

The Effects of Family Quality of Life and Attachment on College Students' Life Meaning

Abel Gitimu Waithaka¹, Kristen Dota²

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

Abstract: The focus of this study is to investigate the relationship between the effects of family quality of life and attachment on college students' life meaning. The study uses Measure of Attachment Qualities (MAQ) scale with 14 items, Meaning of Life Questionnaire (MLQ) scale with 10 items and Family Quality of Life (FQOL) scale with 16 items. A total of 150 undergraduate students participated in the study with an age range of 18-52 years. The study sample was made up of 80 males (53%) and 70 female (46%) participants. Data was collected in a classroom setting during class time in a university college. The findings indicate participants who were dissatisfied with life scored higher in attachment on avoidance, ambivalence-worry, and ambivalence-merger scales, and scored lower on low presence meaning of life. Participants with dissatisfied life and low presence of life scored lower on family interactions, parenting, and emotional well-being scales.

Keywords: attachment, ambivalence, interactions, parenting, emotional well-being, parenting.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been a growing recognition regarding the importance of the presence of and the search for meaning in life. Meaning in life (MIL) refers to the "extent to which people comprehend, make sense of, or see significance in their lives, accompanied by the degree to which they perceive themselves to have a purpose, mission, or over-arching aim in life" (Steger et al, 2006). Little is known about how perceptions of life meaning are formed, although recent evidence suggests that "basic attitudes about the meaning of existence are commonly rooted in evolved biological factors that are influenced through people's experiences throughout a life time" (Lopez, 2015). Positive psychological perspectives have similarly assumed that the subjective experience of meaningful life is a core of well-being and life satisfaction.

Our close interpersonal relationships satisfy a fundamental need for belonging and provide the most important source of meaning in our lives (Lopez, 2015). Attachment patterns are developed in the first years of life and transferred to adolescence and adulthood. Family environment, which are the interactions within a family, has a great impact on the development of individual's attachment patterns. Families teach individuals how to relate to and teach each other. The family environment is basically a school for children in where they acquire social and emotional skills and form their first attachment bonds (Demirli & Demir, 2014).

Satisfaction of social relatedness needs have demonstrated strong independent links to meaning in life ratings (Machell et al, 2015). Social support, also known as attachment security facilitates the internal stance that the world is generally a safe place, and that one can rely on the attachment figure to be available when needed. College is a stressful time for most, and it is important to develop positive relationships that inspire individuals to reach their goals.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relative contribution of attachment dimensions and family environment in explaining the degree of meaning in life among college students. It is hypothesized that the individuals with coherent families and secure attachment qualities will be more capable of producing positive views on meaning in life, while those with low-coherent families and insecure attachments would have a negative view on meaning of life due to their mistrust towards themselves and their environment.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Meaning in life is widely considered a cornerstone of human functioning. Meaning in life is thought to be important to well-being throughout the human life span. Past research has shown that meaning in life is associated with many aspects of positive functioning (Bodner, 2014). Machell, Kashdan, Short, & Nezelek (2015) produced a novel operational view of meaning in life, and identified two independent dimensions within this concept. Presence of meaning (PML) refers to the extent to which people comprehend, make sense of, or see significance in their lives, accompanied by the degree to which they perceive themselves to have a purpose, mission, or over-arching aim in life (Steger et al. 2006). PML is associated with positive aspects in one's life. These aspects include less depression, higher self-esteem, and positive affect. In contrast, search of life (SML) is when people are trying to gain more understanding of the meaning and purpose in their lives (Steger et al. 2006). SML relates to negative emotions, depression, and having low self-esteem. There are many factors that contribute to an individual's perception on the meaning of life. Our close interpersonal relationships satisfy a fundamental need for belonging and provide the most important source of meaning in our lives (Steger et al 2006). These close relationships include an individual's family or friends that greatly impact one's life. Satisfaction of social relatedness needs have demonstrated strong independent links to both positive affect and meaning in life ratings (Lopez, 2015).

