Impact Of Home Environment And Peer Group Influence On Psychosocial Competence Of Adolescents

Thirupathi Naik Bukya[1] , Dr. Sylvia Fernandez Rao[2]

[1]*Research scholar Department of Psychology, OSMANIA UNIVERSITY, Hyderabad Telangana state, India.*
[2]*Scientist E NIN HYDERABAD, INDIA.*

ABSTRACT :

153 students in the upper secondary grades were chosen at random from five different schools in the state of Telangana to conduct an analysis of the ways in which the home environment influenced different elements of teenagers' psychological well-being. When the data from the psychological well-being scale and the home environment inventory were analysed, they showed a strong association between their respective subscales. Multiple regression analyses revealed that negative HE mostly influenced teenagers' levels of "sociability" and "interpersonal relationships." The "satisfaction", "sociability," and "interpersonal interaction" elements of psychological well-being were significantly predicted by discipline-specific characteristics. In contrast, all five facets of psychological well-being showed a substantial prediction potential for Positive HE factors. Demographic factors have no discernible impact on psychological health. These discoveries concerning the delicate environmental routes into the psychological well-being of teenagers will be useful for counsellors, parents, teachers, and other caregivers.

1. INTRODUCTION

The new century has seen a rise in importance for ecological viewpoints designed to outline delicate routes into people's psychological wellbeing. And this is especially true for a developmental stage that is in transition, such as adolescence. Adolescent population is growing increasingly susceptible to the intricacies of their social surroundings in the worldwide world Culturally established standards of living are rapidly deteriorating as an identity crisis often threatens their psychological disequilibrium.This often deprives the guardians of the next generation of a solid, long-lasting basis from which to determine what constituted the ideal setting for the psychological wellbeing of teenagers. In addition, new study findings continue to support the idea that teens' psychological disorders have a clear environmental cause that is related to how well those environments support those objectives for growth.

The definition of mental health has had to change in light of recent discoveries in positive psychology. As per the World Health Organization, it is at present characterized as "a condition of prosperity where an individual knows about their own gifts, ready to deal with the typical requests of life, work effectively and beneficially, and add to their local area" (WHO, 2001).Additionally, an increasing number of long-term research demonstrate the effectiveness of psychological well-being measures in predicting outcomes such as lifespan, actual wellbeing, personal satisfaction, criminal lead, medication and liquor use, work, income, and favorable to social way of behaving (WHO report, Freidli 2009, p.2). Considering these discoveries, safeguarding the mental strength of youths is a sociopsychological need. Greatest

scholastic capability, social skill and backing, and actual wellbeingare all related to psychological well-being in teenagers, which is defined as feeling a wide range of happy emotions and being content with life. Psychopathology is also not present (Jessica & Savage, 2011). In a broad sense, it is a desirable social and political goal to assess and promote teenage well-being. (2009) (Diener, Lucas, Schimmack, & Helliwell; Vazquez).

The ecological approach developed by Bronfenbrenner & Morris (1998) becomes clear when the theoretical presentations addressing the mechanism behind the interactional effect of home environment (HE) on psychological well-being are compiled. This approach seeks to understand the interactions between developing individuals, developmental contexts, and processes that underlie development (PW).The concept of family systems theory (Minuchin 2002) has increased understanding of the connections and reciprocal impacts among various family subsystems. Family, religion, and ethnicity in particular have been noted as significant contributors of wellbeing (Motkal Abu-Rayya, 2006; Lim & Putnam, 2010). Bowlby's (1988) attachment theory places a strong emphasis on caregiver experiences, which are likely to affect how individuals see the world and have a long-lasting impact on development, including individual variances in life satisfaction. The optimum uniqueness hypothesis looked at happiness within a group environment (ODT; Brewer, 1991, 1993). This idea builds on social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, &Wetherall, 1987), which discuss how an individual's sense of self develops as a result. belonging to a certain group. According to Bandura's (1986, 1997, 2001) social cognitive theory, people are both products and makers of the contexts in which they live. The social determination theory is the most well-known of

