

Impact of Home Environment on Self Esteem and Well Being in Adolescents

Vaishali Goel^{1*}, Dr. Monika Abrol²

ABSTRACT

The present study discuss about the impact of home environment on self esteem and well being in adolescents. The biological and psychological changes of adolescents and the nature of developmental task which they are expected to perform often poses certain challenges and problems to them. Home environment had been identified as a contributing factor in a child's educational, cognitive and affective development. In spite of rapid changes within the modern family the home environment is still the most potent favour in regulating the behaviour of young people.

Keywords: Home Environment, Self Esteem, Well Being, Adolescents

The term "adolescence" is a social construct, like other developmental phases in human growth and development, but unlike others, it breeds a lot of ambiguity. However, some experts view the term as a construct applied by adult members of the society to describe the person who is in the transition to acquire biological features peculiar to the adult population group. The term is derived from the Latin word meaning to grow up' or 'to grow into maturity'. Adolescence begins with the onset of physiologically normal puberty, and ends when an adult identity and behaviour are accepted. This period of development corresponds roughly to the period between the ages of 10 and 19 years, which is consistent with the World Health Organization's definition of adolescence. Those responsible for providing healthcare to adolescents must allow sufficient flexibility in this age span to encompass special situations such as the emancipated minor or the young person with a chronic condition leading to delayed development or prolonged dependency.

Hypotheses of the Study

The following hypotheses are formulated for the present study: -

- **H01:** There is a significant relationship between home environment and self esteem amongst adolescents of South West Delhi.
- **H02:** There is a significant relationship between home environment and general well being and its dimensions amongst adolescents of South West Delhi.

¹PhD. Scholar, Professor, Department of Psychology, Sanskriti University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, India

²Professor, Department of Psychology, Sanskriti University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, India

*Corresponding Author

Received: July 21, 2025; Revision Received: August 18, 2025; Accepted: August 23, 2025

Statement of the Problem

To explore the relationships between home environment, self esteem and general well being amongst adolescents of South West Delhi.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Descriptive survey method of research was used in executing the present study. The objectives of this method are not only to analyze, interpret and report the status of an institute, but also to determine the adequacy of status by comparing it with the established standards. Some surveys are confined to gather all these types of information: (i) data concerning existing status (ii) comparison of existing status with established status and standard and (iii) means of improving the existing status; while other methods are limited to one or two of these types.

Research Design

A correlation design was adopted to study the relationships between home environment, self esteem and general well being of adolescents of South West Delhi.

Population

The population of the study was comprised of male and female adolescents currently studying in the 10th & 11th standard of South West Delhi zone.

Sample & Sampling Techniques

The sample of the study comprised of 200 students from the classes of 10th & 11th in the senior secondary schools of South West Delhi zone, affiliated to CBSE (Central Board of Secondary Education). Out of this 100 students were male and 100 students were females. As the proposed study comprises of two sub-groups, a stratified random sampling method was employed.

Tool Used For Data Collection

The following tools were used in the present study.

- **Home Environment Inventory**

Items of the inventory are in question form demanding information for each in either of five options i.e .. Mostly', 'Often', , Sometimes', , Least' and 'Never'. The response categories to be scored for 'Mostly-4', ' Often-3', Sometimes-2', ' Least-1' and 'Never-0'. The total range of scores for each dimension varies from 0 to 40. Higher scores of each dimension is indicative of the higher perception that particular parental behaviour and vice-versa

- **Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale**

The Rosenberg self esteem scale was developed by Morris Rosenberg (1965). The Rosenberg self esteem scale is a 10 item self report of global self esteem. It consists of 10 statements related to overall feelings of self acceptance. The items are answered on a four point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

- **General Well Being Scale**

The response categories to be scored for positive items is 'Strongly Disagree-1', 'Disagree-2', 'Undecided-3', 'Agree-4' and 'Strongly Agree-5'. In case of negative items the scoring procedure is to be reversed. The total range of scores varies from 55 to 275. Therefore, higher scores indicate the enhanced sense of general well being and viceversa.

