

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

Minu Bharathi D^{1*}, Vimala Arun M²

ABSTRACT

The present study examines the significance between family privacy orientation, family satisfaction and psychological wellbeing among adults and middle-aged population. The study proposes three null hypotheses, which states that, 1) There will be no significant relationship between intimacy with family and family satisfaction among the population, 2) There will be no significant relationship between family satisfaction and psychological wellbeing among the population and 3) There will be no the significant difference in intimacy with family, family satisfaction, psychological wellbeing with age. The measures used to assess the above-mentioned variables are Pedersen's Privacy Questionnaire (1979), Satisfaction With Family Life, SWFL (2013) and Flourishing Scale, FS (2010), respectively. The targeted population include 300 participants with 150 male and 150 female participants, with equal representation of adults and middle-aged population. The results are expected to yield a significant relationship between intimacy with family and family satisfaction, significant relationship between family satisfaction and psychological wellbeing and significant difference between in intimacy with family, family satisfaction, psychological wellbeing with age.

Keywords: *Family Intimacy, Youth and Middle Aged, Family Satisfaction, Psychological Well-Being*

The Indian culture the role of a family influences an individual's life inevitably and promotes social cohesion and interdependence, and serves as a resource for psychological wellbeing. Even in the field of psychotherapy, it is not unknown that family holds a potential for therapeutic milieu (Sethi, 1989). In the present study, family is referred as a "group of individuals living together during important phases of their lifetime and bound to each other biological and/or social and psychological relationship" (Chadda & Deb, 2013). Many spheres of family functioning such as rules for interaction, communication patterns and acceptable practices are determined by culture. In other words, the importance of family is heavily interwoven with culture in India and it can be commonly seen that adolescents and young adults living with their family are supported until there is a life transition such as marriage, beginning of a career or venture into the other aspects of

¹M.Sc Psychology, Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bangalore, India

²Assistant professor, Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bangalore, India

*Corresponding Author

Received: July 07, 2021; Revision Received: August 09, 2021; Accepted: August 27, 2021

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

their lives. On the other hand, literature supports that, in western societies that puts impetus on “individualism”, posits effects on family relationships due to the developmental and relational changes that occurs during the adolescent and young adulthood stages. When the Indian society is sculpted with collectivistic framework, it does leave one to ponder whether family intimacy or family satisfaction contribute to psychological wellbeing among youth and middle aged in India. The psychological wellbeing is measured in terms of social-psychological prosperity, by exploring the positive relationships, feelings of competence and having meaning and purpose in life. Researches support that psychological wellbeing of the respondents can be predicted by the average level of social support that they receive, it may not be necessary to know which people are providing them or how much of support is given (Abbey, Abramis, & Caplan, 1985). Research suggests that the impact of social relationships among children, relationships especially with their family, friends and neighbourhood is likely to increase their well-being (Goswami, 2012).

Thus, the present study attempts to examine the significance between family intimacy, family satisfaction and psychological wellbeing among adults and middle aged population in India.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The present study takes up a quantitative research approach to identify the relationship between family intimacy, satisfaction and psychological well-being. In the study a non-experimental survey research design has been used. The data was collected from the sample through online administration and direct survey method which included demographic details along with the questionnaire. The study included individuals who are in their youth and middle aged, from various regions of the country to get a wider perspective around family intimacy, family satisfaction and psychological well-being.

Objectives

1. To examine the relationship between intimacy with family and family satisfaction among the sample.
2. To examine the relationship between family satisfaction and psychological wellbeing among the sample.
3. To identify the significant difference in intimacy with family, family satisfaction and psychological wellbeing among the adults and middle aged.

Hypothesis

Ho1: There will be no significant relationship between intimacy with family and family satisfaction among the population.

Ho2: There will be no significant relationship between family satisfaction and psychological wellbeing among the population.

Ho3a: There will be no the significant difference in family intimacy and age among the population.

Ho3b: There will be no significant difference in family satisfaction and age among the population.

Ho3c: There will be no significant difference in psychological well-being and age among the population.

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

Sampling Procedure

The study included participants – adults (18 to 40 years of age) and middle aged individuals (40 to 60 years of age), including students and working population. The targeted population is 300 participants with 150 females and 150 males. The study involves individuals belonging to different parts of country to get a wider perspective on the objectives of the study and include participant satisfying the inclusion criteria. The demographic data of the participant were solicited and it included the background information such as age, gender, profession, and region.