these perspectives; it posits that happiness results from the optimal functioning of an individual's mind at the point when their fundamental requirements for relatedness, skill, and independence are met, and when an arrangement of consistent and cognizant objectives is laid out (Dec i& Ryan, 2000). Three of Ryff's aspects of psychological well-being correspond to these fundamental psychological demands (Lent,2003). According to Baumeister and Leary (1995), satisfying a psychological need results in "deep inner feeling of wholeness, vigour, and psychological flexibility" (Ryan & al., 1995) This theory makes an effort to explain the psychological mechanisms by which people desire autonomy and self-expression in the setting of interpersonal interactions.

Five factors—life satisfaction, effectiveness, interpersonal connections, sociability, and mental health—were used to assess the participants' well-being in the present study. The research provides abundant support for the assumption that each of these aspects of mental health is impacted by one's immediate surroundings, and in the case of adolescents, this includes their homes and the parenting style used there. Life fulfillment is a judgment cycle in which people survey the nature of an individual's life as per determined measures; it is affected by factors such as family structure (Demo &Acock, 1996; Zullig, Valois, Huebner, &Drane, 2005) and parenting style (Pavot& Diener, 1993). Petito and Cummins (2000), Suldo and Huebner (2004)b.Comparing family relationships to peers, schools, and environments, Suldo and Huebner (2006) found that they had the strongest link with life satisfaction).

Interpersonal relationships are yet another important component of psychological health. Sine (1998) observed that children who benefited from authoritative parenting methods shown more warmth, had higher emotional regulation, and developed trust in both others and

themselves than their counterparts who had been raised in authoritarian or permissive contexts. Family connections have been shown to be critical for the quality of peer relationships, and dysfunctional family functioning has been shown to predict poor quality of future intimate relationships (Albers et al., 2004). (Kerns, Klepac& Cole, 1996).According to attachment theory, a person's capacity to create and sustain subsequent good connections with other people is causally related to their early experiences with their parents (Bowlby, 1989).

It is possible to understand the academic growth of teenage life as the "efficiency," a metric of mental health that may be defined as "the comparison of what is actually created or completed with what may be obtained."The family environment has a big impact here too, and parenting was a big focus of the earlier research. Adolescent academic performance is encouraged by parental participation and a strict home environment (Steinberg et al. 1992). According to Sarada Devi and Kavita Kiran's findings from 2002, there is a strong correlation between familial variables and academic underachievement. Latha (2005) found that both academic success and home adjustment seemed to be influenced by family environment. Environmental stresses generally have the potential to have an impact on pupils' cognitive abilities, including their ability to focus and remember things (Fisher, 1994).

The family's socialisation strategies and practises have an impact on "sociability," a measure of how well teenagers are doing in their social lives, which is described as "the inclination for being in the organization of others over being separated from everyone else"(Cheek & Buss, 1981). It has been shown that bettering connections and increasing communication between parents and adolescents are excellent ways to favourably impact adolescent social development (Hair, Jager, & Garrett, 2001).

Home life has an effect on a person's emotional and social development (Kaur &Kalaramna 2004). Children who grow up in stable, supportive households are said to have a leg up on their peers socially and emotionally (Rani 1998).

Research on "mental health" shows that fewer than half of the risk factors for mental health problems are hereditary (More et al., 2013), indicating that environmental variables have a greater effect on adolescent mental health than learnt ones. O'Connell et al. (2009) identify a number of risk factors in one's environment that might lead to teenage mental illness. These include a turbulent home life, parental conflict or divorce, parental mental illness, abuse, and social problems at school. Researchers have found that adolescents benefit from parent-adolescent relationships, good parenting skills, shared family activities, and positive parental role models (Hare, Moore, Garrett, Kinokawa, Lipman, & Michelson, 2005; Parker, Benson, & Resnick, 2004). ; IRE , Borowski and Ireland, 2004).As a result, environmental dynamics and mental health are intricately linked.

