Does Quality Multigenerational Interconnectedness Impact Family Quality of Life Among College Students?

[1]Abel Gitimu Waithaka, [2]Rebecca L. Rupert, [3]Caroline Kobia

[1]Youngstown State University

[2]Youngstown State University

[3]Mississippi State University

Abstract: **The purpose of this study was to analyze multigenerational interconnectedness among college students and their grandparents. The study used three scales, the Family Quality of Life scale (FQOL) with 16 items, Multigenerational Interconnectedness scale (MIS) with 30 items and Quality of Relationship Inventory scale (QRI) with 25 items. A total of 201 undergraduates from a State University participated in the study. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 51 years. The participants were 32% male and 68 % were female. Data was collected in a classroom setting during fall of 2018 in a college setting. The findings indicates participants who are dissatisfied with life and concerned financially scored lower on multigenerational interconnectedness and family quality of life than those who are satisfied with life. In addition, participants who are dissatisfied with life and concerned financially scored lower on quality of life except in conflict.**

Keywords: **Multigenerational, Interconnectedness, Quality of Life, Relationships, Parenting.**

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

New research is emerging indicating there is a major increase in multigenerational-headed households. New research have shown both on the positive and negative impacts grandparents can have while indirectly or directly raising their grandchildren and how it can influence both the grandchildren's and grandparent's overall wellbeing. When individuals are able to recognize risk factors and the impact it can have on quality of life, we can help to increase both child and elder care by educating healthcare professionals on new interventions. Healthcare professionals interacting with those affected by these households are vast and include family liaisons, counselors, social workers, and gerontologists.

To understand the groundwork of multigenerational interconnectedness and the impact it has on overall quality of life among children and their future adulthood, it is vital to analyze where relationships first begin. Before grandchildren can form relationships with their grandparents, they must first form relationships with their parents. These relationships can result in successful, nurturing, and secure bonds with their children or on the other hand, result in distant and insubstantial ties, which leave children feeling alone and often times falling victim to being deviant children and worse yet, psychotic future adults. Johnson (2010) parenting is a central part in molding children's and adolescent's social background and ability to engage in relationships with others. Ali and Malik (2015) found that not only the emotional environment that parents bring their children up in shape their social backgrounds and ability to engage in relationships but this strongly goes for grandparents as well.

Baumrind (2005) describes three very influential parenting styles that exhibited within family structures they include authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. Authoritarian refers to those parents who place strict demands on their children. It is the idea of do as I say not as I do; they do not want their children to ask why. This parenting style has a negative consequence because often times, children lose the ability to reach out and successfully express their feelings

without being ridiculed for the way they feel. Next, authoritative parenting is a correct mixture of essentials for successful parenting. Parents display nurturing and forgiving acts when children deviate from what is expected compared to extreme demands and punishments. Children in authoritative family structures know what is expected of them and penalties are clearly explained when children stray from the set rules. The major goal of authoritative parenting is to form children into well-rounded future adults who are self–driven and responsible for their actions. Thirdly, permissive parenting is when parents are detached from their children. They do not find themselves serving as parents but rather best friends to their children. Children who grow up in in such a family structure do as they please and have limited guidance from their parents.

Singh (2017) found many interesting links between parenting styles and the overall wellbeing of children. Children, who are raised in authoritarian family structures often demonstrate concerning behavior such as anxiety, tend to be withdrawn from society, and struggle with their self–esteem. On the other hand, the study noted that authoritative parenting style serves to be beneficial to children's overall wellbeing. Children who grow up in authoritative headed households tend to achieve higher academically, self-driven and keep deviant behavior to a minimum. Children in permissive family households lack the ambition to achieve academically, to complete tasks, and often find themselves engaging in delinquency (Alt, 2015). Studies linked parenting styles and the impact it has on children and their relationship with their grandparents (Alt, 2015).

Johnson (2010) noted both parents and elders play an enormous role in determining children's overall wellbeing in society based on the socialization process. Schwartz (2015) noted that children who obtained close emotional relationships with their parents also obtained close emotional bonds with their grandparents. The linkage between parenting styles and children's ability to engage in quality relationships with their grandparents correlate strongly (Schwartz, 2015). Schwartz (2015) noted that an authoritative parenting style is greatly associated with adolescent's wellbeing and result in obtaining secure and quality relationships with grandparents and others outside the family realm. Schwartz (2015) found that when there is a break in family bonds the consequence is not only the inability to form satisfying relationships with other family members but the failure to form relationships with others in society.

Impacts Grandparents Have on Children's well-Being

There is an enormous amount of explanations on why children end up in the care of their grandparents. Many vital reasons include drug addiction, alcohol abuse, mental illness, economic instability, death, and even a combination of the reasons listed (Williams, 2011). Grandparents serve as a safe landing pad when crisis hits the family. Dunifon (2013) describes grandparents as role models in time of need. Grandparents can serve their grandchildren indirectly and directly. Grandparents who are indirectly helping means they are helping mold the child alongside the parents. Activities include readdressing appropriate behavior, rewarding grandchildren for academic successes, lending a hand with homework, and being a splendid listener when grandchildren need to vent. On the other hand, grandparents who are directly interacting with grandchildren means they are the ones imposing rules, behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs on the grandchildren. Coleman (1988) found that grandparents who are head of the household to their grandchildren exhibit a robust amount of influential strength.

