



Family Environment and Psychological well-being of Adolescents

Khushpreet Kaur¹ and Dr. Rajnish Sharma²
Research Scholar¹, Professor²
Department of Education
CT University, Ludhiana, Punjab¹
MK College of Education, Jalandhar, Punjab²
khushpreet.manshahia@gmail.com¹
manzilvij@yahoo.co.in²

Abstract:

The present study investigated the effect of family environment on psychological well-being of adolescents. A sample of 1008 adolescents studying in 11th and 12th class of rural and urban schools of five districts was selected from Punjab by using simple random sampling technique. Psychological well-being scale by Sisodia and Choudary and Family environment scale by Bhatia and Chadha were used for data collection. The data was analyzed using mean, standard deviation, and 't' test. The study revealed that there is no significant difference in family environment among adolescent with respect to gender. There is a significant difference in family environment among adolescent on independence and organization dimensions of family environment with respect to institution. There is a significant difference in family environment among adolescent on acceptance, independence, and control dimensions of family environment with respect to locale. There exists a positive correlation between psychological well-being and family environment. Further, significant correlation was found on active-recreational orientation dimension of family environment and psychological well-being.

Keywords: Psychological well-being, adolescents, family environment, child development.

DOI Number: 10.14704/nq.2022.20.8.NQ44615

NeuroQuantology 2022;20(8):5887-5900

Introduction: Family is the most important and primary unit of society influencing child development. It plays major role in shaping individual's behavior and all-round development. A family is a spring of firmness, safety, and pleasure. Shukla (2018) believed that a family takes care of the members' material, bodily, and emotional needs. Family is the primary school for emotional learning, according to Goleman (1997). Parents are a child's first teachers, and the home environment has an impact on the child's

general personality. The influence of family on the ideas and a characteristic of adolescents are crucial (Rani, Duban and Sumit, 2020). Parents play a big role in the starting years of their child's life and inspire them to attain better in their future life. A child learns from his family the way of commerce different circumstances in his life. A family determines the behavior and attitude of family. Parental care concern and guidance effects the development of child. Academic success, which is the result of the adolescent's maturational forces and the



experiences offered by the environment, is also influenced by the familial environment (Bernard and Aggarwal, 1971). According to Christenson, Rounds, and Gorney (1992), parental participation helps children succeed academically. In present life students are facing tough competitions in academic field so; they need parental support for coping with these situations. Those students perform better in school whose parents provide them with required facilities and educational environment. Moos and Moos (2002) found that children who lived in organized, supportive households were more likely to have improved social skills and self-confidence. According to Preiffer and Aylward (1990), the family environment has an impact on a child's cognitive and social development, which in turn affects the child's ability to assert oneself, be self-reliant and assertive, as well as other personality traits like motivation and success in school. Family is the most fundamental and intrinsic social group, and Ranhotra (1996) defined family environment as the complex of social and cultural factors, the combinations of extrinsic or external physical elements that affect and influence the growth and development of the member of family. Cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, acceptance and compassion, independence, active recreational orientation, organization, and control are the eight elements that make up the family environment (Bhatia and Chadha, 2012). The eight components that make up the family environment are cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, acceptance and compassion, independence, active recreational orientation, organization, and control (Bhatia and Chadha, 2012). The level of dedication, assistance, and support that family members provide for one another is known as cohesion. The degree of expressivity refers to how much family members are encouraged to act honestly and verbally communicate their emotions and views. Conflict is the degree of openly expressed hostility and contention between

family members. Acceptance and care refer to how much each family member is accepted without conditions and how much concern is shown for them. Family members' independence is measured by how aggressive and self-reliant they are. The level of engagement in social and recreational activities is known as active-recreational orientation. The degree to which a clear organizational framework is important in organizing family activities and obligations is called organization. Control is the extent to which limits are set within a family.

