

Influence of Social Support, Financial Well-Being and Family Quality of Life of College Students

¹Abel Gitimu Waithaka, ²Allison M. Fortunato

^{1,2}Youngstown State University

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence social support, financial well-being and family quality of life on college students. The study used three scales; Positive event scale with 41 items, Negative event scale with 57 items and Family quality of Life scale with 16 items and 170 college students participated in this study. The finding indicated a significance difference on positive events on low and high social supported students and significance difference of financially concerned and financially satisfied students. The study also found a significance difference on negative event between high and low social supported students. On family quality of life, the study indicated a significance difference on high and low socially supported students and on those dissatisfied and satisfied with life on parenting, emotional wellbeing and family interaction.

Keywords: Positive event, Negative events, parenting, family interaction, emotional-wellbeing.

1. INTRODUCTION

A study found that one of the most important resources that students use to deal with stress is social support (Çivitci, 2015). There are certain factors that can increase or decrease effects on social support. Research found that negative effects have a moderator role in the relationship between social support and stress, where positive affect does not have the same reaction. There was not a relationship between expected work family conflict and using career altering strategies (Weer, Greenhaus, Colakoglu & Foley, 2006).

Students can deal with stress easier with the support of their friends and families (Çivitci, 2015). College is a time when individuals become responsible for their own health, school life, economic conditions, and learning how to manage their own lives (Rahat & İlhan, 2016). One study examined the influence of self-esteem and social support on college student's mental health (Merianos, Nabors, Vidourek, & King, 2013). Females and those with lower levels of self-esteem reported more days with mental health issues. There is evidence that there is a disadvantage in terms of family support, level of financial assistance, knowledge about higher education, academic preparation and educational expectations with first generation students (Jenkins, Belanger, Connally,Boals,& Durón, 2013). Self-esteem and social support are related concepts that serve as protective factors against developing mental health problems during your college years (Merianos, Nabors, Vidourek, & King, 2013). The self-verification theory feels that people with positive self-concepts usually look for positive feedback that is either self-enhancing or self-confirming as people with negative self-concepts look for information from other people that forces their negative view of themselves (Wright, King & Rosenberg, 2014). First generation students are not only confronted with typical anxieties but the stressors from cultural and social transition as well (Jenkins, Belanger, Connally,Boals,& Durón, 2013).

Today mental health disorders are linked to nearly one half of the total burden of disease in young adults in the United States. Universities are positioned to promote mental health among the young people since they encompass several very important aspects of the students' lives (Wang, & Castañeda-Sound, 2008). College students tend to have a wide variety of stressors from academics, uncertainty about the future, difficulties in interpersonal relationships, as well as self-doubt to family issues (Chao, 2012). Research indicates that perceived stress is inversely related physical and psychosocial

problems, including symptoms like blood pressure, reduced response of immune system, cardiovascular disease, morbidity and mortality rates, depression and loneliness (Wright, King, & Rosenberg, 2014). In one study depression but not stress was associated with increased drinking behaviors. Social support was negatively associated with alcohol consumption (Pauley & Hesse, 2009).

Depression is identified as a serious health concern especially among college students (Eisenberg, Gollust, Golberstein & Hefner, 2007). The structural equation modeling showed that college study employments were related to both work school conflict and their work school enrichment; along with school outcomes (McNall & Michel, 2011). Pauley and Hesse (2009) found that half of all respondents in the study reported that they drank to the point where they became ill, 40 percent doing something later that they eventually regretted, 30 percent missed class because of excessive drinking, and over a quarter of the respondents reported they drank so much they could not remember what happened to them.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Family Quality of life:

A study examined an association between early intervention and adequacy and family quality of life and found a positive correlation between ratings of services adequacy and family quality of life. Positive emotions have been found to increase affiliation with others, as well as the quality of social interactions. Studies show that people with a more positive mood are more likely to participate in more activities to strengthen their relationships with others, compared to people with a less positive mood (Chih-Che, 2015; Kyzar, Brady, summers, Haines & Turnbull, 2016). Satisfaction with partnership is a key variable in understanding how services and supports adequacy are related to family quality of life and examined the potential moderating effects of partnership (Kyzar, et al, 2016).

