International Research Journal of MMC (IRJMMC)
ISSN 2717-4999 (Online) | 2717-4980 (Print)
Volume 6, Issue 1 | March 2025

Family Dynamics and Student Well-Being: A Quantitative Study

Namrata Bhattarai[1] | Punam Bhattarai[2]

[1]Lecturer, Department of Social Work
Girija Prasad Koirala Memorial (Community) College Chabhil, Kathmandu

[2]BIM Student at Kantipur college of Information Technology, Tribhuvan University
Email: leopunam10@gmail.com

Corresponding Author
Namrata Bhattarai
Email: bhattarainamrata9@gmail.com

To Cite this article: Bhattarai, N., & Bhattarai, P (2025). Family dynamics and student well-being: A quantitative study. *International Research Journal of MMC*, *6*(1), 68–84. https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v6i1.77486

Submitted: 14 January 2025 **Accepted:** 3 February 2025 **Published:** 31 March 2025

Abstract

Family dynamics play a crucial role in shaping individual well-being. This study examines the connection between family structure and well-being, focusing on life satisfaction relationships, financial stability, community support, life satisfaction, meaning and purpose, and general well-being. A cross-sectional survey was conducted of age group 18-25 among 565 students in Kathmandu Valley using opportunity based purposive sampling. Family structure and well-being were assessed using the Adult Wellbeing Questionnaire (24 items). Descriptive and inferential statistics, including Welch's t-test and ANOVA with Games-Howell post hoc analysis, were employed. Single-parent families reported the highest well-being across multiple domains, whereas blended/stepfamilies had the lowest. Significant differences were found in life satisfaction ($p = .005$), physical/mental health ($p = .005$), overall well-being ($p = .002$), social support ($p = .009$), meaning/purpose ($p = .013$), and positive/negative affect ($p = .016$). Character/caring ($p = .121$) and relationships ($p = .052$) were non-significant. Findings highlight the impact of family structure on well-being, emphasizing the need for targeted interventions for children in blended/stepfamilies. Future research should explore underlying mechanisms and develop support strategies to promote well-being and positive development across diverse family types.

Keywords: parenting, mental health, life satisfaction, family structure, student well-being

1. Introduction

There are different definitions of family, and cultural, social, and individual viewpoints can all affect what family means. A group of people who are related by blood, marriage, adoption, or a committed partnership are generally referred to as family. Families give people a feeling of support, identification, and belonging. The most fundamental and important social unit is the family, this is a microsocial institution (Bhasin, 2016). Family dynamics refer to the patterns of relationships and interactions among family members, shaped by various factors such as family arrangements, hierarchies, rules, and behavioral patterns. These dynamics are unique to each family and can be both beneficial and detrimental. Positive family dynamics foster healthy development, while negative dynamics can lead to challenges in self-perception, relationships, and behaviors. Ultimately, the quality of family dynamics plays a significant role in shaping a young person's worldview and their overall well-being (Ubaidi, 2017) According to diverse individualistic and collectivistic cultures, parenting research is still developing in academia, with a variety of theoretical and research approaches being used. Many young people are creating new paths, particularly in entrepreneurship and informal economies. This shift calls for an evolution in our understanding of adulthood to better reflect changing societal dynamics. As noted, "waithood' 'need to adapt education and employment policies to support a wider range of life and career trajectories" (UNDP, 2024). These changes are crucial for preparing young people for the future. UNICEF Innocenti's Global Office of Research and Foresight prioritizes mental health and well-being by exploring the social determinants that impact children's development, identifying risk and protective factors at different stages of their lives. Through research and the mapping of psychosocial interventions, they aim to improve overall child well-being.

Erikson's (1963, 1968) in psychosocial development theory of identity offers essential view for understanding development of personality as individuals grow from puberty to adulthood. He points out the need to reconcile childhood experiences with future objectives to achieve a sense of continuity and self-coherence. Emerging adulthood, which spans the late teens to mid-20s, connects Erikson's "Identity vs. Role Confusion" stage in adolescence with the "Intimacy vs. Isolation" stage in young adulthood. This stage is marked by exploration—of careers, relationships, and personal values—guided by individual ambitions and societal expectations. Family plays a crucial role during this phase by providing emotional support, stability, wellbeing and resilience as emerging adults seek independence and self-definition, which shapes ability to form fruitful external relationships, as values and relational skills learned within the family serve as a foundation. In adulthood, Erikson presents the importance of making recognized socially and fulfilling personal choices, such as career paths and ideological commitments, with family continuing to serve as a root for confidence, continuity, and personal growth. Arnett (2007) defines emerging adulthood as a distinct period in the life course, in industrialized societies, spanning from the late teens to the late 20s, phase is characterized by both positive experiences and developmental challenges, with a great deal of differences in how individuals experience it. While generally seen as a time of growth, emerging adulthood also presents difficulties for some, and its impact on society is viewed as a "mixed blessing."

Emerging adulthood, as described by Baggio et al. (2017), is a transitional life between adolescence and full adulthood, typically occurring in individuals aged 18 to 25. In this period, young adults experience crucial psychological changes, such as "identity exploration" and "negativity," which are more closely related to their overall psychosocial well-being than traditional markers of adulthood, like financial independence or stable relationships. The authors ensure that emerging adulthood should be assessed by focusing on these psychological states, as they are essential for identifying vulnerable individuals in this phase of life.

