

Effects of Emotional Stability and Family Quality of Life on Well-Being of College Students

Abel Gitimu Waithaka¹, Lachelle Goldson²

^{1,2} Youngstown State University, Ohio USA
Human Ecology Department

Abstract: The focus of this study was to investigate the effects of emotional stability and family quality of life on well-being of college students. Data was collected in a campus classroom setting among N=202 adult undergraduate students with an age range of 18-54 years; 69 (34%) male and 133 (66%) female participants. The participants completed three instruments: Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-14) with 14 items, the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ Scale) with 10 items, and the Family Quality of Life Scale (FQOL Scale) with 16 items. A One-Way ANOVA was used for data analysis that indicated participants with low social support, dissatisfied with life, and concerned financially scored lower in family interaction, parenting and emotional well-being. Participants who were concerned financially scored lower on reappraisal and higher on suppression.

Keywords: Emotional Stability, reappraisal, suppression, parenting, emotional-wellbeing.

1. INTRODUCTION

There is a growing interest among economists, government leaders and social scientists on the well-being of college students. Diener, Kesebir & Lucas (2008) suggests that social indicators guide the decisions of business leaders and government officials. Increased knowledge of emotional stability and its effect on the well-being of college students may assist policy-makers in enhancing quality of life.

According to Chen and Page (2016), post high school transitioning is a life period when adolescents leave the compulsory education system, and start a life path of divergence and independence. During this life period, college students face a series of problems, challenges and life adjustments. It is important to understand the variables that promote college students well-being because it can help predict important positive individual and relational consequences (Ratelle, Simard, & Guay, 2013). Students face many stressors such as balancing academic requirements, financial obligations, time, family and work demands (De Carvalho, Gadzella, Henley & Ball, 2009). The ability to regulate emotions can protect individuals from stress (Ciarrochi & Scott, 2006), which contributes to improved life satisfaction. In the cognitive sense of emotion regulation, an individual changes the way he or she thinks about an emotionally evoking situation in order to change the emotional impact. Reappraisal in the present moment is beneficial in decreasing negative emotions and increasing positive emotions (De Castella, Goldin, Jazaieri, Ziv, Dweck, & Gross, 2013).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Psychological stress is defined as “the demand made on an organism to adapt, cope, or adjust, and prolonged stress can affect adjustment capacity, mood, ability to experience pleasure, and physical health” (Holinka, 2015). High levels of stress interfere with academic performance, and more importantly, stressors can cause students to be vulnerable to stress-related mental health problems (Conley, Travers, & Bryant, 2013). Chronic stress has been linked to chronic fatigue, inability to concentrate, irritability, chronic headaches, disordered eating, coronary disease, depression, and heart disease

(Holinka, 2015). Therefore, understanding stress and related experiences in college students is pertinent to maintaining health and well-being (Holinka, 2015). How individuals deal with stress is based on their ability to regulate their emotions. There are growing expectations that individuals have a great amount of control over their emotions using a variety of strategies that can influence types of emotions and how these emotions are experienced and expressed (Peters, Smart, Eisenlohr-Moul, Geiger, Smith, & Baer, 2015).

Social support has been widely acknowledged as playing a buffering role between stress and psychological well-being (Zhou, Zhu & Zhang, 2013). The Social Support Theory posits that individuals receiving social support see otherwise potentially threatening situations as less stressful, while a lack of social support may reduce life satisfaction (Mahmoud, Staten, Lennie, & Hall, 2015). Maladaptive emotion regulation strategies such as avoidance or rumination increase the risk of mental and behavioral disorders, while adaptive strategies such as problem solving or reappraisal act as protective factors (Martins, Freire, & Ferreira-Santos, 2016). Adaptive coping strategies counteract the effect of stress and foster psychological well-being (Martins, Freire, & Ferreira-Santos, 2016). College students are ideal candidates for the creation of preventive mental health interventions that work toward lifelong wellness, adjustment, and success, and they represent the population where promotion of mental health programs can be most effective (Conley, Travers, & Bryant, 2013), because they are more inclined to use maladaptive strategies (Martins, Freire, & Ferreira-Santos, 2016).