2.1. ATTACHMENT THEORY

According to attachment theory (Lopez, 2015), human beings are biologically equipped with a unique motivational system that, from birth, is activated by stress, illness, fatigue, or uncertainty, and orients persons to seek caregiving support from others as a means of reestablishing a sense of security. Several studies have shown that adult attachment anxiety and avoidance are related to perceptions and outcomes associated with life meaning. Attachment anxiety captures chronic fears of rejection and abandonment by relationship partners, whereas attachment avoidance expresses discomfort and interpersonal closeness and dependency (Lopez, 2015). Following these arguments, Shaver and Mikulincer (2002) suggested a typology of four styles of attachment, secure, preoccupied, dismissive and fearful, which are derived from the manner by which individuals create a model of themselves and of others. Secure attachments are when people view themselves and others positively. People who are considered to have preoccupied attachment are individuals who perceive themselves negatively, but see others in a positively manner. People who perceive themselves positively, but see others in a negative manner are described dismissive and people who perceive both themselves and others negatively are termed fearful. When determining the different styles of attachment, multiple factors play a role in one's life, perceiving the type of style one will acquire.

2.2. SECURE ATTACHMENT

Attachment styles are often acquired when one is an infant. The secure base constitutes one of the basic notions of Bowlby's attachment theory. According to this concept, interactions with an available and responsive attachment figure early in life result in the formation of a secure base, especially in stressful situations (Laible & Carlo, 2004). The infant experiences a sense of security, a sense that the world is safe and the attachment figures are available in times of need. This allows the child to explore the environment with curiosity and confidence. Over the last decades a number of studies have examined correlates of the secure base schema in adult life (Kafetsios & Hess, 2015). These studies have been mostly based on self-report measures of adult attachment, and have provided evidence in support of Bowlby's (1969) claims concerning the beneficial effects of secure attachment (Kafetsios & Hess, 2015). Secure individuals experience lower levels of physical arousal under stressful situations, seek proximity as a strategy to combat distress, and interpret their behavior more positively having a more positive self-image (Kafetsios & Hess, 2015). Secure individuals also employ functional coping strategies such as problem solving, planning and reattribution, they attempt to put negative events into a more realistic perspective and seek support from people with extra resources (Andriopoulos & Kafetsios, 2015). Based on the available evidence one would expect that secure adults tend to avoid the processing of threatening information that may have negative effects on meaning of life. A study by O'Connor and Scott (2007) investigated whether repeated priming of attachment security had more lasting effects on views of self and relationships. In line with researchers, participants in the security prime condition reported more positive relationship expectations, more positive self-views and less attachment anxiety.

2.3. AVOIDANCE AND AMBIVALENCE ATTACHMENT

In the past 20 years, there has been a great amount of studies focused on understanding adult attachment styles and its antecedents and consequences. Although there are differences in how adult attachment style is measured and conceptualized, there is a general agreement that there are at least two major dimensions that describe individual differences in adult relationship patterns: avoidance and ambivalence (Green, Furrer & McAllister, 2007). People who are high on the avoidant dimension are thought to be less comfortable with intimacy, and to suppress their desire for close relationships (Yu & Gamble, 2008). Ambivalence is characterized by feelings of stress and insecurity about relationships, and people with high ambivalent dimension experience fears of rejection and abandonment, distrust their own ability to develop close relationships (Green, Furrer & McAllister 2007). Attachment style shapes how social support is accessed and experienced. Avoidant people seek to maintain a positive self-view, and do so by avoiding contact and feedback from others (Yu & Gamble, 2008). Anxious/ambivalent people strive for closeness but have problems establishing these relationships because of pervasive negative self-perceptions and fear of rejection (Titze et al. 2013). These studies have suggested that attachment style is a relatively stable trait that influences the ways in which social support is enacted. Developing anxious and ambivalent attachment styles at a young age may affect a person's parenting style affecting their overall family quality of life which contributes to a person's meaning of life.

2.4. PARENTAL RELATIONSHIPS AND ATTACHMENT

Through parents' interactions, the child understands how people relate to each other and learns the rules, norms, values, and behaviors associated with interpersonal relationships (Yu & Gamble, 2008). From the family, the child learns the necessary social skills for developing typical relationships within the extra-familial social environment. Social learning theory (Bandura, 1989) suggests that children observe and then imitate their parents' interactions. However, cumulative evidence indicates that children do not simply imitate their parents' behavior, but instead interpret the beliefs, desires, and meanings attributed to the overt behaviors and variations in these experiences lead to different attachment styles. (Yu & Gamble, 2008).