Wright and Von (2024) notice a great change in a career, marriage, and parenthood, out of reach for many young people but these are increasingly delayed and it's a phase of adulthood today. These expectations, values and reality can negatively affect mental health and well-being. Embracing Positive view of adulthood can help young adults adapt and thrive. Redefining success beyond traditional milestones supports resilience, fulfillment, and healthy psychological growth. Well-being is strongly linked to factors young adults can control, such as relational maturity—building equal relationships with parents and being considerate of others. Conversely, traditional achievements like settling into a career, which are harder to attain, have less impact on well-being. Emerging adults' journey are more challenging for females than males.

Sharon (2016) claimed that the EPOCH Measure of Adolescent Well-Being, a 20-item test created to evaluate five positive psychological traits—engagement, perseverance, optimism, connectedness, and happiness—were first presented by Kern et al. (2016). The measure, which was created through ten trials teenagers from Australia and the United States, showed good psychometric reliability, predictive validity, and internal consistency. It emphasizes how crucial it is to cultivate these qualities to support teenage wellbeing and long-term favorable results, with a focus on the role that social ties and family play in building optimism and tenacity. Although encouraging, more study is required to confirm its application across a variety of demographics and investigate its long-term prognostic ability. The EPOCH measure offers a useful framework for comprehending positive psychological functioning in teenagers by tying well-being theory and empirical testing together. This instrument offers useful ramifications for family-centered treatments meant to improve the growth and welfare of youth. Awareness about a child's education and overall well-being is crucial for their growth and development, especially in disadvantaged communities. Bhattrai (2023) parental awareness plays a key role in shaping children's opportunities, as informed parents are more likely to support learning at home and engage with schools. Lack of awareness can lead to disengagement, limiting children's access to quality education and essential resources.

1.2 Research objective

i. To analyze the influence of diverse family structures on the well-being of students.

1.3 Rational of the study

Analyzing how various family configurations affect students' well-being within the Nepali environment is the aim of this study. Previous studies have shown that family dynamics, such as parental involvement and family stability, have a major impact on

children's behavioral and cognitive development (Hofferth 2006; Fomby & Cherlin 2007). This study aims to investigate whether comparable influences are seen in Nepal, even though previous studies mostly focus on Western societies, minimum research can be found in context of Nepal. In order to better understand how family circumstances, influence young people's overall development within Nepal's distinct cultural and socioeconomic framework, this research concentrate on student well-being.

2. Literature Review:

2.1 Gender Transition and Well-being

Bergman and Scott (2001) state that past worries, self-confidence, self-efficacy, happiness, are more interconnected for girls than boys, adolescent girls might experience a negative feedback loop, where small things, like school grades or social morality, can lead to a thought of negativity. Surprisingly, both boys' and girls' impact on well-being equally, age was positively linked to girls' unhappiness and past worries, but not to self-esteem or self-efficacy for either gender. lack of connection be due to the narrow age range of the sample. Overall, it shows complex ways in which these factors interact, especially for adolescent girls. Bhattrai (2024) study found that responsive parenting and autonomy granting significantly enhance resilience, whereas demandingness has little effect. Minimal gender differences were observed, with males reporting slightly greater autonomy than females. These findings highlight the importance of fostering supportive and autonomy-promoting parenting to build resilience in young adults.

Even after adjusting for positive feelings, Yurkewicz and Kashdan (2008) point out that thankfulness has an impact on students' well-being and is associated with pleasant emotions, life satisfaction, optimism, social support, and prosocial character. Gratitude was adversely correlated with physical problems, although it was unrelated to negative emotions. The relationship between improved physical health and thankfulness was significantly influenced by relational fulfillment. Additionally, there was a high correlation between gratitude and sentiments of inspiration, hope, and pride. It's interesting to note that boys appeared to benefit socially more from appreciation than girls did, particularly when it came to supporting their families. The paper talks about its advantages, disadvantages, and possible applications in fostering thankfulness. importance of shifting focus from solely mental illness to also exploring positive mental health to promote well-being. It suggests the need for more longitudinal research to better understand the factors contributing to mental health, especially considering age and gender differences. Singh, Bassi, Junnarkar, and Negri, (2015) assert that Intervention strategies, particularly targeting older adolescents and boys, could benefit from well-being therapy and positive education programs. The study also advocates for further research on culture-specific resources that contribute to a flourishing society.

2.2 Family Structure and Student Mental Health

There was no significant correlation between maternal well-being and the degree of impairment. Nonetheless, both separately and in combination, reported stress and perceived social support were highly predictive of mother well-being. According to the study, social support moderately mitigates the negative effects of stress on wellbeing. Although it cannot

definitively say whether social support mitigates the effects of stress or directly affects well-being, the results support both theories. Service providers should make sure mothers have access to enough social support by employing tactics like involving extended family, offering information in a variety of formats, and keeping a family-centered approach. (Skok & Reddihough, 2006). Hatch et al. (2010) affirm that early-life predictors contribute to both poor psychosocial functioning and mental ill-health. Individual and social contextual factors in early life provide insights into why the absence of psychological distress does not necessarily equate to optimal mental health or social functioning. Future younger adults were more inclined to focus, while older adults tended to concentrate on the past. This difference in focus suggests a shift in perspective with age. Younger individuals prioritize future goals and aspirations, while older individuals reflect more on past experiences. These patterns find how time orientation varies across the lifespan. (Webster and Ma, 2013) According to Sigfusdottir et al. (2017), stress has multiple levels—societal, psychological, and biological—each of which has a distinct impact on well-being. As a result, a comprehensive, interdisciplinary approach that integrates biological, psychological, and social contexts through longitudinal studies is recommended. This research links stress to poor health and harmful behavior among children and adolescents. Such studies ought to evaluate stress across developmental stages and take prenatal influences into account. Emphasis is placed on the mediating and moderating impacts of social-environmental predictors on behavioral, emotional, and physiological outcomes. The ultimate goal of this strategy is to provide guidance for efficient interventions that lessen the negative effects of stress on adolescents. To comprehend and lessen the cumulative consequences of stress on teenage well-being, multidisciplinary research and complete frameworks are essential.