Inclusion criteria

- Individuals who are willing to participant in the study.
- Individuals who are able to understand English.
- Individuals who are falling in the age range from 18 – 60 years of age.

Exclusion criteria

- Individuals who are not born and brought up in the Indian society.
- Individuals who are below the age of 18 and above the age of 60.

Tools used for the study

The study uses three tools to understand the relationship between family intimacy, family satisfaction and subjective psychological well-being. The tools used to collect the data includes Pedersen's Privacy Questionnaire, the Satisfaction With Life Scale and the Flourishing Scale. Along with the questionnaires, 4 questions were added to collect the respondent's demographic variables of the study sample. It includes: Age, Gender, Occupation, Region.

The Pedersen's Privacy Questionnaire (1979) measures the types of privacy and consists of six privacy factors which includes – reverse (not revealing personal aspects of one's self to other), isolation (being geographically removed from and free from observation by others), solitary (freedom from observation by others), intimacy with family (being alone with family), intimacy with friends (being alone with friends) and anonymity (being seen but not identified by others). Each of the factors have 5 items and each item is rated by a 6-point numerical scale, the six points are as follows: 1- Never, 2 – Rarely, 3 – Occasionally, 4 – Sometimes, 5 – Often and 6 – Usually. The empirical validity of these dimensions has been established in various studies involving personality and behavioural correlates (Pedersen, 1994). The present study uses the 'intimacy with family' dimension to identify the significant relationship with life satisfaction.

The Satisfaction with Family Life (SWFL) scale (Zabriskie & Ward, 2013) measures the global judgment of family satisfaction of an individual. The general idea of the scale depends on the comparison of family life circumstances with one's own standards and expectations. The scale consists of 5 items for which the respondents respond with a 7 – point Likert-type scale. The point scale is as follows 1 – Strongly disagree, 2- Disagree, 3 – Slightly disagree, 4 – Neither agree nor disagree, 5 – Slightly agree, 6 – Agree and 7 – Strongly agree. Summing up all the items would produce the satisfaction with life score possibly ranging from 5 to 35. The reliability of the scale holds good with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from $\alpha = .91$ to $.94$ when the scale was administered to U.S families and Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from $\alpha = .92$ to $.94$ when administered to Canadian families. The validity of the scale poses good validity when used in other studies (da Costa

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

& Neto, 2019) (Schnettler et al., 2013), for example, researches indicate that family functioning is found to be higher in adoptive families rather than the general normative family samples.

The psychological wellbeing is measured through Flourishing Scale (FS) (Diener, Wirtz, & Tov, 2010). The flourishing Scale was previous called as Psychological Wellbeing scale but was renamed since the scale measured content beyond psychological well-being, that is, it explore various domains across positive functioning of an individual. The scale consists of 8 items for which the participants respond in 1 – 7 numerical scale ranging from strong disagreement to strong agreement. The high scores indicate that the respondents perceive themselves in positive terms in the important areas of functioning. The reliability and validity of the FS was measured in a study with a sample of older adults in Iran (Fassih-Ramandi, Soleimani, Allen, Gorgulu, & Motalebi, 2020). The study revealed that the FS showed a direct and significant association with the Oxford happiness questionnaire in the test of concurrent validity ($r=0.647$, $p<0.001$). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient (0.819) and the test-retest value (0.821) were acceptable.

Statistical Techniques

The collected data were coded in master data sheet in excel worksheet. The data were then be imported to Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26 for further analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

The present study employed descriptive variables which includes age, gender, family privacy orientation, family satisfaction and psychological wellbeing.

Inferential Statistics

To achieve the objectives of the study, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used to examine the significant relationship between the intimacy with family and family satisfaction among the population. Similarly, to examine the significant relationship between family satisfaction and psychological wellbeing among the population, the Pearson's Correlation was employed. To identify the significant difference in intimacy with family, family satisfaction and psychological wellbeing among the adults and middle-aged population, t-test was used in the study.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The present study attempted to find the relationship between family intimacy, family satisfaction and psychological well-being among youth and middle aged population. All the data gathered were logged into Microsoft Excel and were analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 26. Following the research design mentioned in the previous chapter, the obtained data was put through statistical analysis and will be presented in this present chapter.

