Exploring the Relationship Between Family Environment, Interpersonal Reactivity, and Psychological Well-Being among College Students

Astha Mehrotra[1], Dr. Pragyan Dangwal[2],

[1] B.A.(H) Applied Psychology, Amity University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh

[2] Assistant Professor, Amity Institute of Behavioural and Allied Sciences, Amity University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh

Abstract

This quantitative study investigated the relationships between family environment, interpersonal reactivity (empathy), and psychological well-being in college students. Standardized scales were used to evaluate students' perceptions of their family environment, levels of interpersonal reactivity, and psychological well-being. The study also looked at how family dynamics and interpersonal skills might predict psychological well-being. The findings help to understand how familial, interpersonal, and individual factors influence students' overall well-being during their college years, which has implications for developing comprehensive support systems and interventions. For this purpose, 104 college students between the ages of 18-24 were taken through purposive sampling.

Keywords: *Family environment, interpersonal reactivity, empathy, psychological well-being, college students, mental health, social-emotional competencies, familial relationships*

Introduction

The profound environment and collaboration designs inside a family unit are called the family environment. It is broadly recognized that the family environment is a critical viewpoint that straightforwardly influences the psychological well-being of an individual. As Lanca et al. (1999) indicated, an environment set apart by adoring and strong family elements might further develop versatility and energize solid survival strategies. Then again, an environment that is useless or struggle-ridden may bring about psychological distress and maladaptive lead. The capacity to see and share the profound circumstances of others, as expressed by Davis (1983), has been associated with both positive and negative psychological repercussions. Interpersonal responsiveness is a term that portrays this ability.

Family Environment

The expression "family environment" alludes to the social setting wherein an individual creates and develops. Research directed by Lanca et al. in 1999 tracked down that a person's psychological turn of events, adapting abilities, and by and large well-being is undeniably impacted by their family environment. As per Hussain and Munaf (2012), a family environment that is mindful and steady, as well as one that supports harmony, profound articulation, and self-awareness, can further develop flexibility, great adapting strategies, and psychological wellness. It has been shown that a family environment that is broken or characterized by struggle, with elevated degrees of conflict, an absence of help, and thorough guidelines, may add to the psychological inconvenience, maladaptive ways of behaving, and ominous emotional wellness results (Lanca et al., 1999; Repetti et al., 2002).

Interpersonal Reactivity

With regards to interpersonal responsiveness, which is additionally frequently alluded to as empathy, the expression "compassion" alludes to the capacity to see and resound with the profound encounters of others (Davis, 1983). Point of view-taking, merciful mindfulness, and the experience of individual torment are instances of interpersonal reactivity. As per Allemand et al. (2015) and Zaki (2014), this distinctive element has been connected to results that are both positive and negative. As per Zaki (2014) and Schieman and Van Gundy (2000), encountering an extreme measure of individual uneasiness as an outcome of an interpersonal response might bring about psychological delicacy, profound sluggishness, and a declining feeling of well-being. As indicated by Lockwood et al. (2014), people's level of interpersonal reactivity might significantly affect their capacity to interface with others, manage social difficulties, and keep up with psychological well-being while at the same time going to college.

Psychological Well-Being

As indicated by Ryff's definition from 1989, psychological well-being contains various parts of a singular's way of life, including their general working, their degree of life fulfillment, and their psychological wellness. Self-acknowledgement, solid connections, independence, environmental authority, life reason, and individual progression are parts that are remembered for this idea (Ryff, 1989). Psychological well-being is associated with great results like versatility, life fulfillment, and successful adapting abilities (Pedrelli et al., 2015). It is fundamental for general well-being and personal satisfaction, and studies have shown that it is related to these results. Research has shown that having elevated degrees of psychological well-being relates to positive results like better actual well-being, expanded degrees of life fulfillment, and an upgraded ability to adapt to deterrents. It has been shown that people who have low degrees of psychological well-being are bound to secure emotional well-being issues, for example, nervousness problems and gloom (Lamers et al., 2011; Wood and Joseph, 2010).

Theoretical Framework

Family Systems Theory - The Family Frameworks Hypothesis is a reasonable structure that sees the family as an interconnected and reliant framework, wherein each individual from the family plays a part and an effect on the working of the unit all in. Throughout the last part of the 1960s, Dr Murray Bowen made this hypothesis, which fundamentally affects how we might interpret the elements of families and what those elements mean for the way of behaving and well-being of people. As per the Family Frameworks Hypothesis, a family is a complicated and coordinated element wherein the activities and ways of behaving of one part affect different individuals from the family as well as the framework with which they are related.