Psychological well-being is a very important term in present era. When our health is good, we can behave well, which in turn makes life easier. Psychological well-being is a notion of psychology that has to do with health (Ramesh & Waghmare, 2016). According to Huppert, "Psychological well-being is about lives going well. It is the combination of feeling good and functioning effectively." An individual with high psychological well-being is content with their personal and professional lives, happy, capable, and well-supported (Ashoka, 2017). One of the most commonly researched topics in psychology literature is psychological health (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997). Meaning in life, freedom from somatic symptoms, positive affect, daily activities, satisfaction, lack of suicidal thoughts, self-control, social support, lack of tension, and overall effectiveness are all aspects of psychological well-being (Bhogle and Prakash, 1995).

Need for the study:

Family environment is a vast concept that includes many dimensions. Conducive family environment leads to overall development among adolescents. Adolescence is a very critical stage of life. Hence, positive, and negative family environment affects the personality of the adolescents positively and negatively. Any problem in family could have negative effects on adolescents like substance abuse, depression, anti-social behavior, and low level of psychological well-being. Psychological



well-being is directly related with happiness, satisfaction in life, relation with others, self-esteem, and general efficiency. Therefore, psychological well-being is a very important factor. Family environment can be a strong source of enhancing psychological well-being among adolescents. Related review reveals that psychological well-being has not received much recognition in the context of family environment.

The scarcity of research in this area came up with further investigation into examining the relationship between psychological well-being and family environment.

Literature review:

Stanescu and Romer (2011) investigated how a family functions and an adolescent's mental health when one parent has a brain injury. There were 58 families included in the study. Youth self-report, family crisis-oriented personal measures and a family evaluation tool were the tools employed for the study. According to the study, affective responsiveness, affective participation roles, and communication are the four sub-dimensions of family functioning that best predict children's issues. Family dysfunction was also found to positively link with teenagers' psychiatric symptoms. Researchers Lavasani, Borhanzadeh, Afzali, and Hejazi (2011) examined the connection between social support, perceived parenting methods, and psychological well-being. 398 Tehrani female students were chosen as the sample. The parenting style of Baum-Rind, the social support of Vaux, and the psychological well-being of Ryff measures were all utilized. It was determined that although authoritative parenting style doesn't predict psychological well-being, the perception of an authoritarian and permissive parenting style shows a significantly negative relationship with psychological well-being. In contrast, the perception of social support shows a significantly positive relationship with

psychological well-being. In their study, Sbicigo and Aglio (2012) investigated the association between adolescent psychological adjustment indices and home environment. 656 students between the ages of 12 and 18 comprised the sample. The Family Climate Inventory, the Rosenberg self-esteem scale, and the General Perceived Self-Efficacy measures were the instruments employed. Psychological adaptation was found to be significantly predicted by family environment. Family ties were revealed to be crucial for adolescent adolescents' manifestation of good psychological traits. Pappa (2013) studied the connection between adolescent psychological health and parent marital status in Greece. It was discovered that an adolescent's mental health was related to their relationship with their parents. Internalizing and externalizing issues as well as the adolescent's mental health were linked to the parent-child interaction following the divorce. Kaur (2013) studied 260 teenagers to determine the connection between their home environments and psychological well-being. The findings showed a significant positive relationship between adolescents' psychological well-being and the protectiveness, conformity, reward, and nurturing aspects of their home environments, as well as a significant negative relationship between adolescents' psychological well-being and the control and punishment aspects of their home environments. Additionally, it was discovered that the only significant determinants of adolescents' psychological wellbeing in the home setting were the compliance, reward, and nurturance dimensions. Rapheal, Damodaran, and Paul K. (2014) investigated how teenage psychological wellbeing is impacted by the home environment. 153 students were chosen as the sample. The Psychological Well-Being Scale and the Home Environment Inventory were used to gather the data. Significant correlations between the subscales of the two assessments were found by the study. Adolescents'