The current research assesses environmental characteristics that are important for the general psychological health of the teenage group, but it also looks at the pattern of how the home environment affects psychological health. Our focus was on how diverse indices of psychological well-being differed in their contributions from home contextual factors. We anticipate that such an analysis will have a significant impact on the area of psychotherapy and counselling for teenagers who are experiencing different psychological abnormalities. Parents, other caregivers, therapists, and counsellors now have a new frame of reference for diagnosing problems and choosing the best intervention tactics because they are aware of the far-reaching effects that various adult-adopted disciplinary and

socialisingpractises have on the psychological wellbeing of adolescents. Our interest in the following goals sprang from this goal.

1) What aspects of the home's psychological environment influenced the psychological health of teenagers as a whole?

2) Which aspects of the home environment of adolescents—life satisfaction, sociability, interpersonal interactions, mental health, and productivity—were relevant in each of these areas of psychological well-being?

3) Which elements of teenagers' psychological health were most impacted by the disciplinary HE factors, "control," "compliance," and "protectiveness"?

4) Which areas of teenagers' psychological health were most impacted by a poor family environment?

5) What aspects of teenagers' psychological health were most influenced by a healthy family environment?

METHOD

Participants

The sample was made up of 153 teenagers who were chosen from two private (N=51), two aided (N=64), and one government (N=38) schools in Telangana's   STATE HYDERABADdistrict. There were 67 females and 86 guys. Participants' average age was 15.84.

Instruments

1. Home Environment Inventory (HEI): Karuna Shankar Mishra developed the system. It has ten subscales, which are A-Control, B-Protectiveness, C- Punishment, D-Conformity, E-Social Isolation, F-Reward, G-Deprivation of privileges, H-Nurturance, I-Rejection, and J-Permissiveness. Each subscale on the Likert

scale, which has five points, has ten questions and is primarily used to gauge how children view the psycho-social environment at home. High substance and validity in relation to criteria are both claimed by HEI. A-.879, B-.748, C-.947, D-.866, E-.870, F-875, G-.855, H-.901, I-.841, and J-.726 are the established reliability coefficients for each dimension, accordingly.

2. Psychological Well-Being Scale: Built by Devendra Sing The psychological well-being of pupils was estimated using Sisodia. It is a 5-point Likert scale that measures psychological well-being along five dimensions, including satisfaction, efficiency, sociability, mental health, and interpersonal relationships. According to the responses, there were five different categories: "strongly agree," "agree," "not sure," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." Internal consistency is.90 and test-retest reliability is.87 for this substance. Additionally, scale promises good content validity. The validity coefficient as measured by outside standards is.94. There are 50 things in it. Each subscale has ten elements.

Procedure

Students, parents, and school administration all provided informed consent. The Home Environment Inventory by Karuna Shankar Mishra and the Psychological Well-Being Scale by Devendra nath Sisodia were immediately handed to the pupils after a short explanation of the study's objectives. Students received a short explanation of the nature of replying, and their questions were explained at each stage.

RESULTS

Nearly all dimensions of psychological wellbeing were significantly correlated with the Home Environment factors. Age, kind of school, location of residence, religion, and birth order are demographic factors, however none of these factors had any effect on psychological well-being or its components (table:2, table:3).

Multiple regression demonstrated disciplinary characteristics such control, compliance, and protectiveness had a substantial predictive capacity for components of PW's contentment, sociability, and interpersonal relationships (table:4). Negative home environments mostly have a negative impact on sociability and interpersonal interactions. However, all five indicators of psychological well-being were significantly improved by factors related to the home environment. Influence of "nurture" and "reward" was notably substantial among them.