2.3 Parental Involvement and Family Dynamics in Youth Well-being

Piaget (2008) asserts that formal thinking skills, which are developed between the ages of 12 and 15, enable teenagers to think hypothetically and abstractly. These abilities can differ based on culture and personal interests, so it's critical to assess them in domains that are relevant to their hobbies or occupations. Though it can help us understand how previous phases of development occur, studying young adults is more difficult than studying children or teens. Additionally, studies on young adults offer fresh perspectives on childhood and adolescence. Different people develop at different rates, depending on their culture, professional interests, and personal qualities.

Global health concern, elevated body mass index is influenced by both environmental and hereditary factors. Data from 8,179 monozygotic (MZ) and 9,977 dizygotic (DZ) twin pairs from 12 studies, as well as 629 MZ and 594 DZ pairs from twin registries, were examined in a comprehensive evaluation of genetic investigations conducted during pre-adolescence, young adulthood, and late adulthood. The results revealed that while distinct environmental influences rose with age, from 14% to 40%, the heritability of BMI was consistently high throughout all age categories, ranging from 61% to 80%. According to structural equation modeling, environmental factors have a smaller proportional impact than previously thought, while genetic factors dominate the change in BMI over time. These find out substantial and long-lasting genetic influence on BMI throughout all life stages (Nan et al., 2012).

There is strong empirical evidence to support Erikson's theory of identity development, which holds that identity changes gradually as a person moves from adolescence to maturity. Particularly after high school, research indicates a higher propensity to investigate identity alternatives and make personally significant commitments. However, the precise timing and direction of identity development are still unknown, and very minor alterations take place prior to or throughout adolescence. Although research backs up Erikson's stages' hierarchical structure, methodological flaws make it impossible to draw firm conclusions about causality. More investigation is required to examine identity development over a wider age range, with a particular emphasis on those who do not attend college and the inclusion of longitudinal studies that consider potential drivers of identity change (Waterman, 1982).

The study carried out by Smith (2010) show how parents interact with their children is also influenced by their conduct and temperament. Sensitive and responsive parents are associated with better early parenting outcomes. It is possible when children are willing to participate parents are in excellent mental health, have a strong support system, and are not under a lot of stress. Interventions can improve the mother-child relationship when these conditions are not satisfied by increasing the mother's sense of competence and confidence as a parent, as well as her responsiveness and attention to the kid. Throughout a child's life, parental involvement is essential, but it usually declines when the youngster reaches puberty. Parents who struggle with their children's usage of social media as they become older tend to adopt tight and rigid parenting techniques, which can result in disobedience and a decline in academic achievement, Lack of control and the media highlight how crucial it is to raise awareness of good parenting techniques in order to cultivate wholesome parent-child bonds and, eventually, contribute to a healthier society (Mokal & Zaki, 2023). Franck and Power (2008) mention that children's attitudes can be improved via parental monitoring and involvement in their schooling. Many parents don't fully understand the kind of education their kids receive in school, whether it conforms to social standards and permits a variety of social contacts, or how these elements affect the way kids behave in the future. Families and institutions can collaborate to build a relationship that benefits kids. Education turns into a collaborative endeavor in which each partner's worth and impact are respected and trusted (Amorim & colleagues, 2020).

Early adult life paths have become more varied, especially in terms of schooling, employment, and family formation (Sirniö, Kauppinen, & Martikainen (2017). Six typical routes to maturity influenced by family dynamics, labor market engagement, and educational attainment were found in a st.udy of Finnish men and women born between 1972 and 1975. One major factor affecting these paths and having a significant impact on other life events is education. There were significant gender disparities, with men frequently remaining childless and unmarried and women in lower-education courses more likely to become mothers and partners early. These trajectories were greatly influenced by parental income and resources, especially in terms of schooling, underscoring the long-lasting effects of family background on early adult life paths.

Hofferth (2006) affirms that child's family structure significantly impacts their behavioral issues, even when other factors are considered. How much time parents spend engaging with their children helps explain these behavioral differences? Children in blended

families tend to have fewer behavioral problems than those in other family types. However, academically, children in blended families often perform worse overall, except stepchildren, who perform similarly to their half-siblings, the complex relationship between family dynamics, parental involvement, and child outcomes.

Children who go through multiple changes in family structure often face worse developmental outcomes compared to those in stable two-parent or even single-parent families. Research suggests that these negative outcomes could stem from either the instability itself or factors like parents' behaviors and traits before the child's birth. Fomby and Cherlin (2007) analyzed data from a large, national study that tracked families over two generations. They found that for white children, mothers' pre-existing characteristics largely explain the impact of family instability on cognitive development, while behavioral issues seem to be directly influenced by the instability. For black children, no strong effects of family structure changes were observed.