"interpersonal-relation" and "sociability" levels were impacted by their home environment. The "satisfaction," "sociability," and "interpersonal interaction" elements of psychological well-being were significantly predicted by discipline-specific characteristics. Additionally, each of the five components of psychological well-being showed a substantial prediction power for households with a pleasant environment. Demographic factors have no discernible impact on psychological health. In their study, Cadena, Rubia, Diaz, Rodriguez, Reyes, and Rosales (2014) investigated how effectively the psychological constructs "internal locus of control" and "psychological well-being" may be predicted using the psychosocial concept "family strength." The study, which involved 400 students, discovered that the psychosocial dimension was more important than the psychological dimension. In their 2014 study, Khodabaksh, Kiani, and Ahmedbookani looked at how parental practices and psychological well-being relate to students' mental health. 278 high school students from Boukan's high schools participated in the study. Data were gathered using the Psychological Well-Being Inventory and the Mental Health Parenting Style Questionnaire. It was discovered that authoritative parenting and psychological factors were strongly associated with mental health. Permissive parenting practices also have a strong favorable impact on mental. With the aid of the Student Stress Scale and the Psychological Well-being Scale, Rapheal and Paul K (2015) did a study on 152 students to examine the role of the home environment on adolescent psychological well-being and distress. Between factors related to the home environment and stress, anxiety, and psychological well-being, a significant linear association was discovered. Participants with low, normal, and high levels of home environment factors showed significant differences in their psychological well-being, stress, and anxiety, respectively. In controlling the psychological well-being of teenagers, self-

efficacy and home environment were examined by Antony P. and Manikandan K. in 2015. 200 teenagers make up the sample. The Self-Efficacy Scale, Family Environment Scale, Psychological Well-Being Scale, and Personal Information Sheet were the instruments utilized for data collection. Teenagers were found to differ significantly by sex on factors including psychological well-being and the organization and management of the family environment. Additionally, there are notable religious differences for the variables of self-efficacy, psychological well-being, and two aspects of the home environment, specifically intellectual cultural orientation and moral religious emphasis. In terms of family type, neither nuclear nor joint families exhibit any discernible differences in the ten aspects of the family environment, including self-efficacy and psychological well-being. Kaneez (2015) investigated the relationship between adolescent psychological health and home environment. The study involved 60 teenagers between the ages of 16 and 19. It was done using the Family Environment Scale and the Psychological Well-Being Scale. The study found a strong and favorable correlation between psychological well-being and the family's cohesion, expressiveness, acceptance and care, and active recreational aspects. Marikutty and Joseph (2016) examined how parenting practices affect teenagers' psychological health. 2060 adolescents made up the sample. A questionnaire on parental authority and another one about psychological health were both employed. The study discovered strong relationships between numerous aspects of psychological well-being and diverse parenting philosophies. Additionally, groups of adolescents showed substantial differences in a variety of parenting style variables and psychological well-being. Hooja and Shaktawat (2017) conducted research on how the family environment and motivation for accomplishment affect children who are enrolled in school. A total of 100 pupils were

5890



given the Deo-Mohan accomplishment motivation scale, home environment assessment, and Ryff's psychological well-being measure. The findings showed a substantial correlation between accomplishment motivation and six out of ten subscales of home environment. Subscales of social exclusion, privation of privileges, and rejection have a substantial negative link with psychological well-being, whereas subscales of reward have a positive relationship. Furthermore, there is a link between psychological well-being and motivation for accomplishment, and the only component that significantly affected psychological well-being was permissiveness. Kammar and Pujar (2018) investigated the effect of family environment on pre-university college students' psychological well-being. 320 students between the ages of 16 and 18 made up the sample. The Family Environment Scale and Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale were applied. The study discovered a favorable and significant association between family environment and psychological well-being of pre-university college students in both rural and urban settings in the dimensions of relationship, personal growth, and system maintenance. In their research, Kassa and Rao (2019) examined how academic success mediates the link between parenting practices and psychological well-being. 502 teenagers were chosen for the investigation. The findings showed that reasonable and ethical parenting practices were favorably and significantly connected with psychological well-being. Additionally, there was a strong positive correlation between academic success and the six components of psychological well-being as well as overall psychological well-being. Using data from 23 pertinent research, Wahyuningsih, Kusumaningrum and Novitasari (2020) did a Meta analysis. Positive parental marital quality was associated with high psychological well-being, while positive parental marital quality was associated with low psychological well-being, high psychological well-being, low