Table 1. Demographic summary of the sample.

	N	Gender		Occupation	N	Region	N
		Male	Female				
Youth	145	56	89	Student	56	Urban	113
				Teacher	9		
				Engineer	6		
				Others	74		

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

				Bank Employee	9	Rural	32
				Teacher	4		
Middle Aged	122	67	55	Public Sector Employee	16	Urban	91
				Business	9		
				Engineer	10	Rural	
				Retired	12		
				Others	62		

The table 1 shows the demographic summary of the sample. From the table, it could be seen that the data were obtained from 145 youth, falling within the age range of 18 – 39 years old and 122 middle aged population falling within the age range of 40 – 60 years old discretely. Among the youth population there were 56 male and 89 female participants and among the middle aged population, there were 67 male and 55 female participants. In the youth population, 56 participants were students, 9 were teachers, 6 were engineers and rest of the 74 participants were having various occupations such as social work, tourism professionals, etc. On the other hand, in the middle aged population, there were 9 bank employees, 4 teachers, 16 public sector employees, 9 businessmen, 10 engineers, 12 retired personnel and 62 participants with miscellaneous jobs. Also, among the youth population, 113 participants were from urban region and 32 were from rural region. From the middle aged population, 91 participants were from urban region and 31 participants were from rural region.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

		N	Mean	SD
Occupation	Youth	145	3.94	2.20
	Middle aged	122		
Gender	Male	123	1.46	.49
	Female	144		
Family Intimacy	Youth	145	18	4.86
	Middle aged	122	17.42	5.06
Family Satisfaction	Youth	145	26.61	5.13
	Middle aged	122	28.73	4.46
Psychological Well-being	Youth	145	45.19	6.87
	Middle aged	122	45.84	7.42

The table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the variables used in the present study. The occupation of the sample consists of youth and middle aged, of which 145 participants were youth and 122 were middle aged participants. The mean and standard deviation of the occupation of the sample was ($\mu = 3.94 \pm 2.20$). In the aspect of gender, the sample consists of 123 male participants and 144 female participants. The mean and standard deviation of the gender of the sample was ($\mu = 1.46 \pm .49$).

To satisfy the objective of the study, the sample was assessed on their family intimacy, family satisfaction and psychological well-being. On family intimacy, the mean and standard deviation among the youth was ($\mu = 18 \pm 4.86$) and the mean and Standard deviation of the middle aged was ($\mu = 17.42 \pm 5.06$). In family satisfaction, the mean and standard deviation was ($\mu = 26.61 \pm 5.13$) among the youth, whereas the mean and standard deviation was ($\mu = 28.73 \pm 4.46$) among the middle aged. In psychological well-being, the

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

mean and standard deviation among the youth was ($\mu=45.19 \pm 6.87$) and the mean and Standard deviation of the middle aged was ($\mu= 45.84 \pm 7.42$).

The descriptive variables will further be analysed as follows to achieve the objective of the study.

Table 3. The relationship between family intimacy and family satisfaction among youth and the middle aged.

		N = 267	
		Family Intimacy	Family Satisfaction
Family Intimacy	Pearson Correlation		.169
	p		.006**
Family Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.169	
	p	.006**	

Significant at ** $p < 0.05$

The table 3 shows the relationship between family intimacy and family satisfaction among the youth and the middle aged. From the table it could be seen that there is a significant relationship between family intimacy and family satisfaction as the p value is .006, which indicates that $p < 0.05$, hence it can be said that there exists a significant relationship. Thus, the data result rejects the proposed hypothesis (H_01) – there will be no significant relationship between family intimacy and family satisfaction among the population.

From the results, it could be inferred from the data that there is a correlation between family intimacy and family satisfaction. As mentioned earlier in the study, family intimacy refers “being alone with members of one’s family to the exclusion of other people” (PEDERSEN, 1999). Literature (Bridge & Schrod, 2013) supports that how the family manages information and how they interact with the members of the family and individuals outside the family have association with family relationship and family satisfaction.

Table 4. The relationship between family satisfaction and psychological well-being among the youth and middle aged.