According to Mallik and Das's (2021) research, parental education is essential in influencing students' drive for success, which in turn influences their general wellbeing. Self-esteem and emotional resilience can be improved by a strong succeed that is impacted by parental expectations and support. Individual differences exist in the degree of this desire, though, with some students being more resilient to setbacks like time or skill constraints. The drive to succeed can benefit these students' psychological health by encouraging a feeling of achievement and personal development. On the other hand, those who lack motivation could have emotions of inadequacy, which could have an adverse effect on their mental well-being and level of pleasure with their lives.

Demonstrating the ways in which social interactions impact health and well-being over the life span, interconnected convoys improve our comprehension of linked lives, concept emphasizes how social relationships are dynamic, both influencing and being influenced by life events. It facilitates the examination of both individual experiences and more expansive groups, such as families, couples, and parent-child triads. We can learn more about how social support networks change and affect mental and physical health by looking at these networks. This method helps us better understand how family well-being is passed down through the generations (Laura, 2023)

Silverberg (2023) asserts that nuclear families, traditionally seen as the standard domestic structure, consist of a married couple and their children. However, other family structures are becoming more common and diverse. Single-parent families arise from divorce, the death of a parent, or intentional planning. Multigenerational families often include grandparents as caregivers, while blended families unite children from previous relationships. Caregivers in these families face stigma, and children in non-nuclear families' experience higher rates of certain health risks, such as obesity or mental illness, although the long-term outcomes remain unclear. Physicians should avoid assumptions about family roles and offer tailored support and screening to meet the unique needs of diverse family structures. Families, which are impacted by both structural elements and the larger family environment, are essential in providing care and making decisions. This study examines the effects of factors such as caregiver type, elder impairment, flexibility, conflict, and cohesion on caregiver satisfaction and well-being. It is based on 244 caregiver interviews. Caregiver sadness and satisfaction with care-related decisions are significantly predicted by family conflict and flexibility. These

findings show how crucial it is to create a nurturing family atmosphere in order to improve caregiver outcomes (Smerglia, 1997).

Older adults without close family connections tend to have poorer mental health and engage in less social activity. This study shows that both the presence and quality of family ties are crucial for identifying older adults at risk. Interestingly, being geographically distant from family did not negatively impact well-being as much as weak or poor-quality relationships. The findings emphasize that the strength and quality of family bonds play a key role in supporting older adults' well-being (Patterson, 2023).

Tafà, et al. (2022), pinpoint that whichever is the form of family, the relationships between parents and emerging adults are crucial to the wellbeing of adolescents. This article demonstrates that factors like as parental conflict, relationship quality, and economic shifts are more significant than family structure. It draws attention to a change from examining family kinds to concentrating on family dynamics and urges more research to examine family complexity through more comprehensive approaches.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

To examine the connection between family structure and student well-being, a quantitative, cross-sectional study design was used among 565 participants.

3.2 Participants

Students from a variety of educational institutions, ages 18 to 25, take part in the study. Purposive and opportunity sampling was employed to collect data on; from January to May 2024 data was collected.

3.3 Data Collection Tools

The Well-Being Assessment (Adult – 24 items) used in this study is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License**.** The purpose of the Adult Wellbeing Questionnaire was to assess students' life satisfaction, meaning and purpose, Relationships, Affects, Financial Evaluation and Stability, community and social support, character and caring, physical and mental function and overall well-being from these factors. Furthermore, to gather data on age, gender, family structure, academic background, and socioeconomic situation, demographic questionnaire were included.

3.4 Method for Collecting Data

An online survey with questionnaires in both Nepali and English was used to gather data. To guarantee the precise meaning of the original questions, the Nepali version was meticulously translated by linguists and examined by instructors. To maintain ethical compliance, participation was anonymous and voluntary, and each participant's informed consent was taken before the survey was administered.

3.5 Data Analysis

While manually entering the paper-based responses into a corresponding Google Form, data from both Google Forms and paper-based surveys were combined. Google Sheets and Microsoft Excel were used to process the pooled dataset before it was exported as CSV files for JASP analysis. Survey responses and participant demographics were compiled using descriptive statistics. At a significance level of $p < .05$ inferential analyses were conducted to assess mean differences across family structures for various well-being indicators. These analyses included Welch's t-test and one-way Welch's ANOVA with post hoc comparisons (Games-Howell). To compare means between groups with uneven variances, Welch's t-test was utilized. The unequal distribution of data was addressed by evaluating differences across several groups using one-way Welch's ANOVA with post hoc comparisons (Games-Howell). Furthermore, Mendeley was also used for citation management.

4. Results

4.1 Descriptive statistics for each variable by family type

Variable	Family Type	N	Mean	SE	Coefficient of variations	F	P	ω^2
Life Satisfaction								
	Joint	186	19.31	0.42	0.30	4.61	0.005	0.021
	Nuclear	293	17.96	0.32	0.31			
	Blended/Stepfamily	31	16.58	1.03	0.35			
	Single-parent	54	20.22	0.86	0.31			
Physical Mental Function								
	Joint	186	17.79	0.40	0.31	4.56	0.005	0.025
	Nuclear	293	16.98	0.30	0.30			
	Blended/Stepfamily	31	14.26	1.12	0.44			
	Single-parent	54	19.04	0.89	0.34			
Meaning and Purpose								
	Joint	186	20.79	0.47	0.307	3.78	0.013	0.016
	Nuclear	293	20.02	0.37	0.322			
	Blended/Stepfamily	31	18.39	1.29	0.39			
	Single-parent	54	22.85	0.90	0.29			
Character and Caring								
	Joint	186	20.38	0.49	0.33	1.98	0.121	0.003
	Nuclear	293	19.90	0.35	0.30			
	Blended/Stepfamily	31	18.42	0.87	0.26			
	Single-parent	54	21.30	0.91	0.32			
Relationships								
	Joint	186	19.27	0.39	0.28	2.66	0.052	0.01
	Nuclear	293	18.75	0.31	0.28			
	Blended/Stepfamily	31	16.84	0.94	0.31			

