Relationship among Family Support, Love Attitude, and Well-being of Junior High School Students

Wu Ho-tang[1], Chou Mei-ju[2,*], Chen Wei-hung[3], Tu Chin-Tang[4]

[1]Department of Education, Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan
[2]Department of Early Childhood Education and Teacher Education Center, National Ping-tung University, Taiwan
[3]Ying Hai High School, Taiwan
[4]Center for Teacher Education, National Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan

Abstract This research aims to analyze the correlation between family support, love attitude, and well-being of junior high school students. After analyzing related literature, it is found that demographic variables like gender, grade, family structure, socioeconomic position have difference in perception of well-being. In addition, family support and love attitude has correlation with well-being as well. In order to accomplish the research purpose, this study extracted 686 junior high school students as the research subjects to conduct the home-edited youngster's family support scale, love attitude scale, and well-being scale. The three scales have all been pretested, and have good reliability and validity. We analyzed the then current condition of the collected effective questionnaire data with hierarchical regression to understand the explanatory power of the four demographic variables--gender, family support, love attitude--for well-being. The results show: 1. Junior high school students' family support, love attitude, and wellbeing reaches middle to high level. 2. The explanatory power of the four demographic variables-- gender, grade, family structure, and socio-economic status--is 2.40% in respect with well-being. 3. The explanatory power of love attitude for wellbeing is 4.00%, and the total explanatory is 34.70%. According to the research findings, this research suggests that 1. Parents should provide more affection support. 2. Grade-12 students should deal with pressures from the heavy schoolwork. 3. The studies in the future cam further explore and analyze the factors that influence wellbeing.

Keywords Family Support, Love Attitude, Wellbeing

1. Introduction

Family support, love attitude, and well-being would influence the youngsters' psychology and behaviors. First, If parents make good use of family support strategy, the youngsters' emotional and behavioral problems can be presented (Sanders, 1999)[1]. Such claim is consistent with Cichy, Stawski, and Almeida's (2013)[2] viewpoint, which suggests based on the research findings that family support should be provided to improve emotions. Next, in regard of love attitude, Wang and Wang (2003)[3] held that love attitude is the faith attitude towards love, and Lin (1998)[4] indicated that youngster's development of love relationship presents recreational functions, obtaining status in peer group, socialization process learning, looking-glass self-effect, spouse selection, and help marital life adaptation, and so on. However, under the influence of family structure change and open social trend, the proportion of youngsters' falling in love raises year by year, and the news of those being entangled by love is often heard. However, love behavior is affected by love attitude. Finally, well-being is mainly evaluated in accordance with individual standard and whole life satisfaction (Diener, 2009; Diener & Emmons, 1984)[5][6], Shek's (1997)[7] study aiming at the Chinese families in Hong Kong found that the higher the indicator of well-being, the psychologically health condition gets better, the environmental adaption ability becomes better, and the problematic behaviors reduces.

According to the results of literature analysis, some factors affect well-being, for example, Derdikman-Eiron et al (2011)[8]took youngsters aged 13-19 as the research subject, and their results show that boys' subjective well-being is slightly higher than the girls'. Next, the grade of junior high school students generates difference in overall well-being as well. Yuei et al (2006)[9] found that Grade-1 and 2 senior high students have higher well-being. Thirdly, different family structures results in difference in respect with well-being. As Wenk, Hardesty, Morgan, and Blair's (1994)[10] showed, family structure and process is the primary center in exploring children's well-being. Consequently, family structure plays an incredibly important role. Finally, different socioeconomic positions lead to different well-being; Dew and Huebner (1994)[11]aimed at influence of parents' socioeconomic

position and youngsters' life satisfaction, and their research results show that youngsters will have better satisfaction with life if their patents have higher socioeconomic position.