2.1. Family Quality of life and Parental Marital Status:

Family Systems Theory (FST) posits that individuals can be better understood as a part of a family unit (Hertlein & Killmer, 2004). Ali and Malik (2015) define family as consisting of a group of people that live together and are related by blood, marriage, or adoption. Wang and Kober (2011) define family quality of life as a dynamic sense of well-being of the family, collectively and subjectively. The responsibilities of the family are to satisfy physical needs, provide love and affection, pass on values and attitudes, and socialization (Ali & Malik, 2015).

Recent research reports that family affects health-related quality of life regardless of age, gender, quality of social support, and lifestyle risk factors (Ali & Malik, 2015). Healthy families promote well-being of its' members through clear affective communication, unambiguous interpretation of that communication, equally beneficial patterns of interaction, and clear boundaries (Ali & Malik, 2015). In terms of interpersonal relationships, parents provide children with their very first opportunities to develop a relationship, communicate, and interact (Baker & Verrocchio, 2013). The parent-child relationship is the most actively pursued line of research (Utsunomiya, 2011). Parents not only influence their children, but children also affect their parents. This is known as a bidirectional point of view. However, most studies focus on the effects of parents on children (VanderValk, De Goede, Spruijt, & Meeus, 2007). As a result of the family bond, college students frequently report loneliness, homesickness, conflict, and distress in interpersonal relationships (Conley, Travers, & Bryant, 2013).

When children are involved in their parent's post-divorce struggles, they can suffer from intense feelings of divided loyalties causing stress (Baker & Verrocchio, 2013). Theoretically, literature on family systems theory suggests that marital conflict affects children's adjustment. Moné and Biringen (2006) hypothesized that higher levels of "feeling parent-child alienation" occurs most often in families with high conflict, regardless of parents' marital status. These findings imply that it is highly likely that parent-child alienation occurs in intact families as well as divorced families. Moreover, the fact that conflict was a predictor of parent-child alienation, rather than family type, supports previous research that continuous parental conflict is more important than whether parents remain married or not. Moné and Biringen (2006) showed that marital distress as reported by parents and emotional adjustment as reported by adolescents were reciprocally related in a transactional model over time.

Parental alienation is a very unhealthy practice for an individual especially during the transitional years. Parents who engage in parental alienation behaviors require a child to relinquish his or her autonomy and vanquish his or her needs to those of the parent (VanderValk, de Goede, Spruijt, & Meeus, 2007). Students reported childhood exposure to parental alienation correlates with their well-being. Caregivers, who discourage their children from performing tasks of which they are capable or ridicule attempts at self-direction, instill shame and doubt in them. Parents engaged in parental alienation demand obedience, which can interfere with the child's ability to make independent decisions and to be instrumentally competent. However, parents who encourage self-reliant behavior help their children develop a sense of autonomy and a sense of being able to handle problems (Baker & Verrocchio, 2013).

2.2. College Student Finances and Financial Self-Efficacy:

One of the leading causes of stress on college students, according to national surveys, is finances. In the National College Health Assessment, finance stressors are ranked the second highest, following academics (HanNa, Heckman, Letkiewicz & Montalto, 2014). Identifying factors that affect college students' coping behaviors is essential to the effort to improve college students' well-being; especially because financial stress has been associated with academic failures and negative financial practices (HanNa et al, 2014). Financial Self-Efficacy (FSE) is important because it operates as a cognitive mediator on stress and stress related behaviors that are adaptable. FSE implies a feeling of being able to deal effectively with situations that occur. High levels of FSE are said to produce benefits to well-being through its influence on an individuals' ability to modify their behavior (HanNa, Heckman, Letkiewicz & Montalto, 2014). Vlaev and Elliott (2014) examined whether the amount of debt caused a reduction in the number of classes students took, contemplation of dropping out of college, or abandonment of their homework. Students' who reported feeling stressed did indeed take fewer classes per quarter, dropped out for a semester, and earned lower grades (Vlaev & Elliott, 2014). Putting aside the stress of parental marital status and finances, a significant part of the population is ineffective at regulating their emotions, therefore, it is of prime importance to examine emotion regulation strategies (ERS) to determine how different emotion regulation strategies affect well-being of college students (Peters et al. 2015).