Grandparents who are raising their grandchildren offer many strengths. Dunifo and Kopko (2012) identified that grandparents who have a solid religious background created a strong link in forming quality relationships with their grandchildren and associated it with enhanced overall wellbeing of the grandchildren. Dunifon (2013) noted that grandchildren who have a warm and nurturing relationship with their grandparents tend to experience less psychological stress. Dunifon (2013) also noted that when children feel they have the ability to converse problems they have with their grandparents it acts as a two- way street. It works like this, children who have the ability to talk to their grandparents about personal problems results in granting the grandparents a chance to put into place a type of informal control either directly or indirectly and as an overall result, helps fill in the gap of communication among family members.

Henderson, et al (2009) found that quality of closeness to grandparents could serve in another beneficial way to grandchildren's overall wellbeing. Grandparents are indeed the safety landing in times when children are at risk for weak social skills (Akhtar, Malik, & Begeer, 2016). It was found that grandchildren go beyond describing their relationship with their grandparents as just loving and affectionate but they obtained great appreciation and respect for their grandparent's willingness to step up to the plate and take on the role as their caretakers (Machab and Keiley, 2009). In return this great appreciation and respect for grandparents left grandchildren being more patient and cooperative with

them because of the fear of being placed in the care of complete strangers. Machab and Keiley (2009) noted that grandchildren who indirectly associate with their grandparents describe their grandparents as fun to be around. On the other hand, grandparents who have raised their grandchildren since the start refer to them as their parents. Moreover, this is due to the underlying framework of grandparents creating a safe and loving environment that grandchildren could prosper by providing the basic needs for survival, which include food, clothes, shelter, and healthy predictable schedules.

Purcal, Brennan, Cass, Jenkins (2014) noted that grandparents income takes a significant loss due to the change in their employment status when they take on the responsibility of raising their grandchildren. Backhouse (2008) noted that grandparents tended to withdraw from the labor force entirely when grandchildren moved in permanently. This concept creates a domino effect because not only does grandparents raising their grandchildren pose potential risks for the overall wellbeing of the children but it also puts the overall wellbeing of grandparents in harm's way as well. Yardley et, al. (2009) indicated that grandparents often reside in much smaller homes compared to a typical family sized home. This puts grandparents in a bind if more grandchildren come to live with them than what their house can accommodate. If this were the case, grandparents would have to make important decisions to relocate or renovate to meet the needs of the new family structure. Either of these two options can be quite difficult choices to make when grandparents recently took a decrease in work hours or withdrew from the workforce entirely to be able to care for their grandchildren and balance their survival needs as well.

Nandy and Selwn (2011) indicated that grandparents have an abundant of risk factors that do not play in their favor, age and physical health. Many elderly individuals cope with conditions such as arthritis, diabetes, heart disease, mobility conditions, and high blood pressure. The physical demands of raising grandchildren can challenge grandparent's physical energy levels and leave them exhausted. Grandchildren on the other hand become agitated at the fact that their grandparents cannot practice with them for school sports or stay up late helping with complete school projects compared to the younger parent headed households. Wellard (2010) explained that the elderly parents find it difficult to socialize among the younger parents within the school setting and outside on the playground. Also, with the advancement in technology forms another generational gap conflict. Wellard (2010) mentioned that grandparents find it straining to use and understand technology, impose quality parenting, obtain financial stability, and worrying about their grandchildren if they were to pass away. Hayslip and Kaminksi (2008) noted different standards within educational systems makes it hard to help children academically succeed. Between the lack of knowledge on technology and changing state standards of problem, solving grandparents unintentionally are increasing the risk of their grandchildren falling behind in school.

Culture & Socioeconomic Views

Culture plays a significant role in the formation of multigenerational households. Grandparents serve as the glue that keeps family ties firm. Uhlenberg and Cheuk (2010) found that grandparents are a socially recognized set of individuals within all human societies. Even though grandparents fall under the same recognized group, what grandparenthood consists of varies across other countries. Among the many reasons, why grandparents end up becoming the caretakers for their grandchildren varies due to the amount of diverse personal cases among families. What to keep in mind is that worldwide approximately 163 million children are in the care of their grandparents (Leinaweaver, 2014). It is vital to understand that grandparents have a significant struggle with attaining a stable income and the inability to access resources add to the abundant number of stressors grandparents face while trying to raise their grandchildren (Delany, Ismail, Graham, & Ramkissoon, 2008).

Socioeconomic status is a constant factor relating to family interconnectedness. One might think that a family household of high socioeconomic status obtains stronger interconnectedness among the family but just the opposite is correct. Dykstra and Komter (2012) noted that families who are in extreme poverty are much closer in multigenerational family structure. In order to survive the family must pool together as one unit to care for children. The reason culture intertwines with socioeconomic status is because the choice of grandparents to step up and raise their grandchildren is deeply rooted in the social messages that have been passed down from generation to generation. These social messages include culture beliefs, values, and reasoning. Beegle, Filmer, Stoks, and Tiererova (2010) noted the ways in which such messages is interpreted predict if the family structure will result as a beneficial to the children or serve to be detrimental to the children's overall wellbeing and development. Grandparent involvement is engrained in family cultural background. Beegle, Filmer, Stoks, and Tiererova (2010) described that the choice grandparents make to take on the role of raising their grandchildren directly or indirectly depends on similar beliefs when it comes to interconnectedness, mutual support, and feel as if it is their sole duty to engage in helping in the wellbeing and development of their grandchildren.