Table:1 Correlation Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Satisfaction	.15*	.25***	.14*	.07	-.04	.21**	-.01	.21**	-.11	.01
Efficiency	.09	.04	.08	.19**	-.05	.41***	.07	.27***	-.02	.18**
Sociability	.14*	.32***	.21**	.31***	.03	.43***	-.01	.34***	.02	.01
M Health	.15*	.02	.07	.09	-.01	.23**	.01	.17*	-.11	.004
In Relation	.13*	.23	.05	.13*	-.18**	.49***	-.13*	.48***	-.21**	-.07
PW	.17*	.23**	.11	.24**	-.09	.49***	-.02	.42***	-.12	.06

A-control, B-protectiveness, C-punishment, D-conformity, E-isolation, F-reward, G-deprivation of privileges, H-nurturance, I-rejection, J-permissiveness, PW-psychological well-being.
$*P<.05, **P<.01, ***P<.001, ****P<.0001$

Table:2 ANOVA Summary for PW   **Table:3 t-test Results for PW**

Independent variables	Mean (PW)	Df	F	P		Independent variables	Mean (PW)	SD	Df	T
Christian Hindu Muslim	189.59	2 (150)	.3800	.685		Boys Girls	188.77	18.13	151	.65
	190.64						190.71	18.43		
	186.83					Rural	189.75	16.74	151	.109
Aided Govt Private	189	2(150)	.0616	.9402		Urban	189.43	20.06		
	190.16					*W-Mother	190.88	17.61	151	.441
	189.96					**H-Mother	189.27	18.44		
Eldest	188.64	2(150)	.5797	.561		Single	189.42	18.11	151	.3850
In-between	186.71					Not-single	191.33	19.83		
Youngest	191.38					*Working **House wife				

Table:4 Multiple Regression Summary

Dependent Variable		R²	Df	F	Beta loadings		
Group1 A,B,D	Satisfaction	.068	3(149)	3.625**	A=.04,	B=.24**,	D=-.02
	Efficiency	.037	3(149)	1.934	A=.05,	B=-.04,	D=.19*
	Sociability	.152	3(149)	8.872****	A=-.05,	B=.27**,	D=.24**
	Mental health	.027	3(149)	1.393	A=.16,	B=-.07,	D=.06
	Inter-Relations	.111	3(149)	6.192***	A=-.03,	B=.24**,	D=.19*
Group2. C,EGI	Satisfaction	.054	4(148)	2.12	C=.24, I=-.15	E=-.16,	G=.06,
	Efficiency	.041	4(148)	1.569	C=.17 I=-.05	E=-.25*	G=.21
	Sociability	.063	4(148)	2.417*	C=.30** I=.03	E=-.06	G=-.13
	Mental health	.025	4(148)	.943	C=.10 I=-.16	E=-.05	G=.08
	Inter-Relations	.093	4(148)	3.798**	C=.24** I=-.18	E=-.26*	G=.02
Group 3. FHJ	Satisfaction	.054	3(149)	2.854*	F=.13 H=.13		J=-.002
	Efficiency	.139	3(149)	11.861*** *	F=.41**** H=-.01		J=.17*
	Sociability	.194	3(149)	11.926*** *	F=.36**** H=.11		J=-.01
	Mental health	.054	3(149)	2.820*	F=.21* H=.03		J=-.00
	Inter Relations	.296	3(149)	20.884*** *	F=.30*** H=.30***		J=-.11

A-control, B-protectiveness, C-punishment, D-conformity, E-isolation, F-reward, G-deprivation of privileges, H-nurturance, I-rejection, J-permissiveness. *P<.05, **P<.01, ***P<.001, ****P<.0001

DISCUSSIONS

Teenagers' subjective home environments and its impact on their psychological health cannot be completely disregarded. Correlation test results that show a significant relationship between HE factors and PW indicate this (Table1). Favorable HE factors, as anticipated, were more important in enhancing the positive effect. The extremely strong link between "nurture" and "reward" and psychological wellness shows the need of an environment that is positively charged to assure teenagers' psychological wellbeing.