2.3. Rumination and Expressive Suppression among College Students:

Rumination is defined as "uncontrollable, repetitive thoughts focusing on negative mood and its causes, meanings, and consequences" (Seligowski & Holly, 2015). Individuals that use rumination as an emotion regulation strategy interprets this pattern of thinking as a productive problem-solving strategy; although it contributes to a downward spiral of negative affect and increased dysregulated behavior (Seligowski & Holly, 2015). Individuals with a high level of rumination show more aggressive behaviors than those with low levels of rumination. Most of the research on rumination has been linked to depression (Seligowski & Holly, 2015). When comparing depression to other psychological disorders, rumination is higher in individuals with symptoms of depression that lasts for a long period of time. Rumination has also been linked to binge eating, drug and alcohol abuse, anxiety, and posttraumatic stress disorder (Seligowski & Holly, 2015).

Germain and Kangas (2015) suggests that the best way to dysregulate and alter negative emotion is to modify or reappraise negative thoughts about the emotionally evoking situation before the emotional response is fully activated. Although there is empirical evidence that supports suppression as an adaptive emotion regulation strategy, conversely, emotion suppression can be an unhelpful strategy when used perpetually; resulting in an increase in unwanted emotional responses. While little is known about how individual differences relate to the experience and expression of emotion, expressive suppression requires tremendous cognitive efforts (Peters, Smart, Eisenlohr-Moul, Geiger, Smith & Baer, 2015).

Environmental or situational demands impact an individuals' ability to perform in social situations. These demands require individuals to continuously regulate their emotions because emotions guide our behavior to fit with the environmental and situational demands. Reappraisal is a cognitive form of an emotion regulation strategy (ERS) with a widely adaptive profile. Reappraisal involves changing the way individuals think about emotionally-evoking situations in order to change the emotional impact. Reappraisal can be beneficial or detrimental, however it is considered an effective ERS for decreasing negative, and increasing positive emotions currently. In fact, perpetual use of reappraisal as an ERS is associated with higher levels of positive and lower levels of negative affect, as well as improved interpersonal functioning, and satisfaction with life (De Castella, Goldin, Jazaieri, Ziv, Dweck, & Gross, 2013).

Reappraisal has many advantages but it is not the most sought after ERS in day-to-day life because of individuals' implicit beliefs on the ability to control one's emotions or the nature of the emotions one experiences (De Castella et. al, 2013). Entity theorists believe that their emotions are fixed, innate in nature. They tend to show helplessness upon failing at something (Niiya, Brook, & Crocker, 2010). In an entity theory framework, a setback is viewed as incompetence (Teunissen & Bok, 2013). Incremental theorists believe abilities can be improved upon, and tend to show more adaptive academic behaviors, have fewer concerns, and focus on ways they can get better results (Niiya, Brook, & Crocker, 2010). College students who hold an incremental theory of intelligence view setbacks as a lack of effort or poor study habits on their part, not as a lack of their own innate ability. When they are faced with a task that is difficult, they respond by trying harder (Niiya, Brook, & Crocker, 2010). Whether entity or incremental, the beliefs about emotion regulation or implicit

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

Vol. 5, Issue 6, pp: (1-10), Month: November - December 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

theories insinuate important outcomes for students during their transition to college. Students with entity beliefs about emotion reported more negative emotional experiences as well as increased feelings of depression, loneliness, and isolation from their peers. It is not yet clear as to why beliefs about emotions have these affective and social associations. One option is that when people believe their emotions cannot be controlled, they are less likely to use cognitive strategies like reappraisal, to regulate their emotions daily (De Castella, Goldin, Jazaieri, Ziv, Dweck, & Gross, 2013).

2.4. Life Satisfaction and Social Support:

Life satisfaction is an all-inclusive evaluation of an individuals' overall life. Individuals' assess their lives in as far as their mood, emotional reactions, fulfillment and satisfaction with their work, relationships, or school and compare their real-life situations to their ideal situations from a baseline perspective (Holinka, 2015). Research on life satisfaction has focused on specific relationships between life satisfaction and concepts like worry, self-concepts, and life events. Some studies have examined the relationships between stress and life satisfaction, emotional intelligence and stress, as well as emotional intelligence and life satisfaction (Holinka, 2015). Assessments made of what an individual believes is an acceptable standard or the norm, are more internal judgments based on how one believes life should be (Paolini, Yanez & Kelly, 2006). High self-esteem, perceptions of having a good social support system, self-efficacy, and optimism are linked to greater levels of life satisfaction (Paolini, Yanez & Kelly, 2006). It is possible for individuals to maintain some level of life satisfaction even when facing a negative life event by detaching slightly from reality and focusing on the positive aspects of life daily (Paolini, Yanez & Kelly, 2006).