Gratitude as a positive emotion can help individuals build relationships and other social bonds which lead to more perceived social support. Gratitude as a positive emotion can also increase coping strategies to overcome challenges that may occur in a person's life (Chih-Che, 2015). Parents often lack firsthand information, when it comes to their child's social functioning. Private feelings experienced by children and youth with a chronic disease and their desire to keep these experiences in a secret means that parents may be unaware of any non-visible experiences and non-expressed feelings of their youth (Quitmann, Rohenkohl, Sommer, Bullinger, & Silva, 2016).

Gratitude as positive emotion can also increase creative and efficient cognitive processes and also enable creative positive thinking to cope with stress and adversity. It can increase emotional well-being, such as satisfaction with life and improve psychological functioning and enhances other positive emotions as well to promote life satisfaction (Chih-Che, 2015). Gratifying physical needs, providing love and affection, transferring attitudes and values, and socializing are some of most common valuables of all families. An important need for a human being is to feel accepted and loved, and being able to have the ability of giving and receiving love within a family is important for the development of positive self-concept (Ali & Malik, 2015).

College students who are away from their families for the first time while they attend college deals with many issues as well as challenge which can be hard to adjust (Rahat & İlhan, 2016). Some of the challenges include learning how to be a monotonous adult, adjusting to an environment from which is very differ than what they experienced in high school , being able to stand on their own two feet, financial responsibilities, and taking care of their own basic needs which include washing clothes, ironing, and cooking (Rahat & İlhan, 2016). A balance is needed for stability and change to endorse the health of an individual family member. Family functioning has an important relationship with quality of family life. Disorder in family functioning has a negative effect on family quality of life (Ali & Malik 2015). Positive emotions have been found to build psychological resources, assisting with successful coping with negative events and increasing life satisfaction (Chih-Che, 2015). Family functioning in a person's family is considered a determinant of health in individuals' social environment. Families beyond parent child relationships participate in learning and communicating about various ways to improve their health behaviors (Ali & Malik 2015). Family functioning may affect family quality of life directly as well as indirectly through health prompting behaviors and quality of life and confirms it across generations (Ali & Malik 2015).

Influence of Social Support on college students:

Negative events increase the positive effect of social support on perceived stress decreases (Baron & Kenny, 1986). First generation college students have reported less social support from their families compared with their non-first generation college student peers and are more susceptible to have problems in areas like academic performance and persistence

(Wang & Castañeda-Sound, 2008). Students can deal with stress easier with the support of their friends and families (Çivitci, 2015). Promoting and maintaining effective parent child relationships is a fundamental element of current parenting (Gus, Rose & Gilbert, 2015). However, there is a need for broader and more explicit focus on a child parent relationship and teaching children about their emotions in the moment go with the idea of a broad and explicit model of parenting (Gus, Rose, & Gilbert, 2015)

The most important resource that students use to deal with stress is social support (Çivitci, 2015). The self-verification theory feels that people with positive self-concepts usually look for positive feedback that is either self-enhancing or self-confirming as people with negative self-concepts look for information from other people that forces their negative view of themselves (Wright, King & Rosenberg, 2014). First generation College students are not only confronted with typical anxieties but the stressors from cultural and social transition as well (Jenkins, Belanger, Connally, Boals, & Durón, 2013). There are certain factors that can increase or decrease effects on social support. Research has shown that negative events have a moderator role in the relationship between social support and stress, where positive events does not have the same reaction (Çivitci, 2015). When the negative relation between stress and subjective wellbeing is considered it is positive to feel that negative events can relate on stress which is another variable of social support as a result of coping with stress (Çivitci, 2015).

Family forms an important context for children's social emotional development. One of the most often investigated aspects of regarding family is parenting styles. There are three parenting style dimensions; affection or warmth, behavior control and psychological control and each have been shown to be associated with children's social emotional development. A high level of psychological control has been shown to lead to internalizing problems, like depression, anxiety, and internalized distress (Zarra-Nezhad et al, 2014). When the negative relation between stress and subjective well-being is considered it is positive to feel that negative event can relate on stress which is another variable of social support as a result of coping with stress (Çivitci, 2015). Depending on certain characteristics, some children are more susceptible than others to parental socialization (Zarra-Nezhad et al, 2014).

College is a time when individuals become responsible for their own health, school life, economic conditions, and learning how to manage their own lives as being away from families for what is most likely the first time , students will deal with many issues as well as challenges which can be hard to adjust (Rahat & İlhan, 2016). Some of the challenges college student face includes learning how to be a monotonous adult, adjusting to the new environment, standing on their own two feet, financial responsibilities, and meeting their basic needs (Rahat, & İlhan, 2016). Parental involvement overall is positively related to satisfaction in college students (Strapp & Farr, 2010). Authoritarian and permissive parenting styles associate negatively with cognitive achievement in a child (Dumais, 2009). Parenting styles can also affect self-concept and academic achievement. The nonacademic self-concept that can be affected may include physical, moral, personal and family self-concert (Ishak, Low & Lau, 2012).

