

# Impacts of Family Functioning on Family Quality of Life among College Students

<sup>1</sup>Abel Gitimu Waithaka, <sup>2</sup>Alexis Martinelli, <sup>3</sup>Caroline Kobia

<sup>1</sup>Youngstown State University, Ohio USA

<sup>2</sup>Youngstown State University, Ohio USA

<sup>3</sup>Mississippi State University

---

**Abstract:** The focus of this study is to investigate family functioning on family quality of life among college students. The study used three scales, the family functioning scale (FFS) with 20 items, Family Quality of Life scale (FQOL) with 16 items and Perpetual Indicators of Family Life Quality with 35 items. A total of 150 undergraduate students participated in the study with age range of 18-52 years. The study sample was made up of 75 (50%) males and 75 (50%) females' participants. Data was collected in a classroom setting during class time in fall 2018 in a university college. The findings indicate that participants with dissatisfied life and those concerned financially scored lower on family functioning than those satisfied financially and satisfied with life. Also participants with low social support and concerned financially scored lower on perceptual indicators of family life quality than those with high social support and financial satisfaction. Finally, participants with low social support and those concerned financially scored lower on family quality of life than those with high social support and financial satisfaction.

**Keywords:** Family-functioning, social-support, family, quality-of-life, perceptual-indicators.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Family is all around us, whether you were born into one or adopted along the way. This study will investigate the influence of family quality of life of college students and its impact on by their family functioning level. There are several theories family functioning. Olson Annular Mode Theory divide family functioning into three different areas: family intimacy (relationships), family adaptability (family change and power structure), and family communication (Dai and Wang, 2015). A stable and secure family life is vital to healthy child and youth development. Briefly, strong families are those in which family members get along and communicate well, follow routines, share tasks and enjoy time together, enjoy a positive outlook, have a support network, and where parents use positive parenting skills (Black and Lobo, 2008). Family functioning levels is also be affected by outside sources such as perceptual indicators, gender, financial well-being, and social support. Some families consist of single parent households, others could be nuclear families, and therefore it is important to look at diverse families (Dai and Wang, 2015). The "season" of life is important to consider because a family with a preschooler in the family may have higher levels of stress than a family with an adolescent child resulting in lower family functioning. Spousal relationships contributes family functioning level.

## 2. LITERATRUE REVIEW

Family members are usually first friends and the ones who always support members throughout life, however, some families' function poorly affecting every other area of their lives. Factors influencing our family functioning and family quality of life include the season in which the family is in, socioeconomic status, spousal relationships, family systems, and life events. Dai and Wang (2015) proposed three main areas that family functioning, communication, adaptability, and intimacy. Additional studies have contributed other essential parts of family functioning such as the roles and

responsibility of each family member, emotional expression, involvement, values, and rules (Dai and Wang, 2015). Family functioning is an area of concern because poor functioning levels could affect various other aspects of an individual's life.

The study of family functioning is important to study because everyone, in some way, has a family. It is interesting to see the results of studies regarding family functioning, family quality of life, and perceptual indicators because different studies yield different results. Some studies argue that family needs only three factors to function positively, while other studies argue that family needs as much as ten factors (Dai and Wang, 2015; Shek, Xie, and Lin, 2013).

### Family Functioning

The concept of family functioning is how well a family system meets the needs of the family, physically and emotionally, as a whole (Dai and Wang, 2015). Family functioning levels depend on the characteristics of the family. Dai and Wang (2015) noted that there are two different theories involving family functioning; the first being result oriented which means the quality of the family and the second theory being process oriented which means the tasks the family needs to complete to function properly.

Dai and Wang (2015) examined result oriented families by reviewing two separate models; Olson annular mode theory and Beavers system theory. The Olson annular mode theory is the most widely used throughout studies involving family functioning. It has been used in clinical evaluations and family therapy. This theory is divided into three main parts; family intimacy, family adaptability, and family communication. Intimacy is the relationships between two or more of the family members. Adaptability is the ability of the family to be able to change and cope with external circumstances. Communication is the way the family members speak to each other, verbally and nonverbally. Moreover, the Olson annular mode theory identified twenty-five different family types, nine of these are named the balanced type, twelve are named the middle type, and four are named the extreme type. Balanced families scored moderate on two dimensions, middle families scored extreme dimension and extreme families scored extreme on both dimensions (Dai and Wang, 2015).