Students transitioning to college experience a greater sense of autonomy, less adult supervision, and new relationships and social experiences. Social support (SS) is defined as "the existence or availability of people on whom we can rely, they care about one's well-being. Perceived social support has been widely acknowledged as playing a buffering role between stress and psychological well-being (Zhou, Zhu & Zhang, 2013). Social support is a resource of a potentially protective nature toward stress. Positive social support is an essential component for students managing their stress.

When stress levels are high, students instinctually seek support from family and friends while executing their coping strategies to maintain their well-being. Social support is positively associated with well-being (Chao, 2009). College students with low social support may not have a barrier against stress. Low social support is linked to a host of issues, such as parental divorce, a lack of friends, or a deficient social life (Chao, 2009). Social support has declined over the past ten years. As a result of this decline, students' notion of social support has shifted from their support being stable to fluctuating in times they feel they need it most. Students' with low social support are more likely to participate in destructive activities, such as drug and alcohol use, too much or too little sleep, sedentary behaviors, suicide, and dissatisfaction with life, all of which worsen well-being (Chao, 2009). Student's with high social support has the barriers to manage through stress. Social support is a resource that includes faculty, fellow students, family, friends and even romantic partners. Social support is a resource that is influential in terms of emotional assistance that can provide a barrier against declined well-being.

3. METHODOLOGY**3.1. Participants:**

The data in this study was collected from 202 undergraduate college students from different majors of study with a mean age of 21 years. There were 69 males (34%) and 133 females (66%) of the participants of this study. Participant's age ranged from 18 to 54 years. Convenient stratified sample was used in this study as participants were the individuals that were from selected classrooms. Participants were informed that participation was voluntary, confidential and anonymous. The participants completed three instruments: Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-14), Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ Scale), and Family Quality of Life Scale (FQOL Scale). Both quantitative and survey designs were used in this study and SPSS was used for data analysis.

3.2. Research Questions:

RQ1- Does social support influence college student's family quality of life?

RQ2- Does student financial well-being influence college student's emotion regulation?

RQ3- Is there a difference in family quality of life between students dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life?

RQ4- Is there a difference in family quality of life between student with financial concerns and those satisfied financially?

3.3. Materials:

The study used three scales; The PSS-14 Scale was created by Cohen & Janicki-Deverts, (2012) which consists of a 14-item instrument designed to measure perceived stress. It uses a Likert rating scale from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). PSS-14 measures the degree to which situations in one's life are appraised as stressful. The questions in this scale ask students about their feelings and thoughts. The participants are instructed to indicate how often they felt or thought a certain way during the last month, the scale has been standardized in a university population, has excellent consistency and good predictive validity. The ERQ scale was created by Gross & John (2013) consist of a 10-item instrument designed to measure emotion regulation with two scales reappraisal and suppression. It uses a Likert rating scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The ERQ scale uses statements such as "I control my emotions by changing the way I think about the situation I'm in" (reappraisal) and "I control my emotions by not expressing them" (suppression). The FQOL scale was created by Hoffman, Marquis, Poston, Summers & Turnbull (2006) consists of a 16-item instrument designed to measure family quality of life. It assesses how participants feel about their family life on areas of parenting, family interaction and emotional well-being.

3.4. Procedure:

The collection of the data for this study was a convenient and stratified sample. The sample was convenient as participants were requested to respond during usual class time and stratified as the investigator identified various classes in the colleges to respond to during class time. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) application for the study was approved. Investigator emailed professors at the university requesting permission to pass out the surveys 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 participants 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 the investigator. All hard copies of surveys are kept in the office of the principal investigator for several years before they are destroyed.

4. RESULTS

RQ1. Does social support influence college student's family quality of life?