Influence of Financial well-being on college students:

Spending habits and the financial management of college students has been a major study in research as high levels of debt and frequent bad budgeting practices have shown to affect college student negatively. These could result in bad credit history, stress related health problems, poor academic performance and even college drop outs (Bluth & Blanton, 2014).The underlying mechanism to whether a student will be financially responsible leads to students attitudes, personal beliefs, financial knowledge and situational factors (Chan, Chau & Chan, 2012).

A person's attitude toward money influence how one spends and handles money and whether one will borrow through loans or credit cards (Chan, Chau & Chan, 2012). A high level of debt is related to decreased sense of ability to manage ones money and lower self-esteem (Norvilitis, Merwin, Osberg, Roehling, Young & Kamas, 2006). Students who have considered dropping out of school for financial reasons are more likely to report poorer mental health and social functioning (Chan, Chau & Chan, 2012).

Financial attitudes and personality factors are more theoretical issues. A student who has many material possessions, and who possess certain personality characteristics, like an increased likelihood to make impulsive choices, will more likely acquire credit card debt. Possession of a credit card may facilitate spending among students, regardless of debt tolerant attitudes (Wright, King & Rosebberg, 2014). It is unclear whether low self-esteem causes people to acquire debt or whether debt decreases self-esteem (Bluth, K & Blanton, 2014).

Amounts of debt that are incurred by college students are related to their budgeting practices and students who perceived themselves as competent in budgeting have less debt (Wright, King & Rosebberg, 2014). A person's behavior can be

predicted by behavior intention, which typically depends on two factors, namely attitude and subjective norm. An attitude is an outcome to the person's beliefs and evaluations of behavioral outcomes while subjective norm is defined as the person's perceived normative belief (Chan, Chau, & Chan, 2012). Students who report financial strain also report lower self-esteem (Norvilitis, Merwin, Osberg, Roehling, Young & Kamas, 2006). Compulsive spenders also report lower self-esteem. Impulsive behaviors have also been known to play a role in the creation of debt. People with high levels of self-control are more likely to save money and spend less money. Those who have high materialism have also been found to have more positive attitudes (Norvilitis, et al, 2006).

3. METHOD

Participants:

The data in this study was collected from college students from middle size universities in Mid- Western United States. The data was collected from students from different majors of study from their classes during the first three weeks of the fall semester. The participants were individual students selected from different classrooms throughout the University.

Research Questions:

RQ1. Is there a difference in positive events between high and low socially supported students?

RQ2. Is there a difference in positive events between financially concerned and financially satisfied students?

RQ3. Is there a difference in negative events between high and low socially supported students?

RQ4. Is there a difference in positive events between financially dissatisfied and satisfied students with life?

RQ5. Is there a difference in student's family quality of life between high and low socially supported students?

Materials:

The materials used in this study were a demographic survey, a positive event scale, negative event scale, and a Family Quality Of Life (FQOL) Scale. The positive event scale was made up of 41 questions, the negative event scale was made up of 57 questions, and the FQOL scale was made up of 16 questions.

Procedure:

The sample of participants was convenient because the participants were requested to fill out the surveys during class time. The investigator contacted professors at the University with a request to pass out surveys to students during their class time. The professor was able to see the survey ahead of time as it was sent with the email as the attachment. The surveys were then taken to professors classrooms on the date specified by the professor. Once in the classroom consent letters were passed out along with the survey. The students were given about 10- 15 minutes to complete the survey. Then the surveys were individually entered into SPSS after data collection.

4. RESULTS

RQ1. Is there a difference in positive events between high and low socially supported students?