Psychological Stressors and Academic Performance

Statistical Analysis

The data was analyzed by descriptive statistical analysis and coefficient of correlation by Pearson's product moment method.

Data Analysis and Interpretations

The data, collected from 200 adolescents (100 males and 100 females) using the appropriate scales for each variance was analyzed with descriptive statistical analysis and correlational analysis.

In order to analyze the scores on various dimensions of home environment and self esteem, the means and standard deviations were calculated which are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of ten dimensions of Home Environment and Self Esteem and General Well Being and its four dimensions.

Variables	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Control	27.65	6.81
Protectiveness	23.38	7.58
Punishment	23.89	6.27
Conformity	22.36	5.77
Social Isolation	33.80	7.51
Reward	23.38	8.35
Deprivation of Privileges	34.15	6.88
Nurturance	28.34	7.69
Rejection	33.48	6.78
Permissiveness	29.46	6.06
Self Esteem	17.67	2.86
General Well Being	165.86	7.71
Physical Well Being	37.67	5.42
Emotional Well Being	43.98	6.10
Social Well Being	53.62	5.79
School Well Being	30.33	6.16

On dimensions of home environment, the mean values on control and nurturance dimensions were found to be 27.65 and 28.34 respectively it can be interpreted as indices of high level of home environment. These denoted that many restrictions are imposed on children by parents and parents have unconditional physical and emotional attachment with their children. The dimensions of home environment namely protectiveness, punishment and reward having mean values of 23.38, 23.89 and 23.38 respectively belong to the slightly above category. Protectiveness shows that proper care is provided to children by their parents than average. Children get physical and emotional punishment from parents for their undesirable behaviour and at the same time they get materialistic rewards for desirable behaviours than average. The mean score (22.36) on conformity denoted that the subjects belong to slightly below average category on this dimension. This indicates that sometimes they do not follow the parent's directions. On the remaining dimensions of home environment i.e. social isolation, deprivation of privileges, rejection and permissiveness the mean scores were 33.80, 34.15, 33.48 and 29.46 respectively belong to very high category. The first three dimensions indicated that subjects are not getting enough love and affection from parents and their behaviour is controlled by depriving them from their rights. Whereas permissiveness indicates that subjects can express their views freely in front of their parents.

Psychological Stressors and Academic Performance

The mean score of self esteem was found to be 17.67. As per norms given in manual, this self esteem is neither low nor high according to norms. This indicated that the subjects had average level of self esteem.

On general well being, the mean score of subjects was found to be 165.86 which fall in the category of low general well being. This showed the diminished sense of well being of the subjects. Regarding the dimensions of general well being the subjects had scored lower on school well being as compared to physical, emotional and social well being.

As mentioned earlier, the major objective of the present study was to explore the relationships between home environment and self esteem and general well being amongst adolescents. The first hypothesis predicted that there would be a significant relationship between home environment and self esteem among adolescents. The coefficient of correlation were computed by applying Pearson's product moment method.

Table 2. Showing the Coefficient of Correlations between various Dimensions of Home Environment and Self Esteem amongst Adolescents.

Dimensions of Home Environment	Self Esteem
Control	-.079
Protectiveness	-.068
Punishment	-.144*
Conformity	-.035
Social Isolation	-.199**
Reward	.167*
Deprivation of Privileges	-.289**
Nurturance	.036
Rejection	-.090
Permissiveness	.165*

*Significant at 0.05 level

** Significant at 0.01 level

It has been observed from above table that first dimension of home environment control had a non significant association with self esteem. This indicates that restrictions imposed by parents on children do not always affect the level of self esteem. However the nature of negative correlation reflects that control lowers the self esteem of adolescents.

