STARS

2018

The Influence of Family Communication Styles on Campus Experience in College-Aged Children

Madison Kjosa

University of Central Florida

Recommended Citation

Kjosa, Madison, "The Influence of Family Communication Styles on Campus Experience in College-Aged Children" (2018). *Honors Undergraduate Theses*. 423.
https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorstheses/423

THE INFLUENCE OF FAMILY COMMUNICATION STYLES

ON CAMPUS EXPERIENCE IN COLLEGE-AGED CHILDREN

by

MADISON L. KJOSA

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Honors in the Major Program in Communication and Conflict
in the College of Sciences
and in the Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term, 2018

Thesis Chair: Harry Weger, Ph.D

ABSTRACT

As an environment, the modern university setting is diverse and subjects students to numerous challenges and opportunities that prepare them to enter careers, build families, and grow as individuals. Yet what a student experiences in college differs greatly and is shaped by internal and external factors in their environment, including campus participation, college self-efficacy, depression and stress. Prior research indicates the influence of family on how a student expresses each of these variables (Schmidtgall, King, Zarski & Cooper, 2000; Bradbury & Mather, 2009; Hannum & Dvorak, 2004; Kenny & Donaldson, 1991; Lopez et al, 2001; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2006). However, there is one area of the family that has been scarcely studied in terms of campus experience influence: family communication patterns (FCPs). The present study sought to investigate this connection. Utilizing a survey-based design, 253 student participants were asked questions to identify the amount of conversation and conformity orientation present in their family unit, as well as levels of campus participation, college self-efficacy, depression and stress. Results indicated that conversation orientation is positively correlated with campus participation, while conformity orientation is positively correlated in all but one aspect of campus participation: time spent on campus. Conversation orientation also led to higher feelings of college self-efficacy and lower feelings of stress and depression in students. While negative as predicted, conformity orientation had no significant correlations with college self-efficacy, stress or depression. The current study suggests that family communication style do indeed influence multiple areas of a student's college experience, though conversation-oriented communication has a greater positive influence than the negative influence of conformity orientation. Having a

positive and communicative family environment allows students to get involved, lowers their

risk of experiencing mental issues, and equips them to feel confident in their environment.

However, the obedience and uniformity found in conformity orientation families instills structure

in a student, which may help them avoid distractions and stay focused on schoolwork (Koerner

& Fitzpatrick, 1997).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In modern society, more and more young adults choose to enter college after completing their high school careers. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, total undergraduate enrollment saw a 30 percent increase of 13.2 million students in 2000, to 17.0 million in 2015 (2017). While in college, students are both subject to and choose to engage in a wide variety of activities, including athletic events, theater and fine arts programs, student clubs and organizations, undergraduate research, and internships/practicums. These situations test self-efficacy, which is "an individual's belief in his or her ability to carry out an action to reach the desired goal" (Gore, Leuwerke, & Turley, 2006, p. 228). These unfamiliar situations can also lead students to experience and overcome psychological issues like stress or depressive symptoms. While not the only ones, these four factors (campus participation, college self-efficacy, stress and depression) have all shaped my experience at the University of Central Florida (UCF). My inspiration to study the connection between these factors and family communication patterns (FCP) stems from belonging to parents who grew up in families of different patterns. These patterns blended into their personalities and parenting styles, offering my brother and I a mix of conformity-oriented structure and conversation-oriented communication. This thesis aims to explore how differing family communication styles influence a child in college, just like mine did.

<u>Campus Participation</u>

Students may enter college with the mindset to graduate and find their ideal career. However, they soon see that college is much more than a realm of academia. It is a community. Merriam-Webster defines community as "an interacting population of various kinds of individuals (such as species) in a common location" (2017). Outside of the classroom, students engage in activities meant to enrich the collective pursuit of scholastic success. These include joining intramural sports teams, clubs, watching athletic competitions, and attending campus events; among others. Another way to view the collegiate environment is via the six dimensions of the campus community: educationally purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring and celebrative (Carnegie Foundation, 1990). As explained by the Carnegie study, a rich campus community contains each of these dimensions/characteristics; and as a result, the chance for students to identify with them. In one study, an inclusive campus environment also facilitated adjustment to college life for first-generation students (Bradbury & Mather, 2009).

The decision to be involved can also have many positive impacts on a student. Research has shown that involvement on campus contributes to an overall greater sense of community in the student (McAuliff, Williams & Ferrari, 2013). There are also psychological impacts of participation, including lower feelings of loneliness and stress for students who participated in campus recreational sports (Elkins, Forrester & Noel-Elkins, 2011). A United Kingdom-based study by Parker, Ansari and Lovell also found that exercise was related to perceived benefits of psychological outlook and preventative health in non-exercising female university students (2010). These findings suggest that physically-active involvement, in particular, can provide psychological benefits for students. Participation also helps to develop positive college self-

efficacy beliefs, which are constructs that determine how effective a student is at thriving in their campus community (Gore, Leuwerke, & Turley, 2006). Additionally, campus involvement aids in the development of social justice attitudes in students (McAuliff, Williams & Ferrari, 2013). Participation in school activities also contributes to student academic success (Bradbury & Mather, 2009). Beyond mere involvement effects, researcher Daniel Elkins found that the type of activity a student was involved in impacted how strongly they connected to six identified factors of the campus community (Teaching and Learning, Residential Experience, Diversity and Acceptance, History and Tradition, Loneliness and Stress, and Socialization Across Backgrounds) (2011). For instance, collegiate athletes felt a higher sense of the History and Tradition dimension, whereas students in conferences, workshops, and fine arts identified more with the Teaching and Learning dimension (Elkins, Forrester & Noel-Elkins, 2011).

What determines whether or not a student gets involved on campus? Research has shown that one cause for a student to participate is the presence of higher social self-efficacy (Gore, Leuwerke, & Turley, 2006). A sub-area of self-efficacy, social self-efficacy is defined as "an individual's confidence in her/his ability to engage in the social interactional tasks necessary to initiate and maintain interpersonal relationships" (Smith & Betz, 2000, p. 286). Students who view themselves as more competent in meeting others may be more likely and willing to engage in socially-orientated events, including sports and campus activities. In another study, academic self-efficacy and institutional commitment were found to predict involvement in sophomore students (Wang & Kennedy-Phillips, 2013). In this case, institutional commitment was a higher predictor of student success than academic self-efficacy, asserting that "it is students' commitment to the institution (sense of belonging, satisfaction, etc.) that seems to encourage

them to engage in academically related interaction" (Wang & Kennedy-Phillips, 2013, p. 545).

The same study also found a link between living on campus and higher involvement. A potential

explanation for this finding is that closer access to campus activities and resources leads to

greater participation, unlike students who must commute to school. However, this is only a

theoretical assumption and should be tested in future studies for validity.

<div align="center">College Self-Efficacy</div>

In the college environment, students are frequently tested in their abilities to perform

certain tasks: for example, making new friends, cooking without parental assistance, and seeking

academic help. Behind a student's collegiate success is the psychological construct called self-

efficacy. As previously defined, self-efficacy is "an individual's belief in his or her ability to

carry out an action to reach a desired goal" (Gore, Leuwerke, & Turley, 2006, p. 228). The

likelihood of someone completing an action can depend on their perceived self-efficacy. In other

words, a person is less likely to strive for something if they see it as 'unattainable' or 'out of their

skill set.'

For this study, one specific type of self-efficacy will be examined: college self-efficacy.

This term describes one's effectiveness in reaching goals specific to the college environment.