When parenting is attuned to the child's needs, leading to a secure attachment style, the adult child expects trust, consistency and comfort in future relationships, while recognizing and coping with the inevitable disappointments associated with any relationship (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002). This also leads to securely attached people tend to have high, yet balanced and realistic expectations of future relationships which lead to a better over-all well-being (Titze et al, 2013). Studies shown that attachment styles are developed as a child carry over into adult life. Securely attached adults tend to be warmer, more sensitive, and more involved parents (Green, Furrer & McAllister, 2007). Yu and Gamble (2008) found that adults with a more secure attachment history exhibited more positive parenting behavior, based on observer ratings of parent-child interactions. Further, it has been suggested that adults with secure attachment styles are better able to foster secure infant-parent attachments because of their engaged and responsive parenting behavior (Titze, et al. 2013).

Parental cognitions such as self-efficacy play a role in determine the types of strategies parents use during interactions with their children (Psalich, McMahon & Spieker, 2014). Ogwo (2013) found that avoidance, but not ambivalence, was negatively related to parents' involvement and support in children's learning tasks. Another study found that adults high in avoidance, but not ambivalence, were less interested in having children and expected to be less satisfied with the parenting role, while persons high in ambivalence indicated a desire to have children despite generally negative expectations about their ability to parent (Green, Furrer & McAllister 2007). Avoidant parents may feel less committed to the parenting role, given their default coping style of avoiding interpersonal challenges, while ambivalent parents may feel less competent and more fearful of failure in the parenting role (Green, Furrer & McAllister 2007). In general, results suggest that adults with insecure attachment styles described their parents as less caring or more inconsistent with their parenting than those who reported secure adult attachments (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002). Other studies have linked poor quality current attachment relationships and low social support to depression and anxiety, having negative attitudes on the meaning of life (Griffith, 2007). The family environment has been hypothesized to affect control-related cognitions and the ability to form close relationships later in life (Griffith, 2007). In general, the literature suggests that perceived lower parental care in childhood was related to higher levels of depression, and that this relationship was accounted for by how secure people felt in current relationships (Griffith, 2007). This evidence is consistent with the notion that quality of the parent-child relationship influences the child's ability to form a social network, which in turn has been shown to be related to the development of emotional disorders (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002).

2.5. PARENTING STYLES

Parenting styles are conceptualized in line with definition of styles as a reflection of emotional climate in which socialization occurs (Jin Yu & Gamble 2008). Parenting styles consist of a constellation of parental behaviors and attitudes displayed across a variety of parent-child interactions and in different contexts. Parenting practices refer to sets of specific parenting behaviors that parents use to socialize their child. There are four major parenting styles one can acquire, that can affect the quality of the family, and can have a long-term effect on meaning in life (Cyr, Pasalich, McMahon & Spieker, 2014).

Authoritative parenting is widely regarded as the most effective and beneficial parenting style for children. Authoritative parents are easy to recognize, as they are marked by the high expectations that they have of their children, but temper these expectations with understanding a support for their children as well. This type of parenting creates the healthiest environment for a growing child, and helps foster a productive relationship within the family. If a parent can foster the ability to speak to their child without judgement or reprimand, they will be more likely to provide the child with a deeper understanding of the world around them (Green, Furrer, & McAllister, 2007).

Neglectful parenting is one of the most harmful styles of parenting that can be used on a child. Neglectful parenting is unlike the other styles in that parents rarely fluctuate naturally into neglectful parenting as a response to child behavior. Neglectful parenting is damaging to children, because they have no trust foundation with their parents from which to explore the world. Children who have a negative or absent relationship with their parent will have a harder time forming relationships with other people in the future (Cyr, Pasalich, McMahon & Spieker, 2014).

Permissive parenting, also known as indulgent parenting is another potentially harmful style of parenting. These parents are responsive but not demanding. These parents tend to be lenient while trying to avoid confrontation. The lack of structure causes these children to grow up with little self-discipline and self-control. Children who grow up from permissive parents tend to have poor social skills, lack of discipline, self-centeredness, and poor academic success from lack of motivation (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002).