Single-parent	54	17.43	0.90	0.38			
Community and Social Support							
Joint	186	18.56	0.45	0.33	4.08	0.009	0.013
Nuclear	293	18.17	0.35	0.33			
Blended/Stepfamily	31	15.45	0.93	0.33			
Single-parent	54	19.74	0.89	0.33			
Financial Evaluation and Stability							
Joint	186	16.60	0.44	0.36	2.73	0.048	0.009
Nuclear	293	16.42	0.34	0.36			
Blended/Stepfamily	31	14.29	1.01	0.39			
Single-parent	54	18.00	0.82	0.33			
Affects							
Joint	186	17.44	0.33	0.26	3.60	0.016	0.007
Nuclear	293	17.45	0.26	0.25			
Blended/Stepfamily	31	15.61	0.58	0.21			
Single-parent	54	18.22	0.67	0.27			
Wellbeing Test							
Joint	186	150.12	2.57	0.23	5.498	0.002	0.019
Nuclear	293	145.64	1.97	0.23			
Blended/Stepfamily	31	129.84	5.09	0.22			
Single-parent	54	156.80	5.28	0.25			

The results show significant differences in well-being across different family types. Specifically, single-parent families reported the highest levels of life satisfaction, physical and mental function, meaning and purpose, and overall well-being. Joint families also had relatively high scores, while blended/stepfamilies had lower scores across most measures. Statistically significant differences were found in several areas, including life satisfaction ($p = 0.005$), physical and mental function ($p = 0.005$), and well-being ($p = 0.002$). Family structure can influence various aspects of individual well-being, with single-parent families generally reporting more positive outcomes.

4.2 Post Hoc Comparisons (Games-Howell)

Comparison	Mean Difference	SE	t	Df	P Tukey	Cohen's d
Life Satisfaction and Life Evaluation						
Joint- Blended/Stepfamily	2.73	1.12	2.44	40.71	0.085	0.48
Joint- Single-Parent	-0.92	0.95	-0.96	80.75	0.772	-0.16
Nuclear- Blended/Stepfamily	1.38	1.08	1.27	36.01	0.587	0.24
Nuclear- Single-Parent	-2.27	0.91	-2.48	68.69	0.072	-0.40
Blended/Stepfamily- Single-Parent	-3.64	1.34	-2.72	67.26	0.041	-0.64

Physical and Mental Function						
Joint-Nuclear	0.81	0.50	1.62	378.19	0.371	0.15
Joint- Blended/Stepfamily	3.53	1.18	2.98	38.02	0.025	0.65
Joint- Single-Parent	-1.25	0.98	-1.29	75.43	0.575	-0.23
Nuclear- Blended/Stepfamily	2.72	1.15	2.36	34.49	0.105	0.50
Nuclear- Single-Parent	-2.06	0.94	-2.19	65.61	0.136	-0.38
Blended/Stepfamily- Single-Parent	-4.78	1.43	-3.35	65.38	0.007	-0.88
Meaning and Purpose						
Joint-Nuclear	0.76	0.60	1.27	396.77	0.581	0.12
Joint- Blended/Stepfamily	2.40	1.37	1.75	38.35	0.313	0.37
Joint- Single-Parent	-2.07	1.02	-2.04	83.69	0.183	-0.32
Nuclear- Blended/Stepfamily	1.63	1.34	1.22	35.33	0.620	0.25
Nuclear- Single-Parent	-2.83	0.98	-2.90	72.72	0.025	-0.44
Blended/Stepfamily- Single-Parent	-4.47	1.57	-2.84	58.64	0.031	-0.69
Character and Caring						
Joint-Nuclear	0.48	0.60	0.80	359.75	0.8	0.08
Joint- Blended/Stepfamily	1.96	1.00	1.97	51.72	0.214	0.31
Joint- Single-Parent	-0.92	1.04	-0.89	86.26	0.812	-0.15
Nuclear- Blended/Stepfamily	1.48	0.93	1.59	40.44	0.398	0.24
Nuclear- Single-Parent	-1.40	0.98	-1.43	69.34	0.484	-0.22
Blended/Stepfamily- Single-Parent	-2.88	1.26	-2.29	78.74	0.110	-0.46
Relationships						
Joint-Nuclear	0.52	0.50	1.05	388.06	0.721	0.10
Joint- Blended/Stepfamily	2.43	1.02	2.39	41.18	0.095	0.45
Joint- Single-Parent	1.84	0.98	1.89	74.44	0.243	0.34
Nuclear- Blended/Stepfamily	1.91	0.99	1.94	36.68	0.232	0.35
Nuclear- Single-Parent	1.32	0.95	1.40	65.93	0.506	0.24
Blended/Stepfamily- Single-Parent	-0.59	1.30	-0.45	74.56	0.969	-0.11
Community and Social Support						
Joint-Nuclear	0.39	0.57	0.69	383.61	0.9	0.07
Joint- Blended/Stepfamily	3.11	1.03	3.02	45.31	0.021	0.52
Joint- Single-Parent	-1.18	1.00	-1.18	81.69	0.64	-0.20
Nuclear- Blended/Stepfamily	2.72	0.99	2.74	38.83	0.043	0.45
Nuclear- Single-Parent	-1.57	0.96	-1.64	69.76	0.361	-0.26
Blended/Stepfamily- Single-Parent	-4.29	1.29	-3.33	74.96	0.007	-0.71
Financial Evaluation and Stability						
Joint-Nuclear	0.18	0.56	0.33	384.66	0.99	0.03
Joint- Blended/Stepfamily	2.31	1.10	2.11	42.40	0.168	0.39
Joint- Single-Parent	-1.40	0.93	-1.50	86.17	0.44	-0.24
Nuclear- Blended/Stepfamily	2.13	1.06	2.01	37.23	0.204	0.36
Nuclear- Single-Parent	-1.58	0.89	-1.78	72.534	0.29	-0.27
Blended/Stepfamily- Single-Parent	-.3.71	1.30	-2.86	66.43	0.028	-0.63