College self-efficacy is especially important because it can influence academic goals and

behaviors, involvement decisions, and other factors (Gore, Leuwerke, & Turley, 2006). But what

determines a student's college self-efficacy? One answer lies in the student's family of origin.

Research has shown that first-generation students (i.e. the first person in the family to attend

college) have less college self-efficacy; including little knowledge of the financial aid process

and academic environment (Bradbury & Mather, 2009). Parent social support has also been

linked to higher student grade point averages (GPAs) (Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo, Assouline & Russell, 1994).

Research has spliced college self-efficacy into three subcategories: academic, social and roommate self-efficacy (Solberg, O'Brien, Villareal, Kennel & Davis, 1993). Academic self-efficacy is perceived effectiveness in academic tasks (i.e. seeking professor assistance, completing assignments, pursuing research). Having a high level of this construct can affect positive higher education decisions (Gore, Leuwerke, & Turley, 2006). Aside from family, academic self-efficacy can be impacted by roommate conflict, as well as stress (Bentley, 1982; Erb & Short, 2012). The next subcategory of college self-efficacy is social self-efficacy, or how effective a student is in social situations (i.e. making friends, going to campus events, joining Greek life or clubs, etc.). This construct has been positively linked to academic performance in students (Ferrari, Parker & Ware, 1992). Additionally, social self-efficacy can assist students in making career-related decisions (Felsman & Blustein, 1999). A potential influencer of social self-efficacy development is living on campus (Bradbury & Mather, 2009). One explanation for this is that on-campus students have closer access to campus resources, unlike commuter students who live with their parents or in off-campus housing. The final subcategory of college self-efficacy is roommate self-efficacy, which describes how effective a student is at co-existing with their roommate. For many students, their first experience of living with non-family occurs in college (Erb, 2014). Having roommate self-efficacy can assist a student in communicating with their roommate and resolving daily conflicts. Without this construct, students can experience "higher levels of anxiety, lower life satisfaction, worse academic adjustment to

college, worse social functioning in college, and less feelings of attachment to one's college."

(Erb, 2014, p. 7).

<center>Depression in College Students</center>

For some students, the initial transition from home to college can be fraught with emotional instability. One major example of this is experiencing depression, which can be externalized in multiple ways. As described by Oliver Oyama, depression can be a temporary mood, emotional display of sadness, or actual, diagnosed disorder. Oyama explained that--depending on severity--clinical depression can impact one's functioning in a variety of ways, including health, social, and mental functioning (2017).

The turbulent life of a college student puts them especially at-risk for experiencing depression. The National Institute of Mental Health, for instance, found that 10.3 percent of US adults aged 18-25 (which is the range most students fall in) had experienced at least one major depressive episode (n.d.). This finding is mirrored in the 2016 National College Health Assessment (NCHA), which is conducted yearly by the American College Health Association (ACHA) to examine overall mental health status in the college population. The assessment found that 15.6 percent of surveyed students reported as being treated/diagnosed by a professional for depression (2017). Even more alarming, 39.1 percent of surveyed students in the 2016 NCHA answered they had "felt so depressed it was difficult to function" at one point during the previous 12 months (p. 14).

Due to the devastating impacts of depression on college students, it is important to identify what sources contribute to these symptoms. One source, for example, could be the

experience of entering college itself, and the many stressors and life changes that accompany it.

The National Institute of Mental Health lists significant life changes, stress or trauma as risk

factors for depression (n.d.). In a survey of 149 students, Robert Oswalt found that other sources

of depression were issues in relationships, course grades, and social adjustment (1995).

Respondents' depression was also fleeting, lasting less than a month (Oswalt & Finkelberg,

1995). Research has found that roommate conflict and higher levels of criticism also contributes

to depressive feelings in students (Erb & Short, 2012). Finally, emotional support and other

conditions in the family unit can play a significant role in college student depression. In a study

by Tracy Desjardins, less emotional support predicted symptoms of both depression and anxiety

in students (2017). One explanation of this is the potential buffering effect of emotional support

against depression (Levens, Elrahal & Sagui, 2016). If a student perceives less emotional

support, they may be more susceptible to experiencing depression. Moreover, Levens found that

emotional support buffered depression only when student stress reactivity was lower (2016). The

study explained that high-stress reactivity leads to an inability to seek emotional support, even

when it is freely offered. Finally, another family-related cause of depression is conflict. Higher

levels of parental conflict predicted not only depression in children, but distress, insecurity, and

feelings of rejection (Ellis, 2000; Schmidtgall, King, Zarski & Cooper, 2000).

Depression can have several impacts on college students. In the 2016 NCHA, 16.4

percent of students indicated that depression had a negative impact on their academic

performance (defined as a decline in assignment/course grades, failure to complete a class or a

stalling of research/other studies) (2017). In another study, depressed students received lower

grades and felt less grade-satisfaction than their non-depressed counterparts; less success in

friendship endeavors; and less confidence in pursuing post-secondary education (Vredenburg, O'Brien & Krames, 1988). Depression is also linked to lower adjustment in children (Nelson, 1993; Vredenburg, O'Brien & Krames, 1988). Finally, research has attributed high depression and low self-esteem to feelings of body dissatisfaction in Korean female college students (Lim & You, 2017).

<p align="center">Stress in College Students</p>

Just like depression, stress is a common psychological condition that can be brought on by the collegiate environment. As a phenomenon, stress can result from external pressure; be a reaction to "noxious or aversive stimuli"; or an ongoing interplay between a person and their environment (i.e. demands and resources) (Butler, 1993, p.1). This suggests that stress is acquired and experienced in a variety of ways. Connecting to the college environment, it is reasonable to believe that a student has the potential to experience each of these stress definitions at some point. High course loads and other obligations can add external pressure; relationship issues can be aversive stimuli; and a student continuously struggling to pay rent or having to take out college loans can lead to a demands/resources conflict.

The 2016 NCHA found that 37.7 percent of college males and 46.0 percent of college females experienced "more than average stress" in the past 12 months (p. 16). Not only does this statistic indicate the vulnerability of students to stress, but also that females appear to be at a higher risk. One study found that female Turkish university students had significantly higher stress scores than males (Bayram & Bilgel, 2008). This is because women are more expressive than men, as research has indicated (Chentsova-Dutton & Tsai, 2007; Deng et al, 2016; Kring & Gordon, 1998). Research has classified women as externalizers, and men as internalizers of

emotion (Kring & Gordon, 1998). Aside from gender and other biological predispositions, however, college students experience stress due to multiple sources.

In a study of residence hall students by Lauri Dusselier, half of the respondents indicated academics as a source of stress. This includes tests, classes, homework or exams, among other academic sources (2005). Another study found similar results: the top five reported stressors for students were "academic workload, too many tests, difficult courses, exam grades, and lecturer characteristics" (Ong & Cheong, 2009, p. 1279). In another study, students in social and political science majors had higher stress than those in basic sciences, engineering or medicine (Bayram & Bilgel, 2008). This suggests that choice of major can also be an academic source of stress. There are other sources of stress outside the academic realm: for instance, roommate conflicts (Bradbury & Mather, 2009; Dusselier et al, 2005). Other sources identified by research include alcohol, sleep issues, conflict with faculty and/or staff, and worries over friends/family (Dusselier et al, 2005).