Table 1: Influence of Social Support on Family Quality of Life

		N	Mean	Std. Dev	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Low Soc. Support	70	20.9714	5.29416	1	1128.958	59.742	.000
	High Soc. Support	132	25.9394	3.75339	200	18.897		
	Total	202	24.2178	4.94166	201			
Parenting	Low Soc. Support	70	21.7714	4.96122	1	1189.663	78.496	.000
	High Soc. Support	132	26.8712	3.18969	200	15.156		
	Total	202	25.1040	4.58248	201			
Emotional Wellbeing	Low Soc. Support	70	12.7286	3.63127	1	793.647	83.702	.000
	High Soc. Support	132	16.8939	2.74420	200	9.482		
	Total	202	15.4505	3.65829	201			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing social support and family quality of life of the participants who took the study on low and high social support. A significant difference was found on family interaction ($F(1, 200) = 59.742$, Parenting ($F(1, 200) = 78.496$, emotional well-being ($F(1, 200) = 83.702$, $p < 0.05$). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between low and high social support. This analysis revealed that low social supported students scored lower on family interaction ($m = 20.9714$, $sd = 5.29416$) than high social support students who

scored higher on family interaction ($m = 25.9394, sd = 3.75339$). Students with low social support scored lower on parenting ($m = 21.7714, sd = 4.96122$) than students with high social support ($m = 26.8712, sd = 3.18969$). Low social supported students scored lower on emotional well-being ($m = 12.7286, sd = 3.63127$) than high social support students ($m = 16.8939, sd = 2.74420$).

RQ 2. Does student financial wellbeing influence college student’s emotion regulation?

Table 2: Financial wellbeing on college student’s emotion regulation

	N	Mean	Std. Dev	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
ERQReapp	Concerned Financially	127	26.5748	7.10636	1	1367.467	29.510 4.341 .038
	Satisfied Financially	75	31.9600	6.26539	200	46.340	
	Total	202	28.5743	7.27409	201		
ERQSupp	Concerned Financially	127	15.6299	5.55892	1	129.402	.038
	Satisfied Financially	75	13.9733	5.28632	200	29.808	
	Total	202	15.0149	5.50484	201		

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing financial well-being and emotion regulation of the participants who took in the study on financially concerned and financially satisfied students. A significant difference was found on Reappraisal ($F(1, 200) = 29.510$, Suppression ($F(1, 200) = 4.341, p < 0.05$). **Tukey’s HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between low and high reappraisal and suppression. This analysis revealed that students who are concerned financially scored lower on reappraisal ($m = 26.575, sd = 7.106$) than students who are satisfied financially ($m = 31.96, sd = 6.2654$). Concerned financially students scored higher on suppression ($m = 15.63, sd = 5.55892$) than satisfied financially students ($m = 13.9733, sd = 5.28632$).

RQ 3. Is there a difference in family quality of life between students dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life

Table 3: Influence of Life satisfaction on Family quality of life

	N	Mean	Std. Dev	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Dissatisfied Life	127	22.6220	5.18687	1	871.038	43.149 21.231 .000
	Satisfied Life	75	26.9200	2.95809	200	20.187	
	Total	202	24.2178	4.94166	201		
Parenting	Dissatisfied Life	127	24.0157	4.90543	1	405.062	.000
	Satisfied Life	75	26.9467	3.25449	200	19.079	
	Total	202	25.1040	4.58248	201		
Emotional Wellbeing	Dissatisfied Life	127	14.4803	3.75405	1	321.957	27.192 .000
	Satisfied Life	75	17.0933	2.82926	200	11.840	
	Total	202	15.4505	3.65829	201		

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing life satisfaction and family quality of life of the participants who took the study on dissatisfied and satisfied life. A significant difference was found on family interaction ($F(1, 200) = 43.149$, Parenting ($F(1, 200) = 21.231$, emotional well-being ($F(1, 200) = 27.192, p < 0.05$). **Tukey’s HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between dissatisfied and satisfied life. This analysis revealed that students dissatisfied with life scored lower on family interaction ($m = 22.6220, sd = 5.18687$) than students with satisfied life who scored higher on family interaction ($m = 26.9200, sd = 2.95809$). Students dissatisfied with life scored lower on parenting ($m = 24.0157, sd = 4.90543$) than students satisfied with life ($m = 26.9467, sd = 3.25449$). Students dissatisfied with life students scored lower on emotional well-being ($m = 14.4803, sd = 3.75405$) than students satisfied with life ($m = 17.0933, sd = 2.82926$).