On protectiveness dimension non significant and negative correlation have been found between this dimension of home environment and self esteem. Surprisingly the result indicates that parental support does not have an association with self esteem of adolescents. The next dimension of home environment punishment is significantly and negatively related with self esteem ($r = -.144, p < 0.05$) implicating that punishment at home decreases the level of the self esteem of adolescents.

The finding of conformity dimension shows a non significant and negative effect on the self esteem of adolescents indicating that adolescents with conformity do not have a high level of self esteem.

The fifth dimension of home environment social isolation is significant and negatively related to self esteem ($r = -.199, p < 0.01$) suggesting that adolescents with high social

Psychological Stressors and Academic Performance

isolation have shown significantly lower level of self esteem. The coefficient of correlation ($r = .167, p < 0.05$) between reward dimension and self esteem indicates that materialistic and symbolic reward strengthen the self esteem of adolescents. Adolescents with high reward show significantly higher self esteem.

Deprivation of privileges dimension of home environment is significantly and negatively related with self esteem. This means adolescents with high deprivation of privileges have low self esteem showing that the love, respect and childcare from parents are helpful in developing the self esteem of adolescents.

On the dimension nurturance non significant relationship was found with self esteem. The positive nature of correlation between these two variables indicates that unconditional emotional attachment influences the self esteem in a positive direction. On rejection, non significant but negative relationship was found with self esteem inferring that rejection influences the self esteem of adolescents.

Permissiveness dimension of home environment is positively and significantly related to the ($r = .165, p < 0.05$). High permissiveness leads to the high self esteem. This may be because the children are permitted to express their views freely and act according to their wishes not being restricted by parents.

The present results of home environment and self esteem showed that out of ten dimensions of home environment only five dimensions are significantly related self esteem. Punishment, social isolation and deprivation of privileges have been found significantly and negatively related the self esteem whereas significant and positive relationship have been found on reward and permissiveness dimensions amongst adolescents. The relationships between control, protectiveness, conformity, nurturance and rejection are non significant. The second hypothesis stating that there would be a significant relationship between home environment and self esteem amongst adolescents is partially verified.

Self esteem is the stable sense of personal worth and worthiness. It makes the person capable of dealing with limits and that leads to better health and positive well being. The present results of the study are in accordance with the studies conducted earlier. Bhat and Aminabhavi (2011) reported that children who experience more social isolation as a negative sanction to the parents at home, these children suffer from inferiority, insecurity, helplessness and hopelessness. This act as a protect barrier in the development of life skills like problem solving, decision making, coping with emotions and stress. It is well known from psychological theories that reward plays a very important role in shaping the desirable behaviours. The present results confirmed the same. Finding of Kaur, Rana and Kaur (2009) who endorsed that the use of reward from parents should be done for positive self concept development amongst adolescents are in accordance with the present study.

The family, in general, and parents, in particular, has often been deemed to be the most important support system available to the child. At home the child gets ample opportunities to become more inquisitive and explorative and self esteem determining. Linares, Pelegrina and Lendinez (2002) mentioned that adolescents perceiving their parents as permissive obtained the highest score on perceived social competence and self esteem. Parenting behaviours are directly and indirectly associated with emotional (depression, stress, low self esteem) and behavioural (delinquency, aggression) problem amongst adolescents (Finhenauer, Engels and Baumeister, 2005). Parenting is associated with self esteem

Psychological Stressors and Academic Performance

(Martinez and Garcia, 2007). Parental supervision does influence the academic self concept, self efficacy and self esteem of adolescents (Maganol and Gouws, 2012). Thus, family environment appeared to influence the adjustment patterns as well as the performance of adolescents (Rani and Latha, 2005). Family members are very important for survival, these strong emotional bonds evolved to faster long term commitments among parents and children.

To conclude therefore, a significant relationship was found between the five dimensions of home environment and self esteem amongst adolescents.