While stress can have many sources, its impact is partly determined by how a student chooses to resolve it. The use of unhealthy coping methods (drugs and alcohol, stress avoidance, anger) can further negatively impact students, such as getting lower grades in class (Bentley, 1982). One study examined the impact of three coping strategies on students: primary control coping, secondary control coping, and disengagement coping (Coiro, Bettis & Compas, 2017). Engagement coping strategies (primary and secondary control) are based on stressor reactance; disengagement coping strategies on stressor avoidance (Connor-Smith et al, 2000). Specifically, primary control coping strategies include "problem solving and emotional regulation" (Connor-Smith et al, 2000, p. 977). Secondary control coping strategies, on the other hand, are more

adaptive in nature. This means that a person will accept/accommodate stressors, rather than trying to change them. In Coiro's study, greater use of disengagement coping strategies lead to higher stress levels (2017). In return, higher stress increased depression, anxiety and somatization symptoms. This is just one example of how coping style impacts stress impact. By using confrontational, direct coping strategies, students are able to overcome the daily stressors of college life and prevent the effects of them later on. Indirect strategies, however, can perpetuate and worsen the stress students feel.

Influence of Family on College Students

Each of the previous variables, as explained, have high influence on campus experience. Research has identified different sources that influence how each variable is expressed and acquired, including efficacy beliefs, academics, and interpersonal conflict, among others.

Across all four variables, a major source of influence lies in the student's family. This is because students still rely on their families long after entering college (Bradbury & Mather, 2009). Research has examined how different aspects of the family influence college students. In one study, family conflict predicted more psychological distress and weakened parental attachment (Hannum & Dvorak, 2004). Other studies have linked strong family attachment to higher social adjustment and psychological well-being, less distress, and positive relationship outcomes (Hannum & Dvorak, 2004; Kenny & Donaldson, 1991; Lopez et al, 2001; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2006). However, there is one area of the family that has been scarcely studied in terms of campus experience influence: family communication patterns (FCPs).

Family Communication Patterns

Ritchie and Fitzpatrick (1990) identified four main family communication patterns: Consensual, Pluralistic, Laissez-Faire, and Protective. These patterns describe the communication atmospheres present in families, including value systems on idea expression, familial hierarchy, and child autonomy. Each family pattern is distinguished by levels of conversation and conformity orientation, among other differences. Conversation orientation encourages idea expression and conversation between parent and child. It is also predictive of collaborating, accommodating, and compromising parent conflict styles (Beck & Ledbetter, 2013). Finally, conversation orientation helps strengthen family identity, and leads to positive adjustment (i.e higher self-efficacy and lower feelings of loneliness) in children (Beck & Ledbetter, 2013; Dorrance-Hall et al, 2017). Unlike conversation, conformity (socio) orientation stresses parental authority and power over the child (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). The conformity orientation values morals, religion and family cohesion (Buboltz Jr., Johnson & Woller, 2003).

Families high in both conversation and conformity orientations are classified as Consensual (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). These families experience a struggle between preserving hierarchy and order, while also embracing open communication and new ideas (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997). Children in these families are therefore able to develop autonomy with a secure base to assist in emotional reactance and identity formation (Buboltz Jr., Johnson & Woller, 2003).

The opposite from Consensual, Laissez-Faire families are low in both conversation and conformity orientation (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). In these families, there is little emotional expression (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997). Parents encourage children to make decisions, but

care little about what those decisions are (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). In terms of conflict, Laissez-Faire families experience less negative conflict behaviors, however, they also rely more on the avoiding conflict style (Beck & Ledbetter, 2013; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997).

The remaining family communication patterns lie in the middle of the orientation spectrum. Pluralistic families are high in conversation but low in conformity orientation, while protective families are high in conformity but low in conversation orientation (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). As the description suggests, pluralistic families are highly communicative in nature. Unlike Laissez-Faire parents, those from Pluralistic families encourage and care about the decisions their children make (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). In one study, highly communicative parents aided in a college student's decision to use contraceptives (Baugh & Davis, 2016). This suggests that students from Pluralistic families enter with higher competence in different tasks (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997). The final family style is Protective, which emphasizes obedience and respect to established hierarchies (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997). There is low emotional expression, and also less conflict. Yet despite less conflict, research shows that low emotional expression in families can harm a student's adjustment to college (Johnson, Gans, Kerr, & LaValle, 2010). This is possibly because experiencing healthy conflict in families helps children develop communication and conflict resolution skills. Without these experiences, children have limited knowledge of how to cope when such situations arise.

As an environment, the modern college campus is a setting of diversity like none other. Students of varying demographics, ideologies, cultures and upbringings mesh in one location, calling universities to create an inclusive experience. But what determines why students have different experiences?

<div align="center">Hypotheses</div>

The present study aimed to identify the influence of family communication styles on campus experience in college-aged children. Previous research has shown that a student's upbringing can influence their adult life in many ways (Brown, Fitzgerald, Shipman & Schneider, 2007; Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo, Assouline & Russell, 1994; Erb & Short, 2012; Johnson, Gans, Kerr, & LaValle, 2010; Koerner and Fitzpatrick, 1997). It then follows that a college student's family style of origin can and will have a unique influence on their campus experience. As previously explained, each of the family communication patterns exhibits differing levels of conversation and conformity orientation. It is rare that a family will fall into one type of family communication pattern (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997). Instead, most families will display behaviors of more than one type. Therefore, the study instead examined the influences of varying levels of family conversation and conformity orientation on campus experience.

As a concept, campus participation is crucial to a student's college experience. The choice to be involved can help students gain career experience, meet others, escape the stressors of academic life, and other benefits. As previously explained, two concepts linked to involvement are the presence of academic and social self-efficacy beliefs (Gore, Leuwerke, & Turley, 2006; Wang & Kennedy-Phillips, 2013). These beliefs are fostered in cohesive family environments that encourage independence and expression, but still support the family member as this exploration occurs (Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo, Assouline & Russell, 1994; Shekera Stubbs, 2015). Due to little recent research on family and campus involvement, and the ever-

changing college population, studying this variable is especially important. The following

hypothesis was proposed:

H1: (a): Conformity orientation will be negatively associated with campus participation.

   (b): Conversation orientation will be positively associated with campus participation.

As a construct, college-self efficacy has the power individually to influence a student's

campus experience. This is because efficacy beliefs produce certain behaviors in students when

they are placed in situations of academia, roommate/dorm-living, and general social situations.

Yet before it can impact a student, college self-efficacy beliefs are first heavily developed by

one's family of origin.

In one study, coming from a family with less emotional expression led to more difficulty

in adjusting to college (Johnson, Gans, Kerr, & LaValle, 2010). This trait is characteristic in

Laissez-Faire and Protective families, both of which have low conversation orientation. In terms

of roommate and social self-efficacy, students who have open communication with their parents

are more likely to have it with others outside the family unit, thus leading to better roommate

relationships and confidence in pursuing campus activities (Brown, Fitzgerald, Shipman &

Schneider, 2007). When conflicts do arise, those with little experience in conflict are unable to

constructively handle it (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997).

In terms of academic self-efficacy, students who have effective emotional coping

experience little difficulty in adjusting to the stressors of academic life (Johnson, Gans, Kerr, &

LaValle, 2010). As stated earlier, emotional expression is characteristic of conversation

orientation. Therefore, students who learn how to handle their emotions in the family unit will

fare better in similar situations outside of the family. In another study, students performed better

in school when their parents believed in them and shared their concerns (Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo, Assouline & Russell, 1994). Family cohesiveness, which describes how involved families are in each other's lives, has also been linked to higher academic self-efficacy (Shekera Stubbs, 2015). This is another characteristic of conversation-oriented families. Taking this information, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H2: (a): Conformity orientation will be negatively associated with college self-efficacy development.

(b): Conversation orientation will be positively associated with college self-efficacy development.

