

Peer and Parental Support Among College Students

Ryan Anderson, Polina Bugayev, Greta Gaetz, Cia Guglielmina, Kayli Kirkegaard, and sixth author

Sociology/Anthropology 371: Quantitative Research Methods
Professor Ryan Sheppard

December 18, 2009

Abstract. Two main sources of social support for college students are parents and on-campus peers. Our study focused on the relationship between these two support sources, as well as how students perceive social support from each of these sources as their college experience progresses. Using an anonymous, online survey questionnaire at a small, private liberal arts college in the Midwest, we tested the hypotheses that (1) students who perceive high levels of parental social support will also perceive high levels of on-campus peer social support, and (2) first-year college students perceive higher levels of parental social support than do upper-class students. We found that respondents had high levels of social support from both parents and on-campus peers. In addition, about 25% of peer support can be explained by high levels of parental social support, and class year and level of parental support had no correlation.

Humans are social by nature. With this sociability we have become quite adept at creating complex social structures to express values, rituals, and ideas. These social networks are made up of many cooperating and competing groups and are key locations for social support. College is a unique time for the young adults where they are surrounded by people their own age in all areas of life (classes, housing, dining, etc). It is also unique because the time spent in college represents a shift away from the family and toward developing alternate strong social networks and means of social support.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Social support is a concept that varies in definition among scholars. One of the most prevalent definitions of social support in literature includes a feeling

of belonging (Eshbaugh 2008). Additional research links *belonging* to *emotional support*, which is described as an indication by one person to another that he or she loves, values, and cares for the other (Eshbaugh 2008; Valery and O'Connor 1997). Emotional social support also includes verbal communication known as *disclosure*, the sharing of intimate details with others (Eshbaugh 2008). In other studies, social support involves several other conceptual indicators such as *intimacy*, *comfort*, and *tangible support* (Hale, Hannum, and Espelage 2005). *Tangible support* actions, such as lending a friend twenty dollars or giving your child a ride, serve as non-emotional indicators of support (Hale et al. 2005). These various components of social support are present in relationships with friends, family, romantic partners, and co-workers: relationships that form multifaceted resources for companionship and belonging (Eshbaugh 2008).

Despite the many definitions of social support found in literature, feelings of belonging appear to be a common theme. For example, one study found that membership in a group of students who share experiences, such as being involved in sororities or clubs, improves adjustment and sense of belonging within college groups (Garcia 2005). People join groups such as volunteer networks to make contacts and/or friends in order to feel this greater sense of belonging (Prouteau, Lionel and François-Charles Wolff 2008). Those involved in activities also experience positive changes in scholastic competence and social acceptance, as well as an increase in job satisfaction and performance (Pittman and Richmond 2008; Royal and Rossi 1996). However, in some cases, instead of these positive changes, over-integration in social networks and activities is associated with elevated levels of depressive symptoms (Falci and McNeely 2009; Randall and Bohnert 2007). Regarding the dimension of belonging within social support, some research focuses specifically on the role of organized religion. One study found that those who are highly involved in religious groups also report having high-quality relationships (Ellison and George 1994). Another suggests that the religiously involved have a higher sense of community and a greater number of social support networks overall (Bohus, Chan, and Woods 2005).

With the increasing prevalence of Internet communication, many people utilize online social support groups, networks and communities in addition to, or instead of, face-to-face contact. However, much of the research on Internet communication states that people without this face-to-face contact were more likely to report loneliness and depression (Kraut and Robert 2002). One study also found that adolescents with lower levels of perceived parental support were more likely to seek out friendships and receive support from others online (Subrahmanyam and Lin 2007). Similar literature of reciprocal social support, either online or face-to-face, examined how students who give social support

receive, in return, ample support from others (Baus, Dysart-Gale, and Haven 2005). Furthermore, a separate study discovered negative associations with extraversion and received social support. People with highly extroverted personalities formed less intimate relationships overall, which reduced levels of social support provided and received (Lu 1997).

In research on adolescents and college communities, alcohol and other chemical substances are frequently related to social support, which in turn also affects body image. Alcohol is often referred to as the “social drug par excellence” because it can create agreeable moods and ease tension when meeting new people (Park 2004). Moderate drinkers report feeling supported within their peer drinking groups (El-Guebaly 2007). In addition to alcohol, the use of stimulants is fairly common on college campuses, particularly in the realms of academics and recreation. One study found that students use various stimulants, such as Adderall and Ritalin, to compensate for time spent socializing, help improve academic performance, and lose weight (Hall, Irwin, Bowman, Frankenberger, and Jewett 2005). Research on weight and body image has examined the correlation between appearance dissatisfaction and lower perceived social support (Cash, Jakatdar, and Williams 2004). In fact, relationship success is seen to be a necessity for developing self-concepts that lead to healthy eating, higher self-esteem and better body image (Hesse-Biber, Marino, and Watts-Roy 1999).

Some previous studies on social support provide evidence suggesting a link between parental and peer support. A study of Dutch adolescents revealed a strong correlation between cohesive parental relationships and high peer attachment (Engels, Dekovic, and Meeus 2002). Another study reported findings that may confound the correlation between peer and parental support because when students become involved in work study, their peer support decreases as they increase work hours (Cramer, Sheran, and Kulm 2006). Previous research shows that parental social support positively affects students in many facets of their lives. Parents can provide emotional support that is instrumental for their children, and according to one study always did so when their children requested it (Valery and O'Conner 1997). Parental support helps students adjust to college, and high parental involvement in a child's life can increase student commitment to academics (Holahan, Valentiner, and Moss 1994; McNeal 2001). In another study, unconditional support from parents was a stronger determining factor for children's well-being and overall outlook on life than unconditional support received from peers (Harter, Marold, Whitesell, and Cobbs 1996).