psychological well-being, and negative parental marital quality was associated with negative psychological well-being, according to the results. By considering the mediating roles of self-esteem and depression, Farsani, Kelishadi, and Beshlideh (2020) examined the effects of family communication, function, and contentment with one's body image on psychological well-being. There were 173 obese and overweight female students in the study's sample. It was shown that teenage psychological health was directly impacted by family functioning and communication. Additionally, through self-esteem and depression, family functioning and communication as well as contentment with one's body image had an indirect impact on psychological well-being. In Germany, Herke, Knochelmann, and Richter (2020) evaluated the health and happiness of teenagers living in various family types and the significance of the home environment. There were 6838 students in the sample. The findings showed that better parent-child relationships and stronger family coherence are related to higher life satisfaction, better self-rated health, more pro-social behavior, and less problematic behavior. Adolescent children in single parent families' self-esteem and psychological health were examined by Mohan and Priya V (2020). 51 students in grades 8 through 12 made up the sample. Sociodemographic information, a self-esteem scale, and a psychological well-being scale were the instruments employed. The outcomes showed a substantial relationship between the teenagers from single-parent families' self-esteem and psychological health. Gobind and Manju (2020) studied 80 students to determine the predictors of well-being in college students as well as the relationships between personality traits and the home environment and psychological well-being. Friedman's Family Environment Scale The wellbeing scale was applied. The study discovered a positive correlation between familial environment and personality traits and

5891



psychological well-being.

Objectives:

1. To study the family environment as perceived by adolescents.
2. To find out significant differences in family environment as perceived by adolescents with respect to gender.
3. To find out significant differences in family environment as perceived by adolescents with respect to type of institution.
4. To find out significant differences in family environment as perceived by adolescents with respect to locale.
5. To find out significant correlation between family environment and psychological well-being of adolescents.

Hypothesis:

1. There is no significant difference in family environment as perceived by adolescents with respect to gender.
2. There is no significant difference in family environment as perceived by adolescents with respect to type of institution.
3. There is no significant difference in family environment as perceived by adolescents with respect to locale.
4. There is no significant correlation between family environment and psychological well-being of adolescents.

Methodology

Results:

Objective 1: To study family environment as perceived by adolescents

Table 1: Mean for the measure of Family Environment as perceived by adolescents (N=1008)

Variables	Mean	S. D
COHESION	46.87	4.676
EXPRESSIVENESS	28.40	3.101
CONFLICT	20.73	3.394
ACCEPTANCE AND CARING	40.23	3.879

Descriptive survey method was used.

Sample

A sample of 1008 adolescents studying in 11th and 12th rural and urban schools of 5 districts was selected from Punjab. Simple random sampling technique was used.

Tools used

Psychological well-being scale: Psychological well-being scale by Sisodia and Choudry (2005) consists of 50 statements. It includes five areas with 10 items in each area i.e., satisfaction, efficiency, sociability, mental health and interpersonal relations. The test-retest reliability was 0.87 and the consistency value for the scale is 0.90. The scale was validated against the external criteria and coefficient was 0.94.

Family Environment scale: Family environment scale by Bhatia and Chadha (2012) consists of 69 statements and scored as strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. It has three major dimensions. These are: (1) Relationship dimension (Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, and Acceptance and Caring), (2) Personal growth dimensions (Independence and Active Recreational Orientation), (3) System Maintenance Dimensions (Organization and Control). The overall test reliability coefficient was 0.95.



INDEPENDENCE	26.51	2.996
ACTIVE-RECREATIONAL ORIENTATION	26.25	2.755
ORGANIZATION	6.39	1.514
CONTROL	12.60	1.733

Table 1 depicts that the mean of cohesion is 46.87 and S.D is 4.676. The mean of cohesion comes on average range. The mean of expressiveness is 28.40 and S.D is 3.101. The mean of expressiveness falls under average range. The mean of conflict is 20.73 and S.D is 3.394. The mean of conflict was found on high range. The mean of acceptance and caring is 40.23 and S.D is 3.879 and it comes on average range. The mean of independence is 26.51 and S.D is 2.996. The mean of independence comes

on low level. The mean of active-recreational orientation is 26.25 and S.D is 2.755. The mean of active-recreational orientation falls under average range. The mean of organization is 6.39 and S.D is 1.514 which comes on average range. The mean of control is 12.60 and S.D is 1.733. The mean of control comes on low range.