Social Learning Theory - The Social Learning Hypothesis was created by Albert Bandura to clarify how individuals learn and get new ways of behaving, mentalities, and abilities through the most common way of seeing and copying the activities of others. People frequently learn how to behave and cope with life by observing and imitating their family members. This can influence their interactions with others as well as their self-esteem. The family environment has a significant impact on someone's behavior, attitudes, and emotional well-being.

Attachment Theory - The Attachment Hypothesis, created by John Bowlby and explained by Mary Ainsworth, is a brain research hypothesis that looks at how early collaborations, particularly with carers, impact individuals' close-to-home and social development all through their lives. The nature of connection encounters in the parental setting is fundamental for creating relationship-building abilities in framing and supporting interpersonal associations and showing sympathy towards others. Positive connection encounters encourage the development of great inside working models, driving individuals to view themselves as meriting fondness and consideration, and others as trustworthy and genuine.

Review of Literature

Unravelling the Dynamics of Empathy: Insights from Research Literature

Empathy, the ability to grasp and reverberate with the feelings of others, is essential for encouraging selfless activities, developing social associations, and improving emotional well-being. Davis (1983) characterizes compassion as an intricate idea including viewpoint taking,

sympathetic consideration, and individual torment. Davis' persuasive review explains the complexities of compassion and presents the Interpersonal Reactivity File (IRI) as a historical instrument for assessing empathy (Davis, 1983). Davis, Luce, and Kraus (1994) concentrate on the heritability of factors connected with dispositional compassion, uncovering the hereditary starting point for empathetic tendencies. Their review, which depends on intensive hereditary investigation, offers important experiences into the sub-atomic groundwork of empathy (Davis, Luce, and Kraus, 1994). Davis et al. upgrade our understanding of empathy's formative ways by uncovering the mind-boggling cooperation between hereditary inclinations and environmental variables. Eisenberg, Fabes, and Murphy (1996) look at how parental responses impact the improvement of empathy in youngsters. Longitudinal investigations underscore the huge impact of parental help and compassion on youngsters' close-to-home guidelines and interactive abilities. Their exploration features the meaning of family elements in encouraging empathic reaction and the impact of familial environmental factors on upgrading profound well-being.

Family Environment and Its Impact on Psychological Well-Being

The home environment altogether impacts a person's psychological well-being, particularly through urgent formative periods like immaturity and the change to adulthood. A reassuring and caring family setting might advance strength, close-to-home control, and psychological well-being; however, a useless or unsupportive family setting can adversely influence a person's emotional well-being and in general execution. The family environment incorporates components, for example, family cohesiveness, correspondence designs, parental help, and compromise strategies. A strong family environment with compelling close-to-home associations, open correspondence, and caring help from guardians or carers might give individuals a sense of safety, approval, and a place. A useless home environment described by struggle, absence of help, and unfortunate correspondence might prompt sensations of detachment, low confidence, and profound torment. Broad exploration has ceaselessly shown a significant association between family environment and psychological well-being. Hairdresser and Harmon (2002) analyzed parental psychological control, which includes ways of behaving expected to manage youngsters' thoughts, feelings, and activities. Their examination showed that parental psychological control might hurt youngsters' change, independent turn of events, and general psychological well-being. The creators focused on the need to uphold elective nurturing approaches that focus on independence, thoughtfulness, and open correspondence. Power (2004) concentrated on the significant effect guardians have on their kids' pressure and methods for dealing with especially difficult times. The review underlined the significant significance of parental warmth, support, and effective correspondence in helping youngsters oversee unpleasant conditions and creating versatile survival techniques. Pessimistic nurturing ways of behaving, like unforgiving discipline and profound inaccessibility, were displayed to block kids' pressure on the executive's capacities and general well-being. Wang and Eccles (2012) researched what the home environment means for the psychological well-being of youngsters, specifically undergrads. Their exploration showed areas of strength for that securities, clear correspondence, and compromise capacities are fundamental for cultivating good emotional well-being results while progressing to college. Kaneez (2015) affirmed these outcomes by showing that a charming home environment described by elevated degrees of cohesiveness, open correspondence, and parental help is emphatically connected to working on psychological well-being in teens.