The second hypothesis predicted that there would be a significant relationship between home environment and general well being and its dimensions amongst adolescents. The coefficient of correlation between home environment and general well being and its dimensions was computed by applying Pearson's product moment method.

Table 3. Showing the Coefficient of Correlations between various Dimensions of Home Environment and general well being amongst Adolescents.

Dimensions of Home Environment	General Well Beine	Physical Well Beine	Emotional Well Being	Social Well Beine	School Well Bein2
Control	.039	.052	-.175	-.070	.008
Protectiveness	-.010	.177*	.209**	-.107	-.061
Punishment	-.188**	.080	.051	-.177*	-.178*
Conformity	-.011	.148*	.052	-.120	.216**
Social Isolation	-.169*	.076	-.017	-.146*	-.246**
Reward	.163*	.041	.165*	-.019	-.039
Deprivation of Privileges	-.150*	.067	-.009	-.067	-.174*
Nurturance	.081	.152*	.030	.192**	.039
Rejection	-.168*	-.177*	-.264**	-.091	-.258**
Permissiveness	.191**	.079	-.037	.169*	.032

*Significant at 0.05 level

** Significant at 0.01 level

It has been observed from the above table that a few dimension of home environment are significantly related with general well being and its dimensions. On control dimension the relationship between the dimension and general well being is found to non significant. The same trend has been observed with the four dimensions of general well being viz. physical, emotional, social and school well being. The finding indicates that restrictions imposed on children by the parents do not influence the well being of adolescents.

On protectiveness non significant relationship was found between this dimension and general well being. But protectiveness was significantly and positively related with physical and emotional well being ($r = .177$, $p < 0.05$ and $r = .209$, $p < 0.01$ respectively). This means with more protectiveness at home have shown high level of physical and emotional well being. This can be explained with the help of attachment theories. Due to close and enduring association between parents and children, adolescents learn to share and care for each other.

Psychological Stressors and Academic Performance

The protectiveness had a non significant relationship with social and school well being of adolescents.

Punishment dimension of home environment is observed to be significantly and negatively correlated with general well being ($r = -.188, p < 0.01$) and its two dimensions i.e. social well being and school well being ($r = -.177, p < 0.05$ and $-.178, p < 0.05$ respectively). These findings show that physical or psychological punishment has a detrimental effect on the social and school performance which diminished the general well being of adolescents. Whereas punishment has no association with physical and emotional well being of adolescents.

Conformity dimension was significantly and positively related to physical and school well being ($r = .148, p < 0.05$ and $.216, p < 0.01$ respectively). Adolescents with high conformity at home are compelled to understand others, other's desires and expectations. These factors may be responsible in enhancing the physical and school well being. No significant association was found between conformity and social and school well being and overall general well being of adolescents.

Social isolation is observed to be significantly and negatively related to general well being ($r = -.169, p < 0.05$), social well being ($r = -.146, p < 0.05$) and school well being ($r = -.246, p < 0.01$). It reveals that the adolescents with high isolation exhibit significantly lower level of well being, poor social relations and poor performance in the school. Physical and emotional well being are not affected by the social isolation.

Reward dimension was positively and significantly related with general well being ($r = .163, p < 0.05$) and emotional well being ($r = .165, p < 0.05$) of adolescents. Adolescents with high rewards show emotional competence and satisfaction. These results confirm that adolescents who have been rewarded more at home feel more acceptable, confident and self sufficient and more competent. Reward dimension had a non significant relationship with physical, social and school well being.

Deprivation of privileges was negatively and significantly related with general well being ($r = -.150, p < 0.05$) and school well being ($r = -.174, p < 0.05$). This indicates that when parents deprive the children of their rights for love, care and respect, adolescents find themselves in a miserable condition and feel neglected. These diminish their school and overall general well being. But no influence has been seen on physical and emotional well being of adolescents.