The last type of parenting in authoritarian parenting, also called strict parenting is characterized by parents who are demanding but not responsive. Authoritarian parents allow for little dialogue between parent and child and expect children to follow a strict set of rules and expectations. Children of authoritarian parents are prone to having low self-esteem, being fearful or shy, associating obedience with love, and having difficulty in social situations (Cyr, Pasalich, McMahon & Spieker, 2014).

2.6. SIBLING RELATIONSHIPS AND SOCIAL SUPPORT

There are few studies documenting the influences of authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles on sibling relationship quality among young children. Despite the lack of research in this area, in the study of Jin Yu and Gamble (2008), results indicated the effects of positive parenting on enhancing warmth in sibling relationship quality, are broadly consistent showing the interplay between parental warmth and intimate sibling relationships. Positive sibling interaction allows families to grow closer reaching their goals with one and other. Negative sibling attachment may cause one to feel alone, and can have negative effects on one's future life.

The importance of social support in our society is evidenced by the prevalence of research on its nature and its role in people's lives (Korabik, Lero, & Whitehead, 2008). Social embeddedness refers to the broad indicators of social ties; such as marital status, participation in community organizations, and contact with friends, as proxies for support. There are two types of social support, one being instrumental support and emotional support. Instrumental support is characterized by rendering of actual assistance, and emotional support is exemplified by sympathetic and caring behaviors. Family social support has been found to reduce the experience of stress in the family domain, such as marital-related stress. Family members have a unique opportunity to provide both emotional and instrumental support within the family to promote healthy relationships and a positive well-being (Korabik, Lero, & Whitehead, 2008).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. PARTICIPANTS

Data in this study was collected from 150 college students from different majors of study with an age range from 18-52 years old. There were 80 male participants and 70 females. Convenient stratified sample was used in this study as participants were individuals that were from selected classrooms. Both quantitative and survey designs were used in this study.

3.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

RQ1- Is there a difference in student attachment quality between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life?

RQ2- Is there a difference in family Quality of life between those students that are dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life?

RQ3- Is there a difference in family Quality of life between those students that have low social support and those that have high social support?

RQ4- Is there a difference on Quality of attachment between students with low and high presence of meaning of Life?

RQ5- Is there a difference in Family Quality of Life between students with low and high presence of meaning of Life?

3.3. MATERIALS

The demographic scale was basic questions including age, sex, ethnicity, marital status, parent's marital status, life satisfaction, present financial well-being, and current social system. There were seven questions of which were either fill in the blank or multiple choice answers. The second scale was Measure of Attachment Qualities (MAQ) scale by Kim, Carver, Deci, & Kasser, (2008). This survey is a 14-item screening assessment using a 4 point Likert-type scale. MAQ scale examines four domains: Security (three items), Avoidance (five items), Ambivalence- worry (three items), and Ambivalence-merger (three items). The third scale was Meaning of Life Questionnaire (MLQ) scale by Steger, Frazier, Oishi & Kaler, (2006). The scale is a 10- item screening assessment using a 7 point Likert-type scale. The fourth scale was Family Quality of Life (FQOL) Scale by Hu, Summers, Turnbull, & Zuna, (2011). This survey is a 16-item screening assessment on the level of one's family perceived satisfaction using a 5 point Likert-type scale. FQOL scale examines three domains; Family interaction, parenting, 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 college to respond to during class time. The investigator contacted the professors of her choice by e-mail, asking for permission to pass out surveys during their class time. The surveys were then taken to the instructor's classrooms who agreed for data collection. Once in the classrooms, the consent letters and the surveys were passed out to the class and participants were given 10-15 minutes to complete the survey and give it to the investigator. The surveys were then entered individually into SPSS after every class data collection and the hard copies of the surveys were stored in the office of the principle investigator for several years before they are destroyed.

4. RESULTS

RQ 1- Is there a difference in student attachment quality between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life?