The Beavers system theory examines the correlation between family functioning and the strain capacity of the family system. This system divides families into nine types (Dai and Wang, 2015). The first two, appropriate and best families described as being the healthiest and having high levels of communication. The next three kinds of families are the intermediate type; the centripetal intermediate family, the centrifugal intermediate family, and the hybrid intermediate family. The centripetal and centrifugal families often have unpredictable behaviors regarding their families. They struggle with controlling themselves and others. On the opposite end, the hybrid intermediate family tends to adapt well to situations and have intermediate communication levels. Next, to the borderline families consist of two types; centripetal borderline and centrifugal borderline. Consistent with the other two families' types, these families do not function properly; they tend to be inconsistent and unstable due to the poorly functioning levels of the family as a whole (Dai and Wang, 2015).

The McMaster family functioning mode theory provides the conditions for which a family needs to develop physically, psychologically, and socially. Basic functioning required a series of tasks to be successfully completed such as provision of food and clothing, developmental tasks, which means facilitating the growth of family members. Epstein (1987) noted six different areas of tasks a family needs to be complete to be able to function properly. The six areas are problem solving, communication, family role, affective emotional response, affective involvement, and behavioral control (Epstein, 1987).

Skinner (1980) proposed a theory that emphasized the interactions and relationships between family members and their ability to perform tasks as a family unit. This theory focuses on seven different dimensions; completion of task, role, communication, emotional expression, involvement, behavior, values, and rules. Skinner (1980) argued that in order to complete tasks, the family must each take on a role, which facilitates communication and relationships. Therefore, in order to function well a family has to be in agreement with family role and power to be able to complete any tasks in the first place.

Dai and Wang (2015) concluded by stating that family functioning differs for many families along all seasons of life, hence a family with an infant and a family with an adolescent child may function very differently. Other factors

contributing to the levels of family functioning include socioeconomic status, spousal relationships, family systems, and life events (Dai & Wang, 2015).

Banovcinova, Levicka, and Veres (2014) studied the effects of life events, such as poverty, on levels of family functioning. The research identified three main situations; the degree to which poverty had an impact on their family, situations of basic psychobiological needs, and the connection and relationships between family members. Overall, families above the poverty line had higher levels of functioning. Economic stress in a person's life leads to less successful parenting resulting in lower levels of overall family functioning (Papp et al, 2009).

Shek, Xie, and Lin (2015) investigated how family structures, parental control, and familial relationships effect levels of family functioning. Research has hypothesized that levels of family functioning would be higher for intact families than in non-intact families. It is also predicted that levels of communication and control would be higher in intact families. Results also reported that children in intact families were more satisfied with parental control (Shek, Xie, and Lin, 2015). Brown and Manning (2009) found in a similar study on family functioning levels in single parent and nuclear family households found that children living in a nuclear, two-parent household had higher levels of functioning than those children living in single parent or stepparent households. Shek and Leung (2013) study on life satisfaction among adolescents found that non-intact families, such as single families, would notably be working longer hours trying to support their families, thus resulting in low levels parental control and relationships. Kalmijn (2013) found that children with divorced parents, no matter how strong the relationship was prior to divorce, have shown to be negatively affected because children feel pressured to choose a side and feel bad when they do have a stronger relationship with one parent than they do the other resulting in lower levels of family functioning for everyone. Kalmijn (2013) found that children in non-intact families had more risk behaviors, lower academic performance, and negative psychological outcomes.

Dauids, Ryan, Yassin, Hendrickse, and Roman (2016) examined how family structure and family functioning influences adolescents' psychological needs, goals, and aspirations of adolescents in South Africa. In contrast to the study done by Shek, Xie and Lin (2015) who argued that intact families are always better than a single parent household. Dauids et al (2016) argues that two parent households could be just as potentially threatening to the child's/families well-being if there is conflict. The study found that if adolescents in moderate to high functioning families, whether two parent of different structure, were able to have all their psychological needs met, they were able to aspire towards goals more.

### **Perceptual Indicators**

Perceptual indicators is defined as an individual's perceptions regarding their family life and could also be used interchangeably with overall family life satisfaction. The environment an individual lives in and the relationships between family members greatly influences the individual. Rahim, Ishak, Shafie, and Shafiai (2013) noted factors that influence family life quality both positively and negatively. This study focuses on four different general factors; parental involvement, family functioning, family resilience and time spent with family. Rahim et al. (2013) found that parental involvement did not play a significant role in how the family perceived their family life. Overall importance went to the other three factors; family functioning, resilience, and time spent with family. The study also found families might not be able to achieve high family life satisfaction or view their families as functioning if they were not satisfied with their relationships with other family members (paternal, maternal, spousal, or siblings) and basic amenities of the family are met (Rahim et al., 2013)

Schnettler et al. (2013) investigated a different approach using university students as main source of information and data. The study suggested that university students, since many live away from home, experience a greater need for family than other aspects of the population. Schnettler et al, (2013) made the connection between university students overall life satisfaction and food. Family mealtimes are an important part of family rituals and traditions because it keeps families close together, resolve conflicts and improves family functioning. Social support is also correlated with healthy eating habits. Cheng et al. (2012) proposed that economic stability was the biggest predictor regarding university students overall life satisfaction. If the family had enough funds for college and basic needs such as emergency funds or food, then they had greater life satisfaction, however the opposite is also true. If an individual felt, they did not have enough resources or basic needs for survival, that individual's results were greatly reduced in the family quality of life.