Table 1. Positive event on high and low socially supported students

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PYfriends	Low	39	13.7179	4.07785	1	273.496	19.040	.000
	High	110	16.8000	3.68433	147	14.364		
	Total	149	15.9933	4.01433	148			
PWork	Low	39	9.7436	5.64623	1	262.602	6.735	.010
	High	110	12.7636	6.43945	147	38.988		
	Total	149	11.9732	6.36390	148			
PTeacherLectures	Low	39	13.2051	6.80626	1	226.368	4.563	.034
	High	110	16.0091	7.12470	147	49.615		
	Total	149	15.2752	7.12804	148			
PositiveParents	Low	39	15.3333	7.33533	1	1047.006	32.050	.000
	High	110	21.3636	5.02969	147	32.667		
	Total	149	19.7852	6.28658	148			

One way ANOVA computed comparing positive friends, positive work, positive teacher lectures, and positive parents on high and low social support. A significant difference was found among positive friends $F(1, 147) = 19.040$, positive work $F(1, 147) = 6.735$, positive teacher lectures $F(1, 147) = 4.563$, positive parents $F(1, 147) = 32.050$. **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between high and low social supported students. These analysis reveal that the student who had low positive friends ($m = 13.7179$, $sd = 4.07785$) than students who had high social support ($m = 16.8000$, $sd = 3.6843$), low positive work ($m = 9.7436$, $sd = 5.64623$), than the high positive work ($m = 12.7636$, $sd = 6.43945$), low positive teacher lectures ($m = 13.2051$, $sd = 6.80626$), than the students with high positive teacher lectures ($m = 16.0091$, $sd = 7.12470$), low positive parents ($m = 15.333$, $sd = 7.33533$), than the students with high positive parents ($m = 21.3636$, $sd = 5.02969$).

RQ2. Is there a difference in positive events between financially concerned and financially satisfied students?

Table 2. Positive event on financially concerned and financially satisfied students

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PositiveWorkInteractions	Concerned	35	12.0857	8.78291	1	341.712	4.797	.030
	Satisfied	131	15.6031	8.34790	164	71.232		
	Total	166	14.8614	8.53649	165			
POtherStudents	Concerned	35	9.7143	5.67021	1	545.977	15.257	.000
	Satisfied	131	14.1603	6.06099	164	35.785		
	Total	166	13.2229	6.23517	165			
PositiveParents	Concerned	35	16.3143	7.63032	1	579.086	15.908	.000
	Satisfied	131	20.8931	5.54041	164	36.403		
	Total	166	19.9277	6.30014	165			
PositiveYourCourse	Concerned	35	10.5714	4.94253	1	227.716	10.417	.002
	Satisfied	131	13.4427	4.60294	164	21.859		
	Total	166	12.8373	4.80694	165			
PositiveSocial	Concerned	35	8.7143	5.89901	1	167.323	4.399	.037
	Satisfied	131	11.1756	6.23573	164	38.037		
	Total	166	10.6566	6.23063	165			
PTeacherLectures	Concerned	35	12.6286	6.96667	1	239.382	4.534	.035
	Satisfied	131	15.5725	7.34222	164	52.794		
	Total	166	14.9518	7.34336	165			
PWork	Concerned	35	9.0857	5.85296	1	370.474	10.017	.002
	Satisfied	131	12.7481	6.13984	164	36.984		
	Total	166	11.9759	6.24544	165			

One way ANOVA was computed comparing positive work interactions, positive other students, positive parents, positive your course, positive social, positive teacher lectures, and positive work on financially concerned and financially satisfied students. A significant difference was found among positive work interactions $F(1, 164) = 4.797$, among positive other students $F(1, 164) = 15.257$, among positive parents $F(1, 164) = 15.908$, among positive your course $F(1, 164) = 10.417$, among positive social $F(1, 164) = 4.399$, among positive teacher lectures $F(1, 164) = 4.534$ and among positive work $F(1, 164) = 10.017$. **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between financially concerned and satisfied students.

These analysis reveal that the student who were concerned positive work interactions ($m = 12.0857$, $sd = 8.78291$) had difference than students who had satisfied positive work interactions ($m = 15.6031$, $sd = 8.34790$), positive concerned other students ($m = 9.7143$, $sd = 5.67021$) had a difference than the satisfied positive other students ($m = 14.1603$, $sd = 6.061$), concerned positive parents ($m = 16.3143$, $sd = 7.63032$) had a significance than the students with satisfied positive parents ($m = 20.8931$, $sd = 5.54041$), concerned positive your course ($m = 10.5714$, $sd = 4.94253$) had a difference with satisfied positive your course ($m = 13.4427$, $sd = 4.60294$), concerned positive social ($m = 8.7143$, $sd = 5.89901$) had a difference than students with satisfied positive social ($m = 11.1756$, $sd = 6.23573$), concerned positive teacher lectures

($m= 12.6286$, $sd= 6.9667$) had a difference than satisfied positive teacher lectures ($m= 15.5725$, $sd= 7.34222$), concerned positive work ($m= 9.0857$, $sd= 5.85296$) students had a difference with satisfied positive work ($m= 12.7481$, $sd= 6.13984$).