The next dependent variable to examine is stress. In one study, dysfunction in a student's family was significantly associated with more stress (Erb, 2014). While families high in conformity orientation *do* experience less conflict, their negative perceptions of it may leave them unable to effectively communicate in conflict situations that do arise; causing higher overall dysfunction in the family unit than those who routinely resolve conflicts (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997). In another study, higher family cohesion increased psychological reactance in students (which leads to higher stress and less self-control) (Buboltz Jr., Johnson & Woller, 2003). On the other hand, having a supportive family unit to talk with in moments of stress can help students cope (Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo, Assouline & Russell, 1994). Additionally, emotional support from attachment figures (which is characteristic in conversation-oriented families) aids in social competence and stress decrease (Kenny & Donaldson, 1991). Taking these findings into consideration, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H3 (a): Conformity orientation will be positively associated with experiencing stress.

(b): Conversation orientation will be negatively associated with experiencing stress.

Aside from stress, depression is another aspect of the campus experience that is impacted by family of origin. In one study, 41 percent of depressed students indicated that their families were the primary coping mechanism when problems arose (Vredenburg, O'Brien & Krames, 1988). However, family can be both a relief and source of depression. Dysfunction in a student's family has been linked to depression (Erb, 2014). As explained earlier, dysfunction is characteristic of families that regard conflict as bad (i.e. conformity orientation). As dysfunction and negative conflict increase, so does depressive levels and symptoms in children (Schmidtgall, King, Zarski, & Cooper, 2000). Families high in conformity orientation can also put more pressure on children to act according to their will, rather than letting the child be independent. Vredenburg et al discovered that more depressed students felt family pressure to succeed than non-depressed students (1988). In addition to family dysfunction, this finding shows that pressure to conform also causes depression in students. While pressure can cause depression in students, emotional support (which is found in conversation-oriented families) can act as a buffer against it (Levens, Elrahal & Sagui, 2016). Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H4 (a): Conformity orientation will be positively associated with depression.

(b): Conversation orientation will be negatively associated with depression.

CHAPTER 2: METHODS

<u>Participants and Procedures</u>

Study participants were recruited from introductory communication classes taught at the University of Central Florida's Nicholson School of Communication during the Spring 2018/Fall 2018 terms. The data was collected via a survey created by Qualtrics and administered to students online via a link sent to instructors by email. Participation in the study was voluntary, however students who completed it may have been eligible to receive extra credit in their course(s) in exchange for their time.

A total of 253 student responses were analyzed for the study. The sample consisted of 73.7% women, the average age was 21 (SD=1.784), median year in school was three (junior standing), and the ethnic makeup of the sample was 14.9% African American, 2.4% Asian, 59.6% Caucasian, 19.2% Hispanic and 3.5% other.

<div align="center">Measures</div>

Conversation and Conformity Orientation. To determine levels of conversation and conformity orientation, students responded to items in the Revised Family Communication Pattern (RFCP) instrument (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990); a modification of the 1972 Family Communication Pattern instrument (FCP) by McLeod and Chaffee. This instrument is widely used in communication research to measure family communication patterns/norms and predict behaviors in family offspring. At its conception, the reliabilities of the RFCP were "substantially better than are the reliabilities of the original FCP" and better-suited for measuring family communication (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). This first study utilized a pool of families with children in grades 7-11 and reported reliable results across the entire age range. In another study by Yuan Huang which utilized the RFCP toward Chinese college students, it was discovered "that protective and laissez-faire families have a higher level of communication apprehension (CA) than those from pluralistic families" (2010). This indicates the reliability of the RFCP when used toward studying college students.

The instrument contains 15 items to assess conversation orientation, and 11 items for conformity orientation. It was scored using a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) to rate dimensions of family communication patterns. Sample statements included "My parents tend to be very open about their emotions," and "When I am at

home, I am expected to obey my parents' rules." Each measure was summed to create an overall

score. See Table 1 for all descriptive statistics and reliability analyses for variables in the study.

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Analyses for all Variables*

	Family Conversation Orientation	Family Conformity Orientation	CSEI Scale	Stress	Depression	Number of events attended each semester.	Days per week spent on campus.	Amount of time spent on campus on a typical day.	Number of student organizations student is an active member of.
Mean	3.42	2.87	7.23	3.03	2.04	3.06	4.26	2.16	1.66
Standard Deviation	.918	.771	1.50	.551	.630	1.93	1.52	.955	.890

Demographics/Campus Participation. The first section asked students a set of 15

questions on general demographics, as well as information on campus participation. This was

adopted from a study by Kleiman and McConnell (2017, p. 41-43), in which the questions were

used to compare campus presence feelings and campus involvement. This study found that

students who were involved in at least one organization, spent more time on campus and

attended more campus events had significantly higher campus presence (Kleiman & McConnell,

2017, p. 13). To determine campus participation, students were asked these same questions: how

many events they attended each semester, clubs they were involved in, the number of days spent

on camper per week, and time spent on campus.

College Self-Efficacy. The third measure used was the College Self-Efficacy Inventory

(CSEI) (Gore et al, 2005), which determined student self-efficacy beliefs as they applied to the

campus environment. This particular study applied the CSEI to measure three factors: academic/course, roommate and social self-efficacy; in which they reported internal consistency coefficients for the three subscale scores (Course $\alpha = .88$, Roommate $\alpha = .83$, Social $\alpha = .86$), thus providing additional support for the original CSEI created by Solberg at al. (1993). This measurement was also used to examine campus presence, in which increased presence was a key predictor in developing college self-efficacy beliefs (Kleiman & McConnell, 2017, p. 15).

The CSEI contains 20 items that are measured on a 10-point Likert scale from 1 (Not at all Confident) to 10 (Extremely Confident). Students will report their confidence in doing various activities, including to: "Make new friends at UCF," "Ask a question in class," and "Get along with others you live with." The scale was created by summing the scores on each item with a maximum self-efficacy score of 200 and a minimum of 20.

Stress. To measure stress, students responded to questions contained in the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) (Cohen, Karmarck, & Mermelstein, 1983). The PSS is a 14-item questionnaire that asks respondents about the frequency of certain feelings/thoughts during the last month. The questions were measured from 0 (Never) to 4 (Very Often). While originally created for a community with at least junior high education, the PSS items are general enough to fit most any population, including college students. Higher ratings for each question indicated more stressful feelings in respondents. A review of the PSS found that it has mostly been used with college students or workers, showing that this is a fitting measure for the current study audience (Lee, 2012).

Depression. The fifth and final instrument used in this study is the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CESD) (Radloff, 1977). As a long-standing measure

among researchers, this scale was utilized to determine depression levels and feelings in students. It measures "symptoms defined by the American Psychiatric Association' Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-V) for a major depressive episode" (CESD-R, n.d.). Another study provided support for the measure when using it to assess depression in Hispanic college students (Arbona, Burridge & Olvera, 2017). The CESD consists of 20 items that describe ways a student may have felt or behaved, including "I felt hopeful about the future," and "I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing." For each statement, students rated how often they felt that way during the past week, ranging from "Rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)" to "Most or all of the time (5-7 days)." As with the PSS scale, higher frequency in the negatively-based questions indicated higher depression levels in participants.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

After gathering all needed participants, the Qualtrics survey was closed and exported into an Excel file. First, around 216 participants were removed from the data after incorrectly answering questions gauged to test survey involvement, missing answers, or being outside the target demographics for age/year in school.

The remaining 253 participant responses were imported into SPSS for multiple analyses. First, all five survey instruments were tested to ensure that data was usable. Each instrument had a Cronbach's Alpha above .7, allowing them to be used. Correlation analyses were performed between conversation/conformity orientation and each of the four variables (college self-efficacy, stress, depression and campus participation).

CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

H1: Campus Participation

Hypothesis 1a predicted that conformity orientation would be negatively correlated with campus participation. Analysis revealed no significant negative correlation for number of events attended and conformity orientation, measuring at r (253) =.10, p =.052. There was also no significant negative prediction for conformity orientation and days spent on campus. In fact, the numbers were alike for conversation and conformity orientation at r (253) =.09, p =.073. Time spent on campus was negatively correlated with conformity, though it wasn't significant at r (253) =-.02, p =.358. Number of student organizations involved in was positively correlated, though insignificant at r (253) =.07, p =.140.

Inversely, Hypothesis 1b predicted that conversation orientation was positively related to campus participation. The actual correlation between conversation orientation and number of events attended each semester was significant at r (253) =.20, p =.001, partly agreeing with the predicted relationship. No significant correlations existed for conversation orientation and days spent on campus, time spent on campus, or number of student organizations involved in, though all were positive in nature.

Table 2. *1-Tailed Test Correlation Values for All Variables*

Variable	Family Conversation r-value	Family Conformity r-value
Number of events attended each semester.	.20**	.10
Days per week spent on campus.	.09	.09
Amount of time spent on campus on a typical day.	.03	-.02
Number of student organizations student is an active member of.	.06	.07

College Self Efficacy Scale	.34**	-.10
Stress	-.23**	.10
Depression	-.21**	.09

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

H2: College Self-Efficacy

Hypothesis 2a theorized that conformity orientation would be negatively associated with college self-efficacy feelings. After computation, the correlation between these variables turned out to be r (253) =-.10, p =.054, showing no significance.

For conversation orientation, Hypothesis 2b predicted that conversation orientation was positively related to college self-efficacy. The analysis supported this, showing a correlation of r (253) =.34, p =.000.

H3: Stress

For stress, it was predicted in Hypothesis 3a that conformity orientation was positively correlated with experiencing stress. Data for this measure was r (253) =.10, p =.057, indicating no significant correlation.

Hypothesis 3b theorized an opposite relationship for conversation orientation, meaning less stress experiences. The correlation was as predicted, measuring at r (253) = -.23, p = .000.

H4: Depression

Like the predictions of stress, Hypothesis 4a theorized that conformity orientation was positively related to experiencing depression. Data did not significantly support this hypothesis at r (253) =.09, p =.082.

Finally, Hypothesis 4b predicted that conversation orientation would be negatively correlated with depressive feelings. The correlation measured as predicted at r (253) = -.21, p =.001.

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION

<u>The Influence of Family Communication Styles on College-Aged Children</u>

The goal of this study was to determine how family communication styles influence children once they are immersed in the college environment, and specifically conversation and conformity orientation levels in the pattern. It was hypothesized that conversation orientation would be positively associated with campus participation and college self-efficacy, and negatively associated with stress and depression. Conversely, conformity orientation was hypothesized to be negatively associated with campus participation and college self-efficacy, and positively associated with stress and depression. Prior research indicated that conversation orientation provided more positive benefits for college students than conformity orientation, including the ability to socialize, overcome issues/worries, perform well in classes, and other benefits.

After analysis, it was revealed that a majority of the results agreed with the four hypotheses. For campus participation, which was measured by asking students four questions centered around aspects of campus participation, it was shown that only conversation orientation was significantly correlated, and specifically with the number of UCF events attended each semester. However, one oddity in the results was that conversation and conformity orientation were *equally* correlated for the number of days per week spent on campus under campus participation. One explanation for this is that conformity orientation develops structure in a child, which encourages them to always attend class and seek campus resources more than someone raised in a conversation-oriented family that values flexibility and freedom in decision-making.

For college self-efficacy, a significant positive correlation existed with conversation orientation. This was actually the strongest correlation to exist for conversation orientation and the four variables (campus participation, college self-efficacy, stress and depression), measuring at r (253) =.34. There was no significant relationship between conformity orientation and college self-efficacy, however it was negatively correlated as predicted. These results indicate that conversation orientation benefits students in navigating the college environment, including socialization, seeking academic help, joining clubs/sports, etc., and that conformity orientation, while it negatively influences college self-efficacy, doesn't leave as much of a negative influence when compared to the positive influence of conversation orientation.

Similar results were seen in the data for stress and depression in college students. As predicted, conversation orientation was negatively correlated with college students experiencing stress and depression. These were both significant relationships. However, conformity orientation showed *no* significant positive correlations. The data reveals that conversation orientation makes a greater influence on *relieving* stress and depression than conformity does on creating these feelings.

As at it relates to the family unit, this study re-emphasizes the importance of healthy levels of conversation orientation as a child grows up. This orientation equips a child to function independently in the college environment, take advantage of resources both in and out of the classroom, balance social and academic pressures, and also relieve negative feelings (like stress and depression) in a healthy, effective way. Both the data and existing literature presented in the study support this. However, what this study contributes to existing literature is that conversation orientation matters *more* than conformity orientation, as evidenced by very few of the

correlations for conformity being significant predictions at the $p < .01$ level in comparison with conversation orientation. In families who exhibit both orientations, the data suggests a 'net effect' of conversation orientation on conformity orientation. This means that the presence of conversation orientation balances the negative aspects of conformity orientation, while conformity orientation balances conversation by instilling structure in a child.

<div align="center">Limitations</div>

In this study, there are a few important limitations that need to be recognized. The first of which is the sample itself, which only examined 253 beginning college students for the survey instruments. The results may be different for students who are later in their college career, however the focus was on beginning college students for the likelihood that their parents have a larger impact than a student who is more independent after 3-4 years in college. The results are also representative of UCF students only, and not of other private/public universities. The sample was also mostly females, which as the literature review discussed may influence results since females are more emotionally expressive than males (Chentsova-Dutton & Tsai, 2007; Deng et al, 2016; Kring & Gordon, 1998). The second limitation is related to the structure of the campus participation variable measurement, as it utilized four questions on different aspects of campus participation rather than a highly-tested scale. The novelty of this measurement means that it may not have exhaustively examined campus participation as the scales in the other variables did and may have contributed to finding no significant correlations for either orientation, aside from conversation and number of campus events attended. The third limitation is that the current study only examined four variables in the functioning of college-aged students. Other variables exist that may be valuable to examine, such as gender differences, substance abuse, and campus

employment. The final limitation exists in finding no significant relationship between conformity orientation and any of the variables, although significant correlations did exist for conversation orientation and college self-efficacy, stress and depression.

Future Research

Bridging off this study and ones related to it, future researchers should attempt to repeat it using a different method for measuring campus participation. This may influence what significant correlations result for each orientation. Additionally, researchers should repeat the study using different variables to see different ways that conversation and conformity impact students. It would also be beneficial to see if results vary between students who attend public and private institutions, or even state community colleges, in addition to varying sample sizes and where those samples are drawn from (i.e. utilizing STEM vs Social Sciences courses).

One additional student body that would be interesting to examine is the growing population of students who attend college online. Due to the nature of being an online student, it is postulated that they would have lower campus participation and develop college self-efficacy beliefs differently. Studying this population may also reveal a higher level of conformity orientation, as students often choose the online path to save commuting and living expenses and live at home as well. However, there could also be a chance for equally-as-high conversation orientation, as students who choose online may be fully-grown adults who work full time/have families and seek online education as a flexible means to advance their careers.