Gender

Individuals often believe that a woman's place is in the home carrying out feminine chores while the man's responsibility is to provide economically for his family. Although traditional family structured households have drastically changed over the centuries, many grandchildren are still interpreting gender roles in the traditional perspective. Bozalek and Hooyman (2012) found that female grandmothers are given a social and cultural meaning to their place in the family structure. The main gender role they take on is providing care for their family members throughout the lifespan and hardly being recognized for their work.

Boozalek and Hooyman (2012) noted the social environments in which grandmothers are residing increases their risks for oppression and their chances of discrimination. On the other hand, grandmother's social identities can damagingly or positively impact them. MacNab and Yancura (2017) mentioned that grandmothers obtain already pre–established social identities that can make them vulnerable to an overall lower quality of life. Purcal, Brennan, Cass and Jenkins (2014) additionally distinguished that grandmother's raise a vast number of grandchildren on their own compared to the rate of grandfathers. Still in the United States and many other countries there is still numerous women carrying out traditional gender specific household tasks. Purcal, Brennan, Cass and Jenkins (2014) noted women are obtaining unpaid and informal labor and their work obligations still continue to be quite different to that of men.

A popular trend in many counties is that grandmothers have culturally been idealized as women responsible for keeping the family structure together and running smoothly when crisis hits the home. Uhlenberg and Cheuk (2010) noted that grandmothers have been deemed to keep the kin together and provide support to the grandchildren. As grandmothers follow their gender role guidelines set by their culture, it is crucial to analyze how they are more disadvantaged than grandfathers.

The way in which grandchildren interact and the quality connectedness they have with grandparents begins in the biological parent's household and is strongly linked to the different parenting styles. Barnett, Scarmella, Neppl, Ontai, and Conger (2010) found both daughters and sons have been linked to having closer emotional relationships with their mothers than fathers. This is a beneficial study because the way in which parents shape their children impacts quality of interconnectedness with other kin members. Cultures form the socially constructed messages that teach children that women are more nurturing than their fathers are and those socially constructed messages follow the children into their adulthood. Socially constructed messages are then passed down the family structure. Moreover, grandparent's involvement with grandchildren differ because of the differences in their past and current relationships (Barnett, Scaramella, Neppl, Ontai, & Conger, 2010).

Through these socially constructed messages grandchildren are able to interpret what is expected of their grandmothers and grandfathers gender roles. Goodshell, Bates and Behnke (2011) study found numerous ways in which grandchildren interpret what is expected of their personal gender roles as they grow up. The first fact introduced was that relationships interconnectedness tends to be strongly correlated among the same gender. This means grandmothers and granddaughters engage in more time spent together than that of granddaughters and grandfathers. Bates (2009) study found that increased mother involvement especially by nurturing grandmothers may be the result of women's involvement in the socialization of children and maintenance of family ties. Those children who obtain overall quality wellbeing and closer relationships with their grandparents are outcomes of children being raised in an environment with healthy parenting, cultural beliefs, and values. Children who sadly fall victim to weak interconnectedness to their grandparents are often children who come from an authoritarian family-structured backgrounds and have had absent informal and formal support systems.

2. METHOD

Participants

The data in this study was collected from undergraduate students at a University college from various majors of study. A total number of 201 participants, male 65(32%) and female 136 (68%). Each participant was informed the participation in this study was voluntary, confidential and anonymous.

Research Questions

RQ-1. Is there a difference in those students who are dissatisfied and those satisfied with life on multigenerational interconnectedness?

RQ-2. Is there a difference between those concerned and satisfied financially on multigenerational interconnectedness?

Page | 299

RQ-3. Is there a difference in those students who are dissatisfied and those satisfied with life on family quality of life?

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

RQ-5. Is there a difference in those students who are dissatisfied and those satisfied with life on quality of relationship?

RQ-6. Is there a difference between those concerned and satisfied financially on quality of relationship?

Materials

The FQOL scale with 16 items by Hu, X., Summers, J.A., Turnbull, A., & Zuna, N. (2011). The scale measures families' thoughts of their satisfaction with different factors of family quality life. The scale had three subscales, which include family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being. The MIS scale with 31 items by Gavazzi, S. M., Sabatelli, R. M., & Reese-Weber, M. J. (1999). The survey scale type questionnaire designed to assess self-reports and of connectedness preserved by young adults within families, they were raised. The subscales included financial, functional, and psychological. The QRI scale with 25 items by Hoffman, L., Marquis, J., Poston, D., Summers, J. A., & Turnbull, A. (2006). The survey is used to examine relationships with family members and friends. The subscales include social support, interpersonal conflict and depth in relationships among young adults, parents, and friends.