Objective 2

To find out significant differences in Family Environment as perceived by adolescents with respect to gender.

Table 2 Significant differences in Family Environment as perceived by adolescents with respect to gender

Variables	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Error Difference	t-value	Sig.
Cohesion	Male	518	46.63	.293	1.681	.093
	Female	490	47.12			
Expressiveness	Male	518	28.29	.195	1.143	.253
	Female	490	28.51			
Conflict	Male	518	20.70	.217	.288	.773
	Female	490	20.77			
Acceptance and Caring	Male	518	40.18	.238	.394	.693
	Female	490	40.27			



Independence	Male	518	26.52	.194	.098	.922
	Female	490	26.50			
Active-Recreational Orientation	Male	518	26.22	.180	.308	.758
	Female	490	26.28			
Organization	Male	518	6.44	.095	.984	.325
	Female	490	6.34			
Control	Male	518	12.61	.113	.235	.814
	Female	490	12.58			

Table 2 depicts that the mean of cohesion dimension of family environment of males (N=518) is 46.63 and females (N=490) is 47.12 and S.D. error of mean difference is .293. The mean of expressiveness dimension of family environment of males (N=518) is 28.29 and females (N=490) is 28.51 and S.D. error of mean difference is .195. The mean of conflict dimension of family environment of males (N=518) is 20.70 and females (N=490) is 20.77 and S.D. error of mean difference is .217. The mean of acceptance and caring dimension of family environment of males (N=518) is 40.18 and females (N=490) is 40.27 and S.D. error of mean difference is .238. The mean of independence dimension of family environment of males (N=518) is 26.52 and females (N=490) is 26.50 and S.D. error of mean difference is .194. The mean of active-recreational

orientation dimension of family environment of males (N=518) is 26.22 and females (N=490) is 26.28 and S.D. error of mean difference is .180. The mean of organization dimension of family environment of males (N=518) is 6.44 and females (N=490) is 6.34 and S.D. error of mean difference is .095. The mean of control dimension of family environment of males (N=518) is 12.61 and females (N=490) is 12.58 and S.D. error of mean difference is .113. Hence, the hypothesis stated that “there is no significant difference in family environment among adolescents with respect to gender” is accepted

Objective 3

To find out significant differences in Family Environment as perceived by adolescents with respect to type of institution.

Table 3 Significant differences in Family Environment as perceived by adolescents with respect to type of institution

Variables	Type of Institution	N	Mean	Std. Error Difference	t-value	Sig.
Cohesion	Government	498	46.78	.294	.606	.545



	Private	510	46.95			
Expressiveness	Government	498	28.42	.195	.222	.825
	Private	510	28.38			
Conflict	Government	498	20.81	.217	.656	.512
	Private	510	20.66			
Acceptance and Caring	Government	498	40.37	.238	1.215	.225
	Private	510	40.08			
Independence	Government	498	26.31	.194	2.106	.035
	Private	510	26.72			
Active-Recreational Orientation	Government	498	26.10	.180	1.568	.117
	Private	510	26.39			
Organization	Government	498	6.29	.095	2.079	.038
	Private	510	6.49			
Control	Government	498	12.56	.113	.543	.587
	Private	510	12.63			

5895

Table 3 depicts that the mean of cohesion dimension of family environment of adolescents studying in Government schools (N=498) is 46.78 and Private schools (N=510) is 46.95 and S.D. error of mean difference is .294. The mean of expressiveness dimension of family environment of adolescents studying in Government schools (N=498) is 28.42 and Private schools (N=510) is 28.38 and S.D. error of mean difference is .195. The mean of conflict dimension of family environment of Government school's adolescents (N=498) is

eISSN1303-5150

20.81 and private schools (N=510) is 20.66 and S.D. error of mean difference is .217. The mean of acceptance and caring dimension of family environment of government school's adolescents (N=498) is 40.37 and private school's adolescents (N=510) is 40.08 and S.D error of mean difference is .238. The mean of independence dimension of family environment of government school's adolescents (N=498) is 26.31 and private school's adolescents (N=510) is 26.72 and S. Derror of mean difference is 0.194. The t-value