Affects						
Joint-Nuclear	-0.01	0.42	-0.02	390.95	1	-0.001
Joint- Blended/Stepfamily	1.83	0.66	2.75	51.73	0.039	0.41
Joint- Single-Parent	-0.78	0.75	-1.04	79.89	0.725	-0.18
Nuclear- Blended/Stepfamily	1.83	0.63	2.90	43.15	0.029	0.41
Nuclear- Single-Parent	-0.78	0.72	-1.07	69.55	0.707	-0.17
Blended/Stepfamily- Single-Parent	-2.61	0.89	-2.94	81.67	0.022	-0.59
Overall Wellbeing's						
Joint-Nuclear	4.49	3.24	1.39	382.96	0.509	0.13
Joint- Blended/Stepfamily	20.29	5.70	3.56	46.75	0.005	0.59
Joint- Single-Parent	-6.67	5.87	-1.14	79.85	0.668	-0.19
Nuclear- Blended/Stepfamily	15.80	5.46	2.89	39.59	0.03	0.46
Nuclear- Single-Parent	-11.16	5.63	-1.98	68.61	0.205	-0.32
Blended/Stepfamily- Single-Parent	-26.96	7.33	-3.68	78.08	0.002	-0.78

Post-hoc comparisons of family structures revealed important findings, how different family types influenced well-being outcomes. In terms of life satisfaction, there was no significant difference between joint families and blended/stepfamilies (mean difference = 2.73, p = 0.085), nor between joint families and single-parent families (mean difference = -0.92, p = 0.772). However, a notable difference was observed between blended/stepfamilies and single-parent families, with blended families reporting significantly lower life satisfaction (mean difference = -3.64, p = 0.041). While examining physical and mental function, joint families reported significantly higher physical and mental well-being compared to blended/stepfamilies (mean difference = 3.53, p = 0.025). Interestingly, blended/stepfamilies showed significantly lower physical and mental function than single-parent families (mean difference = -4.78, p = 0.007). Regarding meaning and purpose, nuclear families had a significantly lower score than single-parent families (mean difference = -2.83, p = 0.025), and blended/stepfamilies also scored lower than single-parent families (mean difference = -4.47, p = 0.031).

For character and caring, no significant differences were found across family structures. As regards, relationships, joint families had a higher score than blended/stepfamilies (mean difference = 2.43, p = 0.095), though this difference was not statistically significant. No significant differences were observed between nuclear families and blended/stepfamilies, nor between nuclear families and single-parent families. In community and social support, joint families reported significantly higher support than blended/stepfamilies (mean difference = 3.11, p = 0.021), while blended families had significantly lower support than single-parent families (mean difference = -4.29, p = 0.007). When it came to financial stability, no significant differences were found among the family structures. In emotional well-being, joint families reported a significantly higher score than blended families (mean difference = 1.83, p = 0.039), while no significant difference was found between joint families and single-parent families. Finally, regarding overall well-being, joint families reported significantly higher overall well-being compared to blended/stepfamilies (mean difference = 20.29, p = 0.005) and single-parent families (mean

difference = -6.67, p = 0.668). Blended families, on the other hand, reported significantly lower overall well-being than single-parent families (mean difference = -26.96, p = 0.002). These findings revealed that joint families tend to perform better in most areas of well-being, especially in physical and mental function, community support, and overall well-being, while blended families face challenges across multiple dimensions.

5. Discussion

Parenting practices and children's wellbeing are greatly influenced by family structure. Single-parent households in Nepal typically practice more authoritative parenting techniques, which helps kids become resilient (Akhtar et al., 2017). This is corroborated by our data, which indicate that single-parent households are less happy overall than joint families, especially when it comes to meaning and purpose and life satisfaction However, joint families reported higher scores on a number of well-being outcomes, including general well-being and mental and physical function.

According to Tian et al. (2024), people from single-parent households had increased anxiety, depression, and altered brain connections. Additionally, our research indicates that whereas single-parent households report poorer levels of resilience and mental function, joint families typically report higher levels whereas households with only one parent report worse mental and physical health (mean difference = -4.78, p = 0.007). These results imply that long-term mental health is impacted by family structure.