Nurturance was positively and significantly related to physical ($r = .152, p < 0.05$) and school well being ($r = .192, p < 0.01$). High nurturance leads to high physical and good interpersonal relations may be due to the fact that a keen interest and love for the child and unconditional emotional attachment at home make the child to learn some positive behavior. No significant association has been found between nurturance and overall general well being, emotional and school well being.

Rejection was significantly and negatively related with general well being and physical, emotional and school well being. The lower feelings of well being may be due to inadequacy and inferiority feeling in children formed by parental rejection and not allowing them to become independent and unique.

Psychological Stressors and Academic Performance

Permissiveness significantly enhances the general well being ($r = .191$, $p < .001$) and social well being ($r = .169$, $p < .05$) of adolescents. No association has been found between this dimension of home environment and physical, emotional and school well being.

Overall, it can be concluded that punishment, social isolation, deprivation of privileges, rejection had a significant but negative relationship with general well being amongst adolescents. Regarding the dimension of general well being, protectiveness, conformity and nurturance had a significant positive relationship with physical well being and significant inverse relation is seen with rejection dimension. Similarly protectiveness and reward are significant and positively related with emotional well being. Significant and negative correlation is found between rejection and emotional well being. Regarding the third dimension of general well being which is social well being punishment and social isolation have significant but negative relation with social well being whereas nurturance and permissiveness have positive significant association with social well being. Out of ten dimensions only four dimensions namely punishment, conformity, social isolation, deprivation of privileges and rejection were significantly related to school well being. The direction of correlation for punishment, social isolation, deprivation of privileges and rejection was negative whereas conformity was positively related to school well being of adolescents.

The above findings indicated that a few dimension of home environment are significantly related to general well being and its dimensions. Thus the third hypothesis stating that there would be a significant between home environment and general well being and its dimensions amongst adolescents has been partially verified.

Well being is a meaningful concept in several respects. It is highly related with contentment, happiness and satisfaction with life experiences. It is a combination a positive effect (in absence of negative affect) and general life satisfaction. The results are in congruence with earlier studies. Rohner and Britner (2002) reported that parental rejection tends everywhere to precede the development of a variety of mental health problems such as depression and depressed affect, conduct problem and behavior disorders and substance abuses. The reality functioning of interaction patterns enhance self confidence, self reliance, work orientation, self esteem and well being of the adolescents. Researches shows that both overall family system functioning and parental behavior are positively related to adolescents well being (Karavasilis, Doyle and Markiewicz, 2003; Muris, Meester, Schouter and Hoge, 2004).

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Parenting practices characterized by warmth and support, consistent and firm discipline and close monitoring have been shown for several decades to be important for positive development of young children. Driscoll, Russell and Crockett (2008) found that permissiveness parents are helpful in enhancing the well being of adolescents. The findings of Farokhzad (2009) clearly show that family environment dimensions viz. relationship, personal growth and system maintenance are significantly correlated with positive mental status i.e. happiness, optimism and hope. Deepshikha and Bhanot (2010) found a significant role of family environment in socio-emotional and educational adjustment of adolescents.

To conclude therefore, a significant relationship was found between the few dimensions of home environment and general well being and its dimensions.

To summarize the results of the study, it is clear that there is a significant interplay among few dimensions of home environment and self esteem and general well being amongst adolescents.

CONCLUSIONS & SUGGESTIONS

Main Findings

On the basis of the analyses and interpretations in the previous chapter the following findings have been drawn out.