Procedure

Institutional Review Board (IRB) application for the study was approved. Investigator emailed professors at the University asking for permission to give survey during class time. Once professors responded and 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 students and it took 10-15 minutes to complete the survey. The investigator collected all finished surveys. The data from all collected surveys was then individually entered into SPSS by the investigator for data analysis.

3. RESULT SECTION

RQ1. Is there a difference in those students who are dissatisfied and those satisfied with life on mutigenerational interconnectedness?

Dissatisfied and those satisfied with life on mutigenerational interconnectedness

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Emotional Interconetion	Dissatisfied Life	126	51.9048	13.60020	1	506.119	2.588	.109
	Satisfied Life	75	55.1858	14.60729	199	195.529		
	Total	201	53.1290	14.03859	200			
Finacial Interconection	Dissatisfied Life	126	25.7956	10.96655	1	478.738	4.272	.040
	Satisfied Life	75	28.9867	9.90910	199	112.056		
	Total	201	26.9863	10.67192	200			
Functional Interconection	Dissatisfied Life	126	29.8571	10.19638	1	1764.480	18.264	.000
	Satisfied Life	75	35.9833	9.17485	199	96.608		
	Total	201	32.1430	10.24437	200			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing student dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life on multigenerational Interconnectedness (Emotional, Financial and Functional). A significant difference was found on Financial Interconnectedness (F (1, 199) = 4.27, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who had dissatisfied life scored lower (M= 25.80, sd = 10.97) than those who had satisfied life (M = 28.99, sd = 9.91). A significant difference was also found on Functional Interconnectedness (F(1, 199) = 18.26, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who had dissatisfied life scored lower (M= 29.86, sd = 10.20) that those who had satisfied life (M = 35.98, sd = 9.17). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine nature of the differences between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life. No significant difference was found on Emotional Interconnectedness ($\underline{F}$(1, 199) =.2.58, $p<.05$. Student who had dissatisfied and satisfied life did not differ significantly on Emotional Interconnectedness as those with dissatisfied life had a mean of 51.90(sd = 13.60). Those with satisfied life has a mean of 55.19 (sd = 14.61).

RQ 2. Is there a difference between those concerned and satisfied financially on multigenerational interconnectedness?

Concerned and satisfied financially on multigenerational interconnectedness

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Emotional Interconetion	Concerned Financially	107	53.0947	13.20040	1	.269	.001	.971
	Satisfied Financially	94	53.1681	15.00737	199	198.071		
	Total	201	53.1290	14.03859	200			
Finacial Interconection	Concerned Financially	107	23.8026	9.91332	1	2319.153	22.558	.000
	Satisfied Financially	94	30.6104	10.39115	199	102.808		
	Total	201	26.9863	10.67192	200			
Functional Interconection	Concerned Financially	107	29.8341	9.74711	1	1219.750	12.278	.001
	Satisfied Financially	94	34.7713	10.21227	199	99.345		
	Total	201	32.1430	10.24437	200			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing student concerned financially and satisfied financially on multigenerational Interconnectedness (Emotional, Financial and Functional). A significant difference was found on Financial Interconnectedness ($F(1, 199) = 22.53$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower (M= 53.09, sd = 13.20) than those who were satisfied financially (M = 53.17, sd = 15.01). A significant difference was also found on Functional Interconnectedness ($F(1, 199) = 12.28$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower (M= 29.83, sd = 9.75) than those who were satisfied financially (M = 34.77, sd = 10.21). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine nature of the differences between those concerned financially and those who were satisfied financially. No significant difference was found on Emotional Interconnectedness ($\underline{F}(1, 199) =.001$, $p<.05$. Student who were concerned and satisfied financially did not differ significantly on Emotional Interconnectedness as those who were concerned financially had a mean of 53.09 (sd = 13.20). Those satisfied financially has a mean of 53.12 (sd = 15.01).

RQ 3. Is there a difference in those students who are dissatisfied and those satisfied with life on family quality of life?

Dissatisfied and those satisfied with life on family quality of life

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Dissatisfied Life	126	23.1429	5.34822	1	597.124	25.928	.000
	Satisfied Life	75	26.7067	3.68992	199	23.030		
	Total	201	24.4726	5.08925	200			
Parenting	Dissatisfied Life	126	24.0079	5.59642	1	436.037	17.499	.000
	Satisfied Life	75	27.0533	3.75569	199	24.918		
	Total	201	25.1443	5.19366	200			
Emotional Wellbeing	Dissatisfied Life	126	14.7381	4.12248	1	272.744	18.861	.000
	Satisfied Life	75	17.1467	3.19075	199	14.461		
	Total	201	15.6368	3.96893	200			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing student dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life on family quality of life (Family Interaction, Parenting, and Emotional Well - Being). A significant difference was found on Family Interaction ($F (1, 199) = 25.93$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who had dissatisfied life scored lower (M= 23.14, sd = 5.35) than those who had satisfied life (M = 26.71 sd = 3.69). A significant difference was also found on Parenting ($F (1, 199) = 17.50$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who had dissatisfied life scored lower (M= 24.00, sd = 5.60) that those who had satisfied life (M = 27.10, sd = 3.76). A significant difference was also found on Emotional Well – Being ($F(1, 199) = 18.87$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who had dissatisfied life scored lower (M= 14.74 sd = 4.12) than those who had satisfied life (M = 17.15, sd = 3.19). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine nature of the differences between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life.