Tinnfalt, Jenson, and Eriksson (2015) study focuses on what mother and fathers should provide for their children and what the participants wish their family dynamic looked and acted like. The participants believed that the mother has more roles than the father does and would choose to talk to her over their father about important issues, however, about recreational activities; they often turn towards their father. Evidence from another research stated that adolescent's mental health and social adaptation were positively influenced when they had good communication with both mom and dad (Sarkadi, Kristiansson, and Bremberg, 2008). Just as parents influence children, children influence parents too. When dealing with adolescents or young age individuals, arguments are natural; however, sometimes parents give up on positive parenting strategies and turn to negative ones (Glatz, Stattin, and Kerr, 2011).

Overall, adolescents found their parent to be extremely important, however similar to other research, mothers were found to be most important. Adolescents identified strengths in their mother which including helping them to succeed at school, helping with bullying, and helping to deter drug and alcohol use. The adolescents' perception on emotional well-being indicated that emotional support, moral guidance and advice, allowing freedom, showing respect and trust is of great importance (Glatz, Stattin, and Kerr 2011). Contrary to other research on family systems, the adolescents noted that it was of no importance whether a parent was a stepparent, foster parent, or birth parent. As long as they were receiving the love and support they need, they were satisfied. Adolescents also describe siblings as being an important part of family. The participants stated that doing things as a family could mean making dinner, watching television, or cleaning the dishes. It did not have to be anything extravagant; however, they thought 'doing family' was critical for overall family quality of life (Tinnfalt, Jensen, and Eriksson, 2015). The study also identified that it is important to have a common value system. This is where everyone agrees on the roles and responsibilities of each individual. Each family member should support, respect, and protect each other. Additionally, a common value system is when everyone makes important decisions together. The adolescents wanted their parents to be an active part of their lives, such as listening, supporting, and giving advice. The adolescents also had a desire to communicate with their parents. They felt as if their parents should be included in topics such as feelings, friends, and schools (Tinnfalt, Jensen and Eriksson, 2015).

Regarding how adolescents think mothers and fathers should act, they felt that both mother and fathers should have most of the same roles, such as loving the child or making the child feel safe. The adolescents felt the mother's role was to teach the children right from wrong and to talk with them about their feelings, relationships, or personal matters. Adolescents described fathers as the ones to push and motivate you but also the ones to have fun with (Tinnfalt, Jensen, and Eriksson 2015). Adolescents perceived fathers as having more parental responsibility than mothers have and agreed that both parents should teach good behavior, monitor their children, and establish rules (Tinnfalt, Jensen, and Eriksson, 2015). The study described unwanted and poor functioning behaviors such as fighting, using harsh words, being mean and too strict (Tinnfalt, Jensen, and Eriksson 2015). Overall, adolescents felt as if the whole family had individual responsibilities to each other in order to function positively. They also highly favored any activity that involved doing family activities together and described this as a critical component to family functioning and quality of life (Tinnfalt, Jensen, and Eriksson 2015).

In conclusion, in order for a family to function positively, all family members must communicate, have roles and responsibilities, and the ability to adapt effectively to life's events. Shek, Xie, and Lin (2015) argued that intact families were always better than one parent households, however, Davids et al (2016) argued that two parent households could have even worse consequences for children if the household is experiencing conflict. Additionally, on studies regarding adolescents' perceptions of families, the adolescents noted that the "intact or non-intact" families did not matter as long as they had loving/caring parents. Matejevic, Todorovic, and Jovanovic (2013) thought that family needs to be viewed by subsystems; spousal, parental, and sibling, whereas, Dai and Wang (2015) thought researchers should view the family as a whole unit on functioning levels.

### 3. METHOD

#### Participants

The data was collected from undergraduate students at a University college from various majors of study. The total number of participants in this study were 75 Male (50%) and 75 female (50%). The age of the participants ranged from 18-52 years. Each participant was informed that the participation of study was voluntary, confidential and anonymous.