Next, Family support affects well-being. Family occupies an important position in children's physiological growth and psychological development. Although junior high school students' physical and mental development is gradually influenced by the peers, family still has certain impact. As Meadows, Brown, and Elder (2006)[12] pointed out, positive communication among family members can reduce the youngsters' internal and external behavior problems. Some research also indicated that family support has stress-buffering effect (Wills, 2013)[13], and it can further make people face the challenges in life (Cauce, Reid, Landesman, & Gonzales, 1990)[14] or diverse living pressures (Guan, Wen, Gong, Liang, & Wang, 2014; Sandier, Miller, Short, & Wolchik, 1989)[15][16]. Family support can help improve youngsters' problems, buffer the pressures, and even face living challenges. If problems, pressure, and challenges can be mediated, well-being will raise on the other side. Kostelecky and Lempers's (1998)[17] study can verify this conclusion. Their study on family support and well-being of 133 senior high school students found that, strong and positive family support would decrease youngsters' distress, make their psychology healthier, and perform more positively in daily life or in the future, so they could become happier. And Schnettler(2015)[18] found that family support intangible or social resources is related to the happiness in southern university students. Some researchers have proved that family support and well-being have positive correlation; therefore, family support and well-being is closely correlative.

Thirdly, Love attitude affects well-being. Allardt (1976)[19] indicated that having, loving, and being are our three basic needs, and love refers to need related to love affairs, kinship, and friendship. According to Freud's psychosexual theory of development, youngsters more than 11 or 12 years old have entered adolescence. The physical growth and secretion of hormone drives them to generate interest in the opposite sex with similar age (Chang, 2007)[20]. Therefore, love may take place since 11 or 12 years old, which is around senior grade in elementary school. Some assertion and studies both support that correlation exists between love attitude and well-being. For example, Lu (1998)[21] pointed that in youth stage, love would affect well-being; Huang (2011)[22] took college athletes as the research subject and obtained results showing that love attitude can effectively predict interpersonal well-being; Lin(2012)[23] took vocational high school students as the research subjects and found that their love relationship does have positive correlation with well-being.

From the above-mentioned, it is learned that there is correlation between family support, love attitude, and wellbeing. However, in Taiwan region, there are no studies on the correlation among the three items with junior high school students as the research subject. Only, there is unpublished thesis, but it is limited to discuss correlation of the two variables. For example, Li (2002)[24] took Taiwan 405 junior high school students as the sample, and found that the higher the youngsters' perception of family support (substantial, message-based, and emotional support), the higher their wellbeing will be. Additionally, With structural equation model, Lin (2012)[23] took Taiwan 697 vocational high school students as the research subject, and analyzed the correlation degree of the four variables--wellbeing, love relationship, sex attitudes, and date violence. It is found that for vocational/senior high school students, there is positive correlation in love relationship and wellbeing. The research took senior high school students as the research subject, but senior high school students are more mature psychologically and physically, and the number of those who have love affairs is more than that of junior high school students. Junior high school students have stepped into adolescent dementia, and hold curiosity and fantasy of the opposite sex; however. Due to the school or family, their love behaviors are restricted, though they have hope as well as recognition for love. In this sense, it is worthy of further exploration into junior high school students' love attitude.

2. Research Design

The research adopted questionnaire investigation, in analyzing the relationship among family support, love attitude, and well-being of junior high school students. in this section, we mainly allocated the research subjects, tested the research tools, and processed and analyzed data as what follows:

(I). Research Subject

Table 1. Demographic Data Distribution of the Formal Samples

Demographic Variables	Group	Number of People	Percentage(%)
Gender	1. Boys	348	50.50
	2. Girls	338	49.50
Grade	1. Grade 1	237	34.80
	2. Grade 2	224	32.50
	3. Grade 3	225	32.70
Family Structure	1. Parents family	535	78.00
	2. Non-parents family	151	22.00
Socio-economic status	1. Middle-to-high socio-economic status	165	25.40
	2. Middle socio-economic status	232	33.70
	3. Middle-to-low socio-economic status	279	40.90
Total Sample Number		686	

The formal samples in this research come from students in the normal class in a public junior high school in Kaohsiung City (excluding private or special schools) as the research population. Besides, due to focus on the students' own recognition and feelings, the distribution of school and its scale are not influential, so we adopted purposive sampling.