Table 1: Attachment quality and satisfaction in life

		N	Mean	Std. Dev	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Security	Dissatisfied Life	109	10.0092	1.98837	1	13.965	3.937	.049
	Satisfied Life	40	10.7000	1.55580	147	3.547		
	Total	149	10.1946	1.90191	148			
Avoidance	Dissatisfied Life	110	9.9545	3.47042	1	114.946	10.921	.001
	Satisfied Life	40	7.9750	2.50627	148	10.525		
	Total	150	9.4267	3.35054	149			
Ambivalence-Worry	Dissatisfied Life	110	6.2636	2.27744	1	52.564	10.454	.002
	Satisfied Life	40	4.9250	2.14102	148	5.028		
	Total	150	5.9067	2.31234	149			
Ambivalence-Merger	Dissatisfied Life	110	6.2545	1.81955	1	44.346	13.564	.000
	Satisfied Life	40	5.0250	1.77573	148	3.269		
	Total	150	5.9267	1.88280	149			

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning

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

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing student attachment quality between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life. A significant difference was found among security ($F(1,147) = 3.937$, Avoidance ($F(1,148) = 10.921$, Ambivalence-Worry ($F(1,148) = 10.454$, Ambivalence-Merger ($F(1,148) = 13.564$, $p < .05$). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life. This analysis revealed that students on security scale with dissatisfied life scored lower ($m = 10.0092$, $sd = 1.98837$) than those with satisfied life ($m = 10.7000$, $sd = 1.55580$), on Avoidance those with dissatisfied life scored higher ($m = 9.9545$, $sd = 3.47042$) than those with satisfied life ($m = 7.9750$, $sd = 2.50627$), on Ambivalence-Worry those with dissatisfied life scored higher ($m = 6.2636$, $sd = 2.27744$), than those with satisfied life ($m = 4.9250$, $sd = 2.14102$), on Ambivalence-Merger those with dissatisfied life scored higher ($m = 6.2545$, $sd = 1.81955$), than those with satisfied life ($m = 5.0250$, $sd = 1.77573$).

RQ 2- Is there a difference in family Quality of life between those students that are dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life?

Table 2: Family quality of life and satisfaction in life

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family-Interaction	Dissatisfied Life	110	23.0636	5.24147	1	297.819	12.776	.000
	Satisfied Life	40	26.2500	3.41753	148	23.311		
	Total	150	23.9133	5.01533	149			
Parenting	Dissatisfied Life	110	24.0545	4.87991	1	144.626	6.892	.010
	Satisfied Life	40	26.2750	3.61611	148	20.984		
	Total	150	24.6467	4.67054	149			
Emotional-Well-being	Dissatisfied Life	110	14.9818	3.55296	1	84.095	7.166	.008
	Satisfied Life	40	16.6750	3.04149	148	11.735		
	Total	150	15.4333	3.49576	149			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing family quality of life between those dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life. A significant difference was found among Family Interaction ($F(1,148) = 12.776$, Parenting ($F(1,148) = 6.892$, Emotional Well-being ($F(1,148) = 7.166$, $p < .05$). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between dissatisfied with life and those satisfied with life. This analysis revealed that students dissatisfied with life scored lower Family Interaction ($m = 23.0636$, $sd = 5.24147$) than those satisfied life ($m = 26.2500$, $sd = 3.41753$), on Parenting those dissatisfied life scored lower ($m = 24.0545$, $sd = 4.87991$) than those satisfied with life ($m = 26.2750$, $sd = 3.61611$), on Emotional Well-being those dissatisfied life scored lower ($m = 14.9818$, $sd = 3.55296$) than those satisfied life ($m = 16.6750$, $sd = 3.04149$).

RQ 3- Is there a difference in family Quality of life between those students that have low social support and those that have high social support?

Table 3: Family quality of life and social support

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Low Social Support	56	20.9107	4.99555	1	805.660	40.527	.000
	High Social Support	94	25.7021	4.10829	148	19.880		
	Total	150	23.9133	5.01533	149			
Parenting	Low Social Support	56	21.9643	5.20477	1	642.972	36.497	.000
	High Social Support	94	26.2447	3.46623	148	17.617		
	Total	150	24.6467	4.67054	149			
Emotional Wellbeing	Low Social Support	56	13.3750	3.10754	1	378.602	38.852	.000
	High Social Support	94	16.6596	3.12999	148	9.745		
	Total	150	15.4333	3.49576	149			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing student family quality of life between those with low social support and those with high social support, a significant difference was found among Family Interaction ($F(1,148) = 40.52$, Parenting ($F(1,148) = 36.497$, Emotional Well-being ($F(1,148) = 38.852$, $p < .05$). **Tukey’s HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between Low social support and high social support participants. This analysis revealed that students on Family Interaction scale those with low social support scored lower ($m = 20.9107$, $sd = 4.99555$) than those with high social support ($m = 25.7021$, $sd = 4.10829$), on Parenting those with low social support scored lower ($m = 21.9643$, $sd = 5.20477$) than those with high social support ($m = 26.2447$, $sd = 3.46623$), on Emotional Well-being those with low social support scored lower ($m = 13.3750$, $sd = 3.10754$), than those with high social support ($m = 16.6596$, $sd = 3.12999$).