RQ3. Is there a difference in Negative events between high and low socially supported students?

Table 3. Negative events on high and low socially supported students

		N	Mean	Std Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
NegativeAcademicLimitations	High	39	4.5385	4.24169	1	128.329	10.328	.002
	Low	110	2.4273	3.23813	147	12.426		
	Total	149	2.9799	3.63443	148			
NegativeGetaJob	High	39	5.5897	6.92333	1	235.914	8.476	.004
	Low	110	2.7273	4.56333	147	27.832		
	Total	149	3.4765	5.40718	148			
NegativeWork	High	39	3.3590	5.37777	1	71.628	3.977	.048
	Low	109	1.7798	3.76474	146	18.012		
	Total	148	2.1959	4.28676	147			
NHealthProblems	High	39	5.9487	5.34568	1	293.757	16.658	.000
	Low	110	2.7545	3.71752	147	17.634		
	Total	149	3.5906	4.41590	148			
NRelatives	High	39	5.8974	6.00787	1	261.833	11.513	.001
	Low	110	2.8818	4.25286	147	22.742		
	Total	149	3.6711	4.93532	148			
NegativeParents	High	39	7.4359	6.09052	1	419.641	17.810	.000
	Low	110	3.6182	4.34093	147	23.562		
	Total	149	4.6174	5.12228	148			
NegativeCourse	High	38	9.5263	4.78588	1	163.254	6.016	.015
	Low	109	7.1193	5.34673	145	27.137		
	Total	147	7.7415	5.29808	146			
NMoney	High	39	11.2308	7.12468	1	1031.442	26.557	.000
	Low	110	5.2455	5.88917	147	38.839		
	Total	149	6.8121	6.74874	148			
NSBF	High	39	8.5385	8.12354	1	218.792	3.918	.050
	Low	110	5.7818	7.23191	147	55.840		
	Total	149	6.5034	7.54592	148			
NegativeFriends	High	39	6.9744	6.20902	1	152.526	5.590	.019
	Low	110	4.6727	4.83320	147	27.287		
	Total	149	5.2752	5.30408	148			

One way ANOVA was computed comparing negative academic limitations, negative getting a job, negative work, negative health problems, negative relatives, negative parents, negative course, negative money, NSBF (Negative problems with your spouse or partner, boyfriend or girlfriend), and negative friends. A significant difference was found among negative academic limitations $F(1, 147) = 10.328$, among negative getting a job $F(1, 147) = 8.476$, among negative work $F(1, 147) = 3.977$, among negative health problems $F(1, 147) = 16.658$, among negative relatives $F(1, 147) = 11.513$, among negative parents $F(1, 147) = 17.810$, among negative course $F(1, 147) = 6.016$, among negative money $F(1, 147) = 26.557$, among NSBF $F(1, 147) = 3.918$ and among Negative friends $F(1, 147) = 5.590$. **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between high and low socially supported students.

These analysis reveal that the students who high social support scored higher on negative academic limitations ($m= 4.5385$, $sd=4.24169$) than students who low social support of negative academic limitations ($m= 2.4273$, $sd=3.23813$), high social support of negative getting a job ($m= 5.5897$, $sd= 6.92333$), than low social support of negative getting a job ($m= 2.7273$, $sd= 4.56333$), high negative work ($m= 3.3590$, $sd= 5.37777$) than the low social support of work ($m=$

1.7798, sd= 3.76474), high social support of negative health problems (m= 5.9487, sd= 5.34568) than the low social support of negative health problems (m= 2.7545, sd= 3.71752), high social support of negative relatives (m= 5.8974, sd= 6.00787) than the low social support of negative relatives (m= 2.8818, sd= 4.25286), high social support of negative parents(m= 7.4359, sd= 6.09052) than the low social support of negative parents (m=3.6182, sd= 4.34093), high social support of negative course (m= 9.5263, sd= 4.78588) than the low social support of negative course(m= 7.1193 , sd= 5.34673), high social support of negative money (m= 11.2308, sd= 7.12468) than the low social support of negative money (m= 5.2455, sd= 5.88917), high social support of NSBF (m= 8.5385, sd= 8.12354) than the low social support of NSBF (m= 5.7818, sd=7.23191), high social support of negative friends (m= 6.9744, sd= 6.20902) than the low social support of negative friends (m= 4.6727, sd= 4.83320).