www.neuroquantology.com



is 2.106 which is significant at 0.05 level. It shows that mean family environment score on psychological well-being scale with respect to type of institution differ significantly. Hence, the hypothesis stated that “there is no significant difference in family environment among adolescent with respect to type of institution” is rejected on independence dimension of family environment. The mean of active recreational orientation dimension of family environment of adolescents studying in government schools (N=498) is 26.10 and private schools(N=510) mean is 26.39 and S.D.error of mean difference is .180. The mean of organization dimension of family environment of government school’s

adolescents (N=498) is 6.29 and private schools(N=510) is 6.49 and S.D. error of mean difference is 0.095. The t-value is 2.079 which is significant at 0.05 level. It shows that mean family environment score on psychological well-being scale with respect to type of institution differ significantly. Hence, the hypothesis stated that “there is no significant difference in family environment among adolescent with respect to type of institution” is rejected on organization dimension of family environment. The mean of control dimension of family environment of adolescents studying in government schools (N=498) is 12.56 and private schools(N=510) mean is 12.63 and S.D. error of mean difference is .113.

Objective 4

To find out significant differences in Family Environment among adolescents with respect to locale.

Table 4 Significant differences in Family Environment among adolescents with respect to locale

Variables	Locale	N	Mean	Std. Error Difference	t-value	Sig.
Cohesion	Rural	462	47.12	.294	1.580	.114
	Urban	546	46.65			
Expressiveness	Rural	462	28.58	.195	1.764	.078
	Urban	546	28.24			
Conflict	Rural	462	20.87	.218	1.197	.232
	Urban	546	20.61			
Acceptance and Caring	Rural	462	40.66	.238	3.36	.001
	Urban	546	39.86			
Independence	Rural	462	26.84	.194	3.058	.002
	Urban	546	26.24			



Active-Recreational Orientation	Rural	462	26.25	.181	.041	.967
	Urban	546	26.24			
Organization	Rural	462	6.44	.095	.856	.392
	Urban	546	6.35			
Control	Rural	462	12.78	.113	3.088	.002
	Urban	546	12.44			

Table 4 depicts that the mean of cohesion dimension of family environment of adolescents residing in rural area (N=462) is 47.12 and urban area (N=546) is 46.65 and S.D. error of mean difference is .294. The mean of expressiveness dimension of family environment of rural adolescents (N=462) is 28.58 and urban adolescents (N=546) is 28.24 and S.D. error of mean difference is .195. The mean of conflict dimension of family environment of rural adolescents (N=462) is 20.87 and urban adolescents (N=546) is 20.61 and S.D. error of mean difference is .218. The mean of acceptance and caring dimension of family environment of rural adolescents (N=462) is 40.66 and urban adolescents (N=546) is 39.86 and S.D. error of mean difference is .238. The t-value is 3.36 which is significant at 0.01 level. It shows that mean family environment score on psychological well-being scale with respect to locale differ significantly. Hence, the hypothesis stated that “there is no significant difference in family environment among adolescent with respect to locale” is rejected on acceptance dimension of family environment. The mean of independence dimension of family environment of rural adolescents (N=462) is 26.84 and urban adolescents (N=546) is 26.24 and S.D. error of mean difference is .194. The t-value is 3.058 which is significant at 0.01 level. It shows that mean family environment score on

psychological well-being scale with respect to locale do not differ significantly. Hence, the hypothesis stated that “there is no significant difference in family environment among adolescent with respect to locale” is rejected on independence dimension of family environment. The mean of active-recreational orientation dimension of family environment of rural adolescents (N=462) is 26.25 and urban adolescents (N=546) is 26.24 and S.D. error of mean difference is .181. The mean of organization dimension of family environment of rural adolescents (N=462) is 6.44 and urban adolescents (N=546) is 6.35 and S.D. error of mean difference is .095. The mean of control dimension of family environment of rural adolescents (N=462) is 12.78 and urban adolescents (N=546) is 12.44 and S.D. error of mean difference is .113. The t-value is 3.088 which is significant at 0.01 level. It shows that mean family environment score on psychological well-being scale with respect to locale do not differ significantly. Hence, the hypothesis stated that “there is no significant difference in family environment among adolescent with respect to locale” is rejected on control dimension of family environment.