- On dimensions of home environment the mean values on control and nurturance dimensions were found to be 27.65 and 28.34 respectively it can be interpreted as indices of high level of home environment. These denoted that many restrictions are imposed on children by parents and parents have unconditional physical and emotional attachment with their children. The dimensions of home environment namely protectiveness, punishment and reward having mean values of 23.38, 23.89 and 23.38 respectively belong to the slightly above category. Protectiveness shows that proper care is provided to children by their parents than average. Children get physical and emotional punishment from parents for their undesirable behaviour and at the same time they get materialistic rewards for desirable behaviours than average. The mean score (22.36) on conformity denoted that the subjects belong to slightly below average category on this dimension. This indicates that sometimes they do not follow the parent's directions. On the remaining dimensions of home environment i.e. social isolation, deprivation of privileges, rejection and permissiveness the mean scores were 33.80, 34.15, 33.48 and 29.46 respectively belong to very high category. The first three dimensions indicated that subjects are not getting enough love and affection from parents and their behaviour is controlled by depriving them from their rights. Whereas permissiveness indicates that subjects can express the views freely in front of their parents.
- The mean score of self esteem was found to be 17.67. As per norms given in manual, this self esteem is neither low nor high according to norms. This indicated that the subjects had average level of self esteem.
- On general well being, the mean score of subjects was found to be 165.86 which fall in the category of low general well being. This showed the diminished sense of well being of the subjects. Regarding the dimensions of general well being the subjects had scored lower on school well being as compared to physical, emotional and social well being.
- First dimension of home environment control had a non significant association with self esteem. This indicates that restrictions imposed by parents on children do not always affect the level of self esteem. However the nature of negative correlation reflects that control lowers the self esteem of adolescents.
- On protectiveness dimension non significant and negative correlation have been found between this dimension of home environment and self esteem. Surprisingly the result indicates that parental support does not have an association with self esteem of adolescents.
- The next dimension of home environment punishment is significantly and negatively related with self esteem ($r = -.144, p < 0.05$) implicating that punishment at home decreases the level of the self esteem of adolescents.
- The finding of conformity dimension shows a non significant and negative effect on the self esteem of adolescents indicating that adolescents with conformity do not have a high level of self esteem.

Psychological Stressors and Academic Performance

- The fifth dimension of home environment social isolation is significant and negatively related to self esteem ($r = -.199, p < 0.01$) suggesting that adolescents with high social isolation have shown significantly lower level of self esteem. The coefficient of correlation ($r = .167, p < 0.05$) between reward dimension and self esteem indicates that materialistic and symbolic reward strengthen the self esteem of adolescents. Adolescents with high reward show significantly higher self esteem.
- Deprivation of privileges dimension of home environment is significantly and negatively related with self esteem. This means adolescents with high deprivation of privileges have low self esteem showing that the love, respect and childcare from parents are helpful in developing the self esteem of adolescents.
- On the dimension nurturance non significant relationship was found with self esteem. The positive nature of correlation between these two variables indicates that unconditional emotional attachment influences the self esteem in a positive direction. On rejection, non significant but negative relationship was found with self esteem inferring that rejection influences the self esteem of adolescents.
- Permissiveness dimension of home environment is positively and significantly related to the ($r = .165, p < 0.05$). High permissiveness leads to the high self esteem. This may be because the children are permitted to express their views freely and act according to their wishes not being restricted by parents.
- It has been observed from the above table that a few dimension of home environment are significantly related with general well being and its dimensions. On control dimension the relationship between the dimension and general well being is found to non significant. The same trend has been observed with the four dimensions of general well being viz. physical, emotional, social and school well being. The finding indicates that restrictions imposed on children by the parents do not influence the well being of adolescents.
- On protectiveness non significant relationship was found between this dimension and general well being. But protectiveness was significantly and positively related with physical and emotional well being ($r = .177, p < 0.05$ and $r = .209, p < 0.01$ respectively). This means with more protectiveness at home have shown high level of physical and emotional well being. This can be explained with the help of attachment theories. Due to close and enduring association between parents and children, adolescents learn to share and care for each other. The protectiveness had a non significant relationship with social and school well being of adolescents.
- Punishment dimension of home environment is observed to be significantly and negatively correlated with general well being ($r = -.188, p < 0.001$) and its two dimensions i.e. social well being and school well being ($r = -.177, p < 0.05$ and $r = -.178, p < 0.05$ respectively). These findings show that physical or psychological punishment has a detrimental effect on the social and school performance which diminished the general well being of adolescents. Whereas punishment has no association with physical and emotional well being of adolescents.
- Conformity dimension was significantly and positively related to physical and school well being ($r = .148, p < 0.05$ and $r = .216, p < 0.01$ respectively). Adolescents with high conformity at home are compelled to understand others, other's desires and expectations. These factors may be responsible in enhancing the physical and school well being. No significant association was found between conformity and social and school well being and overall general well being of adolescents.
- Social isolation is observed to be significantly and negatively related to general well being ($r = -.169, p < 0.05$), social well being ($r = -.146, p < 0.05$) and school well being ($r = -.246, p < 0.01$). It reveals that the adolescents with high isolation exhibit