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

Concerned and satisfied financially on family quality of life

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Concerned Financially	107	23.1121	5.12546	1	423.488	17.717	.000
	Satisfied Financially	94	26.0213	4.60476	199	23.903		
	Total	201	24.4726	5.08925	200			
Parenting	Concerned Financially	107	23.5327	5.84923	1	594.223	24.632	.000
	Satisfied Financially	94	26.9787	3.55291	199	24.124		
	Total	201	25.1443	5.19366	200			
Emotional Wellbeing	Concerned Financially	107	14.3645	4.17629	1	370.383	26.512	.000
	Satisfied Financially	94	17.0851	3.16452	199	13.970		
	Total	201	15.6368	3.96893	200			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing student concerned and satisfied financially with life on family quality of life (Family Interaction, Parenting, and Emotional Well - Being). A significant difference was found on Family Interaction ($F(1, 199) = 17.72$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower (M= 23.11, sd = 5.13) than those who were satisfied financiall (M = 26.02 sd = 4.60). A significant difference was also found on Parenting ($F(1, 199) = 24.63$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower (M= 23.53, sd = 5.85) that those who were satisfied financially (M = 26.98, sd = 3.55). A significant difference was also found on Emotional Well – Being ($F(1, 199) = 26.51$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower (M= 14.36 sd = 4.18) than those who were satisfied financially (M = 17.09, sd = 3.16). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine nature of the differences between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life.

RQ 5. Is there a difference in those students who are dissatisfied and those satisfied with life on quality of relationship?

Dissatisfied and those satisfied with life on quality of relationship

		N	Mean	Std.Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Support	Dissatisfied Life	126	17.4921	5.44975	1	260.869	9.911	.002
	Satisfied Life	75	19.8476	4.54039	199	26.322		
	Total	201	18.3710	5.24350	200			
Conflict	Dissatisfied Life	126	18.7884	6.55591	1	237.901	6.151	.014
	Satisfied Life	75	16.5389	5.60469	199	38.679		
	Total	201	17.9490	6.29878	200			
Depth	Dissatisfied Life	126	15.4669	4.83772	1	111.784	5.635	.019
	Satisfied Life	75	17.0089	3.71678	199	19.838		
	Total	201	16.0423	4.50528	200			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing student dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life on family quality of relationship (Support, Conflict, and Depth). A significant difference was found on Support ($F(1, 199) = 9.91$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who had dissatisfied life scored lower (M= 17.49, sd = 5.45) than those who had satisfied life (M = 19.851 sd = 4.54). A significant difference was also found on Conflict ($F(1, 199) = 6.15$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who had dissatisfied life scored higher (M= 18.79, sd = 6.56) that those who had satisfied life (M = 16.54, sd = 5.60). A significant difference was also found on Depth ($F(1, 199) = 5.63$, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who had dissatisfied life scored lower (M= 15.47 sd = 4.84) than those who had satisfied life (M = 17.01, sd = 3.72). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine nature of the differences between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life.

RQ 6. Is there a difference between those concerned and satisfied financially on quality of relationship?

Concerned and satisfied financially on quality of relationship

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Support	Concerned Financially	107	17.4486	5.36509	1	194.668	7.303	.007
	Satisfied Financially	94	19.4210	4.92206	199	26.654		
	Total	201	18.3710	5.24350	200			
Conflict	Concerned Financially	107	19.1417	6.88664	1	325.494	8.512	.004
	Satisfied Financially	94	16.5913	5.26940	199	38.238		
	Total	201	17.9490	6.29878	200			
Depth	Concerned Financially	107	15.4657	4.71803	1	76.056	3.800	.050
	Satisfied Financially	94	16.6986	4.17868	199	20.017		
	Total	201	16.0423	4.50528	200			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing student concerned and satisfied financially on quality of relationship (Support, Conflict, and Depth). A significant difference was found on Support (F(1, 199) = 7.30, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower (M= 17.45, sd = 5.37) than those who were satisfied financially (M = 19.42 sd = 4.92). A significant difference was also found on Conflict (F (1, 199) = 8.51, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who concerned financially scored higher (M= 19.14, sd = 6.89) that those who were satisfied financially (M = 16.59, sd = 5.27). A significant difference was also found on Depth (F(1, 199) = 3.80, $p<.05$. This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower (M= 15.47 sd = 4.72) than those who were satisfied financially (M = 16.70, sd = 4.18). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine nature of the differences between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life.