According to regression analysis, the three HE variables "control (A)", "compliance (B)", and "protectiveness (D)" that make up the family's disciplinary environment exhibited the biggest F-changes in "sociability" ($R2 =.15$, $F=8.872$, $P.001$) and "interpersonal interactions" ($R2 =.11$, $F=6.19$, $P.001$) (table:4). The largest beta-loading of these three HE variables was for "protectiveness," demonstrating a substantial capacity to predict "sociability" ($=.27$, $p.01$). Additionally, there were moderately strong and significant positive connections between "control" and life satisfaction ($r=.15$, $p.05$), sociability ($r=.14$, $P.05$), and mental health ($r=.15$, $p.05$). Later was more pronounced in the associations of "protectiveness" with contentment ($r=.25$, $p.001$) and sociability ($r=.32$, $p.001$). Additionally, "conformity" showed a favourable correlation with sociability ($r=.31$, $P.000$), interpersonal interactions ($r=.13$, $P.05$), and efficiency ($r=.19$, $P.01$), with sociability showing the strongest correlation. In other words, these disciplinary factors mostly had a positive impact on teenagers' social lives and helped to improve wellbeing generally. Teenagers may have a more tangible frame of reference for adopting more practical norms of behaviour, particularly in group situations, if there is a culture that values conformity and control. The improvement of sociability and interpersonal relationships may result from their being better equipped to deal equitably with the demands of

the circumstance. The observed outcome, however, supports the idea that parental supervision has always been linked to improved teenage adjustment (Lamborn et al. 1996, Pettit et al.2001). Overall, this reflects the 'collective' culture found in Indian family systems, in contrast to the 'individualist' cultures prevalent in the West, where the values and standards of the elderly and their caregivers are supported and promoted, and where there is little room for the pursuit of one's unique identity.Finally, it supports the findings of the earlier research that integrating the self into collectives may either improve or harm one's well-being (Bettencourt &Dorr, 1997; Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, &Broadnax, 1994; Suh, Oishi, Diener, &Triandis, 1998).

Teenagers' interpersonal relationships are mostly affected by more severe negative discipline methods including punishment (C), rejection (I), social exclusion (E), and privilege deprivation that lead to an unfavourable, maybe pathological atmosphere in HE. Only the three variables "Isolation" (E) ($r=-18$, $P,.01$), "rejection" (I) ($r=-.21$, $P,.01$), and "deprivation of privileges" ($r=-.13$, $P,.05$) revealed a significant negative connection with interpersonal interaction (table:1). They had no impact on PW's other features. Discipline via "punishment" (negative reinforcement) demonstrated a strong positive link with life satisfaction ($r=.14$, $P.05$) and sociability ($r=.21$, $P.01$), much like it did with compliance and control. Interpersonal relations showed a substantial F-change in the multiple regression analysis for these negative HE factors ($R2 =.093$, $F=3.796$, $p.01$), while "sociability" level only showed a marginally significant F-change ($R2 =.06$, $F=2.42$, $P,.05$). The largest loading in "Isolation" of the negative HE was in interpersonal contacts ($=-.26$, $p.05$), and the same in sociability was not significant (table:4). This demonstrates how poor HE factors may have a bad impact on one's capacity to build

relationships of security and trust, which will unquestionably be detrimental to one's overall wellbeing. Additionally, one of the main developmental objectives for teenagers is to build positive interpersonal relationships with others. According to self determination theory, a negative HE often impedes the fulfilment of fundamental psychological needs such as "autonomy, competence, and closeness," which may disrupt the appropriate dynamics underlying the development of strong interpersonal relationships. External punishment decreases autonomy throughout the continuum of self-determination, making the kid less self-determined. (Deci et al., 2001; Deci, Koestner et al., 1999; Deci, Eghrari, Patrick et al., 1994) It is thought that a supportive setting that satisfies fundamental psychological requirements promotes psychological wellbeing (Ryan & al., 1995).