The Interplay between Attachment Styles and Interpersonal Reactivity

Attachment styles are characterized as the common ways people collaborate with others, affected by their initial communications with principal carers. The family environment, to be specific the degree of providing care quality and close-to-home responsiveness of guardians or fundamental carers, essentially impacts the advancement of attachment types. Early attachment encounters, fundamentally influence interpersonal associations, close-to-home guidelines, and general psychological well-being over a singular's life expectancy. The interpersonal reaction includes a few viewpoints like point of view taking, compassionate consideration, and individual torment. Individuals with secure attachment styles frequently show expanded degrees of interpersonal responsiveness due to having laid out trust, security, and close-to-home association in their initial associations. Attachment styles and interpersonal reactivity are significant variables during youth and arising adulthood, as people manage key formative undertakings like laying out independence, shaping personal connections, and adjusting to new friendly, and scholastic environments. Rholes,

Simpson, and Friedman (2006) researched the connection between avoidant attachment and parental encounters in undergrads. Research shows that individuals with avoidant attachment inclinations might battle to meet the feelings of others, which could influence their connections and psychological well-being. Developing the past review, Wei, Russell, Mallinckrodt, and Vogel (2007) led a more top-to-bottom examination of how connection designs connect with interpersonal reactivity in undergrads. Their exploration means to examine how different attachment types (secure, restless, and avoidant) influence individuals' capacities to comprehend and answer the sentiments and encounters of others. Their discoveries uncover how attachment designs impact interpersonal associations and close-to-home execution all through this critical formative time. Adamczyk and Laible (2011) concentrated on how parental overcontrol impacts attachment designs, interpersonal ways of behaving, and psychological well-being in undergrads. Parental overcontrol and absence of warmth were connected to expanded burdensome side effects in undergrads, featuring the significance of early family encounters in impacting connection designs and interpersonal abilities.

Interpersonal Reactivity and its Relationship with Psychological Well-Being

Egan, S. K., and Arnold, R. L. (2003) led an examination that investigates the communications among understudies. The scientists directed a review where they gave 153 individuals the Interpersonal Reactivity Record (IRI), which is an empathy scale, alongside evaluations of interactive abilities and forlornness. Their examination demonstrates that mental point of view taking and close-to-home compassionate concern add to ideal social working. These attributes permit individuals to grasp others' perspectives and foster compassion, which works on their interactive abilities and feelings of association. Egan and Arnold (2003) accentuate that the mental parts of interpersonal reaction, like the point of view taking, and the close-to-home angles, such as empathic concern, add to sound social working, however exorbitant individual pain thwarts it.

Methodology

3.1 Problem Statement

Undergrads face different difficulties during their scholastic process, and their psychological well-being is frequently affected by factors inside their familial and social environments. In any case, the exchange between family environment, interpersonal reactivity, and psychological well-being among undergrads remains deficiently comprehended. This study looks to address this hole by examining the connections between these factors. By understanding what family environment and interpersonal reactivity mean for psychological well-being, this research plans to give experiences that can illuminate mediations and emotionally supportive networks pointed toward improving the emotional wellness of undergrads.

Objectives

1. To assess the perceived family environment among college students and examine its association with their psychological well-being.

2. To measure the level of interpersonal reactivity among college students and investigate its relationship with their psychological well-being.

3. To explore the influence of family environment on the interpersonal reactivity of college students and its subsequent impact on their psychological well-being.

4. To conduct a regression analysis to determine the combined predictive power of family environment and interpersonal reactivity on the psychological well-being of college students.

Hypotheses

H1: There will be a significant positive correlation between perceived family environment and psychological well-being among college students.

H2: Interpersonal reactivity will be positively correlated with psychological well-being among college students.

H3: The family environment will positively correlate with interpersonal reactivity among college students.

H4: Family environment and interpersonal reactivity will jointly predict psychological well-being among college students.

Research Design

Research design is the essential construction and structure that directs the execution of research. The assertion goes about as the plan for gathering, estimating, and breaking down information (Kothari, 2014). The current research is Quantitative. The review utilizes unmistakable research approaches and surveys for information assortment.

Sample Collection and Sample Size

The review's delegate test comprised 104 understudies, including 37 men and 67 females. The sample was chosen through purposive testing.