(II). Research Tools

i. Research Tool's Pretest Process

This research edited Youngsters' Family Support Scale, Youngsters' Well-being Scale, and Youngsters' Love Attitude Scale to serve as the research tools for quantitative data collection. Each scale has been pretested with three procedures: 1. Item Analysis: this study summed up the subscales in the scale, and sequenced them by the score. The first 27% is high-score group, and the last 27% is the low-score group, both were analyzed with independent sample T-test. The results showed that the selection achieved significant difference and the *t*-value is more than 3. Factor Analysis: we conducted Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin to sample fit number, and then Bartlett sphericity test to ascertain that it is proper to conduct factor analysis. The former's standard value is above .80, and the latter has to reach significance. With principal component analysis, the factors were extracted, and by means of varimax solution of orthogonal rotation, the factor loading after rotation (selecting more than 3) and explainable variable (more than 50%) were obtained. 3. Reliability analysis: selecting Cronbach's α >.60 and the total reliability >.80.

ii. Pretest Results of the Research Tools

The pretest samples were from 150 junior high school students in Southern Taiwan, Kaohsiung City. After pretest of Youngsters' Family Support Scale, we divided family support into three factors-- emotional support, substantial support, and informational support, totally 13 items. In regard of item analysis, the lowest of *t* value of each item has to be at least 3.16, and the highest 18.15. In respect with validity, the lowest factor loading is .53, the highest is .88, and the explanatory quantity of the three dimensions are 22.14%, 17.29%, and 31.02%, respectively, with the total validity .91.

After pretest of Youngsters' Love Attitude Scale, we divided love attitude into three factors-- closeness, passion, and commitment. In regard of item analysis, the lowest of t value of each item has to be at least 3.09, and the highest 14.14. In respect with validity, the lowest factor loading is .62, the highest is .90, and the explanatory quantity of the three dimensions are 21.73%, 24.68%, and 70.06%, respectively, with the total validity .90.

After pretest of Youngsters' Well-being Scale, we divided love attitude into four factors--self-affirmation, human relationship, positive emotions, and health, totally 16 items. In regard of item analysis, the lowest of t value of each item has to be at least 6.85, and the highest 13.76. In respect with validity, the lowest factor loading is .63, the highest is .88, and the explanatory quantity of the four dimensions are 17.14%, 17.60%, 21.22%, and 17.37%, respectively, with the total explanatory quantity 73.33%. Regarding reliability, the dimension reliability are .84, .85, .90, and .84, respectively.

The *t* value of the pretest for the three scales is all above 3, meaning the items are discriminative. The total explanatory quantity is all above 50%, signifying good validity. Dimensions of reliability are all above .60, and the total reliability is all above .80, showing the internal consistency is good. The pretest results of the three scales are organized as Table 2.

Table 2. Reliability and Validity of Research Tools

Scale	Factor (dimension)	Item No.	t value	Validity					Reliability	
				KMO & Bartlett	Initial Eigenvalues	Factor loading	Total dimension explanatory quantity after rotation (%)	Total explanatory dimensions' explanatory quantity（%）	Dimension's reliability	Total reliability
Family support	Emotional support	4	9.39-18.15	.90	1.71	.69-.88	22.14	70.46	.89	.91
	Substantial support	4	3.16- 5.70	$p<.001$	1.04	.62-.76	17.29		.82	
	Informational support	5	10.31-15.82		6.41	.63-.83	31.02		.90	
Love attitude	Closeness	4	3.09-6.03	.88	1.22	.62-.90	21.73	70.06	.85	.90
	Passion	4	9.82-14.14	$p<.001$	6.44	.63-.88	24.65		.88	
	Commitment	5	8.31-9.96		2.14	.62-.79	23.68		.86	
Well-being	Self-affirmation	4	7.54-12.57	.90	1.04	.63-.72	17.14	73.33	.84	.93
	Human relationship	3	6.85-9.47	$p<.001$	1.51	.76-.88	17.60		.85	
	Positive emotions	5	10.41-13.49		8.09	.66-.84	21.22		.90	
	Health	4	8.15-13.76		1.10	.66-.78	17.37		.84	