Impact of shifting family structures on maternal well-being is shown by the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (Osborne et al., 2012). According to our research, social support is higher in joint families (mean difference = 3.11, p = 0.021), which could lessen stress. In contrast, blended families report less social support than single-parent families (mean difference = -4.29, p = 0.007), which might lead to emotional and financial difficulties. Adolescent well-being is enhanced by religious participation and healthy family relationships, according to Petts (2014). According to our research, blended and single-parent households report lower levels of emotional well-being, but joint families report higher levels (mean difference = 1.83, p = 0.039), but blended and single-parent households show lower levels of well-being. The overall well-being of adolescents in single-parent households was substantially not good than that of adolescents in joint families (mean difference = -6.67, p = 0.668). To sum up, family structure has a significant impact on resilience, mental health, and overall well-being. While single-parent and mixed families have greater difficulties, joint families offer a more encouraging atmosphere that produces better results. Comprehending these processes can aid in directing treatments aimed at enhancing the welfare of kids in diverse family configurations.

6. Conclusion

Family structure has a significant impact on students' well-being, with joint families continuously showing superior results in a number of areas, such as resilience, mental health, and general life satisfaction. Despite building resilience via authoritative parenting, single-parent households struggle with reduced mental and social support. In certain areas, blended families performed better than single-parent households, but in other areas, their physical and

mental functioning was lower than that of joint families. These results display the need for more research on the relationship between family dynamics and adolescent growth and adult well-being, especially in settings where social standards and financial demands are shifting. The study emphasizes the importance of family in the transition to adulthood, when relational maturity and emotional support play a major role in producing favorable psychological results. Interventions that address the specific needs of different family structures can play a crucial role in improving the well-being of students and preparing them for the challenges of adulthood.

7. Recommendation

Counseling programs that are adapted to various family situations must be implemented by educational institutions, and community-based projects can improve both financial and emotional assistance. To investigate the long-term impacts of family dynamics on well-being, more longitudinal research is required. Finally, in order to help young adults, develop resilience and mental stability, awareness campaigns should encourage good parenting and social support.

Further research on the academic performance of children from single-parent, nuclear, and joint households is necessary because we were unable to locate any studies on the effects of single parenting on children's wellbeing in the context of Nepal. It is crucial to investigate if disparities result from parental participation, social support, or economic circumstances. Additionally, need to study on the differences in child well-being (emotional, psychological, and social) across children of unmarried, divorced, separated, and widowed single parents in Nepal, and what factors contribute to these differences.

References

1. Arnett, J. J. (2007). Emerging adulthood: What is it, and what is it good for? *Child Development Perspectives, 1*(2), 68–73. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2007.00016.x
2. Amorim, R., Catarino, S., Miragaia, P., Ferreras, C., Viana, V., & Guardiano, M.
3. (2020). *The impact of COVID-19 on children with autism spectrum disorder.* https://repositorio-aberto.up.pt/bitstream/10216/131286/2/434740.pdf
4. Akhtar, Perveen; Malik, Jamil A.; Begeer, Sander (2017). The grandparents' influence: parenting styles and social competence among children of joint families. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 26*(2), 603–611. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0576-5
5. Baggio, S., Studer, J., Iglesias, K., Daeppen, J.-B., & Gmel, G. (2017). Emerging adulthood: A time of changes in psychosocial well-being. *Evaluation & the Health Professions, 40*(4), 383-400. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163278716663602
6. Bergman, M. M., & Scott, J. (2001). Young adolescents' wellbeing and health-risk behaviours: Gender and socio-economic differences. *Journal of Adolescence, 24*(2), 183–197. https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.2001.0378
7. Bhattrai, N. (2024). Parenting styles and its impact on emerging adults in Nepal. NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, *1*(8), 50–62. https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v1i8.73028

8. Bhattrai, N. (2024). Addressing Educational Inequities in Urban Slums: A Narrative Review. International Research Journal of MMC, 5(5), 123–132. https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v5i5.73702
9. Chu, P. S., Saucier, D. A., & Hafner, E. (2010). Meta-analysis of the relationships between social support and well-being in children and adolescents. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 29*(6), 624–645. doi:10.1521/jscp.2010.29.6.624
10. Erikson, E. H. (1959) Identity and life cycle: Selected papers. Psychological Issues, *I*,1-171.
11. Erikson, E. H. Childhood and society (2nd ed.). New York: Norton 1963.
12. Fomby, P., & Cherlin, A. J. (2007). Family instability and child well-being. *American Sociological Review, 72*(2), 181–204. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240707200 20
13. H Bhasin (2016), Change In Family Structure In The Modern Times,International Journal of Indian Psychology, Volume 3 (4),DIP: 18.01.169/20160304,DOI: 10.25215/0304.169
14. Hatch, S. L., Harvey, S. B., & Maughan, B. (2010). A developmental-contextual approach to understanding mental health and well-being in early adulthood. *Social Science & Medicine, 70*(2), 261–268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.10.005
15. Hofferth, S. L. (2006). Residential father family type and child well-being: Investment versus selection. *Demography, 43*(1), 53–77. https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.2006.0006
16. J. J., Yurkewicz, C., & Kashdan, T. B. (2008). Gratitude and subjective well-being in early adolescence*: Examining gender differences. Journal of Adolescence, xx*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.06.006
17. Kern, M. L., Benson, L., & Steinberg, E. (2015). The EPOCH measure of adolescent well-being. *Psychological Assessment, 28*(5), 586–597.https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000201
18. Koehly, L. M., & Manalel, J. A. (2023). Interconnected social convoys: Understanding health and well-being through linked personal networks. *Advances in life course research, 56*, 100541. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2023.100541
19. Mokal, M. N., & Ahmad, Z. (2023). The impact of positive parenting practices on children's education and behavioral change. *International Journal of Modern Languages and Applied Linguistics (IJMAL), 7*(3), 65–80 https://ir.uitm.edu.my/id/eprint/84158/1/84158.pdf
20. Masarik, A. S., Conger, R. D., Martin, M. J., Donnellan, M. B., Masyn, K. E., & Lorenz, F. O. (2012). Romantic relationships in early adulthood: Influences of family, personality, and relationship cognitions. *Journal of the International Association for Relationship Research, 19*(3), 356–373.https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2012.01416.x
21. Mallik, P., & Das, J. (2021). Achievement motivation of slum children in relation to their gender and parental education. *International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Methods (IJARESM), 9*(3), 558. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Prasanta-Mallik/publication/351633579_Achievement_Motivation_of_Slum_Children_in_Relation_to_their_Gender_and_Parental_Education/links/60a27dd6299bf134c42c2b26/Achievement-Motivation-of-Slum-Children-in-Relation-to-their-Gender-and-Parental