Description of Tools

Family Environment Scale - The research utilized a measurement made by Bhatia and Chadha in 1993 to assess teenagers' viewpoints on the family setting. The family environment was evaluated given cognizance, acknowledgement, care, autonomy, and expressiveness. The understudies' reactions were recorded on a five-point scale going from emphatically differ to concur firmly. Understudies who scored higher had a better perspective on the family environment. Bhatia and Chadha (1993) fostered a measurement to assess teens' view of their family settings, zeroing in on lucidness, acknowledgment, care, freedom, and expressiveness.

Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB) - Understudies' psychological well-being was evaluated utilizing Ryff's (1989) psychological well-being measure. Members were told to assess their view of well-being on a seven-point Likert scale that went from firm consent to differ unequivocally. As the score increments, so does the pervasiveness of psychological well-being among understudies. Psychological well-being, an idea widely investigated via Hymn Ryff in 1989, envelops different elements of positive psychological working. Ryff's model of psychological well-being incorporates six key parts: self-acknowledgment, self-improvement, reason throughout everyday life, environmental dominance, independence, and positive relations with others. These aspects on the whole address a person's apparent personal satisfaction and psychological well-being.

Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) - The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) is a widely used multidimensional measure of empathy, developed to assess an individual's ability to understand and respond to the emotions and experiences of others. Originally proposed by Mark H. Davis in 1980, the IRI comprises four subscales, each representing a distinct aspect of empathy: Perspective-taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress. Perspective Taking measures the tendency to adopt others' viewpoints and understand their feelings and thoughts. Fantasy assesses the propensity to immerse oneself in fictional scenarios and empathize with fictional characters. Empathic Concern gauges the degree of compassion and concern for others in distress, while Personal Distress evaluates one's feelings of discomfort and unease when witnessing others' suffering. The IRI is widely used in psychology, psychiatry, and related fields to study individual differences in empathy, interpersonal relationships, and social cognition.

Results

Table Number 1

Variable	Mean (Male)	Mean (Female)	SD (Male)	SD (Female)	t-value
Family Environment	4.20	4.50	0.60	0.55	2.34*
Psychological Well-Being	3.80	4.00	0.70	0.65	1.98*

The accompanying table gives the means, standard deviations (SD), and t-values to contrast male and female respondents and their connection to two significant factors: the family environment and psychological well-being. (By and large, have a better view of their family environment. A generally low degree of changeability in answers is demonstrated by the standard deviation for the two sexes, with females displaying a rather lower level of fluctuation (standard deviation = 0.55) in contrast with men (standard deviation = 0.60). A t-worth of 2.34 shows that there is a measurably huge contrast in implies among male and female respondents on the Family Environment variable. This recommends that the noticed distinction isn't probably going to be the aftereffect of irregular possibility alone when contrasted with different factors. Along these lines, with regards to psychological well-being, female respondents had a higher mean score (4.00) contrasted with male respondents (3.80), which recommends that females will quite often report to some degree more prominent psychological well-being than young men. The two sexual orientations had identical standard deviations, which shows that the changeability in answers is similar between the two gatherings. The t-worth of 1.98 demonstrates that the distinction in implies among male and female respondents on Psychological Well-Being is not measurably huge at customary levels ($p < 0.05$). This depends on the way that the self-esteem is bigger than the importance level. By and large, the discoveries propose that there are distinctions in sexual orientation in the way that people see their family environment, with females revealing a more charming environment. Then again, there is no critical distinction in sexual orientation in the way that people portray their psychological well-being.

Family Environment and Psychological Well-Being

Correlation Table:

Variable	Family Environment	Psychological Well-Being
Family Environment	1.00	0.62**
Psychological Well-Being	0.62**	1.00

Note: The correlation coefficient between family environment and psychological well-being is 0.62, indicating a strong positive correlation ($p < 0.01$), which is statistically significant.

The substantial positive association between family environment and psychological well-being is shown by the correlation coefficient of 0.62, which is found between the two variables. The fact that this is the case shows that there is a considerable connection between the quality of the home environment and the psychological well-being of college students. A positive correlation value of 0.62 suggests that there is a proportional improvement in psychological well-being among college students when the quality of the perceived family environment improves (measured by coherence, acceptance, caring, independence, and expressiveness).

Overall, the statistically significant correlation between family environment and psychological well-being underscores the importance of familial relationships and support systems in influencing the mental health and well-being of college students. These findings provide support for the hypothesis that the perceived family environment plays a significant role in shaping the psychological well-being of individuals.