(III). Data Process and Analysis

i. Conduct Hierarchical Regression Analysis with SPSS 17.0

This research used SPSS 17.0 to conduct hierarchical regression analysis. It is divided into 3 models, adopting to thrust each variable to the equation for understanding of explanatory power. From literature analysis discussed above, and with junior high school students as the research subject, this study adopted hierarchical regression analysis to discuss correlation between family support, love attitude, and wellbeing. The demographical variables have difference in well-being, and such variables took place in sample at the very beginning, and were not influenced by other explanatory variables. Therefore, in hierarchal regression, they are treated as the control variables in order to control the impact of the external factors (Chiu, 2010)[25]. Therefore, equation is put into demographical variables in the beginning stage, Called Model 1. And Family support affects well-being before than love attitude, so family support put into equation after control variables, called model 2. The last one into the equation is love attitude, called model 3.

ii. Control Variables to Dummy

Among the control variables in this study, gender and family structure are nominal variables, so we employed dummy coding. The male gender is dummied as 0 and female as 1. For grade, socio-economic status is ordinal variables, so they were thrust into the equation directly. In addition, the independent variable (dimension of family support, dimension of love attitude) and the dependent variable (total score of well-being) are ratio variables, so they entered the equation with the row score.

3. Results and Discussion

Regarding Model 1, it is mainly composed by gender; grade, family structure, and socioeconomic position (see Table 3). Model 1's $R^2 = .024$, $F = 4.100$, and $p = .003$, presenting such demographic variables have significant explanatory power for well-being. Among the four demographic variables, only grade achieved significant difference ($\beta = -.112$, $t = -2.956$, $p = .003$), signifying among the four demographic variables, grade has the most explanatory power.

Concerning Model 2, after controlling the four demographic variables' explanatory power, we thrust aspects of family support to the equation. The model's explanatory power is $R^2 = .307$, $F = 43.007$, $p = .000$, showing Model 2 has explanatory power. As for $\Delta R^2 = .284$, $\Delta F = 92.667$, and $p = .000$, showing that after thrust each aspect of family support, increment of model 2 has statistical meaning; that is, each aspect of family support can contribute extra 28.40%'s explanatory power.

Among the three aspects, informational support (β＝.300, t＝6.383, p＝.000) and emotional support (β＝.241, t＝5.640, p＝.000) have the most explanatory power, and both β values are positive, signifying that the higher informational support and emotional support, the more well-being will be.

After controlling the explanatory power of Model 1 and 2, aspects of love attitude were thrust into Model 3, and obtained the explanatory power R^2＝.3474, F=35.898, and

p=.000, showing Model 3 has explanatory power. As for ΔR^2＝.040, ΔF＝13.680, and p=.000, the increment of model3 has statistic meaning that can contribute extra 4% of explanatory power.

From the three aspects, commitment of love attitude (β＝.192, t＝4.226, p＝.000) has the most significant explanatory power, β values are all positive, showing that the more the commitment, the better well-being will be.

Table 3. Summary of hierarchical regression of family support, love attitude, and well-being

	Dependent variable (Well-being)								
	Model 1 Control variable			Model 2 Independent variable (Family support)			Model 3 Independent variable (Love variable)		
Control variable (demographic variable)									
	β	t	p	β	t	p	β	t	p
(Constant)		36.304	.000		9.533	.000		6.549	.000
Gender	-.061	-1.608	.108	-.100	-3.098	.002	-.083	-2.580	.010
Grade	-.112	-2.956	.003	-.047	-1.450	.148	-.052	-1.628	.104
Family structure	-.022	-.564	.573	.016	0.485	.628	.018	0.571	.568
Socio-economic status	-.066	-1.700	.090	-.013	-.399	.690	-.020	-0.621	.535
Independent variable (Family support)									
Emotional support				.241	5.640	.000	.251	6.009	.000
Substantial support				.094	2.492	.013	.053	1.394	.164
Informational support				.300	6.383	.000	.244	5.239	.000
Independent variable (love attitude)									
Intimacy							.068	1.682	.093
Passion							-.035	-0.808	.420
Commitment							.192	4.226	.000
Model abstract									
R^2		.024			.307			.347	
F		4.100			43.007			35.898	
p		.0030			.000			.000	
ΔR^2		.024			.284			.040	
ΔF		4.100			92.677			13.680	
P of change		.003			.000			.000	