Psychological Stressors and Academic Performance

- significantly lower level of well being, poor social relations and poor performance in the school. Physical and emotional well being are not affected by the social isolation.
- Reward dimension was positively and significantly related with general well being ($r = .163, p < 0.05$) and emotional well being ($r = .165, p < 0.05$) of adolescents. Adolescents with high rewards show emotional competence and satisfaction. These results confirm that adolescents who have been rewarded more at home feel more acceptable, confident and self sufficient and more competent. Reward dimension had a non significant relationship with physical, social and school well being.
 - Deprivation of privileges was negatively and significantly related with general well being ($r = -.150, p < 0.05$) and school well being ($r = -.174, p < 0.05$). This indicates that when parents deprive the children of their rights for love, care and respect, adolescents find themselves in a miserable condition and feel neglected. These diminish their school and overall general well being. But no influence has been seen on physical and emotional well being of adolescents.
 - Nurturance was positively and significantly related to physical ($r = .152, p < 0.05$) and school well being ($r = .192, p < 0.01$). High nurturance leads to high physical and good interpersonal relations may be due to the fact that a keen interest and love for the child and unconditional emotional attachment at home make the child to learn the some positive behavior. No significant association has been found between nurturance and overall general well being, emotional and school well being.
 - Rejection was significantly and negatively related with general well being and physical, emotional and school well being. The lower feelings of well being may be due to inadequacy and inferiority feeling in children formed by parental rejection and not allowing them to become independent and unique.
 - Permissiveness significantly enhance the general well being ($r = .191, p < 0.01$) and social well being ($r = .169, p < 0.05$) of adolescents. No association has been found between this dimension of home environment and physical, emotional and school well being.

CONCLUSION

Punishment, social isolation and deprivation of privileges have been found significantly and negatively related the self esteem whereas significant and positive relationship have been found on reward and permissiveness dimensions amongst adolescents.