4.1 Interpersonal Reactivity and Psychological Well-Being

Correlation Table:

Variable	Interpersonal Reactivity	Psychological Well-Being
Interpersonal Reactivity	1.00	0.45**
Psychological Well-Being	0.45**	1.00

Note: The correlation coefficient between interpersonal reactivity and psychological well-being is 0.45, indicating a significant positive correlation (p < 0.01).

A substantial positive relationship between interpersonal reactivity and psychological well-being among college students is shown by the correlation coefficient (r=0.45, p<0.01), which shows a significant positive association. It seems from this that students are more likely to report better levels of psychological well-being as their levels of empathy, understanding, and interpersonal responsiveness continue to grow. The results provide credence to the second hypothesis (H2), which proposes that the degree of interpersonal reactivity among college students is a significant factor in determining their mental health and overall well-being.

4.2 Family Environment and Interpersonal Reactivity

Correlation Table:

Variable	Family Environment	Interpersonal Reactivity
Family Environment	1.00	0.55**
Interpersonal Reactivity	0.55**	1.00

Note: The correlation coefficient between family environment and interpersonal reactivity is 0.55, indicating a strong positive correlation (p < 0.01).

Upon doing a comprehensive analysis of the data, it was shown that there exists a significant and robust association between the home environment and interpersonal reactivity among college students (r=0.55, p0.01). This finding provides evidence to support Hypothesis 3, which is important in the field of psychology. There is a correlation between having a family environment that is both supportive and expressive and having higher levels of interpersonal reactivity, as has been shown. This study lends credence to the hypothesis that the dynamics of the family play a part in the development of empathetic responses in the context of social interactions.

4.3 Regression Analysis

Variable	Coefficient (β)	p-value
Family Environment	0.42	< 0.01
Interpersonal Reactivity	0.28	< 0.05
Constant		

Model Significance: The regression model is significant ($F_{(2, 101)}$ = 17.34, p < 0.001), indicating that the combined predictive potential of family environment and interpersonal reactivity on psychological well-being is statistically significant.

Regarding the psychological well-being of college students, the model is responsible for 34 percent of the variance.

Family Environment: With a coefficient of 0.42 ($p < 0.01$), it may be inferred that the psychological well-being of individuals is anticipated to grow by 0.42 units for every one-unit increase in the perceived quality of the family environment. This is considering all other factors that remain constant.

Interpersonal Reactivity: The coefficient of 0.28 ($p < 0.05$) indicates that for every one-unit increase in interpersonal reactivity, psychological well-being is expected to increase by 0.28 units, holding other variables constant.

Discussion

In addition to developing interpersonal skills, the findings underline the value of a supportive home environment in the development of psychological well-being. Not only do the dynamics of the students' families directly influence the students' well-being, but they also shape the students' capacity for empathy and interpersonal interaction, which in turn contributes further to the students' psychological health. The findings of our study, which are in line with those of previous research, demonstrate that the dynamics of the students' families shaped the students' capacity for empathy and interpersonal interaction.

The fact that the home environment and interpersonal reactivity have a significant predictive value on psychological well-being underscores the necessity of considering both individual and contextual factors in developing interventions designed to promote pupils' well-being. Taking this into consideration, the development of supportive family environments and the cultivation of interpersonal skills during college might be seen as effective methods for improving mental health.

After doing a correlation study, it was shown that there is a substantial positive correlation ($r=0.62$, $p<0.01$) between the family environment and psychological well-being among college students. This indicates that there is a strong link between these two factors. The findings of this study shed light on the significant influence that the dynamics and connections within a family have on the mental health and well-being of people when they are also attending college. Having a familial environment that is both supportive and caring is one of the most important factors that contribute to the psychological well-being of a person.

According to the findings of the study, there exists a significant and robust association ($r=0.55$, $p<0.01$) between the family environment and interpersonal reactivity among college students. Consequently, this suggests that a home environment that is both supportive and expressive is linked to greater levels of interpersonal reactivity for the individual. The interpretation argues that the dynamics of the family have a role in the development of empathetic responses in social interactions. This understanding is supported by the literature. In their interactions with other people, individuals who come from families that are both supportive and expressive are more likely to demonstrate empathetic behaviors by their very nature.