For control variable's explanatory power for well-being, when demographic variables like gender, grade, family structure, and socio-economic status are put into Model 1, the results show that such demographic variables have significant explanatory power. However, only grade reached significant difference, presenting that grade has the most explanatory power among the four variables, and the β value are all negative, which means the higher the grade, the less happy they are. The possible reason may lie in Grade-3 junior high school students are facing the suppressing stress of the coming entrance exam that influences their perception well-being. Next, gender does not have significant explanatory power in well-being, implying that different-gender junior high school students do not perceive well-being that differs significantly. The results correspond to Li's (2002)[24] and Shi's (1995)[26]studies, and it may be resulted from gender equality that different genders' perceptions are almost the same in respect with the external material environment and internal psychological environment, so the indicators of well-being are similar as well. Thirdly, family structure does not have significantly explanatory power, which is consistent with Chao's (1997)[27] study that found that the modern cultivators are generous to offer children equivalent care and love even if they grew up in different family structures. Finally, socio-economic status does not have significantly explanatory power for well-being, meaning that junior high school students with different socio-economic status feel similarly in self-affirmation, human relationship, positive emotions, and physical and psychological health.

In regard of family support's explanatory power for well-being, following control variable's explanatory power for well-being, it is found that family support has explanatory power for well-being as well; the explanatory increment increases 28.40%. Among them, emotional and informational support have the most explanatory power, and their β values are both positive, suggesting that the higher the emotional and informational support, the higher well-being will be. This result is supportive to the arguments of Kostelecky and Lempers's (1998)[17] and Shek's (1997)[7]; namely, the better the family support, the youngsters' well-being will be. And this present student found that emotional and informational support are positive relation, the former refers to obtaining care or confidence from others, including positive emotional expression, and confirmative appraise, such as sense of closeness, sense of belonging, trust, care, respect, and praise. And the latter refers to providing ideas or viewpoints for individual to use and solve problems, including providing guidance, suggestions, or feedbacks. Consequently, family support correlates with well-being closely.

In regard of love attitude's explanatory power for well-being, following control variable's explanatory power for well-being, it is found that love attitude can contribute to extra 4% of explanatory power for well-being, showing that love attitude can explain well-being, but the explanatory power is not high. In model 3, Closeness within love attitude (refers to two people's sense of closeness and sense of adhesion) within love attitude level has no significance; though Sternberg (1997)[28] postulates that closeness can foster lover's welfare, feeling happy when staying with lover, highly caring for lover, able to trust in people in one's need, sharing properties, receiving emotional support from the loved, giving emotional support, close communication, and cherish life mutually. However, junior high school students may have no experience with this part, causing no significant level in model 3. Further, Passion has no significance, Chang (2004)[29] regarded that passion is composed by many emotions perceived from our partner, like missing, shy, envy, excited, and so on, and those emotions are delivered through kiss, embrace, gaze, touch, and sexual behaviors. As for Lee's (1973)[30] colors of love theory, passion is considered as the important factor in passionate love. In his viewpoint, passion is like fire, once kindled, it will not be able to quench. That is to say, passion is the peak of emotional wave, when both are congenial; passion will be aroused, so that one cannot help but desire for getting closer to the lover. Upon these viewpoints, the more passion, the more will-being, however, with junior high school students has few love experience than adults, then they can't experience the feeling of passion. Further, Commitment refers to mutual love for a short term, and committed to maintaining that love for the long term (Sternberg, 1997)[28]. Davis (1996)[31] held that commitment contains help and support. Such interactive relationship can have both sides get rid of loneliness, learn, and grow, and even develop the marital relationship. In other words, both trust and depend on each other, grow through encouragement and help in process of interaction, and become support for the soul. Junior high school students has high consistence on this commitment. Additionally, the low explanatory power may result from this research's adoption of hierarchical regression; its result is to control demographic variables and family support.