4. DISCUSSION

The study found significant differences in those students who are dissatisfied and those satisfied with life when it comes to multigenerational interconnectedness. Students who were dissatisfied with life scored much lower on financial and functional interconnectedness compared to those students who are satisfied with their lives. The findings suggest there is a crucial gap between college students who lead satisfied lives versus those who are dissatisfied. Students dissatisfied with life might not have the same opportunities to confide in others for social support and obtain other useful resources

A prime example would be low socioeconomic, working class, and first-generation college students. Such students take on many barriers such as financial strain, lack of social support, and burnout in college life. Researchers have found that low socioeconomic students are a minority in higher education (Alon, 2009; Hearn & Rosinger, 2014). As a result, low socioeconomic, working class, and first-generation college students often feel isolated and alone (Reay, Crozier, and Clayton, 2009). Simply put, these students feel disconnected or out of place among those of higher socioeconomic status. Jenkins et al., 2013; Sy, Fong, Carter, Boehme, & Alpert (2011) noted that students from lower socioeconomic background receive less support from their families compared to higher socioeconomic students. It is important to note that family structure is exceptionally diverse and not all low socioeconomic, working class, and first-generation college students fall under the same umbrella. Dykstra and Komter (2012) noted that families who are in extreme poverty are much closer and generate multigenerational family order.

The study found a significant difference between students who are concerned financially and students who are satisfied financially on multigenerational interconnectedness. Students who were concerned financially scored lower in financial and functional interconnectedness than those students who were satisfied financially. This finding is essential to the study because financial stability impacts the overall quality of a student's life. Often, the label of being a low socioeconomic, working class, and first-generation college student tends to define the students before they even have an opportunity to step inside a classroom. Such students are often looked at as inevitable failures compared to their fellow higher socioeconomic classmates, and this is because the less advantaged do not possess the resources needed to make it through college successfully. Research has found that low socioeconomic, working class, and first-generation college students struggle with financial and emotional difficulties as well as, difficulty with academic and social experiences (Stebleton and Soria, 2012). Other researchers suggest that the less advantaged college students might carry the weight of financial

strain during their time in college but only reside in that position until they graduate and seek financial security. CIRP (2015) found that incoming university students with low socioeconomic backgrounds solely chose to attend college because it was their only opportunity to mobilize upward on the economic ladder.

The study indicates that students with dissatisfied life scored much lower in family interaction, parenting, and emotional wellbeing than those with satisfied life. If students lack the fundamental building blocks in these categories, their overall quality of life is deprived. Schwartz (2015) noted that an authoritative parenting style is much associated with adolescent's wellbeing and results in obtaining secure and quality relationships with parents, grandparents, and those outside the family realm. Contrary, (Schwartz, 2015) found that when there is a break in family bonds the consequence is not only the inability to form satisfying relationships with other family members but failure to develop relationships with others in society.

The study showed that students concerned financially with life on overall family of life scored lower in family interaction, parenting, and emotional wellbeing that those with satisfied life. Financial security is the main ingredient that predicts not only the student's overall family quality of life but the student's personal overall quality of life as well. Financial security and parenting have a significant role in how young children will thrive as future adults. Studies have suggested that the most beneficial parenting style is authoritative. Singh (2017) noted that authoritative parenting styles serve to be helpful to children's overall wellbeing. Dunifon & Kopko (2012) analyzed that parents working long hours generate higher psychological distress and less quality parenting. This could mean that parents from low socioeconomic and working-class backgrounds were absent or did not spend much time interacting with their children and resulted in weak family interaction, parenting, and emotional wellbeing for students.

The study indicates that students who are dissatisfied with life scored lower in support and depth, but scored higher in conflict when it came to quality of relationship with their grandparents. This is a noteworthy finding because students who are dissatisfied with life have weak social support and depth in relationships. This goes to show the importance of grandparent's roles in students' lives. Dunifon (2013) found that grandchildren who have warm nurturing relationships with their grandparents tend to experience less psychological stress. Schwartz (2009) analyzed that increase conflict can be a result of emotional closeness inhibiting positive functioning among family. This is because mixed social messages from parenting styles can be exchanged among children, parents, and grandparents.

The study finding showed students concerned financially on quality of relationship scored lower in support and depth but higher in conflict than those students who were satisfied financially. When children have strong bonds with their grandparents, the bond serve as a safety net in times of financial and emotional need. Dunifon (2013) describes grandparents as role models in a time of need. Dunifon and Kopko (2012) identified that grandparents who have a solid religious background created a strong link in forming quality relationships with their grandchildren and was associated with the overall wellbeing of the grandchildren. Students who are concerned financially might have lost their grandparents as safety nets whereas those students from higher socioeconomic status have an abundant list of resources for financial security.

5. CONCLUSION

The multigenerational household structure is becoming more prevalent in today's society with the ever-changing definition of family. This study found many important patterns to better understand the dynamic framework of multigenerational interconnectedness among college students and their families. The key elements that was found to be of major significance on student's overall quality of life, relationships, and financial security depended on many factors. It is important to note that students from lower socioeconomic status, the overall quality of life for students is much lower than those students who come from higher socioeconomic status.