RQ4. Is there a difference in positive events between financially dissatisfied and satisfied students with life?

Table 4. Positive events on financially dissatisfied and satisfied students

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
POtherStudents	Dissatisfied	62	11.9677	5.79703	1	155.019	4.074	.045
	Satisfied	105	13.9619	6.37592	165	38.047		
	Total	167	13.2216	6.22510	166			
PositiveParents	Dissatisfied	62	16.9032	7.64737	1	905.866	26.257	.000
	Satisfied	105	21.7238	4.52024	165	34.499		
	Total	167	19.9341	6.30465	166			
PositiveRelationships	Dissatisfied	62	16.2258	12.51022	1	621.607	4.277	.040
	Satisfied	105	20.2190	11.78002	165	145.326		
	Total	167	18.7365	12.17355	166			
PositiveYourCourse	Dissatisfied	62	11.1452	4.56949	1	270.824	12.603	.001
	Satisfied	105	13.7810	4.67395	165	21.489		
	Total	167	12.8024	4.79488	166			
PositiveSocial	Dissatisfied	62	9.1774	6.20028	1	218.116	5.822	.017
	Satisfied	105	11.5429	6.07332	165	37.461		
	Total	167	10.6647	6.20883	166			
PTeacherLectures	Dissatisfied	62	12.6774	7.81083	1	529.198	10.413	.002
	Satisfied	105	16.3619	6.69690	165	50.823		
	Total	167	14.9940	7.32835	166			
PYfriends	Dissatisfied	62	14.4677	3.94519	1	224.335	15.086	.000
	Satisfied	105	16.8667	3.80300	165	14.870		
	Total	167	15.9760	4.01646	166			

One way ANOVA was computed on positive other students, positive parents, positive relationships, positive your course, positive social, positive teacher lectures and positive your friends. A significant difference was found among positive other students $F(1, 165) = 4.074$, among positive parents $F(1, 165) = 26.257$, among positive relationships $F(1, 165) = 4.277$, among negative positive your course $F(1, 165) = 12.603$, among positive social $F(1, 165) = 5.822$, among positive teacher lectures $F(1, 165) = 10.413$ and among positive your friends $F(1, 165) = 15.086$. **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between financially dissatisfied and satisfied students. These analysis reveal that the student who are financially dissatisfied positive other students had a difference (m= 11.9677, sd= 5.79703) than students who are financially satisfied positive other students (m= 13.9619, sd=6.37592), financially dissatisfied positive parents (m= 16.9032, sd= 7.64737), than financially satisfied positive parents (m= 21.7238, sd= 4.52024), financially dissatisfied positive your relationships (m= 16.2258, sd= 12.51022), than the financially satisfied your relationships (m= 20.2190, sd= 11.78002), financially dissatisfied positive your course (m= 11.1452, sd= 4.56949), than the financially satisfied your course (m= 13.7810, sd= 4.67395), financially dissatisfied positive social (m= 9.1774, sd= 6.20028), than the financially satisfied positive social (m=11.5429, sd= 6.07332), financially dissatisfied positive teacher lectures (m= 12.6774, sd= 7.81083), than the financially satisfied positive teacher lectures (m=16.3619, sd= 6.69690), financially dissatisfied positive your friends (m= 14.4677, sd= 3.94519), than the financially satisfied positive your friends(m= 16.8667, sd= 3.80300).

RQ5. Is there a difference in student's family quality of life between high and low socially supported students?

Table 5. Student's family quality of life between high and low socially supported students

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
EmotionalWellBeing	Low	39	12.5897	4.80525	1	510.373	36.686	.000
	High	110	16.8000	3.27291	147	13.912		
	Total	149	15.6980	4.15527	148			
Parenting	Low	39	20.0000	6.65306	1	1169.289	30.850	.000
	High	110	26.3727	5.97373	147	37.903		
	Total	149	24.7047	6.74888	148			
FamilyInteraction	Low	39	19.9231	8.45852	1	1294.090	24.891	.000
	High	110	26.6273	6.72099	147	51.990		
	Total	149	24.8725	7.77060	148			

One way ANOVA was computed using emotional well-being, parenting, and family interaction. A significant difference was found among emotional wellbeing $F(1, 147) = 36.686$, on parenting $F(1, 147) = 30.850$ and on family interaction $F(1, 147) = 24.891$. **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between high and low socially supported students. These analysis reveal difference on student low emotional wellbeing social support ($m = 12.5897$, $sd = 4.80525$) than students who are high emotional wellbeing social support ($m = 16.8000$, $sd = 3.27291$), difference on low positive parenting social support ($m = 20.0000$, $sd = 6.65306$), than high parenting social support ($m = 26.3727$, $sd = 5.97373$), difference on low family interaction social support ($m = 19.9231$, $sd = 8.45852$) than the high family interaction social support ($m = 26.6273$, $sd = 6.72099$).

