley, P. K., Gotlib, I. H., & Hayward, C. (1999). Gender differences in correlates of depressive symptoms in adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 25, 98–108.
- [103] Schunk, D. H. (1989). Self-efficacy and achievement behaviors. *Educational Psychology Review*, 1(1), 173-208.
- [104] Seltzer, J. A., Laub, C. Q., & Bianchi, S. M. (2012). Doubling up when times are tough: A study of obligations to share a home in response to economic hardship. *Social Science Research*, 41(5), 1307–1319. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012. 05.008.
- [105] Sieverding, J. A., Adler, N., Witt, S., & Ellen, J. (2005). The influence of parental monitoring on adolescent sexual initiation. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 159(8), 724–729. doi:10.1001/archpedi.159.8.724.
- [106] Speare, A. Jr., & Avery, R. (1993). Who helps whom in older parent-child families. *Journal of Gerontology*, 48(2), S64–S73.
- [107] Spera, C. (2005). A review of the relationship among parenting practices, parenting styles, and adolescent school achievement. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17, 125-146.
- [108] Smith, C. A., Elwyn, L. J., Ireland, T. O., & Thornberry, T. P. (2010). Impact of adolescent exposure to intimate partner violence on substance use in early adulthood. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 71(2), 219–230.
- [109] Smits, A., Van Gaalen, R. I., & Mulder, C. H. (2010). Parent-child coresidence: Who moves in with whom and for whose needs? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(4), 1022–1033. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00746.x
- [110] Sruthy, R., & Naachimuthu, K. P. (2017). Family relationship and general well-being of adolescents and young adults. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 8(7), 674-679.
- [111] Steele, R. G., Nesbitt, S., Daniel, R. C., & Forehand, R. (2005) factor structure of the parenting scale in a low-income African American sample. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 14, 535-549
- [112] Taylor, R., Budescu, M., Gebre, A., & Hodzic, I. (2014). Family Financial Pressure and Maternal and Adolescent Socioemotional Adjustment: Moderating Effects of Kin Social Support in Low Income African American Families. *Journal Of Child & Family Studies*, 23(2), 242-254.
- [113] Telzer, E. H., & Fuligni, A. J. (2013). Positive daily family interactions eliminate gender differences in internalizing symptoms among adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42, 1498–1511.
- [114] The WHOQOL Group. (1998). The World Health Organization quality of life assessment (WHOQOL): Development and general psychometric properties. *Social Science & Medicine*, 46, 1569– 1585
- [115] Trishala, M., & Kiran, S. (2015). Impact of perceived parenting styles on the emotional maturity among adolescents. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 6(2), 212-215.
- [116] Uji, M., Sakamoto, A., Adachi, K., & Kitamura, T. (2014). The Impact of Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive Parenting Styles on Children's Later Mental Health in Japan: Focusing on Parent and Child Gender. *Journal Of Child & Family Studies*, 23(2), 293-302. doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9740-3
- [117] Vrugt, A., Oort, F. J., & Zebera, C. (2010). Goal orientations, perceived self-efficacy and results amongst beginners and advanced students [Abstract]. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72(3), 385-397.

- [118] Ward, R., Logan, J., & Spitze, G. (1992). The influence of parent and child needs on coresidence in middle and later life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54(1), 209–221.
- [119] White, L. (1994). Coresidence and leaving home: Young adults and their parents. *Annual Review Sociology*, 20(1), 81–102.
- [120] Whitechurch, G. G., & Constantine, L. L. (1993). Systems theory. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 325–352). New York, NY: Plenum Press
- [121] World Health Organization. (1948). *Constitution of the World Health Organization*. Geneva: WHO
- [122] Winton, C. A. (2003). *Children as caregivers: Parental & parentified children*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- [123] Yarnell, L. M., & Neff, K. D. (2013). Self-compassion, interpersonal conflict resolutions, and well-being. *Self and Identity*, 12(2), 146–159.
- [124] Zautra, A. J., Hall, J. S., & Murray, K. E. (2010). Resilience: A new definition of healthier people and communities. In J.W. Reich, A.J. Zautra, and J.S. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience* (pp. 3-30). The Guilford Press, New York, London.
- [125] Zhan, M., & Sherraden, M. (2011). Assets and liabilities, educational expectations, and children's college degree attainment. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33, 846–854. doi:10.1016/j.child youth.2010.12.006.
- [126] Zhao, J., Kong, F., & Wang, Y. (2013). Shyness and subjective wellbeing: The role of emotional intelligence and social support. *Social Indicators Research*, 114, 891–900. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0178-6>
- [127] Zhou, X., Zhu, H., Zhang, B., & Cai, T (2013). Perceived social support as moderator of perfectionism, depression, and anxiety in college students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 41, 1141–1152.
- [128] Zimmermann, J. J., Eisemann, M. R., & Fleck, M. P. (2008). Is parental rearing an associated factor of quality of life in adulthood? *Quality Of Life Research*, 17(2), 249-255. Doi: 10.1007/s11136-007-9261-x