REFERENCES

[1] Akhtar, P., Malik, J., & Begeer, S. (2017). The Grandparents' Influence: Parenting Styles and Social Competence among Children of Joint Families. *Journal Of Child & Family Studies*, *26*(2), 603-611. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0576-5

[2] Ali, S., & Malik, J. (2015). Consistency of prediction across generation: explaining quality of life by family functioning and health-promoting behaviors. *Quality Of Life Research*, *24*(9), 2105-2112. doi:10.1007/s11136-015-0942-6

[3] Alon, S. (2009). The evolution of class inequality in higher education: Competition, exclusion, and adaptation. American Sociological Review, 74(5), 731–755. doi:10.1177/ 000312240907400503

[4] Alt, D. (2015). First-Year Female College Students' Academic Motivation as a Function of Perceived Parenting Styles: A Contextual Perspective. *Journal Of Adult Development*, *22*(2), 63-75. doi:10.1007/s10804-014-9201-2

[5] Attar-Schwartz, S. (2015). Emotional closeness to parents and grandparents: A moderated mediation model predicting adolescent adjustment. *American Journal Of Orthopsychiatry*, *85*(5), 495-503. doi:10.1037/ort0000082

[6] Attar-Schwartz, S., Tan, J., & Buchanan, A. (2009). Adolescents' perspectives on relationships with grandparents: The contribution of adolescent, grandparent, and parent–grandparent relationship variables. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*(9), 1057-1066. doi:10.1016/J.CHILDYOUTH.2009.05.007

[7] Backhouse, J. (2008). Grandparents raising their grandchildren: Impact of the transition from a traditional grandparent role to a grandparent-as-parent role. 1-218.

[8] Barnett, M. A., Scaramella, L. V., Neppl, T. K., Ontai, L., & Conger, R. D. (2010). Intergenerational Relationship Quality, Gender, and Grandparent Involvement. *Family Relations*, *59*(1), 28-44. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2009. 00584.x

[9] Bartle, S.E. (1993). The degree of similarity of differentiation of self between partners in married and dating couples: Preliminary evidence. Contemporary Family Therapy, 15, 467-484.

[10] Bartle, S.E., Anderson, S. A., & Sabatelli, R. M. (1989). A modei of parenting style, adolescent individuation, and adolescent self – esteem. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *4,* 283-298.

[11] Bates, J. S. (2009). Generative grandfathering: A conceptual framework for nurturing grandchildren. *Marriage and Family Review, 45*, 331–352.

[12] Baumrind, D. (2005). Patterns of parental authority and adolescent autonomy. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 2005*(108), 61-69. doi:10.1002/cd.128

[13] Beegle, K., Filmer, D., Stokes, A., & Tiererova, L. (2010). Orphanhood and the Living Arrangements of Children in Sub-Saharan Africa. *World Development*, *38*(12), 1727-1746. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2010.06.015

[14] Bozalek, V., & Hooyman, N. R. (2012). Ageing and intergenerational care: Critical/ political ethics of care and feminist gerontology perspectives. *Agenda*, 26(4), 37–47. doi:10.1080/10130950.2012.755378

[15] Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2011). Employment characteristics of families in 2010. Washington, DC: United States Department of Labor.

[16] Chen, F., & Liu, G. (2012). The Health Implications of Grandparents Caring for Grandchildren in China. *Journals Of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences & Social Sciences*, *67B*(1), 99-112.

[17] Child Trends. (2013). Two, one, or no parents? Children's living arrangements and educational outcomes around the world. Bethesda, MD: Author.

[18] CIRP (2015). The American freshman: National norms fall 2015. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

[19] Coleman, J. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*, S95-S120.

[20] Collinson, M., Clark, S. J., Gerritsen, A. A. M., Byass, P., Kahn, K., & Tollman, S. (2009). The dynamics of poverty and migration in a rural South African community, 2001–2005.

[21] Delany, A., Ismail, Z., Graham, L., & Ramkissoon, Y. (2008). Review of the child support grant: Uses, implementation and obstacles. Johannesburg, South Africa: Community Agency for Social doi:10.4135/978144 6200933.n34

[22] Dolbin-MacNab, M. L., & Yancura, L. A. (2018). International Perspectives on Grandparents Raising Grandchildren: Contextual Considerations for Advancing Global Discourse. The International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 86(1), 3-33. doi:10.1177/0091415016689565

[23] Dolbin-MacNab, M. L., & Keiley, M. K. (2009). Navigating Interdependence: How Adolescents Raised Solely by Grandparents Experience Their Family Relationships. *Family Relations*, *58*(2), 162-175. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00544.x

[24] Duan, C. R., & Yang, G. (2008). Status of left-behind children in rural China. *Population Journal*, 5, 17–23.

[25] Dunifon, R. (2013). The Influence of Grandparents on the Lives of Children and Adolescents. *Child Development Perspectives, 7*(1), 55-60. doi:10.1111/cdep.12016

[26] Dunifon, R., & Kopko, K. (2012). The Influence of Grandparents on the Lives of Children and Adolescents. *Child Development Perspectives, 7*(1), 55-60. doi:10.1111/cdep.12016

[27] Dykstra, P. A., & Komter, A. (2012). Generational interdependencies in families. *Demographic Research, 27*, 487-506. doi:10.4054/demres.2012.27.18

[28] Gavazzi, S. M., & Sabatelli, R. M. (1990). Family system dynamics, the individuation process, and psychosocial development. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 5,* 500 -519.

[29] Gavazzi, S. M., Sabatelli, R. M., & Reese – Weber, M. J. (1999). Measurement of the financial, functional, and psychological connections in families: Conceptual development and empirical use of the Multigenerational Interconnectedness Scale. *Psychological Reports, 84,* 1361 – 1371.

[30] Glaser, K., Price, D., Di Gessa, G., Ribe, E., Stuchbury, R., & Tinker, A. (2013). Grandparenting in Europe: Family policy and grandparent's role in providing childcare. London, England: Grandparents Plus.