5. DISCUSSION

The study found a major difference between high and low social supports. Those with high social support scored higher in all scales. First generation college students have reported less social support from their families compared with their non-first generation college student peers and are more susceptible to have problems in areas like academic performance and persistence (Wang & Castañeda-Sound, 2008).

The study found a major difference between financially concerned and financially satisfied students. Those who were financially satisfied score higher on all scales. Even though employment for college students may not be the most recommended, there are still benefits that can help college student success. Some examples would show how individuals who are employed are more likely to show skills of greater responsibility, interactive communication, patience, teamwork, and good time management (McGaha & Fitzpatrick, 2010).

The study found a major difference between negative events of high and low social supported students. Those students with low negative events on social supported students scored higher. Some findings found a link between perfectionism and anxiety. A study investigated the possible variables that will influence the relationship between perfectionism, depression and anxiety; like self-esteem, self-efficacy and coping styles and findings indicated that perceived social support was a possible moderator for depression and anxiety (Xueting, Hong, Bin & Taisheng, 2013). The influence of self-esteem and social support on college student's mental health and found that females and those with lower levels of self-esteem reported more days with mental health issues (Merianos, Nabors, Vidourek, & King, 2013). Extracurricular activities are not just a way to pass time but offer an opportunity for students to learn teamwork, and responsibility.

The study found a major difference between the positive events between financially dissatisfied and satisfied students. The students who were financially satisfied scored higher on all of the scales. An anticipation of work family conflict may play a big role in career plans of young adults and during their adulthood (Cinamon, 2010). There is an increase in the number of nontraditional students who are attending institutions that include higher education. One third of graduate students are now working adults. A lot of these students will bring with them unique needs that should be addressed by these academic institutions (Giancola, Grawitch, & Borchert, 2009).

The study found a major difference between family quality of life between high and low socially supported students. Students with high family quality of life scored higher on all of the scales. Relative findings showed how, as negative events increases the positive effect of social support on perceived stress decreases. Another study found that one of the

most important resource that students to deal with stress are social support (Çivitci, 2015). There are certain factors that can increase or decrease effects on social support. Research found that negative events have a moderator role in the relationship between social support and stress, where positive events does not have the same reaction. In contrast to traditional students, adult students have additional responsibilities within their job as well as their personal life that could eventually lead to a demand overload and a role conflict when combining it with school. The intensity or demands adult students have to face are important but so are the role conflicts that these students experience while managing the demands of each domain (Giancola, Grawitch, & Borchert, 2009).