RQ4. Is there a difference in family quality of life between student with financial concerns and those satisfied financially?

Table 4: Influence of financial wellbeing on student’s family quality of life

		N	Mean	Std.Dev	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Concerned Financially	122	23.4836	5.41994	1	166.061	7.003	.009
	Satisfied Financially	80	25.3375	3.87770	200	23.712		
	Total	202	24.2178	4.94166	201			
Parenting	Concerned Financially	122	24.4918	5.19097	1	115.438	5.624	.019
	Satisfied Financially	80	26.0375	3.27029	200	20.527		
	Total	202	25.1040	4.58248	201			
Emotional Wellbeing	Concerned Financially	122	14.8361	3.81246	1	116.296	9.037	.003
	Satisfied Financially	80	16.3875	3.21190	200	12.869		
	Total	202	15.4505	3.65829	201			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing financial well-being and family quality of life the participants in the study on concerned financially and satisfied financially participants. A significant difference was found on family interaction ($F(1, 200) = 7.003$), Parenting ($F(1, 200) = 5.624$), and emotional well-being ($F(1, 200) = 9.037$, $p < 0.05$). **Tukey’s HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between concerned and satisfied financially students. This analysis revealed that students who are concerned financially scored lower on family interaction ($m = 23.4836$, $sd = 5.41994$) than students who are satisfied financially on family interaction ($m = 25.3375$, $sd = 3.87770$). Concerned financially students scored lower on parenting ($m = 24.4918$, $sd = 5.19097$) than satisfied financially students ($m = 26.0375$, $sd = 3.27029$). Concerned financially students scored lower on emotional well-being ($m = 14.8361$, $sd = 3.81246$) than satisfied financially students ($m = 16.3875$, $sd = 3.21190$).

5. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of emotional stability and family quality of life on well-being of college student’s life satisfaction. The knowledge of stress and related experiences in college students is pertinent to maintaining health and well-being (Holinka, 2015). This study revealed that students with low social support, dissatisfied with life, and concerned financially has a positive correlation with family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being; hence the less social support students perceive themselves as having, the less they interact with family, have negative relationships with their parents, and are not as emotionally stable. In addition, this study also revealed that students who are concerned financially are less likely to use reappraisal. Instead, they suppress their emotions, while students that are satisfied financially reappraise stressful situations more and suppress their emotions less.

Mahmoud et al, (2015) supported the findings that negative thinking was inversely associated with life satisfaction, and life satisfaction was enhanced by perceived social support. When stress levels are high, students instinctually seek support from family and friends while executing their coping strategies to maintain their well-being. Social support is positively associated with well-being (Chao, 2009). High self-esteem, perceptions of having a good social support system, self-efficacy, and optimism are linked to greater levels of life satisfaction (Paolini, Yanez & Kelly, 2006).

De Castella et al, (2013) demonstrated significant correlations with emotion regulation, well-being and psychological distress. The study examined people’s beliefs about their own emotions and possible links. The findings showed that the more people endorsed entity beliefs about emotions, the less likely they were to use reappraisal in their daily life. They also reported that entity beliefs about emotions were also associated with decreased well-being (i.e., reduced self-esteem and satisfaction with life). Reappraisal in the present moment is beneficial in decreasing negative emotions and increasing positive emotions (De Castella, Goldin, Jazaieri, Ziv, Dweck, & Gross, 2013).

Ali and Malik (2015) did a model test to assess the relationship between effects of family functioning on quality of life and found a significant positive relationship between quality of life and family functioning. Perry and Isaacs (2015) assessed and obtained five variable subscales, of five items each: physical and material well-being, emotional well-being, family interaction, parenting, and disability-related support. This content did tend to be moderately correlated.

Vlaev and Elliott (2014) reported a strong relationship between life 'situation' and financial satisfaction, a moderate relationship between financial satisfaction and overall quality of life and a strong relationship between financial well-being and financial satisfaction. Zagorski, Evans, Kelley and Piotrowska (2014) reported correlations are negative on societal inequality with individuals' overall well-being, financial quality of life, and health.