[31] Goodsell, T. L., Bates, J. S., & Behnke, A. O. (2011). Fatherhood stories: Grandparents, grandchildren, and gender differences. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 28(1), 134-154. doi:10.1177/0265407510386447

[32] Gordon, L. (2016). The empty nest is filled: The joys and tribulations of raising grandchildren in Aotearoa. Auckland, New Zealand: Grandparents Raising Grandchildren Trust.

[33] Hayslip, B., & Kaminski, P. (2008). *Parenting the custodial grandchild: Implications for clinical practice*. New York: Springer

[34] Hearn, J. C., & Rosinger, K. O. (2014). Socioeconomic diversity in selective private colleges: An organizational analysis. The Review of Higher Education, 38(1), 71–104. doi:10.1353/rhe.2014.0043

[35] Henderson, C. E., Hayslip, B., Sanders, L. M., & Louden, L. (2009). Grandmother—Grandchild Relationship Quality Predicts Psychological Adjustment Among Youth From Divorced Families. *Journal of Family Issues, 30*(9), 1245-1264. doi:10.1177/0192513x09334913

[36] 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.

[37] Howes, A. J. (2013). White Middle-class Identities and Urban Schooling . By Diane Reay, Gill Crozier and David James. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *61*(2), 249–252.

[38] Hu, X., Summers, J. A., Turnbull, A., & Zuna, N. (2011). The quantitative measurement of family quality of life: A review of available instruments. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 55, 1098-1114.

[39] Jenkins, S. R., Belanger, A., Connally, M. L., Boals, A., & Duron, K. M. (2013). First-generation ´undergraduate students' social support, depression, and life satisfaction. Journal of College Counseling, 16(2), 129–142. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2013.00032.x

[40] Johnson, V. K. (2010). From Early Childhood to Adolescence: Linking Family Functioning and School Behavior. *Family Relations*, *59*(3), 313-325. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00604.x

[41] Leinaweaver, J. (2014). Informal Kinship-Based Fostering Around the World: Anthropological Findings. *Child Development Perspectives*, *8*(3), 131-136. doi:10.1111/cdep.12075

[42] Nandy, S. & Selwyn, J. (2011) Spotlight on kinship care, Bristol, University of Bristol.Nyasani, E., Sterberg, E., & Smith, H.   (2009). Fostering children affected by AIDS in Richards Bay, South Africa: A qualitative study of grandparents experiences. *African Journal of AIDS Research, 8*(2), 181-192. doi:10.2989/ajar.2009.8.2.6.858

[43] Purcal, C., Brennan, D., Cass, B., & Jenkins, B. (2014). Grandparents raising grandchildren: impacts of lifecourse stage on the experiences and costs of care. *Australian Journal Of Social Issues (Australian Social Policy Association)*, *49*(4), 467-488.

[44] Rappa, A., & Tan, S. (2003). Political Implications of Confucian Familism. *Asian Philosophy,13*(2-3), 87-102. doi:10.1080/0955236032000162709

[45] Reay, D., Crozier, G., & Clayton, J. (2009). "Strangers in paradise"?: Working-class students in elite universities. Sociology, 43(6), 1103–1121. doi:10.1177/0038038509345700

[46] Singh, S. (2017). Parenting style in relation to children's mental health and self-esteem: A review of literature. *Indian Journal Of Health & Wellbeing*, *8*(12), 1522-1527.

[47] Stats New Zealand. (2014). Retrieved March 03, 2018, from stats.govt.nz/census/2013-census/profile-andsummary-reports-gstatsfamilies-households/grandparents.aspx

[48] Stebleton,M.J.,&Soria,K.M.(2012).Breakingdownbarriers:Academicobstaclesoffirst-generation students at research universities. The Learning and Assistance Review, 17(2), 7–19.

[49] Sy, S. R., Fong, K., Carter, R., Boehme, J., & Alpert, A. (2011). Parent support and stress among first-generation and continuing-generation female students during the transition to college. Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice, 13(3), 383–398. doi: 10.2190/CS.13.3.g

[50] Uhlenberg, P., & Cheuk, M. (2010). The Significance of Grandparents to Grandchildren: An International Perspective. *The SAGE Handbook of Social Gerontology,* 447-458. doi:10.4135/9781446200933.n34

[51] Wellard, S. (2010) Too old to care?: The experiences of older grandparents raising their grandchildren, London, Grandparents

[52] Wen, M., & Lin, D. (2012). Child Development in Rural China: Children Left Behind by Their Migrant Parents and Children of Nonimmigrant Families. *Child Development, 83*(1), 120-136. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01698.x

[53] Williams, M. N. (2011). The Changing Roles of Grandparents Raising Grandchildren. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 21*(8), 948-962. doi:10.1080/10911359.2011.588535

[54] Worrall, J. (2009). When Grandparents Take Custody—Changing Intergenerational Relationships: The New Zealand Experience. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 7*(2-3), 259-273. doi:10.1080/15350770902851106

[55] Yardley, A., Mason, J. & Watson, E. (2009) Kinship care in NSW: Finding a way forward, Sydney, University of Western Sydney.