Education.pdf? _sg%5B0%5D=started_experiment_milestone&origin=journal Detail&_rtd=e30%3D
22. Osborne, C., Berger, L. M., & Magnuson, K. (2012). Family structure transitions and changes in maternal resources and well-being. *Demography, 49*(1), 23–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-011-0080-x
23. Petts R. J. (2014). Family, religious attendance, and trajectories of psychological well-being among youth. *journal of the Division of Family Psychology of the American Psychological Association (Division 43), 28*(6), 759–768. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036892
24. Piaget, J. (2008). Intellectual evolution from adolescence to adulthood. *Human Development, 51*(1), 40–47. https://doi.org/10.1159/000112531 [Reprint of Human Development, 15(1), 1–12, 1972]
25. Patterson, S. E., & Margolis, R. (2023). Family ties and older adult well-being: Incorporating social networks and proximity. *Psychological Sciences and Social sciences, 78*(12), 2080–2089. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbad139
26. Waterman, A. S. (1982). Identity development from adolescence to adulthood: An extension of theory and a review of research. *Developmental Psychology, 18*(3), 341–358. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.18.3.341
27. Webster, J. D., & Ma, X. (2013). A balanced time perspective in adulthood: Well-being and developmental effects. Canadian Journal on Aging / La Revue canadienne du vieillissement, 32(4), 433–442. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0714980813000500
28. Wright, M., von Stumm, S (2024). Perceptions of Adulthood: What Does it Mean to be Grown-Up? *Journal of adult development*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-024-09477-8
29. Sanders, M. R., & Turner, K. M. T. (2018). The importance of parenting in influencing the lives of children. *Handbook of parenting and child development across the lifespan, 3*–26. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-94598-9_1
30. Schmuck, D. (2013). Single parenting: Fewer negative effects on children's behaviors than claimed. Modern Psychological Studies, 18(2), Article 12. Retrieved from https://scholar.utc.edu/mps/vol18/iss2/12
31. Smith, M. (2010). Good parenting: Making a difference. *Early Human Development, 86*(11), 689–693. doi: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2010.08.011
32. Singh, K., Bassi, M., Junnarkar, M., & Negri, L. (2015). Mental health and psychosocial functioning in adolescence: An investigation among Indian students from Delhi. *Journal of adolescence, 39*, 59-69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.12.008
33. Sigfusdottir, I. D., Kristjansson, A. L., Thorlindsson, T., & Allegrante, J. P. (2017). Stress and adolescent well-being: The need for an interdisciplinary framework. *Health Promotion International, 32*(6), 1081–1090. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daw038
34. Skok, A., Harvey, D., & Reddihough, D. (2006). Perceived stress, perceived social support, and well-being among mothers of school-aged children with cerebral palsy. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 31*(1), 53–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668250600561929

35. Sharon, T. (2016). Constructing adulthood: markers of adulthood and well-being among emerging adults. *Emerging Adulthood, 4*(3), 161-167. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696815579826
36. Sirniö, O., Kauppinen, T. M., & Martikainen, P. (2017). Intergenerational determinants of joint labor market and family formation pathways in early adulthood. Advances in Life Course Research, 34, 10–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2017.09.001
37. Silverberg B. (2023). Care of diverse families: Single-parent, multigenerational, and blended families. FP essentials, 524, 19–24.
38. Smerglia, V. L., & Deimling, G. T. (1997). Care-related decision-making satisfaction and caregiver well-being in families caring for older members. The Gerontologist, *37*(5), 658–665. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/37.5.658
39. Tafà, M., Bracaglia, F., Inguscio, L., & Carone, N. (2022). What decides the well-being of the relationship between parents and adolescents. *International journal of environmental research and public health, 20*(1), 383. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20010383
40. Tian, T., Fang, J., Liu, D., Qin, Y., Zhu, H., Li, J., Li, Y., & Zhu, W. (2024). Long-term effects of childhood single-parent family structure on brain connectivity and psychological well-being. *Brain Imaging and Behavior, 18*(5), 1010–1018. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-024-00887-6 (pubmed)
41. UNDP. (2024). *Waithood: The evolving face of adulthood*. United Nations Development Programme. https://www.undp.org/future-development/signals-spotlight-2024/waithood
42. UNICEF Innocenti. (n.d.). *Health and well-being.* UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti. https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/areas-of-work/health-and-well-being2
43. Al-Ubaidi, B. (2017). Cost of growing up in dysfunctional family characteristics of healthy families. *Journal of Family Medicine and Disease Prevention, 3*, 1-4. https://doi.org/10.23937/2469-5793/1510059