**Research Questions**

- RQ1. Is there a difference between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life on family functioning?
- RQ2. Is there a difference between concerned and those satisfied financially on family functioning?
- RQ3. Is there a difference between those concerned and those satisfied financially on perceptual indicators of life quality?
- RQ4. Is there a difference between those with low and high social supports on family quality of life?
- RQ5. Is there a difference between those concerned and those satisfied financially on family quality of life?

**Materials**

The Family Functioning Scale (FFS) developed by Patricia Noller (1988). This survey is a 30-item screening assessment using a 6-point Likert-type scale from 1- “Totally disagree” to 6- “Totally agree”. The survey’s primary purpose measures the family, which an individual is now living and focuses on how well the family communicates, gets along, and supports each other. FFS examines three domains: Intimacy (twelve items), Conflict (eleven items), and Parenting-Style (seven items).

The Perceptual Indicators of Family Quality (PIFQ) (Foa and Foa, 1974) is a 35- item screening assessment survey using a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1- “Terrible” to 7- “Delighted”. An individual can also choose 4- “Mixed” feelings about their family life. The survey’s primary purpose is to measure an individual’s feeling about their family life as a whole. Questions pertain to how individuals feel about their overall family quality of life, financial well-being, and social well-being. PIFQ examines six domains: Love (thirteen items), Status (five items), Services (four items), Information (two items), Goods (six items), and Money (five items).

The Family Quality of life (FQOL) Scale by Hu, Summers, Turnbull, & Zuna (2011). The survey is a 16-item screening assessment on the level of one’s family perceived satisfaction using a 5 point Likert-type scale from 1- “Feeling very dissatisfied” to 5- “Feeling very satisfied.” This survey focuses on family attachment, how one feels about their life together as a family. Questions pertain to how individuals feel about the people who support and care for each other on a regular basis. FQOL Scale examines three domains: Family Interaction (six items), Parenting (six items) and Emotional Well-being (four items).

**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 data from all collected surveys was then individually entered into SPSS by the investigator.

**4. RESULT SECTION**

RQ1. Is there a difference between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life on family functioning?

**TABLE I: Difference between dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life on family functioning**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intimacy	Dissatisfied Life	92	56.1522	10.27419	1	2645.518	32.737	.000
	Satisfied life	58	64.7759	6.42649	148	80.811		
	Total	150	59.4867	9.90067	149			
Conflict	Dissatisfied Life	92	31.9239	8.80963	1	32.675	.441	.508
	Satisfied life	58	30.9655	8.27799	148	74.111		
	Total	150	31.5533	8.59260	149			
Parenting Style	Dissatisfied Life	92	36.1630	7.12105	1	961.542	23.042	.000
	Satisfied life	58	41.3621	5.23382	148	41.729		
	Total	150	38.1733	6.92117	149			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing students dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life on family functioning (Intimacy, Conflict and Parenting Style). A significant difference was found on Intimacy ( $F(1, 148) = 32.74, p < .05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who had dissatisfied life scored lower ( $M = 56.15, sd = 10.27$ ) than those who had satisfied life ( $M = 64.78, sd = 6.43$ ). A significant difference was also found on Parenting Style ( $F(1, 148) = 23.04, p < .05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who had dissatisfied life scored lower ( $M = 36.16, sd = 7.12$ ) than those who had satisfied life ( $M = 41.36, sd = 5.23$ ). **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 Conflict ( $F(1, 48) = .441, p < .05$ ). Both students who had dissatisfied and satisfied life did not differ significantly on conflict as those with dissatisfied life had a mean of 31.92 ( $sd = 8.81$ ). Those with satisfied life has a mean of 30.97 ( $sd = 8.28$ ).

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

**TABLE II: Difference between concerned and those satisfied financially on family functioning**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intimacy	Concerned Financially	72	56.1806	10.70123	1	1513.436	17.109	.000
	Satisfied Financially	78	62.5385	8.02705	148	88.460		
	Total	150	59.4867	9.90067	149			
Conflict	Concerned Financially	72	31.7500	8.65903	1	5.355	.072	.789
	Satisfied Financially	78	31.3718	8.58284	148	74.295		
	Total	150	31.5533	8.59260	149			
Parenting Style	Concerned Financially	72	36.0556	6.91169	1	620.998	14.104	.000
	Satisfied Financially	78	40.1282	6.37030	148	44.030		
	Total	150	38.1733	6.92117	149			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing students concerned financially and those satisfied financially on family functioning (Intimacy, Conflict and Parenting style). A significant difference was found on Intimacy ( $F(1, 148) = 17.10, p < .05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 56.18, sd = 10.70$ ) than those who were satisfied financially ( $M = 62.54, sd = 8.03$ ). A significant difference was also found on Parenting Style ( $F(1, 148) = 14.10, p < .05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 36.06, sd = 6.91$ ) than those who were satisfied financially ( $M = 40.13, sd = 6.37$ ). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine nature of the differences between those concerned financially and those satisfied financially. No significant difference was found on Conflict ( $F(1, 48) = .072, p < .05$ ). Both students who were concerned financially and those satisfied financially did not differ significantly on conflict as those concerned financially had a mean of 31.75 ( $sd = 8.66$ ). Those satisfied financially had a mean of 31.37 ( $sd = 8.58$ ).