		N=267	
		Family Satisfaction	Psychological Well-Being
Family Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation		.432
	p		.0001**
Psychological Well-Being	Pearson Correlation	.432	
	p	.0001**	

Significant at ** $p < 0.05$

The table 4 shows the relationship between family satisfaction and psychological well-being among the youth and middle aged. From the table, it can be observed that the family

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

satisfaction does have a significant relationship with psychological well-being as p value is .0001, which indicates that $p < 0.05$, hence it can be said that there is a significant relationship. Thus, the data results reject the proposed hypothesis (Ho2) – there will be no significant relationship between family satisfaction and psychological well-being among the population.

Researches (Krys et al., 2019, Lu & Gilmour, 2004, Zabriskie & Ward, 2013) explain that in many of the collectivistic societies, individuals place more importance over their family than their self or personal needs which in turn contributes to their psychological well-being. Out of the six aspects in life – family, friends, leisure time, politics, work and religion; individuals from collectivistic societies rated family as the most important aspect of life.

Table 5. Significant difference between age, family intimacy, family satisfaction, psychological well-being among youth and middle aged.

	Mean (SD)		t	df	p
	18 – 39 Yrs (n = 145)	40 – 60 Yrs (n = 122)			
Family Intimacy	18 (4.86)	17.42 (5.06)	.955	265	.340
Family Satisfaction	26.61 (5.13)	28.73 (4.46)	-3.57	265	.0001
Psychological Well-being	45.19 (6.87)	45.84 (7.42)	-.74	265	.459

The table 5 shows the significant difference between age, family intimacy, family satisfaction, psychological well-being among youth and middle aged. From the table it can be observed that, in the case of family intimacy, the mean value among youth was ($\mu = 18$) and the standard deviation (4.86), on the other hand, the middle aged participants scored slightly lower with the mean value of ($\mu = 17.42$) and standard deviation (5.06). The p value obtained was (0.34), since the $p > 0.05$ there is no significant difference among the youth and middle aged in family intimacy. Thus, the data result accepts the proposed hypothesis (Ho3a) – there will be no significant difference between family intimacy and age among the population.

Similarly, in family satisfaction, the youth has scored a mean value of ($\mu = 26.61$) and standard deviation (5.13) whereas the middle aged participants has scored a slightly higher mean value of ($\mu = 28.73$) with standard deviation (4.46). The p value obtained was (.0001), since the $p < 0.05$ there is a significant difference among the youth and middle aged in family satisfaction. Thus, the data results rejects the proposed hypothesis (Ho3b) – there will be no significant difference between family satisfaction and age among the population.

Likewise, in psychological well-being the youth and the middle aged participants scored more or less equal to each other. The youth has scored a mean value of ($\mu = 45.19$) with standard deviation (6.87) and the middle aged population has scored a mean value of ($\mu = 45.84$) with standard deviation of (7.42). The p value obtained was (.459), since the $p > 0.05$ there is no significant difference among the youth and middle aged in psychological well-being. Thus, the data results accept the proposed hypothesis (Ho3c) – there will be no significant difference between psychological well-being and age among the population.

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

Table 6. Correlation between family intimacy, family satisfaction and psychological well-being among the sample.

		Family Intimacy	Family Satisfaction	Psychological Well-being
Family Intimacy	Pearson Correlation	-	.16	.09
	p		.003**	.07
Family Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.16	-	.43
	p	.003**		.001**
Psychological Well-being	Pearson Correlation	.09	.43	-
	p	.07	.001**	

Significant at **p<0.05

Table 7. Regression analysis predicting the level of psychological wellbeing.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients β	R2	F	Sig. F	t	p
		B	Std. Error						
		1.	(Constant)	27.99					
	Family Intimacy	.024	.081	.017	.187	30.34	0.0001	.303	.762
	Family Satisfaction	.619	.081	.429				7.62	.000

The table 7 shows the regression analysis predicting the level of psychological well-being of the sample. From the table it could be observed that the R2 is 18% were R2 is the coefficient of determination. Thus, it can be said that 18% of an individual's psychological well-being is explained family intimacy and family satisfaction. To predict the effect of family intimacy and family satisfaction on psychological well-being, the unstandardized coefficient (B) explains the effect on the dependent variable (psychological well-being) with every 1 unit increase in family intimacy and family satisfaction. With the increase in family intimacy, there is no significant impact on psychological well-being, as B=.02 and with the increase in family satisfaction has a 61% impact on psychological well-being. The F value indicates the usefulness of the linear regression model, i.e. it explains the significance of the model. From the table, it could be seen that significance F is 0. Since, F<0.05 the null hypothesis in the regression model cannot be rejected.