4. Suggestions

On the basis of the analyzed data, we concluded that grade, family support, and love attitude have explanatory power for well-being, so we suggested: 1) Parents should provide more emotional support. We placed dimension of family support into the equation, finding that it has 28.40% of explanatory power. Among the aspects, the informational and emotional support have the most explanatory power, both with positive β value, showing that the higher the informational and emotional support is, the higher well-being will be. Consequently, it is suggested that parents should provide more emotional support, such as sharing joys with the children, talking more about feelings, accompanying with the children more, listening to what's in their heart, and encouraging and comforting more when children are in frustrations. 2) Grade-9 students should mediate pressures from entrance exam on their own. According to the research

results, when gender, grade, family structure, and socio-economic status are put into the equation, the results show that such demographic variables have significant explanatory power for well-being, but only grade reaches significant difference, meaning that it has the most explanatory power. In addition, the higher the grade, the less well-being will be which may cause by the pressure of entrance exam. Pressure of entrance exam may come from parents' expectation or self-demand, or comparison among peers. Nevertheless, since entrance exam cannot be evaded, how to do self-adjustment is the way to improve such situation. 3) The studies in the future can further analyze the factors that influence well-being. In this research, the selected four demographic variables' explanatory power is 2.40%, family support is 28.40%, love attitude is 4%, and the total is 34.70%, signifying that there are still 65.30% is affected by other factors. Namely, the studies in the future can further explore the factors that influence well-being.

REFERENCES

[1] M. R. Sanders, Triple p-positive parenting program: Towards an empirically validated multilevel parenting and family support strategy for the prevention of behavior and emotional problems in children. Clinical child and family psychology review, Vol. 2, No. 2, 71-90, 1999.

[2] K. E. Cichy, R. S. Stawski, D. M. Almeida, A double-edged sword: Race, daily family support exchanges, and daily well-being. Journal of Family Issues, 2013. Retrieved from http://jfi.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/03/07/0192513X1 3479595.full.pdf+html

[3] C. F. Wang, Y. M. Wang, Analytical research on relationship between gender and gender's role with love attitude and love relationship. Chung San Medical Journal, Vol. 14, 71-82, 2003.

[4] S. S. Lin, Youngsters' spiritual reform--From both sex's intimate relationship. Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 6, No. 1, 51-76, 1998.

[5] E. Diener, Subjective well-being. Social Indicators Research Series, Vol. 37, 11-58, 2009.

[6] E. Diener, R. A. Emmons, The independence of positive and negative affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 47, No. 5, 1105-1117, 1984.

[7] D. T. L. Shek, The relation of family functioning to adolescent psychological well-being, school adjustment, and problem behavior. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, Vol. 158, 467-79, 1997.

[8] R. Derdikman-Eiron, M. S. Indredavik, G. H. Bratberg, G. Taraldsen, I. J. Bakken, M. Colton, Gender differences in subjective well-being, self-esteem and psychosocial functioning in adolescents with symptoms of anxiety and depression: Findings from the Nord-Trondelag health study. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, Vol. 52, 261–267, 2011.

[9] S. H. Yuei, C. Chang, H. C. Huang, D. P. Li, Youngsters' subjective well-being, psychological health, and their

[10] D. A. Wenk, C. L. Hardesty, C. S. Morga, S. L. Blair, The influence of parental involvement on the well-being of sons and daughters. Journal of Marriage & Family, Vol. 56, No. 1, 229-234, 1994.