RQ 4- Is there a difference on Quality of attachment between students with low and high presence of meaning of Life?

Table 4: Quality of attachment and presence of meaning of Life

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Security	Low Presence	65	9.9538	1.89102	1	6.685	1.859	.175
	High Presence	84	10.3810	1.90057	147	3.596		
	Total	149	10.1946	1.90191	148			
Avoidance	Low Presence	66	10.6061	3.14706	1	163.936	16.081	.000
	High Presence	84	8.5000	3.22826	148	10.194		
	Total	150	9.4267	3.35054	149			
Ambivalence-Worry	Low Presence	66	6.8030	2.32193	1	94.694	19.964	.000
	High Presence	84	5.2024	2.05807	148	4.743		
	Total	150	5.9067	2.31234	149			
Ambivalence-Merger	Low Presence	66	6.3939	1.61606	1	25.733	7.580	.007
	High Presence	84	5.5595	2.00211	148	3.395		
	Total	150	5.9267	1.88280	149			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing student attachment quality between those with low presence of life and those with high presence of life, a significant difference was found on Avoidance ($F(1,148) = 16.081$, Ambivalence Worry ($F(1,148) = 19.964$, Ambivalence Merger ($F(1,148) = 7.580$, $p < .05$). **Tukey’s HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between those with high and low presence of life. This analysis revealed that students on Avoidance scale, those with low presence of life scored higher ($m = 10.6061$, $sd = 3.14706$) than high presence of life ($m = 8.5000$, $sd = 3.22826$), Ambivalence Worry low presence of life scored higher ($m = 6.8030$, $sd = 2.32193$), than high presence of life ($m = 5.2024$, $sd = 2.05807$), Ambivalence Merger low presence of life scored higher ($m = 6.3939$, $sd = 1.61606$), than high presence of life ($m = 5.5595$, $sd = 2.00211$). There was no significant difference on Security scale for low presence of life ($m = 9.9538$, $sd = 1.89102$) and high presence of life ($m = 10.3810$, $sd = 1.90057$).

RQ 5- Is there a difference in Family Quality of Life between students with low and high presence of meaning of Life?

Table 5: Family Quality of Life between and presence of meaning of Life

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family Interaction	Low Presence	66	22.1667	5.68286	1	359.564	15.706	.000
	High Presence	84	25.2857	3.94105	148	22.894		
	Total	150	23.9133	5.01533	149			
Parenting	Low Presence	66	23.3182	5.02963	1	208.003	10.119	.002
	High Presence	84	25.6905	4.10400	148	20.556		
	Total	150	24.6467	4.67054	149			
Emotional Wellbeing	Low Presence	66	14.0909	3.61078	1	212.391	19.543	.000
	High Presence	84	16.4881	3.02796	148	10.868		
	Total	150	15.4333	3.49576	149			

One-way ANOVA was computed comparing student family quality of life between those with low presence of life and those with high presence of life, a significant difference was found among Family Interaction ($F(1,148) = 15.706$, Parenting ($F(1,148) = 10.119$, Emotional Well-being ($F(1,148) = 19.543$, $p < .05$). **Tukey's HSD** was used to determine the nature of the differences between those with high and low presence of life. This analysis revealed that students on Family Interaction scale those with low presence of life scored lower ($m = 22.1667$, $sd = 5.68286$) than those with high presence of life ($m = 25.2857$, $sd = 3.94105$), on Parenting low presence of life ($m = 23.3182$, $sd = 5.02963$) scored lower than high presence of life ($m = 25.6905$, $sd = 4.10400$), Emotional Well-being low presence of life ($m = 14.0909$, $sd = 3.61078$) scored lower than high presence of life ($m = 16.4881$, $sd = 3.02796$).