CONCLUSION

The present study made three hypothesize to satisfy the objective of the study. It was hypothesised that (H01) – there will be no significant relationship between family intimacy and family satisfaction among the population, (H02) – there will be no significant relationship between family satisfaction and psychological well-being among the population, (H03a) – there will be no significant difference between family intimacy and age among the population, (H03b) there will be no significant difference between family satisfaction and age among the population, and (Ho3c) – there will be no significant difference between

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

psychological well-being and age among the population. . When correlation analysis was employed to study (H01), the data revealed that there is a significant relationship between family intimacy and family satisfaction among the population. Similarly, when correlation analysis was employed to study (H02) the data revealed that there is a significant relationship between family satisfaction and psychological well-being among the population. And when independent sample t-test was employed to study the significant difference among the population, the data revealed that there is no significant difference between family intimacy and age among the population, however there was a significant difference between family satisfaction and age among the population. And it was found that there is no significant difference between psychological well-being and age among the population. The regression analysis in predicting the level of psychological wellbeing revealed that 18% of an individual's psychological well-being is explained family intimacy and family satisfaction. Thus, the present study enables the policy makers to have an insight over the psychological well-being of the youth and middle- age population.

Implications

A part of the study focused on studying the family intimacy based on privacy orientation and its relationship with family satisfaction. Future studies with qualitative research design on family intimacy based on privacy orientation would better capture the essence of the variable. From the results obtained from the study, it can be said that there is a significant difference between family satisfaction and age among the population. This open the scope to study the factors leading to the difference in family satisfaction with age in the Indian population.

Limitations

1. The present study adopted an empirical approach to explore the family intimacy and family satisfaction, missing out the nuance of the factors that attribute to family intimacy and family satisfaction which could've been achieved through qualitative research.
2. The data collected from the sample is small and hence it cannot be generalized to the population.
3. The questionnaire used to measure family intimacy based on privacy orientation does not cover the full aspect of family intimacy based on privacy orientation.

REFERENCES

- Abbey, A., Abramis, D. J., & Caplan, R. D. (1985). Effects of Different Sources of Social support and Social Conflict on Emotional Well-Being. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 6(2), 111–129. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp0602_2
- Belsky, J., Jaffee, S., Hsieh, K. H., & Silva, P. A. (2001). Child-rearing antecedents of intergenerational relations in young adulthood: a prospective study. *Developmental Psychology*, 37(6), 801–813. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0012-1649.37.6.801>
- Bridge, M. C., & Schrodt, P. (2013). Privacy Orientations as a Function of Family Communication Patterns. *Communication Reports*, 26(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08934215.2013.773054>
- Carmon, A. F., Miller, A. N., & Brasher, K. J. (2013). Privacy Orientations: A Look at Family Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, and Work–Life Balance. *Communication Reports*, 26(2), 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08934215.2013.824017>
- Carver, M. D., & Jones, W. H. (1992). The family satisfaction scale. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 20(2), 71–83.