Objective 5

To find out significant correlation between Family Environment and Psychological Well-being of adolescents.

5897



Table 5 Correlation of Psychological Well-Being and Family Environment(Including various dimensions) among adolescents

Variables	R	p-value
Cohesion	.032	.311
Expressiveness	.040	.201
Conflict	.045	.157
Acceptance and Caring	.043	.174
Independence	.036	.257
Active-Recreational Orientation	.064	.042
Organization	.017	.590
Control	.025	.425

Table 5 shows that a very low and positive correlation was found between psychological well-being and cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, acceptance and caring, independence, organization, and control dimension of family environment. The correlation value of active-recreational orientation was .064 which is significant at 0.05 level. A positive and very low correlation was also found between psychological well-being and active-recreational orientation dimension of family environment. It shows that the adolescent who are high on active-recreational orientation dimension are also high on psychological well-being.

Discussion and Conclusion:

The present study found that the mean of cohesion, expressiveness, acceptance and caring, active recreational orientation and organization dimensions of family environment falls under average level and mean of conflict dimension of family environment comes on high level. Further, the mean of independence

and control dimensions of family environment comes on lower level. The study also found that males are high on cohesion. They enjoy doing things together. They always take initiative to solve any problem or situation that arises in family. Females are found to be more expressive than males. They can share their emotions more easily than males. They can talk about their personal problems with others. Also, they are more expressive in opinion about matters. Females are also found high on conflict. They are more fault finding in others by nature and they easily lose their temper. Mean scores of males are found high on independence, organization, and control dimensions of family environment. It indicates that males are more independent, organized and more emotionally stable than females. They can make decisions independently. They can ask for what they want quite openly. They are better aware of their responsibilities. They have more control on their families. Mean scores of



females are high on acceptance and caring and active-recreational orientation. It depicts that female more acceptable in nature and they care more than males. They are more expressive in affection. They give more time and attention to others. Females are more involved in social and recreational activities. They are more interacting in nature. They have good relations with neighbors and relatives. Family should provide convenient environment to both males and females. Females should be more independent so that they can fulfill their ambitions. They should be more expressive in their ideas. Males should be expressive in their emotions and feelings. They should also involve in recreational activities. So, family should provide proper resources to their children for their all-round development. Also, private schools are high on cohesion, independence, active-recreational orientation, and organization and caring and control. Private school adolescents are more independent, organized more focused goals of life and participated in activities. Further, government school adolescents are high on expressiveness, conflict, and acceptance and caring. The study depicts that rural school students are high on expressiveness, conflict, acceptance and caring, independence, organization, and control dimensions of family environment. On the other hand, urban adolescents are high on cohesion dimension of family environment. Further, the study also found that positive and very low correlation was found between family environment and psychological well-being. School is also an important part of student's life. So, school should also provide assist for good psychological well-being of adolescents. School should also provide extra co-curricular activities for the refreshment of the mind of students. There should also be more activities so that adolescents could share and express their thoughts, ideas, and emotions. It was also found that there is a positive correlation between psychological well-being and family environment. Positivity in family environment

leads to better psychological well-being. Psychological well-being of adolescents depends upon the functioning of family. As we discussed above about the dimensions of family environment, all the dimensions of family environment affect the psychological well-being. Cohesion, the feeling of togetherness, whenever something needs to be done in the house, if everyone joins in, happily and ideas and suggestions of every member of the house be welcomed then the psychological well-being of adolescents could be improved. Males and females are both should be free to express their feelings, views, and ideas. Females should also have right to make their decisions independently. Both should be aware of their responsibilities. Males should also be expressive in affection and caring. They should also be interacting with others. So, psychological well-being of adolescents could be improved if both of them are able to communicate openly to each other and to share and also accept specific new roles and responsibilities.