RQ3. Is there a difference between those concerned and those satisfied financially on perceptual indicators of life quality?

**TABLE III: Concerned and those satisfied financially on perceptual indicators of life quality**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Love	Concerned Financially	72	28.2500	6.25908	1	288.445	9.952	.002
	Satisfied Financially	78	31.0256	4.42535	148	28.983		
	Total	150	29.6933	5.54293	149			
Status	Concerned Financially	72	28.4444	5.91939	1	352.495	13.746	.000
	Satisfied Financially	78	31.5128	4.12072	148	25.644		
	Total	150	30.0400	5.27611	149			
Services	Concerned Financially	72	28.0278	6.52616	1	353.969	12.370	.001

	Satisfied Financially	78	31.1026	3.96606	148	28.616		
	Total	150	29.6267	5.54971	149			
Information	Concerned Financially	72	42.5417	10.86659	1	954.087	10.640	.001
	Satisfied Financially	78	47.5897	7.96655	148	89.667		
	Total	150	45.1667	9.77081	149			
Goods	Concerned Financially	72	30.2500	9.73704	1	185.245	2.119	.148
	Satisfied Financially	78	32.4744	8.97721	148	87.412		
	Total	150	31.4067	9.38448	149			
Money	Concerned Financially	72	27.7917	6.63736	1	379.250	12.424	.001
	Satisfied Financially	78	30.9744	4.24868	148	30.526		
	Total	150	29.4467	5.73291	149			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing students concerned financially and those satisfied financially on perceptual indicators of life quality (Love, Status, Services, Information, Goods, and Money). A significant difference was found on Love ( $F(1, 148) = 9.952, p < .05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 28.25, sd = 6.26$ ) than those who were satisfied financially ( $M = 31.03, sd = 4.43$ ). A significant difference was also found on Status ( $F(1, 148) = 13.75, p < .05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 28.44, sd = 5.92$ ) than those who were satisfied financially ( $M = 31.51, sd = 4.12$ ). A significant difference was also found on Services ( $F(1, 148) = 12.37, p < .05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 28.03, sd = 6.63$ ) than those who were satisfied financially ( $M = 31.10, sd = 3.97$ ). A significant difference was also found on Information ( $F(1, 148) = 10.64, p < .05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 42.54, sd = 10.87$ ) than those who were satisfied financially ( $M = 47.59, sd = 7.97$ ). A significant difference was also found on Money ( $F(1, 148) = 12.42, p < .05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower ( $M = 27.79, sd = 6.64$ ) than those who were satisfied financially ( $M = 30.97, sd = 4.25$ ). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine nature of the differences between those concerned financially and those satisfied financially. No significant difference was found on Goods ( $F(1, 48) = .148, p < .05$ ). Both students who were concerned financially and those satisfied financially did not differ significantly on goods as those concerned financially had a mean of 30.25 ( $sd = 9.74$ ). Those satisfied financially had a mean of 32.47 ( $sd = 8.98$ ).

RQ4. Is there a difference between those with low and high social supports on family quality of life?

**TABLE IV: Low and high social supports on family quality of life**

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Low Social Support	50	23.2800	4.72527	1	341.333	21.672	.000
	High Social Support	100	26.4800	3.53476	148	15.750		
	Total	150	25.4133	4.23502	149			
Parenting	Low Social Support	50	24.4000	4.22336	1	284.213	23.320	.000
	High Social Support	100	27.3200	3.06456	148	12.188		
	Total	150	26.3467	3.74343	149			
Emotional Wellbeing	Low Social Support	50	16.0600	3.12599	1	84.270	10.555	.001
	High Social Support	100	17.6500	2.66430	148	7.984		
	Total	150	17.1200	2.91472	149			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing students with low social support and students with high social support on family quality of life (Family Interaction, Parenting, and Emotional Wellbeing). A significant difference was found on Family Interaction ( $F(1, 148) = 21.67, p < .05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who had low social support scored

lower ( $M= 23.28, sd = 4.73$ ) than those who had high social support ( $M = 26.48, sd = 3.53$ ). A significant difference was also found on Parenting ( $F(1, 148) = 23.32, p<.05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who had low social support scored lower ( $M= 24.40, sd = 4.22$ ) than those who had high social support ( $M = 27.32, sd = 3.06$ ). A significant difference was also found on Emotional Wellbeing ( $F(1, 148) = 10.56, p<.05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who had low social support scored lower ( $M= 16.06, sd = 3.13$ ) than those who had high social support ( $M = 17.65, sd = 2.66$ ). **Tukey’s HSD** was used to determine nature of the differences between those with low social support and high social support.