There is no denying the benefits of living in a positive environment for psychological health. Nearly all aspects of PW have an extremely substantial positive link with a "rewarding" environment (Table:1). Efficiency (r=.41, p.000) and interpersonal interactions (r=.49, P.000) had the largest associations with "reward," respectively. From the perspective of academics, the role of rewards in "efficiency" is crucial since "efficiency" throughout the teenage years primarily refers to academic success. This may be interpreted in terms of the following data from prior research, which indicated a substantial association between academic success and self-concept (Saraswat 1982; Desai and Uchat 1983; Panwar1986; Lyon1993; Kobal and Musek 2001; Trautwein et al. 2006 and Tracy 2007). Self-concept serves as a mediating factor between the family environment and academic success. Home environment was discovered to be impacting the self idea in some manner by Hattie (1984). (Revicki 1981; Lau 1995; Massey 1999; Lau and Kwok 2000 and Foluke-Henderson 2007). A

gratifying environment is probably going to help teenagers develop a positive, realistic self-concept, which may later show up in their degree of "efficiency." Another positive HE variable called "permissiveness" shown a strong influence only on the "efficiency" component of PW (r=.18, p.01) (table:1). Almost all of the PW components showed a substantial association with "nurture." The strongest association was seen in the area of interpersonal relationships. Interpersonal relations had the highest and most significant F-change for the positive HE variables (R2 =.296, F=20.884, P.000) (table:4), and beta-loadings for "nurture" (=.30, P.001) and "reward" (=.30, P.001) in it were similarly high and significant. A household devoid of these good traits may unintentionally or intentionally be sowing the seeds of psychopathology, given the vital role that positive HE plays in every area of PW. This assertion is supported by the finding that the "mental health" of the chosen sample was significantly influenced by just the positive HE factors "reward" and "nurture" (table:1, see picture).

CONCLUSION & IMPLICATIONS

The aforementioned finding indicates the ideal criteria for identifying the environment type really required for teenage psychological wellbeing. According to the research, an adolescent's psychological health is totally determined by the subjective environment of the household, of which he or she is a member. And the primary element that contributes to their psychological well-being is the positivity of the family environment. As long as there are no severe forms of discipline, such as social isolation and rejection, discipline via control, compliance, etc., does not necessarily endanger psychological well-being but instead promotes it.

Adolescent psychological distress concerns must be addressed, but focusing more on their psychological health provides

advantages for research on mental health as well. Positive psychotherapy is a novel psychological approach that has recently gained popularity (Nossart, 1968), and it is highly encouraging from a practical standpoint. But all of these initiatives should leave enough room to investigate the surroundings, particularly the family environment of teenagers, and find any hidden obstacles that stand in the way of their psychological well-being.

REFERENCE

1. Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

2. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.

. Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. Psychological Bulletin, 117, 497–529.

4. Bettencourt, B. A., & Dorr, N. (1997). Collective self-esteem as a mediator of the relationship between all centrism and subjective well- being. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23, 963–972.

5. Bowlby, J. (1988). A secure base: Clinical applications of attachment theory. London: Tavistock.

6. Brewer,M. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17, 475–482.

7. Brewer, M. (1993a). The role of distinctiveness in social identity and group behavior. In M. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), Group motivation: Social psychological perspectives (pp. 1– 16).London: Harvester Wheat sheaf.

8. Brewer,M. (1993b). Social identity, distinctiveness, and in-group homogeneity. Social Cognition,11, 150–164

9. Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P.A. (1998). The ecology of developmental process. In Handbook of Child Psychology, Theoretical Models of Human Development, ed. W Damon, RM Lerner, 1:993–1028. New York: Wiley. 5thed.

10. Crocker, K., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among White, Black, and Asian college students. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 503–513.

11. Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1981).Shyness and sociability. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 330–339Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum.

12. Deci, E. L., &Ryan, R. M. (1991).Amotivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation: Vol. 38, Perspectives on motivation (pp. 237–288). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.