Conclusion

The present study sought to analyze how conversation and conformity orientation levels in the family unit influence a student once they enter college. This was based on literature that

introduced two types of communication orientations in a family: conversation and conformity. Conversation orientation encourages open, evolving communication, challenging values, independence, and personal growth, while the latter consists of communication behaviors that reinforce structure, homogeneity, and adherence to norms in a family unit. Knowing these definitions and the various studied implications of them, it was theorized that conversation orientation would provide positive influences on a child once they enter college, while conformity would provide negative influences.

Previous literature also identified four types of family types, which each differ in their levels of conversation and conformity orientation. Consensual families are high in both conversation and conformity orientations are classified as Consensual (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). On the flipside, Laissez-Faire families are low in conversation and conformity orientation. In the middle of the orientation spectrum are Pluralistic families (high in conversation but low in conformity orientation) and Protective families (high in conformity but low in conversation orientation). However, this study chose to instead examine participants on a scale range rather than classify each one into a family style. This decision was based on previous research which recognized that families are rarely one of the aforementioned types, but instead a mix of each one. The types are mentioned here as a reference for explaining communication behaviors and their impacts on children.

A majority of the results for conversation orientation agreed with the study hypotheses, indicating that this orientation encourages students to attend more campus events, experience greater college self-efficacy (in both the academic and social realm), and feel less stress and depression/ability to relieve these feelings. While the correlations for conformity orientation

generally agreed with the study hypotheses, very few of these relationships were significant in nature.

Overall, the study results indicate that the presence of positive, conversation-based communication in a family leaves strong impacts on a child once they enter college. If both orientations are present in a family (which they usually are in varying degrees), it is the conversation aspect in communication that seems to matter more. This higher importance of conversation orientation is supported in a 2008 study by Punyanunt-Carter, which revealed that conversation but not conformity orientation was associated with communication satisfaction between college-aged daughters and their fathers. Building onto this, conformity orientation then serves as a balancing act; allowing open communication to occur but still retaining structure as a child develops. The same is said for conversation orientation, which acts as a buffer against the negative impacts of conformity orientation and keeps these expressions at bay. It is suggested that families incorporate both orientations into their communication structure but recognize the importance of increased conversation orientation as a child grows.

In conclusion, this study sought to examine the influence of conversation and conformity orientation communication styles on college-aged children. The largest takeaway is that conversation orientation makes a greater, positive influence in the collegiate setting than the negative influence of conformity orientation. Using these results, it is hoped that families work toward including more conversation orientation in their communication structure, as any behaviors—good or bad—a child learns from their family will be carried into their college career.

APPENDIX A: FIGURES AND TABLES

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Analyses for all Variables*

	Family Conversation Orientation	Family Conformity Orientation	CSEI Scale	Stress	Depression	Number of events attended each semester.	Days per week spent on campus.	Amount of time spent on campus on a typical day.	Number of student organizations student is an active member of.
Mean	3.42	2.87	7.23	3.03	2.04	3.06	4.26	2.16	1.66
Standard Deviation	.918	.771	1.50	.551	.630	1.93	1.52	.955	.890

Table 2. *1-Tailed Test Correlation Values for All Variables*

Variable	Family Conversation r-value	Family Conformity r-value
Number of events attended each semester.	.20**	.10
Days per week spent on campus.	.09	.09
Amount of time spent on campus on a typical day.	.03	-.02
Number of student organizations student is an active member of.	.06	.07
College Self Efficacy Scale	.34**	-.10
Stress	-.23**	.10

Depression	-.21**	.09

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

APPENDIX B: REVISED FAMILY COMMUNICATION PATTERN INSTRUMENT

Instructions: Read each statement and rate how strongly you agree/disagree, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

(Strongly Disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 (Strongly Agree)

1. In our family we often talk about topics like politics and religion where some persons disagree with others.

2. My parents often say something like "Every member of the family should have some say in family decisions."

3. My parents often ask me my opinion when the family is talking about something.

4. My parents encourage me to challenge their ideas and beliefs.

5. My parents often say something like "You should always look at both sides of an issue."

6. I usually tell my parents what I am thinking about things.

7. I can tell my parents almost anything.

8. In our family we often talk about our feelings and emotions.

9. My parents and I often have long, relaxed conversations about nothing in particular.

10. I really enjoy talking with my parents, even when they disagree.

11. My parents like to hear my opinions, even when they don't agree with me.

12. My parents encourage me to express my feelings.

13. My parents tend to be very open about their emotions.

14. We often talk as a family about things we have done during the day.

15. In our family we often talk about our plans and hopes for the future.

16. My parents often say something like "You'll know better when you grow up."

17. My parents often say something like "My ideas are right, and you should not question them."

18. My parents often say something like "A child should not argue with adults."

19. I make my own clothes and shoes.

20. My parents often say something like "There are some things that just shouldn't be talked about."

21. My parents often say something like "You should give in on arguments rather than risk making people mad."

22. When anything really important is involved, my parents expect me to obey without question.

23. In our home, my parents usually have the last word.

24. My parents feel that it is important to be the boss.

25. My parents sometimes become irritated with my views if they are different from theirs.

26. If my parents don't approve of it, they don't want to know about it.

27. When I am at home, I am expected to obey my parents' rules.

Scoring: Items 1-15 assessed levels of conversation orientation, while items 16-18 and 20-27 assessed conformity orientation. Item 19 was a filler question to test survey engagement and was

omitted in the results. The ratings for each question were totaled to determine levels of conversation and conformity orientation. The max scores for conversation and conformity orientation were 75 and 55, respectively.

APPENDIX C: DEMOGRAPHICS/CAMPUS PARTICIPATION SCALE

Instructions: Please answer the following anonymous demographical questions.

1. What do you identify as your gender?

    a. Male

    b. Female

    c. Other: _____

2. Type your age in years (please use a numeral, example 22) _____

3. What year are you in?

    a. Freshman

    b. Sophomore

    c. Junior

    d. Senior

    e. Graduate Student

4. What is your major? _____

5. What ethnic group do you most identify with?

    a. American Indian or Alaskan Native

b. Asian or Pacific Islander

c. Black/African American

d. Hispanic/Latino

e. White/Caucasian

f. Other _____

6. Are you a traditional or transfer student?

    a. Traditional

    b. Transfer

7. What is your household income range?

    a. Less than $24,999

    b. $25,000 to $49,999

    c. $50,000 to $99,999

    d. Over $100,000

8. Are you considered a part-time or full-time student?

    a. Part-time

    b. Full-time

9. What is your overall GPA? (If you don't know your exact GPA it is ok to estimate) _____

10. Have you lived on campus?

    a. Yes (If yes, how many years? 1, 2, 3, etc.) _____

    b. No

11. How many UCF events or activities do you attend each semester (for example, spirit splash, sporting events, non-class related lectures, drama or music productions, etc.)?

a. 0

b. 1-2

c. 2-3

d. 4-5

e. 5-6

f. 8-9

g. 10 or more

12. How many days per week are you on campus?

a. 0

b. 1

c. 2

d. 3

e. 4

f. 5+

13. On average, how much time do you spend on a typical day?

a. 0 to 2 hours

b. 3 to 5 hours

c. 6 to 9 hours

d. Over 10 hours

14. How many student organizations are you an active member of?

a. None

b. 1

c. 2

d. 3

e. 4

f. 5

g. More than 5

15. Are you employed?

     a. If yes, how many hours a week do you work? (15, 20, 30, etc.) _____

     b. No

APPENDIX D: COLLEGE SELF-EFFICACY INVENTORY

Instructions: Using the scale below, please indicate how confident you are (with extremely confident as a "10", not-at-all confident as a "1") as a student at UCF that you could successfully complete the following tasks.