RQ5. Is there a difference between those concerned and those satisfied financially on family quality of life?

**TABLE V: Concerned and those satisfied financially on family quality of life**

		N	Mean	Std. Devi	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Concerned Financially	72	24.0694	4.44157	1	250.067	15.279	.000
	Satisfied Financially	78	26.6538	3.64256	148	16.367		
	Total	150	25.4133	4.23502	149			
Parenting	Concerned Financially	72	25.3472	4.18636	1	138.308	10.499	.001
	Satisfied Financially	78	27.2692	3.02661	148	13.173		
	Total	150	26.3467	3.74343	149			
Emotional Wellbeing	Concerned Financially	72	16.4722	3.09007	1	58.101	7.120	.008
	Satisfied Financially	78	17.7179	2.62306	148	8.160		
	Total	150	17.1200	2.91472	149			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing students concerned financially and those satisfied financially on family quality of life (Family Interaction, Parenting, and Emotional Wellbeing). A significant difference was found on Family Interaction ( $F(1, 148) = 15.28, p<.05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower ( $M= 24.07, sd = 4.44$ ) than those who were satisfied financially ( $M = 26.65, sd = 3.64$ ). A significant difference was also found on Parenting ( $F(1, 148) = 25.35, p<.05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower ( $M= 25.35, sd = 4.19$ ) than those who were satisfied financially ( $M = 27.27, sd = 3.03$ ). A significant difference was also found on Emotional Wellbeing ( $F(1, 148) = 7.12, p<.05$ ). This analysis revealed that students who were concerned financially scored lower ( $M= 16.47, sd = 3.09$ ) than those who were satisfied financially ( $M = 17.72, sd = 2.62$ ). **Tukey’s HSD** was used to determine nature of the differences between those concerned financially and those satisfied financially.

### 5. DISCUSSION SECTION

The study findings indicates a significant difference in intimacy and parenting style comparing those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life on family functioning. Participants who were satisfied with life reported higher levels of intimacy and parenting styles, which ultimately resulted in positive family functioning within their lives. Matejevic et al. (2013) study on family functioning and parenting styles found that individuals who reported that they were from authoritarian families passed every dysfunctional test and failed every functional test. The individuals that reported being in permissive families scored better than authoritarian families, however, not nearly as well as those from authoritative families. Authoritative families pride themselves on emotional connectedness, intimacy, respectable boundaries, and self-reliance. All of these traits contributed to positive family functioning. Similarly, Epstein (1987) concluded that in order for a family to function positively, they needed to have six traits. These traits are problem solving, communication, family role, affective emotional response, affective involvement, and behavioral control. All of which are directly related to parenting styles and intimacy. On the contrary, the results could have been tainted due to the current families’ situation, For example, individuals who were dissatisfied with life could be dealing with a death within the family, job loss, poverty or other issues within the family systems,. Furthermore, participants in the study may be at different stages of life. For instance, one participant may be dealing with a newborn and the stress of being a new parent/stay at home mom. However, another participant may be newly married and starting a new job thus improving her life satisfaction. Life



events could alter at any moment; therefore, it is important to consider alternative explanations for the findings. The clinical relevance of this study is that individuals will be able to improve their intimacy within their own families and can adopt positive parenting styles with their own children or family members would be improve their family functioning and, as a result, improve their satisfaction with life.

The study findings shows that there was a significant difference on intimacy and parenting style on those concerned financially and those satisfied financially on family functioning. Participants that reported that they were satisfied financially scored higher on intimacy and parenting styles. This indicates that those people who were satisfied financially reported better communication, support, help, flexibility, respect, and affection within their families. Those who were dissatisfied financially scored low on intimacy and parenting styles.. In a similar study, Banovcinova, Levicka, and Veres (2014), studied the effects of life events, such as poverty, on levels of family functioning. They studied families below the poverty line and their functioning and families with a standard income and their functioning. Families above the poverty line had higher levels of functioning. In addition, further research concluded that more economic stress in a person's life led to less successful parenting, which resulted in lower levels of overall family functioning (Papp et al, 2009). Dai & Wang (2015) concluded that socioeconomic status is a significant factor in family functioning. The clinical relevance of my research is to hopefully improve individual's family functioning by improving their financial wellbeing, which would raise both parenting styles and intimacy within the family.