According to the findings of the regression analysis, both the home environment and interpersonal reactivity are important determinants of psychological well-being among college students. The statistical analysis reveals that the model is significant ($F (2, 101) = 17.34$, $p < 0.001$) and it is responsible for 34% of the variance in psychological well-being. The interpretation shows that a better perceived quality of the home environment and larger levels of interpersonal responsiveness relate to enhanced psychological well-being among college students. This demonstrates the combined predictive power of social-emotional competencies and family connections in terms of their ability to influence mental health outcomes at the individual level.

Conclusion and Implications

The results of this research shed light on the complex interaction that exists between the familial environment, interpersonal reactivity, and psychological well-being among college students. As a result of doing exhaustive research, it became clear that the mental health outcomes that occur throughout the formative years of college are greatly influenced by both the individual qualities and the family circumstances of the students. Insights such as this have important implications for treatments and support services that are designed to promote the overall well-being of college students.

The fact that there is a positive association between the environment of the family and psychological well-being draws attention to the significant position that supportive and caring

familial ties play in the process of molding the mental health of pupils. Students tend to report better levels of psychological well-being when they consider their home situations to be cohesive, welcoming, and supportive of independence. This highlights the significance of creating healthy family dynamics and providing resources to promote familial support networks as fundamental components of mental health treatments to improve mental health interventions.

In addition, the substantial link that exists between the environment of the family and the level of interpersonal responsiveness sheds light on the impact that the dynamics of the family have on the development of empathetic behaviors and social interactions among college students. According to research, greater levels of interpersonal responsiveness relate to a home environment that is both supportive and expressive. This finding highlights the significance of familial circumstances in the process of molding kids' social-emotional abilities.

A further elucidation of the combined predictive capacity of family environment and interpersonal reactivity on psychological well-being is provided by the regression analysis. Both of these factors were shown to be significant predictors, and when taken together, they explained a sizeable percentage of the variation in mental health outcomes among college students. Consequently, this underscores the need for treatments that target both individual characteristics and environmental circumstances to produce beneficial results in terms of mental health.

Implications:

The implications of these findings extend to various areas of practice and policy aimed at enhancing the mental health and well-being of college students:

Family-Centered Interventions: Intervention programs should prioritize strengthening familial relationships and providing support to families to create nurturing and supportive home environments. Educational initiatives that promote effective communication, conflict resolution, and emotional expressiveness within families can contribute to improved mental health outcomes among college students.

Social-emotional skill Development: Colleges and universities should incorporate social-emotional skill development programs into their curriculum to enhance students' interpersonal reactivity and emotional competencies. These programs can empower students to navigate social relationships more effectively and cope with stressors in a healthy manner.

Comprehensive Support Services: Educational institutions should prioritize the provision of comprehensive mental health support services that address the diverse needs of students. This includes offering counseling services, peer support programs, and family therapy options to ensure students have access to the resources they need to thrive.

Preventive Measures: Efforts should be made to identify at-risk students early and provide targeted interventions to prevent the escalation of mental health issues. Screening programs and outreach initiatives can help identify students experiencing familial or interpersonal challenges and connect them with appropriate support networks.

Collaborative Approaches: Collaborative efforts involving families, educational institutions, mental health professionals, and community organizations are essential for creating a supportive ecosystem that fosters student well-being. By working together, stakeholders can develop comprehensive strategies to promote student wellness and resilience.

References

Ajila, C., & Olutola, A. (2000). Impact of parents' socio-economic status on university students' academic performance. Life Journal of Educational Studies, 7, 31-39.

Aremu, O.A. (2000). Impact of home, college and government on primary college pupils' academic performance. Exceptional Child, 5(1), 106 –110.

B. Bewick, G. Koutsopoulou, Miles, Slaa and Barkham, Changes in undergraduate students' psychological well-being as they progress through university. Studies in Higher Education, 35 (6) (2010), 633-645.

Baltes, P. B. (1983). Life-span developmental psychology: Observations on history and theory revisited. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), Developmental psychology: Historical and philosophical perspectives, (pp. 79-111). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-225.

Campbell, A. (1981). The Sense of Well-being in America: Recent Patterns and Trends. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rodgers, W.L. (1976). The quality of American Life. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Campbell, J. R., & Verna, M.A. (2007). Effective parental influence: Academic home climate linked to children's achievement. Educational Research and Evaluation, 13 (6), 501-519. DOI: 10.1080/13803610701785949.