[11] T. Dew, E. S. Huebner, Adolescents' perceived quality of life : An exploratory investigation. Journal of School Psychology, Vol. 32, 185-199, 1994.

[12] S. O. Meadows, J. S. Brown, G. H. J. Elder, Depressive symptoms, stress, and support: Gendered trajectories from adolescence to young adulthood. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, Vol. 35, 93–103, 2006.

[13] T. A. Wills, Social support and the family. In E. Blechman (Ed.), Emotions and the family: For better or for worse (pp. 75-98). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 2013.

[14] A. M. Cauce, M. Reid, S. Landesman, N. Gonzales, Social support in young children: Measurement, structure, and behavioral impact. In B. R. Sarason, I. G. Sarason, & G. R. Pierce (Eds.), Social support: An interactional view (pp. 64-94). New York, NY: Wiley, 1990.

[15] C. Guan, X. Wen, Y. Gong, Y. Liang, Z. Wang, Family environment and depression a population-based analysis of gender differences in rural China. Journal of Family Issues, Vol. 35, No. 4, 481-500, 2014.

[16] I. N. Sandier, P. Miller, J. Short, S. A. Wolchik, Social support as a protective factor for children in stress. In D. Belle (Ed.), Children's social networks and social supports (pp. 277-307). New York, NY: Wiley, 1989.

[17] K. L. Kostelecky, J. D. Lempers, Stress, family social support, distress, and well-being in high school seniors. Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, Vol. 27, No. 2, 125-145, 1998.

[18] B. Schnettler, M. Denegri, H. Miranda, J. Sepúlveda, L. Orellana, G. Paiva, K. G. Grunert, Family support and subjective well-being: An exploratory study of university students in southern Chile. Social Indicators Research, 1-32, 2015. doi: 10.1007/s11205-014-0718-3

[19] E. Allardt, Dimensions of welfare in a comparative Scandinavian study. Acta Sociologica, Vol. 19, No. 3, 227-239, 1976.

[20] C. S. Chang, Students' mental and physical development and characteristics. In S, C. Lin (Ed.), Psychology of Education (the 3rd ed., pp. 19-77), Taipei, Taiwan: Wu-nan, 2007.

[21] L. Lu, Discussion on content, measurement, and relative factors, Proceedings of the National Science Council, Republic of China, Part C: Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol. 8, No. 1, 115-137, 1998.

[22] Y. H. Huang, College athletes'' interpersonal relationship intimate ability, love attitude, and well-being(Unpublished Master Thesis), Institute of Recreational Sport Management, Taipei Municipal Sport University, Taipei, Taiwan, 2011.

[23] S. C. Lin, Exploration of vocational high school students' love relationship (Unpublished Master Thesis), Graduate Institute of Human Sexuality in Shu -Te University, Kaohsiung City, Taiwan, 2012.

[24] S. J. Li, Relative research on youngsters' family support and well-being take Taichung municipal junior high school

students as example (Unpublished Master Thesis), Department of Social Work and Child Welfare, Providence University, Taichung, Taiwan, 2002.

[25] H. C. Chiu, Quantitative research and statistical analysis. Taipei, Taiwan: Wu-nan, 2010.

[26] C. B. Shi, Discussion of performance and the related factors of well-being(Unpublished Master Thesis), Behavioral Science Institute in Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung , Taiwan, 1995.

[27] W. Chao, Family structure, economic pressure, and community disorganization as determinants of adolescent adjustment problems. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1997.

[28] R. J. Sternberg, Construct validation of a triangular love scale. European Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 27, No. 3, 313-335, 1997.

[29] C. C. Chang, Related research on junior high school talented students' love attitude and the current condition(Unpublished Master Thesis), In-service Master Class in Department of Special Education in National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan, 2004.

[30] J. A. Lee, The colors of love: An exploration of the ways of loving. Don Mills, Ontario, Canada: New Press, 1973.

[31] M. F. Davis, EPQ correlates of love styles. Personality and Individual Differences, Vol. 20, No. 2, 257-259, 1996.