(Not at all confident) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Extremely confident)

1. Make new friends at college.

2. Divide chores with others you live with.

3. Talk to university staff.

4. Manage time effectively.

5. Ask a question in class.

6. Participate in class discussions.

7. Get a date when you want one.

8. Research a term paper.

9. Do well on your exams.

10. Join a student organization.

11. Talk to your professors.

12. Join an intramural sports team.

13. Ask a professor a question.

14. Take good class notes.

15. Run a mile under 3 minutes.

16. Get along with others you live with.

17. Divide space in your residence.

18. Understand your textbooks.

19. Keep up to date with your schoolwork.

20. Write course papers.

21. Socialize with others you live with.

Scoring: Each item on the scale is added together and totaled for a maximum participant score of 200. Item 15 was a filler question to test survey engagement and was omitted in the survey analysis.

APPENDIX E: PERCIEVED STRESS-SCALE

Instructions: The questions below ask you about your feelings and thoughts during THE LAST MONTH. In each case, indicate your response by selecting the option that represents HOW OFTEN you felt or thought a certain way.

Never | Almost Never | Sometimes | Fairly Often | Very Often

1. In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?

2. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?

3. In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and "stressed"?

4. In the last month, how often have you dealt successfully with day to day problems and annoyances?

5. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were effectively coping with important changes that were occurring in your life?

6. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?

7. In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?

8. In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?

9. In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?

10. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?

11. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control?

12. In the last month, how often have you found yourself thinking about things that you have to accomplish?

13. In the last month, how often have you been able to control the way you spend your time?

14. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

Scoring: Each item ranges from a score of 0 to 5, with the higher scores for items 1, 2, 3, 8, 11, and 14 indicating more feelings of stress. Higher scores for items 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 13 showed less feelings of stress, and were reverse-scored. The maximum scale score was 70, with higher scores indicating increased stress symptoms.

APPENDIX F: CENTER FOR EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES DEPRESSION SCALE

Instructions: Please indicate on the scale below how often you have felt this way during the past week.

Rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day).	**Some or a little of the time (1-2 days).**	**Occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3-4 days).**	**Most or all of the time (5-7 days).**

1. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me.

2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.

3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends.

4. I felt I was just as good as other people.

5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.

6. I felt depressed.

7. I felt that everything I did was an effort.

8. I felt hopeful about the future.

9. I thought my life had been a failure.

10. I felt fearful.

11. My sleep was restless.

12. I was happy.

13. I talked less than usual.

14. I felt lonely.

15. People were unfriendly.

16. I enjoyed life.

17. I had crying spells.

18. I felt sad.

19. I felt that people dislike me.

20. I could not get "going."

Scoring: Scores ranged for each question from zero (for rarely or none of the time) to three (for most or all of the time). The scoring of positive items 4, 8, 12, and 16 was reversed. The maximum score for the scale was 60, with higher scores indicating more depressive feelings.

APPENDIX G: IRB OUTCOME LETTER

Determination of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: **Madison Lillian Kjosa and Co-PI: Harry Weger**

Date: **March 23, 2018**

Dear Researcher:

On 03/23/2018, the IRB reviewed the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review:	Exempt Determination
Project Title:	The Influence of Family Styles on Campus Experience in College-Aged Children.
Investigator:	Madison Lillian Kjosa
IRB Number:	SBE-18-13759
Funding Agency:	
Grant Title:	
Research ID:	N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

This letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Gillian Morien on 03/23/2018 12:05:03 PM EDT

Designated Reviewer

Page 1 of 1

REFERENCES

American College Health Association (2017). *American College Health Association-National College Health Assessment II: Undergraduate Student Reference Group Executive Summary Fall 2016*. Hanover, MD: American College Health Association.

Arbona, C., Burridge A., & Olvera N. (2017). The Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Measurement equivalence across gender groups in Hispanic college students. *Journal of Affective Disorders,* 219, 122-118.

Baugh, E., & Davis, C. (2016). The influence of perceived parenting style and contraceptive self-efficacy on college student contraceptive use. *Marriage & Family Review, 52*(8), 764-780. doi:10.1080/01494929.2016.1157558

Bayram, N., & Bilgel, N. (2008). The prevalence and socio-demographic correlations of depression, anxiety and stress among a group of university students. *Social Psychiatry And Psychiatric Epidemiology*, (8), 667.

Beck, S. J., & Ledbetter, A. M. (2013). The influence of parent conflict style on children. *Personal Relationships, 20*(3), 495-510. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2012.01420.x

Bentley, D. A. (1982). Reaction to Stress as a Predictor of Academic Success.

Bradbury, B. L., & Mather, P. C. (2009). The Integration of First-Year, First-Generation College Students from Ohio Appalachia. *NASPA Journal*, 46(2), 258-281.

Brown, A., Fitzgerald, M., Shipman, K., & Schneider, R. (2007). Children's Expectations Of Parent–Child Communication Following Interparental Conflict: Do Parents Talk to

Children About Conflict?. *Journal Of Family Violence, 22*(6), 407-412.

doi:10.1007/s10896-007-9095-x

Buboltz Jr., W. C., Johnson, P., & Woller, K. P. (2003). Psychological Reactance in College

Students: Family-of-Origin Predictors. *Journal Of Counseling & Development, 81*(3),

311.

Butler, G. (1993). Definitions of stress. *Occasional Paper (Royal College Of General*

Practitioners), (61), 1-5.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, P. N. (1990). *Campus Life: In Search of*

Community. A Special Report.

CESD-R: Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale Revised Online Depression

Assessment. (n.d.). Retrieved November 7, 2018, from http://cesd-r.com/

Chentsova-Dutton, Y. E., & Tsai, J. L. (2007). Gender differences in emotional response among

European Americans and Hmong Americans. *Cognition & Emotion, 21*(1), 162-181.

doi:10.1080/02699930600911333

Cohen, S., Karmarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress.

Journal of Health & Social Behavior, 24, 385-396.

Coiro, M. J., Bettis, A. H., & Compas, B. E. (2017). College students coping with interpersonal

stress: Examining a control-based model of coping. *Journal Of American College Health,*

65(3), 177-186.

Connor-Smith, J. K., Compas, B. E., Wadsworth, M. E., Thomsen, A. H., Saltzman, H., (2000).

Responses to Stress Questionnaire. *Journal Of Consulting And Clinical Psychology, 68*,

976-992.

Cutrona, C. E., Cole, V., Colangelo, N., Assouline, S. G., & Russell, D. W. (1994). Perceived

parental social support and academic achievement: An attachment theory perspective.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66(2), 369-378.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.2.369

Deng, Y., Chang, L., Yang, M., Huo, M., & Zhou, R. (2016). Gender differences in emotional

response: Inconsistency between experience and expressivity. *Plos ONE, 11*(6),

Depression. (n.d.). Retrieved October 14, 2017, from

https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/depression/index.shtml#part_145396

Desjardins, T., & Leadbeater, B. J. (2017). Changes in parental emotional support and

psychological control in early adulthood: Direct and indirect associations with

educational and occupational adjustment. *Emerging Adulthood, 5*(3), 177-190.

doi:10.1177/2167696816666974

Dorrance-Hall, E. E., McNallie, J., Custers, K., Timmermans, E., Wilson, S. R., & Van den

Bulck, J. (2017). A Cross-Cultural Examination of the Mediating Role of Family Support

and Parental Advice Quality on the Relationship Between Family Communication

Patterns and First-Year College Student Adjustment in the United States and Belgium.