The findings suggest that there was a significant difference on love, status, services, information, and money between those concerned financially and those satisfied financially on perceptual indicators of family quality of life. The results confirm that those satisfied financially reported higher levels of love, status, services, information, and money within their family. This shows the individuals experienced tenderness, respect, help, money available for needs, enjoyment, affection, warmth, love, and recognition of accomplishments. Similar study by Rahim, Ishak, Shafie, and Shafiai (2013), researched factors that influenced family life quality both positively and negatively. The researchers found families might not be able to achieve high family life satisfaction or view their families as functioning if they were not satisfied with their relationships with other family members (paternal, maternal, spousal, or siblings) and basic amenities and other family aspects such as economy, living standards, health, safety, community connections and even spiritual connections. Cheng et al. (2012), proposed that economic stability was the biggest predictor regarding university students overall life satisfaction. If the family had enough funds for college and basic needs such as emergency funds or food, then they had greater life satisfaction, however the opposite is also true. If an individual felt, they did not have enough resources or basic needs for survival, that individual's results were greatly reduced in the family quality of life area. This study is clinically relevant because it can be used to understand and improve families' status, money, services, information, and love to increase their overall family life quality.

The study findings indicates that there was a significant difference on love, status, services, information, goods and money between those with low social support and those with high social support on perceptual indicators of family life quality. The results confirm that those with high social support reported higher levels of love, status, services, information, goods and money within their family. .Tinnfält, Jensen, and Eriksson (2015) proposed that it is important to have a common value system in families. This is where everyone agrees on the roles and responsibilities of each individual. Each family member should support, respect, and protect each other. The adolescents in this study also felt as if the whole family had individual responsibilities to each other in order to function positively. They also highly favored any activity that involved support and any family activities together and described this as a critical component to family functioning and quality of life. When considering alternative explanations for results, it is important to remember that not all families have the same idea when it comes to family activities and support. It is also imperative to consider cultural and religious differences within their families. This can account for differences projected on those with high and low social support. Social support is so important in one's life so the clinical relevance of the findings is to increase all aspects of family life quality, which would in turn increase an individual's social support.

The study findings shows that there was a significant difference on family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being between those with low social support and those with high social support of family quality of life. Samuel, Rillota, and Brown (2012) conducted a study regarding family quality of life. The study stated that families are a dynamic, interconnected system, which means the family members are linked to one another and depend on each other. The findings concluded that those with high social support has a higher family quality of life. An alternative explanation for

the findings would be that some families do not know the support that is available to them in their community. In addition, some families may feel bad asking family and friends to help during time of stress, which would make them score low on social support areas. On family size, for bigger families, more support would be available. These research findings are clinically relevant as it can help to identify social support available and utilized it to benefit family members. This can also help improve parenting, emotional well-being, and family interaction among families thus improving social support.

The study findings indicates that there was a significant difference on family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being between those participants concerned financially and those satisfied financially on family quality of life. Those satisfied financially scored higher on areas such as family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being. This means that they felt their family had the resources and mean to get outside help at the time of need. It also means that the family was able to handle life's ups and downs, made good decisions, and had love and support for each other. Similar studies by Zuna, Turnbull and Summers (2009) and Zuna, Summers, Turnbull, Hu and Xue (2010) suggested that the measurement of family quality of life is related to four factors; family characteristics as a whole, the individuals that make up the family (which includes individual characteristics and beliefs), performances (practices, services and support), and the system (what make the system work such as policies and programs). This study had similar findings that those who had all four positive factors were also financially satisfied. Additionally, cultural norms are important to consider because what works for one culture might not work for another. These findings are clinically relevant because if individuals improve their financial satisfaction, their family quality of life, parenting, family interaction, and emotional well-being will improve.