5. DISCUSSION

The study showed a significant difference between participants satisfied with life and those dissatisfied with life on attachment. These findings agree with previous research that adults with a secure attachment style have been found to have larger support networks, be more satisfied with their social support, and to seek more support under stressful conditions than adults with insecure attachment styles (Green, Furrer & McAllister, 2007). Similar study Andriopoulos and Kafetsios (2015) reports that secure individuals experience lower levels of physical arousal under stressful situations, seek proximity as a strategy to combat distress, and interpret their behavior more positively having a more positive self-image.

On family quality of life between those dissatisfied and those satisfied with life a significant difference was found among family-interactions, parenting, and emotional well-being. Participants satisfied with life scored higher on family interaction, parenting and emotional-wellbeing than those dissatisfied with life. As previous research stated, the family environment has been hypothesized to affect control-related cognitions and the ability to form close relationships later in life. Griffith et al (2007) concluded that the relationship of early low parental care to more severe depressive symptoms in college was accounted for by a depressive attributional style and dysfunctional attitudes within the family setting.

The study showed significant results when it comes to comparing student family quality of life between those concerned financially with those satisfied financially, where individuals who were dissatisfied with life and financially concerned scored lower in family interaction, parenting, and emotional-wellbeing. Previous research has agreed with this finding as (Huang, Calzada & Dawson-McClure et al. 2013), reported that when parents engaged in positive parenting practices such as expressing affection, praising positive behaviors, and providing an appropriate degree of instruction and structure, the effects of family income on social-emotional and behavioral competencies are reduced. Also, several studies have found that social support, including emotional and tangible assistance, is positively related to parenting attitudes and behavior (McAllister et al. 2007). This would explain why individuals who are financially satisfied have a better family quality of life. Huang, Calzada & Dawson-McClure et al. (2013) reported that parents living in poverty potentially face greater parenting challenges due to greater exposure to stressful events.

The study compared student attachment quality between those with low presence of life and those with high presence of life, a significant difference was found on avoidance, ambivalence-worry, and ambivalence-merger. There was no significant difference on security scale for low presence of life. The results of the study show that those with low presence of life scored higher on attachment scales of avoidance, ambivalence-worry and ambivalence-merger but lower on security. These findings match well with previous research stating that, daily social and achievement events were related to daily meaning in life, where more positive social and achievement events someone experienced, the more meaningful his or her life (Machell et al. 2012). Since having a secure attachment is related to positive outcomes, this contributes to positive thinking outcomes.

Also, the study compared family quality of life between those with low presence of life and those with high presence of life, a significant difference was found on family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being. The results of the study show that those with high presence of life scored higher in family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being. These findings correlate with previous research that states, as people of all ages see their loved and valued individuals as an important source of meaning in life. The importance of interpersonal relationships has been demonstrated in connection to well-being, specified that a desire for close and reciprocal relationships is one of the life-goals which enhance well-being and personal meaning (Bodner et al. 2014).

Finally, the study compared family quality of life between those with low social support and those with high social support, a significance difference was found on family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being. The results of the study showed that those with high social support scored higher in family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being. These findings match with previous research that states, social relationships are fundamental to human development and well-being, “the only characteristic that distinguishes very happy people from people of average happiness is that very happy people possess more satisfying, lasting relationships” (Ferssizidis et al. 2010).

6. CONCLUSION

The results of the study showed that students who had dissatisfied life scored higher on all attachments Avoidance, Ambivalence-Worry, and Ambivalence- Merger scales. The same group scored lower on Security Scale. Also, those who were dissatisfied with life and financially concerned scored lower in family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being. Those with low presence of life scored higher on attachment scales of Avoidance, Ambivalence-Worry, and Ambivalence- Merger but lower on Security. Finally, participants with low social support and low presence meaning of life scored lower in family interaction, parenting, and emotional well-being.