Kaya et al (2015) found that Turkish college students' scores on satisfaction with life were significantly and negatively correlated with scores on perceived stress. This suggests that students who feel they have higher perceived stress experience less satisfaction with life. Interventions that focus on decreasing perceived stress is said to increase overall satisfaction in Turkish college students. Gnilka et al (2015) reported that overall coping resource effectiveness, which act as a buffer against stressful events, and perceived stress was predictors of life satisfaction. Social support is viewed as a coping resource and is significantly related to lower stress and increased life satisfaction.

6. CONCLUSION

In conclusion this study contributes to the understanding and value of studying the effects of emotional stability and family quality of life on well-being and life satisfaction of college students. It also demonstrated the benefits that lend to better well-being. Life satisfaction is measured by the degree to which an individual's needs and desires are met; hence, individuals dissatisfied with life have higher perceived stress. Although college students experience unusual pressures (e.g., adjusting too new social networks and physical environments, and high academic demands), college promotes an environment where students can intellectually and vocationally achieve their needs and goals.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ali, S., & Malik, J. A. (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] Baker, A. J. L., & Verrocchio, M. C. (2013). Italian college student-reported childhood exposure to parental alienation: Correlates with well-being. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 54, 609–628. doi:10.1080/10502556.2013.837714
- [3] Chao, R. C. (2009). 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
- [4] Chen, X., & Page, A. (2016). Stability and instability of subjective well-being in the transition from adolescence to young adulthood: Longitudinal evidence from 20991 young australians. *Plos ONE*, 11(5), 1-15. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156399
- [5] Ciarrochi, J., & Scott, G. (2006). The link between emotional competence and well-being: A longitudinal study. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 34(2), 231-233. doi:10.1080/03069880600583287
- [6] Cohen, S., & Janicki-Deverts, D. (2012). Who's stressed? Distributions of psychological stress in the United States in probability samples from 1983, 2006 and 2009. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. doi.org/10.13072/midss.461
- [7] Conley, C. S., Travers, L. V., & Bryant, F. B. (2013). Promoting psychosocial adjustment and stress management in first-year college students: The benefits of engagement in a psychosocial wellness seminar. *Journal of American College Health*, 61(2), 75-86.
- [8] De Carvalho, C. F., Gadzella, B. M., Henley, T. B., & Ball, S. E. (2009). Locus of control: Differences among college students' stress levels. *Individual Differences Research*, 7(3), 182-187.
- [9] De Castella, K., Goldin, P., Jazaieri, H., Ziv, M., Dweck, C. S., & Gross, J. J. (2013). Beliefs about emotion: Links to emotion regulation, well-being, and psychological distress. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 497-505. doi:10.1080/01973533.2013.840632
- [10] Diener, E., Kesebir, P., & Lucas, R. (2008). Benefits of accounts of well-being for societies and for psychological science, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57, 37–53. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00353.x

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

 Vol. 5, Issue 6, pp: (1-10), Month: November - December 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