## 6. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the findings indicated that participants with low social support and concerned financially scored lower on intimacy and parenting style. Additionally, participants with low social support and concerned financially scored lower on family interaction, parenting and emotional well-being. On the perpetual indicators of family life quality scale, participants with low social support and concerned financially scored lower in love, status, services, information, goods, and money.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Balcells-Balcells, A., Giné, C., Guàrdia-Olmos, J., & Summers, J. A. (2010). Family quality of life: adaptation to Spanish population of several family support questionnaires. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 55(12), 1151-1163. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2788.2010.01350.x
- [2] Banovcinova, A., Levicka, J., & Veres, M. (2014). The Impact of Poverty on the Family System Functioning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 132, 148-153. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.291
- [3] Beaver, K. M., & Wright, J. P. (2007). Family Functioning Measure. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. doi:10.1037/t20610-000
- [4] Black, K., & Lobo, M. (2008). A Conceptual Review of Family Resilience Factors. *Journal of Family Nursing*, 14(1), 33-55. doi:10.1177/1074840707312237
- [5] Brown, S. L., & Manning, W. D. (2009). Family Boundary Ambiguity and the Measurement of Family Structure: The Significance of Cohabitation. *Demography*, 46(1), 85-101. doi:10.1353/dem.0.0043
- [6] Cheng, W., Ickes, W., & Verhofstadt, L. (2011). How is family support related to students' GPA scores? A longitudinal study. *Higher Education*, 64(3), 399-420. doi:10.1007/s10734-011-9501-4
- [7] Chiu, C., Kyzar, K., Zuna, N., Turnbull, A., Summers, J. A., & Gomez, V. A. (2013). Family Quality of Life. *Oxford Handbooks Online*. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195398786.013.013.0023
- [8] Dai, L., & Wang, L. (2015). Review of Family Functioning. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 03(12), 134-141. doi:10.4236/jss.2015.312014
- [9] 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.

- [11] 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.
- [12] Kalmijn, M. (2012). Long-Term Effects of Divorce on Parent-Child Relationships: Within-Family Comparisons of Fathers and Mothers. *European Sociological Review*, 29(5), 888-898. doi:10.1093/esr/jcs066
- [13] Loyer-Carlson, V.L. (1992) Pets and perceived family life quality. *Psychological Reports*, 70, 947-952.
- [14] Mas, J. M., Baqués, N., Balcells-Balcells, A., Dalmau, M., Giné, C., Gràcia, M., & Vilaseca, R. (2016). Family Quality of Life for Families in Early Intervention in Spain. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 38(1), 59-74. doi:10.1177/1053815116636885
- [15] Matejevic, M., Todorovic, J., & Jovanovic, A. D. (2014). Patterns of Family Functioning and Dimensions of Parenting Style. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 431-437. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.075
- [16] Noller, P., Seth-Smith, M., Bouma, R., & Schweitzer, R. (1992). Parent and adolescent perceptions of family functioning: A comparison of clinic and nonclinic families. *Journal of Adolescence*, 15, 101-114.
- [17] Papp, L. M., Cummings, E. M., & Goeke-Morey, M. C. (2009). For Richer, for Poorer: Money as a Topic of Marital Conflict in the Home. *Family Relations*, 58(1), 91-103. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00537.x
- [18] Rafiq, M. A. (2013). Factors Influencing Family Life Satisfaction among Parents in Malaysia: The Structural Equation Modeling Approach (SEM). *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 17(4), 78-85. doi:10.9790/0837-1747885
- [19] Rettig, K. D., Danes, S. M., & Bauer, J. W. (1991) Family life quality: Theory and assessment in economically stressed farm families. *Social Indicators Research*, 24, 269-299.
- [20] Rettig, K. D., Danes, S. M., & Bauer, J. W. (1993). Gender differences in perceived family life quality among economically stressed farm families. In U. G. Foa, J. Converse, Jr., K. Y. Tornblom, & E. B. Foa (Eds.), *Resource theory: Explorations and applications*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- [21] Rodrigo, M. J., Byrne, S., & Rodríguez, B. (2014). Parenting Styles and Child Well-Being. *Handbook of Child Well-being*, 2173-2196. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8\_86 Samuel, P. S., Rillotta, F., & Brown, I. (2011). Review: The development of family quality of life concepts and measures. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 56(1), 1-16. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01486.x
- [22] Schnettler, B., Miranda-Zapata, E., Grunert, K. G., Lobos, G., Denegri, M., Hueche, C., & Poblete, H. (2017). Life Satisfaction of University Students in Relation to Family and Food in a Developing Country. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01522
- [23] Selig, A. L. (1976). Crisis Theory and Family Growth. *The Family Coordinator*, 25(3), 291. doi:10.2307/582345
- [24] Shek, D. T., & Leung, H. (2013). Positive Youth Development, Life Satisfaction, and Problem Behaviors of Adolescents in Intact and Non-Intact Families in Hong Kong. *Frontiers in Pediatrics*, 1. doi:10.3389/fped.2013.00018
- [25] Shek, D. T., Xie, Q., & Lin, L. (2015). The Impact of Family Intactness on Family Functioning, Parental Control, and Parental-Child Relational Qualities in a Chinese Context. *Frontiers in Pediatrics*, 2. doi:10.3389/fped.2014.00149
- [26] Tinnfält, A., Jensen, J., & Eriksson, C. (2015). What characterises a good family? Giving voice to adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 20(4), 429-441. doi:10.1080/02673843.2015.1018283