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

- Chadda, R. K., & Deb, K. S. (2013). Indian family systems, collectivistic society and psychotherapy. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 55(Suppl 2), S299–S309. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.105555>
- Child, J. T., Pearson, J. C., & Petronio, S. (2009). Blogging, communication, and privacy management: Development of the Blogging Privacy Management Measure. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(10), 2079–2094. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21122>
- da Costa, M. P., & Neto, F. (2019). Psychometric evaluation of the Portuguese Satisfaction with Family Life Scale. *Measurement Instruments for the Social Sciences*, 1(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42409-019-0009-5>
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., & Tov, W. (2010). New measures of well-being: Flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Soc Indic Res*, 39, 247–266.
- Fassih-Ramandi, Z., Soleimani, M. A., Allen, K.-A., Gorgulu, O., & Motalebi, S. A. (2020). Validity and Reliability of the Flourishing Scale in a Sample of Older Adults in Iran. *Clinical Interventions in Aging*, 15, 673–681. <https://doi.org/10.2147/CIA.S251067>
- Finkenauer, C., Engels, R. C. M. E., & Meeus, W. (2002). Keeping secrets from parents: Advantages and disadvantages of secrecy in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(2), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014069926507>
- Foley, M. K., & Duck, S. (2006). “That Dear Octopus”: A Family-Based Model of Intimacy. In *The family communication sourcebook*. (pp. 183–199). <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452233024.n10>
- Fukukawa, Y., Tsuboi, S., Niino, N., Ando, F., Kosugi, S., & Shimokata, H. (2000). Effects of Social Support and Self-Esteem on Depressive Symptoms in Japanese Middle-Aged and Elderly People. *Journal of Epidemiology*, 10(1sup), 63–69. https://doi.org/10.2188/jea.10.1sup_63
- Goswami, H. (2012). Social Relationships and Children’s Subjective Well-Being. *Social Indicators Research*, 107(3), 575–588. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9864-z>
- Johnson, B., & Ray, W. (2016). *Family Systems Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119085621.wbefs130>
- Ketokivi, K. (2012). The Intimate Couple, Family and the Relational Organization of Close Relationships. *Sociology*, 46, 473–489. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038511422552>
- Krys, K., Capaldi, C. A., Zelenski, J. M., Park, J., Nader, M., Kocimska-Zych, A., ... Uchida, Y. (2019). Family well-being is valued more than personal well-being: A four-country study. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00249-2>
- Lu, L., & Gilmour, R. (2004). Culture and conceptions of happiness: individual oriented and social oriented swb. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 5(3), 269–291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-004-8789-5>
- McDermott, B. M., & Cobham, V. E. (2012). Family functioning in the aftermath of a natural disaster. *BMC Psychiatry*, 12(1), 55. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-12-55>
- Pedersen, D. M. (1979). Dimensions of Privacy. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 48(3_suppl), 1291–1297. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1979.48.3c.1291>
- Pedersen, D. M. (1994). Personality and Classroom Seating. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 78(3_suppl), 1355–1360. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1994.78.3c.1355>
- PEDERSEN, D. M. (1999). MODEL FOR TYPES OF PRIVACY BY PRIVACY FUNCTIONS. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 19(4), 397–405. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1006/jevps.1999.0140>

Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age

- Petronio, S. (2002). Boundaries of privacy: Dialectics of disclosure. *Boundaries of Privacy: Dialectics of Disclosure.*, pp. xix, 268–xix, 268. Albany, NY, US: State University of New York Press.
- Petronio, S. (2010). Communication Privacy Management Theory: What Do We Know About Family Privacy Regulation? *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 2(3), 175–196. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2010.00052.x>
- Schnettler, B., Miranda, H., Sepúlveda, J., Denegri, M., Mora, M., Lobos, G., & Grunert, K. G. (2013). Psychometric Properties of the Satisfaction With Food- Related Life Scale: Application in Southern Chile. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, 45(5), 443–449. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2012.08.003>
- Sethi, B. B. (1989). Family as a potent therapeutic force. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 31(1), 22–30.
- Symister, P., & Friend, R. (2003). The influence of social support and problematic support on optimism and depression in chronic illness: a prospective study evaluating self-esteem as a mediator. *Health Psychology: Official Journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association*, 22(2), 123–129. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0278-6133.22.2.123>
- Thoits, P. A. (2010). Stress and Health: Major Findings and Policy Implications. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 51(1_suppl), S41–S53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146510383499>
- Thomas, P. A., Liu, H., & Umberson, D. (2017). Family Relationships and Well- Being. *Innovation in Aging*, 1(3), igx025. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igx025>
- Watson, W. H. (2012). *Family Systems* (V. S. B. T.-E. of H. B. (Second E. Ramachandran, Ed.)). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-375000-6.00169-5>
- Whiteman, S. D., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2011). Family Relationships From Adolescence to Early Adulthood: Changes in the Family System Following Firstborns' Leaving Home. *Journal of Research on Adolescence: The Official Journal of the Society for Research on Adolescence*, 21(2), 461–474. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00683.x>
- Zabriskie, R., & Ward, P. (2013). Satisfaction With Family Life Scale. *Marriage & Family Review*, 49, 446–463. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2013.768321>

Acknowledgement

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Minu B D & Vimala A M (2021). Family Intimacy, Family Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being among the Youth and Middle Age. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(3), 1241-1251. DIP:18.01.116.20210903, DOI:10.25215/0903.116