Overall, it can be concluded that punishment, social isolation, deprivation of privileges, rejection had a significant but negative relationship with general well being amongst adolescents. Regarding the dimension of general well being, protectiveness, conformity and nurturance had a significant positive relationship with physical well being and significant inverse relation is seen with rejection dimension. Similarly protectiveness and reward are significant and positively related with emotional well being. Significant and negative correlation is found between rejection and emotional well being. Regarding the third dimension of general well being which is social well being punishment and social isolation have significant but negative relation with social well being whereas nurturance and permissiveness have positive significant association with social well being. Out of ten dimensions only four dimensions namely punishment, conformity, social isolation, deprivation of privileges and rejection were significantly related to school well being. The direction of correlation for punishment, social isolation, deprivation of privileges and rejection was negative whereas conformity was positively related to school well being of adolescents.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, B. P., Kogos, J., Youngstrom, E., Schoff, K., & Izard, C. (1999). Family instability and the problem behaviors of children from economically disadvantaged families. *Developmental Psychology*, 35, 258-268.
- Angner, E. (2008). The philosophical foundations of subjective measures of well being. In L.B. Comim and M. Pusagno (Eds.), *Capabilities and Happiness* (pp. 286-298). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aufseeser, D., Jekielek, S., & Brown, B. (2006). *The family environment and adolescent well-being: Exposure to positive and negative family influences*. Washington, DC: Child Trends; Adolescent health Information Centre, University of California, San Francisco.
- Barb;rr, C. N., Ball, J., & Armistead, L. (2003). Parent - adolescent relationship quality and adolescent psychological functioning among African American female adolescents: Self-esteem as a mediator. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 12, 361-374.
- Basavanna, M. (1975). *Manual for Self Confidence Inventory*. Varanasi: Rupa Psychological Center.
- Branden, N. (1969). *The psychology of self-esteem*. New York: Bantam.
- Breckenridge, E.M., & Vincent, E.L. (1965). *Child Development*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Columbo, S.A. (1986). *General well-being in adolescents: Its nature and measurement*. Doctoral dissertation, Saint Louis University, St. Louis City.
- Crosnoe, R., Erickson, K.G., & Dornbusch, S.M. (2002). Protective functions of family relationships and school factors on the deviant behavior of adolescent boys and girls: Reducing the impact of risky friendships. *Youth and Society*, 33(4), 515-544.
- Cui, M., Donnellan, M. B., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Reciprocal influences between parents, marital problems and adolescent internalizing and externalizing behaviour. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 1544-1552.
- Essman, C.S. (1977). Sibling relations as socialization for parenthood. *The Family coordinator*, 26 (3), 259-262.
- Farokhzad, P. (2009). Study of family environment and adolescents' positive mental states viz. happiness, optimism and hope: A cross-cultural perspective. *Thought and Behaviour in Clinical Psychology*, 4 (13), 79-90.
- Hall, G. S. (1904). *Adolescence: It's Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion, and Education*. New York: Appleton.
- Kalia, A.K. & Deswal, A. (2011). *Manual for General Well Being Scale*. Agra: National Psychological Corporation.
- Kaur, J., J. S. Rana, J. S., & Kaur, R. (2009). Home environment and academic achievement as correlates of self-concept among adolescents. *Studies on Home and Community Science*, 3(1), 13-17.
- Kemis, M.H. (2003). Towards a conceptualization of optimal self esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 1-26.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1992). The role of parents in the socialization of children: An historical overview. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 1006-1017.1
- Martinez, I., and Garcia, J. F. (2007). Impact of parenting styles on adolescents' self-esteem and internalization of values in Spain. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 10(2), 338-348.
- Neblett, N., & Cortina, K. (2006). Adolescents' thoughts about parents' job and their importance for adolescents' future orientation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29, 795-811.
- Perez, J. A. (2012). Gender difference in psychological well-being among Filipino college student samples. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2 (13), 84-93.

Psychological Stressors and Academic Performance

- Rueter, M.A., & Conger, R.D. (1995). Interaction style, problem-solving and family problem solving effectiveness. *Child Development*, 66, 98-115.
- Selman, R.L. (1980). *The Growth of Interpersonal Understanding: Development and Clinical Analyses*. New York: Academic Press.
- Tesser, A. (2000). The Encyclopedia of psychology. *Behavioural Science*, 3, 213-216.
- Tisdale, S., & Pitt-Catsuphes, M. (2004). Linking social environments with the well-being of adolescents in dual-earner and single working parent families. *Youth Society*, 44(1), 118-140.
- Viner, R., and Deborah, C. (2005). ABC of adolescence: Adolescent development. *British Medical Journal*. 330, 301- 304.
- Wissink, I., Dekovic, M., & Meijer, A. (2006). Parenting behavior, quality of the parent-adolescent relationship, and adolescent functioning in four ethnic groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 26, 133-159.

Acknowledgment

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: Goel, V. & Abrol, M. (2025). Psychological Stressors and Academic Performance. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 13(3), 2327-2339. DIP:18.01.214.20251303, DOI:10.25215/1303.214