REFERENCES

- [1] 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
- [2] Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- [3] Bluth, K., & Blanton, P. (2014). Erratum to: Mindfulness and Self-Compassion: Exploring Pathways to Adolescent Emotional Well-Being. *Journal Of Child & Family Studies*, 23(7), 1313-1314. doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9846-7
- [4] Chan, S. F., Chau, A. W., & Chan, K. Y. (2012). Financial knowledge and aptitudes: Impacts on college students financial well-being. *College Student Journal*, 46(1), 114-132.
- [5] Chao, R. C. (2012). Managing Perceived Stress Among College Students: The Roles of Social Support and Dysfunctional Coping. *Journal Of College Counseling*, 15(1), 5-21. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2012.00002.x Article 26
- [6] Chih-Che, L. (2015). Impacts of gratitude on resource development and emotional well-being. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 43(3), 493-504. doi:10.2224/sbp.2015.43.3.493
- [7] Cinamon, R. G. (2010). Anticipated work-family conflict: effects of role salience and self-efficacy. *British Journal Of Guidance & Counselling*, 38(1), 83-99. doi:10.1080/03069880903408620.
- [8] Çivitci, A. (2015). The Moderating role of positive and negative affect on the relationship between perceived social support and stress in college students. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 15(3), 565-573. doi:10.12738/estp.2015.3.2553
- [9] Dumais, S. A. (2009). Cohort AND Gender Differences in Extracurricular Participation: THE relationship between activities, math achievement, and college expectations. *Sociological Spectrum*, 29(1), 72-100. doi:10.1080/02732170802480543
- [10] Eisenberg, D., Gollust, S. E., Golberstein, E., & Hefner, J. L. (2007). Prevalence and correlates of depression, anxiety, and suicidality among university students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 77, 534–542.
- [11] Giancola, J. K., Grawitch, M. J., & Borchert, D. (2009). Dealing With the Stress of College: A Model for Adult Students. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 59(3), 246-263.
- [12] Gus, L., Rose, J., & Gilbert, L. (2015). Emotion Coaching: A universal strategy for supporting and promoting sustainable emotional and behavioral well-being. *Educational & Child Psychology*, 32(1), 31-41.
- [13] Ishak, Z., Low, S. F. & Lau. P. (2012). Parenting Style as a Moderator for Students' Academic Achievement. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 21,4 p487-p493
- [14] Jenkins, S. R., Belanger, A., Connally, M. L., Boals, A., & Durón, K. M. (2013). First-Generation Undergraduate Students' Social Support, Depression, and Life Satisfaction. *Journal Of College Counseling*, 16(2), 129-142.
- [15] Kyzar, K. B., Brady, S. E., Summers, J. A., Haines, S. J., & Turnbull, A. P. (2016). Services and Supports, Partnership, and Family Quality of Life. *Exceptional Children*, 83(1), 77-91. doi:10.1177/0014402916655432
- [16] McGaha, V., & Fitzpatrick, J. (2010). Employment, academic and extracurricular contributors to college aspirations. *Journal of College Admission*, (207), 22-29

- [17] Merianos, A. L., Nabors, L. A., Vidourek, R. A., & King, K. A. (2013). The impact of self-esteem and social support on college students' mental health. *American Journal Of Health Studies*, 28(1), 27-34.
- [18] Quitmann, J., Rohenkohl, A., Sommer, R., Bullinger, M., & Silva, N. (2016). Explaining parent-child (dis)agreement in generic and short stature-specific health-related quality of life reports: do family and social relationships matter?. *Health & Quality Of Life Outcomes*, 141-12. doi:10.1186/s12955-016-0553
- [19] McNall, L., & Michel, J. (2011). A Dispositional Approach to Work-School Conflict and Enrichment. *Journal Of Business & Psychology*, 26(3), 397-411. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9187-0
- [20] Pauley, P. M., & Hesse, C. (2009). The Effects of Social Support, Depression, and Stress on Drinking Behaviors in a College Student Sample. *Communication Studies*, 60(5), 493-508. doi:10.1080/10510970903260335
- [21] Rahat, E., & İlhan, T. (2016). Coping Styles, Social Support, Relational Self- Construal, and Resilience in Predicting Students' Adjustment to University Life. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 16(1), 187-208.
- [22] Strapp, C. M., & Farr, R. J. (2010). To get involved or not: The relation among extracurricular involvement, satisfaction, and academic achievement. *Teaching Of Psychology*, 37(1), 50-54. doi:10.1080/00986280903425870
- [23] Wang, C. C., & Castañeda-Sound, C. (2008). The Role of Generational Status, Self-Esteem, Academic Self-Efficacy, and
- [24] Perceived Social Support in College Students' Psychological Well-Being. *Journal Of College Counseling*, 11(2), 101-118.
- [25] Weer, C. H., Greenhaus, J. H., Colakoglu, S. N., & Foley, S. (2006). The Role of maternal employment, role-altering strategies, and gender in college students' expectations of work-family conflict. *Sex Roles*, 55(7/8), 535-544.
- [26] Wright, K. B., King, S., & Rosenberg, J. (2014). Functions of Social Support and Self-Verification in Association with Loneliness, Depression, and Stress. *Journal Of Health Communication*, 19(1), 82-99.
- [27] Xueting, Z., Hong, Z., Bin, Z., & Taisheng, C. (2013). Perceived Social Support as Moderator of Perfectionism, Depression, and Anxiety in College Students. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 41(7), 1141-1152.
- [28] Zarra-Nezhad, M., Kiuru, N., Aunola, K., Zarra-Nezhad, M., Ahonen, T., Poikkeus, A., & ... Nurmi, J. (2014). Social withdrawal in children moderates the association between parenting styles and the children's own socioemotional development. *Journal Of Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, 55(11), 1260-1269. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12251