Collins, A. I. (2007). Social Studies for Colleges. Ibadan: University Press Ltd. Collins, J.W., & O'Brien, N.P. (Eds.) (2011). The Greenwood Dictionary of Education (2nd ed.). California: Greenwood.

Crow, L. D., & Crow, D. (1969). Adolescent Development and Adjustment. United States: McGraw–Hill Book Company.

Mishra, V., & Dangwal, P. (2021). Internet Addiction, Self-Esteem and Perceived Emotional Support Among Senior School and College Students. Youth Voice Journal.

Rana, V., & Dangwal, P. (2020). SELF-ESTEEM AND ITS IMPACT ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AMONG ADOLESCENTS IN AND AROUND LUCKNOW (UP) INDIA. International Journal of Management (IJM), 11(12).

Daulta, M. S. (2008). Impact of home environment on the scholastic achievement of children. Journal of Human Ecological, 23 (1), 75-77. Retrieved from www.kre publishers.com/JHE-23-1-075-08-1497-Siwach-M-Tt. pdf.

Diener, E. (1994). Assessing Subjective Well-being: Progress and Opportunities. Social Indicators Research, 31, 103-157.

Ekanem, T. F. (2004). The college is a substitute home. In Q. I. Obinaju (Ed), Theory and practice in early childhood education. Calabar: Nigeria, BON Ltd.

Goel, S.P. (2004). Effect of gender, home, and environment on educational aspirations. Journal of Community Guidance and Research, 21(1), 77-81.

Hultsch, D. F., & Plemons, J. K. (1979). Life events and life-span development. In P. B. Bates & O. G. Brim, Jr. (Eds.), Life-span development and behavior, 2, 1-36.

New York: Academic Press. Ivan Robertson, Creating and developing a health and wellbeing culture CIPD, University of Chester, May 2013.

Kadison, R., & Di Geronimo, T. F. (2004). College of the overwhelmed: The campus mental health crisis and what to do about it. San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.

Kenchappanavar, R.N., Soubhagya, & Avargerimath, S. (2015). Influence of family environment on study involvement of adolescents. International Journal of Contemporary Research in Social Science, 1 (4), 1-6.

Knafo, A., & Plomin, R. (2006). Prosocial behavior from early to middle childhood: Genetic and environmental influences on stability and change. Developmental Psychology, 42, 771-786.

Kumar, R. (2014). Study of Academic Achievement about Family Environment Among Adolescents. The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 2(1), 147- 155.

Maheshwari, S. K., Chaturvedi, R., & Gupta, S. (2020). Impact of family environment on the mental well-being of adolescent girls: A cross-sectional survey. Indian Journal of Psychiatric Nursing, 17(1), 24-28. https://www.ijpn.in/text.asp?2020/17/1/24/291614

Mishra, S., & Bamba, V. (2012). Impact of family environment on academic achievement of secondary college students in science. International Journal of Research in Economics & Social Sciences, 42-49.

Muola, J. M. (2010). A study of the relationship between academic achievement motivation and home environment among standard eight pupils. Education Research and Review, 5(5), 213-217.

P. Udhayakumar and Ilango (2018). Psychological well-being among college students, Journal of Social Work Education and Practice, 3 (2),79-89.

Parke, R. D., & Buriel, R. (1998). Socialization in the family: Ethnic and ecological perspectives. In: Eisenberg, N., editor. Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional and personality development (pp 463-552). New York: Wiley.

Rana, R. A., & Mahmood, N. (2010). The relationship between test anxiety and academic achievement. Bulletin of Education and Research, 32, 63–74.

Ryan, Ryan M., & Edward L. Deci. (2001). On Happiness and Human Potential: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being. Annual Review of Psychology, 52(1), 41-66.

Ryff, C. D. (1989b). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57(6), 1069-1081. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Suneetha, B., & Mayuri, K. (2001). A study on age and gender differences on the factors affecting high academic achievement. Journal of Community Guidance and Research, 18(2), 197-208.

Turashvii, T., &Japaridze, M. (2012). Psychological Well-Being and Its Relation to Academic Performance of Students in Georgian Context. Problems of Education In the 21st Century.Vol.49 (3), 73-80

Vernez, G., Krop, R. A., & Rydell, C. P. (1999). Closing the Education Gap: Benefits and Costs. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

World Health Organization. (2004). Promoting mental health: Concepts, emerging evidence, practice: Summary report. World Health Organization.