REFERENCES

- [1] Andriopoulos, P., & Kafetsios, K. (2015). Avoidant Attachment and the Processing of Emotion Information: Selective Attention or Cognitive Avoidance?. *Journal of Relationships Research*, 6.
- [2] Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American psychologist*, 44(9), 1175.
- [3] Bodner, E., Bergman, Y. S., & Cohen-Fridel, S. (2014). Do attachment styles affect the presence and search for meaning in life?. *Journal Of Happiness Studies*, 15(5), 1041-1059. doi:10.1007/s10902-013-9462-7
- [4] Cyr, M., Pasalich, D. S., McMahon, R. J., & Spieker, S. J. (2014). The longitudinal link between parenting and child aggression: The moderating effect of attachment security. *Child Psychiatry And Human Development*, 45(5), 555-564. doi:10.1007/s10578-013-0424-4
- [5] Demirli, A., & Demir, A. (2014). The role of gender, attachment dimensions, and family environment on loneliness among Turkish university students. *Australian Journal Of Guidance And Counselling*, 24(1), 62-75. doi:10.1017/jgc.2013.11
- [6] Ferssizidis, P., Adams, L.M., Kashdan, T.B. et al. (2010). Motivation for and commitment to social values: The roles of age and gender. *Journal of Motivation Emotion*, 34, 354-362. doi: 10.1007/s11031-010-9187-4
- [7] Green, B. L., Furrer, C., & McAllister, C. (2007). How do relationships support parenting? Effects of attachment style and social support on parenting behavior in an at-risk population. *American Journal Of Community Psychology*, 40(1-2), 96-108. doi:10.1007/s10464-007-9127-y
- [8] Griffith, D. A. (2007). Spatial structure and spatial interaction: 25 years later. *The Review of Regional Studies*, 37(1), 28.
- [9] Huang, K.Y., Calzada, E., Dawson-McClure, S. & Brotman, L. (2013). Parent involvement as a moderator of family and neighborhood socioeconomic context on school readiness among young children. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(3), 265-276.
- [10] 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.
- [11] Kafetsios, K., & Hess, U. (2015). Are you looking at me? The influence of facial orientation and cultural focus salience on the perception of emotion expressions. *Cogent Psychology- Social Psychology Section*. 2, dx.doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2015.1005493
- [12] Kim, Y., Carver, C. S., Deci, E. L., & Kasser, T. (2008). Adult attachment and psychological well-being in cancer caregivers: The mediational role of spouses' motives for caregiving. *Health Psychology*, 27, S144-S154.

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning

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

- [13] Korabick, K., Lero, D.S., & Whitehead, D.L. (2008). *Handbook Of Work-Family Integration*. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Inc.
- [14] Laible, D.J., & Carlo, G. (2004). The differential relations of maternal and paternal support and control to adolescent social competence, self-worth, and sympathy. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 19*, 759-782.
- [15] Lopez, F. G., Ramos, K., Nisenbaum, M., Thind, N., & Ortiz-Rodriguez, T. (2015). Predicting the presence and search for life meaning: Test of an attachment theory-driven model. *Journal Of Happiness Studies, 16*(1), 103-116. doi:10.1007/s10902-013-9498-8
- [16] Machell, K. A., Kashdan, T. B., Short, J. L., & Nezlek, J. B. (2015). Relationships between meaning in life, social and achievement events, and positive and negative affect in daily life. *Journal Of Personality, 83*(3), 287-298. doi:10.1111/py.12103
- [17] O'Connor, G.T., & Scott, B.C.S. (2007). Parenting and outcomes for children. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- [18] Ogwo, A. (2013). Adolescents-parent relationships as perceived by younger and older adolescents. *IFE Psychologia, 21* (3), 224-229.
- [19] Shaver, P.R., & Mikulincer, M. (2002). Attachment related psychodynamic. *Attachment and Human Development, 4*, 133-161.
- [20] Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The Meaning in Life Questionnaire: Assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 80-93.
- [21] Titze, K., Schenck, S., Logoz, M.Z., & Lehmkuhl, U., (2013). Assessing the quality of the parent-child relationship: Validity and reliability of the child-parent relationship test (Chip-c). *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 23* 917-933
- [22] Yu, J. J., & Gamble, W. C. (2008). Pathways of influence: Marital relationships and their association with parenting styles and sibling relationship quality. *Journal Of Child And Family Studies, 17*(6), 757-778. doi:10.1007/s10826-008-9188-z