- [11] Germain, C. L., & Kangas, M. (2015). Trait anger symptoms and emotion regulation: The effectiveness of reappraisal, acceptance and suppression strategies in regulating anger. *Behaviour Change*, 32(1), 35-45. doi:10.1017/bec.2014.28
- [12] Gnilka, P. B., Ashby, J. S., Matheny, K. B., Chung, Y. B., & Chang, Y. (2015). Comparison of coping, stress, and life satisfaction between Taiwanese and U.S. college students. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 37(3), 234-249.
- [13] Gross, J.J., & John, O.P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 348-362.
- [14] HanNa, L., Heckman, S. J., Letkiewicz, J. C., & Montalto, C. P. (2015). Financial Stress, self-efficacy, and financial help-seeking behavior of college students. *Journal of Financial Counseling & Planning*, 25(2), 148-160.
- [15] Hertlein, K. M., & Killmer, J. M. (2004). Toward differentiated decision-making: Family systems theory with the homeless clinical population. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 32(3), 255-270.
- [16] 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. doi.org/10.13072/midss.327
- [17] Holinka, C. (2015). Stress, emotional intelligence, and life satisfaction in college students. *College Student Journal*, 49(2), 300-311.
- [18] Kaya, C., Tansey, T. N., Melekoglu, M., & Çakiroglu, O. (2015). Stress and life satisfaction of Turkish college students. *College Student Journal*, 49(2), 257-261.
- [19] Mahmoud, J. R., Staten, R., Lennie, T. A., & Hall, L. A. (2015). The relationships of coping, negative thinking, life satisfaction, social support, and selected demographics with anxiety of young adult college students. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*, 28(2), 97-108. doi:10.1111/jcap.12109
- [20] Martins, E. C., Freire, M., & Ferreira-Santos, F. (2016). Examination of adaptive and maladaptive cognitive emotion regulation strategies as trans-diagnostic processes: Associations with diverse psychological symptoms in college students. *Studia Psychologica*, 58(1), 59-73.
- [21] Moné, J. G., & Biringen, Z. (2006). Perceived parent-child alienation: Empirical assessment of parent-child relationships within divorced and intact families. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 45, 3-4. doi:10.1300/J087v45n03_07
- [22] Niiya, Y., Brook, A. T., & Crocker, J. (2010). Contingent self-worth and Self-handicapping: Do incremental theorists protect self-esteem? *Self & Identity*, 9(3), 276-297. doi:10.1080/15298860903054233
- [23] Paolini, L., Yanez, A. P., & Kelly, W. E. (2006). An examination of worry and life satisfaction among college students. *Individual Differences Research*, 4(5), 331-339.
- [24] Perry, A., & Isaacs, B. (2015). Validity of the family quality of life survey-2006. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 28(6), 584-588.
- [25] Peters, J. R., Smart, L. M., Eisenlohr-Moul, T. A., Geiger, P. J., Smith, G. T., & Baer, R. A. (2015). Anger rumination as a mediator of the relationship between mindfulness and aggression: The utility of a multidimensional mindfulness model. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 71(9), 871-884.
- [26] Ratelle, C., Simard, K., & Guay, F. (2013). University students' subjective well-being: The role of autonomy support from parents, friends, and the romantic partner. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14(3), 893-910. doi:10.1007/s10902-012-9360-4
- [27] Seligowski, A. V., & Orcutt, H. K. (2015). Examining the structure of emotion regulation: A factor-analytic approach. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 71(10), 1004-1022. doi:10.1002/jclp.22197
- [28] Teunissen, P. W., & Bok, H. J. (2013). Believing is seeing: How people's beliefs influence goals, emotions and behavior. *Medical Education*, 47(11), 1064-1072. doi:10.1111/medu.12228

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social SciencesVol. 5, Issue 6, pp: (1-10), Month: November - December 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

- [29] Utsunomiya, H. (2011). The influence of parental marital commitment on the identity formation of Japanese university students. *Social behavior & personality. An international journal*, 39(10), 1315-1324. doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2011.39.10.1315
- [30] VanderValk, I., De Goede, M., Spruijt, E., & Meeus, W. (2007). A longitudinal study on transactional relations between parental marital distress and adolescent emotional adjustment. *Adolescence*, 42(165), 115-136.
- [31] Vlaev, I., & Elliott, A. (2014). Financial well-being components. *Social Indicators Research*, 118(3), 1103-1123. doi:10.1007/s11205-013-0462-0
- [32] Wang, M., & Kober, R. (2011). Embracing an era of rising family quality of life research. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 55(12), 1093-1097. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01509.x
- [33] Zagorski, K., Evans, M. R., Kelley, J., & Piotrowska, K. (2014). Does national income inequality affect individuals' quality of life in Europe? Inequality, happiness, finances, and health. *Social Indicators Research*, 117(3), 1089-1110. doi:10.1007/s11205-013-0390-z
- [34] Zhang, K. C., Hui, C. H., Lam, J., Lau, E. Y., Cheung, S., & Mok, D. Y. (2014). Personal spiritual values and quality of life: Evidence from Chinese college students. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 53(4), 986-1002. doi:10.1007/s10943-013-9686-1
- [35] Zhou, X., Zhu, H., Zhang, B. (2013). Perceived social support as moderator of perfectionism, depression, and anxiety in college students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 41(7), 1141-1152 doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2013.41.7.1141TAISHENG CAI
- [36] Zullig, K. J., Huebner, E. S., & Pun, S. M. (2009). Demographic correlates of domain-based life satisfaction reports of college students. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(2), 229-238. doi:10.1007/s10902-007-90