Communication Research, 44(5), 638-667. doi:10.1177/0093650216657755

Dusselier, L., Dunn, B., Wang, Y., Shelley, M. I., & Whalen, D. F. (2005). Personal, health,

academic, and environmental predictors of stress for residence hall students. *Journal of

American College Health*, (1). 15.

Elkins, D. J., Forrester, S. A., & Noel-Elkins, A. V. (2011). Students' perceived sense of campus

community: the influence of out-of-class experiences. *College Student Journal, (1), 105.*

Ellis, E. M. (2000). Impact of parental conflict on children's adjustment following divorce. In, *Divorce wars: Interventions with families in conflict* (pp. 37-59). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10359-002

Erb, S.E. & Short, J.L. (2012). [Family of Origin and Roommate Relationships: Dissertation Pilot Study]. Unpublished raw data.

Erb, S. E. (2014). The role of roommate relationships and family of origin functioning in students' mental health and college adjustment outcomes. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 74.

Felsman, D. E., & Blustein, D. L. (1999). The role of peer relatedness in late adolescent career development. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior, 54*(2), 279-295. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1998.1664

Ferrari, J. R., Parker, J. T., & Ware, C. B. (1992). Academic procrastination: Personality correlates with Myers-Briggs types, self-efficacy, and academic locus of control. *Journal Of Social Behavior & Personality, 7*(3), 495-502.

Gore, P. J., Leuwerke, W. C., & Turley, S. E. (2005). A Psychometric Study of the College Self-Efficacy Inventory. *Journal Of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 7(3-4), 227-244.

Hannum, J. W., & Dvorak, D. M. (2004). Effects Of Family Conflict, Divorce, And Attachment Patterns On The Psychological Distress And Social Adjustment Of College Freshmen. *Journal Of College Student Development*, (1), 27.

Huang, Y. (2010). *Family communication patterns, communication apprehension and soci-communicative orientative orientation: a study of Chinese students*. Akron, Ohio: University of Akron, 2010.

Johnson, V. K., Gans, S. E., Kerr, S., & LaValle, W. (2010). Managing the Transition to College: Family Functioning, Emotion Coping, and Adjustment in Emerging Adulthood. *Journal Of College Student Development*, (6), 607.

Kenny, M. E., & Donaldson, G. A. (1991). Contributions of parental attachment and family structure to the social and psychological functioning of first-year college students. *Journal Of Counseling Psychology*, (4), 479.

Kleiman, D. M., & McConnell, D. (2017). *A measurement of campus presence: the cognitive link between campus engagement and positive outcomes in college students*. Orlando, Florida : University of Central Florida, 2017.

Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1997). Family type and conflict: the impact of conversation orientation and conformity orientation on conflict in the family. *Communication Studies*, (1), 59.

Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2002). You never leave your family in a fight: the impact of family of origin on conflict-behavior in romantic relationships. *Communication Studies*, (3), 234.

Kring, A. M., & Gordon, A. H. (1998). Sex differences in emotion: expression, experience, and physiology. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, (3), 686.

Lee, E. (2012). Review of the Psychometric Evidence of the Perceived Stress Scale. *Asian Nursing Research,* 6(4), 121-127.

Levens, S. M., Elrahal, F., & Sagui, S. J. (2016). The Role of Family Support and Perceived

    Stress Reactivity in Predicting Depression in College Freshman. *Journal Of Social &*

    Clinical Psychology, 35(4), 342. doi:10.1521/jscp.2016.35.4.342

Lim, S. A., & You, S. (2017). Effects of self-esteem and depression on abnormal eating behavior

    among Korean female college students: Mediating role of body dissatisfaction. *Journal*

    Of Child And Family Studies, 26(1), 176-182. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0542-2

Lopez, F. G., Mauricio, A. M., Gormley, B., Simko, T., & Berger, E. (2001). Adult Attachment

    Orientations and College Student Distress: The Mediating Role of Problem Coping

    Styles. *Journal Of Counseling & Development, 79*(4), 459.

Major Depression Among Adults. (n.d.). Retrieved October 14, 2017, from

    https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/prevalence/major-depression-among-

    adults.shtml

McAuliff, K. E., Williams, S. M., & Ferrari, J. R. (2013). Social justice and the university

    community: Does campus involvement make a difference?. *Journal Of Prevention &*

    Intervention In The Community, 41(4), 244-254. doi:10.1080/10852352.2013.818486

McLeod, J. M., & Chaffee, S. H. (1972). The construction of social reality. In J. Tedeschi (Ed.),

    The social influence process (pp. 50-59). Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Retrieved October 08, 2017, from https://www.merriam-

    webster.com/dictionary/community

Nelson, W. L. (1993). The Relationship of Family Structure and Family Conflict to Adjustment

    in Young Adult College Students. *Adolescence, 28*(109), 29-40.

Ong, B., & Cheong, K. C. (2009). Sources of Stress among College Students--The Case of a

   Credit Transfer Program. *College Student Journal, 43*(4), 1279-1286.

Oswalt, R., & Finkelberg, S. (1995). College depression: causes, duration, and coping.

   Psychological Reports, (3), 858.

Oyama, O. P., & Piotrowski, N. P. (2017). Depression. <u>*Magill's* Medical Guide</u> (Online Edition)<u>.</u>

Parker, J. K., Ansari, W. E., & Lovell, G. P. (2010). Perceived Exercise Benefits and Barriers of

   Non-Exercising Female University Students in the United Kingdom. *International*

   Journal Of Environmental Research And Public Health, Vol 7, Iss 3, Pp 784-798 (2010),

   (3), 784. doi:10.3390/ijerph7030784

Punyanunt-Carter, N. (2008). Father-daughter relationships: Examining family communication

   patterns and interpersonal communication satisfaction.

   Communication Research Reports, 25(1), 23-33.

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the

   general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*(3), 385-401

Ritchie, L. D., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Family communication patterns: measuring

   intrapersonal perceptions of interpersonal relationships. *Communication Research*, (4),

   523.

Schmidtgall, K., King, A., Zarski, J., & Cooper, J. (2000). The effects of parental conflict on

   later child development. *Journal Of Divorce & Remarriage, 33*(1/2), 149-157.

Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2006). *Attachment Theory, Individual Psychodynamics, and*

   Relationship Functioning. Cambridge University Press.

Shekera Stubbs, N. (2015). Family Functioning and Academic Self-Efficacy among Sixth Form
and Community College Students in Barbados and St. Lucia. *International Journal Of
Learning In Higher Education, 22*(4), 35-48.

Smith, H. M., & Betz, N. E. (2000). Development and validation of a Scale of Perceived Social
Self-Efficacy. *Journal Of Career Assessment, 8*(3), 283-301.
doi:10.1177/106907270000800306

Solberg, V. S., O'Brien, K., Villareal, P., Kennel, R., & Davis, B. (1993). Self-Efficacy and
Hispanic College Students: Validation of the College Self-Efficacy Instrument. *Hispanic
Journal Of Behavioral Sciences, 15*(1), 80-95.

Undergraduate Enrollment. (2017, May). Retrieved October 08, 2017, from
https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cha.asp

Vredenburg, K., O'Brien, E., & Krames, L. (1988). Depression in college students: Personality
and experiential factors. *Journal Of Counseling Psychology, 35*(4), 419-425.
doi:10.1037/0022-0167.35.4.419

Wang, X., & Kennedy-Phillips, L. (2013). Focusing on the Sophomores: Characteristics
Associated With the Academic and Social Involvement of Second-Year College
Students. *Journal Of College Student Development*, (5), 541-548.