References:

- Amalu, M.N. (2017). Family Environment and Self-Esteem as Predictors of Psychological Adjustment of Secondary School Students from Divorced Homes in Cross River State, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (ISOR-JRME)*, 7(6), 9-16. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-0706010916>.
- Antony, M. P. (2015). Role of Self-efficacy and Family Environment in Regulating Psychological Well Being of Adolescents. *International Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(12), 8-14. www.isca.in
- Herke, M., Knöchelmann, A., & Richter, M. (2020). Health and well-being of adolescents in different family structures in germany and the importance of family climate. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(18), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17186470>
- Jamir, T., & Borooah, I. P. (2019). *Relationship between Perceived Parenting Styles and*

5899



Psychological Well-Being of Ao / Naga Adolescents. 6(2), 1–7.

Jeny Rapheal, Deepa. K Damodaran, & Varghese Paul. K. (2014). Influence of Home Environment on Adolescent Psychological Well-being. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.25215/0201.047>

Kaneez, S. (2015). Family Environment and Psychological Well-Being among Adolescents. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6(3), 306–308.

<https://doi.org/10.15614/ijpp/2015/v6i3/147227>

Khodabakhsh, M. R., Kiani, F., & Ahmedbookani, S. (2014). Psychological Wellbeing and Parenting styles as predictors of mental health. *International Journal of Pediatrics*, 2(9), 39–46.

Marikutty, P. J. (2016). *Guru Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences Impact of Parenting Style on the Psychological Well-Being of Adolescents.* 4(1), 549–559.

Mohan, A., & Priya, V. (2020). Self esteem and peer group relationship of adolescent children in single parent families. *Medico-Legal Update*, 20(3), 339–343. <https://doi.org/10.37506/mlu.v20i3.1419>

Sbicigo, J.B., & Dell’Aglia, D.D. (2012). Family environment and psychological adaptation In adolescents. *Psicologia: Reflexao e Critica*, 25(3), 615-622. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-79722012000300022>.

Kaur, J. (2013). Home Environment as a predictor of Psychological Well-Being among Adolescents. *International Journal of Education and Psychology in the Community*, 3(1), 22-33.

Cadena, Rubia., Diaz., Rodriguez., Reyes., & Rosales (2014). Effect of family strength over the Psychological well-being and Internal locus of control. *Journal of Behavior, Health & Social Issues*, 5(2), 33-46.

Lavasani, M.G., Borhazadeh, S., Afzali, L., & Hejazi, E. (2011). The relationship between perceived parenting styles, social support with psychological well-being. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences.* 15(2011), 1852-1856.

Gobind, V., & Manju (2020). Family environment and personality as predictors of psychological well-being. *Shodhsanchar Bulletin*, 10(38), 24-28.

Hooja, H.R., & Shaktawat, P. (2017). The role of Home Environment and Achievement Motivation on Psychological Well-Being among school going children. *Indian Journal of Health and Well-Being.*

Stanescu, D.F., & Romer, G. (2011). Family Functioning and Adolescents’ Psychological Well-Being in Families with TBI Parent. *Psychology*, 2(7), 681-686. <http://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2011.27104>.

Kassa, E.Y., & Rao, T.V. A. (2019). Parenting Styles and Psychological Well-Being: The mediating Role of Academic Achievement. *Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education.* 16(1), 28-36(9). <http://ignited.in/p/58393>.

Wahyuningsih, H., Kusumaningrum, F.A., & Novitasari, R. (2020). Parental Marital Quality and Adolescent Psychological Well-Being: A meta-analysis. *Cogent Psychology.* 7:1, 1819005, <http://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2020.1819005>.

Farsani, Z.K., Kelishadi, R., & Beshlideh, K. (2020). Study the effect of Family Communication and Function, and Satisfaction with Body Image, on Psychological Well-Being of Obese Girls: The Mediating role of Self-esteem and Depression. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Ment Health.* 14(39), 1-10. <https://doi.org?10.1186/s13034-020-00345-3>.

Pappa, V.S. (2013). Relationships between Parents’ Marital Status and the Psychological Well-Being of Adolescents. *Journal of Psychology & Psychotherapy.* Doi:10.4172/2161-0487.1000110.