Familial background influences how effective parental social support might be for students. One study shows that family plays a stronger supportive role for first generation college students than for second generation college students

(Hertel 2002). In addition, parental support affects minority students' personal and career motivations, which in turn has shown to positively affect these students' college commitment and school adjustment (Dennis, Phinney, and Chuateco 2005).

Among the studies that suggested a link between parental and peer support, one shows that parental support encourages a more outgoing social disposition in students which in turn, helps students seek relationships with peers and ultimately adjust to college (Holahan et al. 1994). A similar study found a positive correlation between parental involvement, characterized by a non-controlling and communicative relationship, and children's healthy socialization habits (Conneely 2001).

Given the importance of a supportive peer network suggested by Eshbaugh (2008), we examined a variety of studies that emphasized peer support among youth and found high correlation between absence of peer support and low academic commitment. In fact, the correlation is higher for unsatisfactory peer support than it was for unsatisfactory parental support (Dennis, Phinney, and Chuateco 2005). A study of peer counselors in a Los Angeles public school district found that higher attachment between student counselors and their peers correlated with increased commitment to academics and the possibility of college enrollment (Tierney and Venegas 2006). The student counselors bonded so closely with their peers that researchers classified the relationships as "fictive kin," a kin-like bond between non-relatives (Tierney and Venegas 2006). A study conducted in The Republic of Ireland shows that peer support can provide an alternative to parental support when children are receiving insufficient support at home (Halpenny, Greene and Hogan 2008). In this sense, peer relationships do not emulate parental relationships, but peers compensate by providing support to each other. Because college is often the biggest separation between parents and children peer support may increase and parental support may decrease as adolescents mature into adulthood (Helsen, Vollebergh, and Meeus 2000).

As discussed above, previous research on social support suggests a link between parental and peer support. Based on these studies, we will test for a relationship between parental and peer social support. Despite the abundance of research on social support, we have yet to find any study that has explicitly examined the relationship between parental support and peer support of American college students. Based on our literature review, we posit that examining the relationship between parental and peer support for American college students could benefit the larger study of social behavioral development. We ultimately hope to provide students, parents, and other supporters with applicable information on parental and peer support.

METHODS

Hypotheses

1. Based on our literature review, our first hypothesis was that students who perceive higher levels of parental support also perceive higher levels of on-campus peer support.
2. Our second hypothesis was that first-year students perceive higher levels of parental support than do upper class students (seniors, juniors, and sophomores).

We investigated these hypotheses by using an online survey.

Measures

For our first hypothesis, parental support was the independent variable, and on-campus peer support was the dependent variable. For our second hypothesis, college class year was the independent variable, and parental support was the dependent variable. Since this is not an experimental study, we can only test for a correlation between the variables in our hypotheses, not a causal relationship. For our survey, we used Likert-scale ratings to measure parental and on-campus peer support. Our conceptual definition of parental and peer support was based on previous research that provided the best framework of social support from which to base our study; the indicators in this study consisted of belonging, tangible support, self-disclosure, and intimacy (Hale, Hannum, and Espelage 2005). Also, based on feedback from a pre-test focus group, we decided to add affirmation as an indicator of social support. These five indicators comprehensively cover aspects of social support that we wanted to focus on in our study.

Our study intended to achieve face, content and concurrent criterion validity. Face validity is the judgment evaluated by people in a scientific community of whether variables measure what they intend to in a study (Neuman 2007). We strove to achieve face validity by utilizing indicators that have been acknowledged by members of the scientific community and by members of the sociological community at our college as ones that appropriately measure social support. Content validity intends to capture the entire meaning of a question being studied by conceptualizing the question clearly, encompassing all of its aspects or indicators and using all areas of the definition when measuring the sample (Neuman 2007). To obtain content validity, our conceptualized definition of social support was clearly stated in our survey as tangible support, self-disclosure, intimacy, sense of belonging and affirmation (Neuman 2007; Hale et al. 2005). All of these indicators were included and tested for in our survey. In addition, we intended to capture a well-rounded and exhaustive

definition of social support that was based on previous scientific work and a preliminary focus group, which was an in-person interview held with six St. Olaf students that helped us further conceptualize our definition of social support. Lastly, concurrent criterion validity is achieved when an indicator is validated by previously tested measurements (Neuman 2007). We strove for concurrent content validity by founding our conceptual definition and indicators of social support and the sample measurements on previous scientific studies, such as the Hale et al. study.

Sample

Our study sampled from the student body at St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota. We used a simple random sample excluding current participants of our Sociology/Anthropology Foundations of Social Science Research class, participants in our focus groups, and students under the age of 18, which gave us a population sample size of 2,813 students. Since our target population was 2,813 students, we needed to obtain responses from approximately 340 students to achieve a confidence level of 95 percent with a margin of error of plus or minus 5 percentage points (<http://research-advisors.com/tools/SampleSize.htm>). In addition, we followed Neuman's rule of thumb in obtaining an appropriate sample size, which states that for a small population (under 1,000) a larger sampling ratio is needed (30%) and for a larger population (about 10,000) a smaller ratio is needed (10%) (Neuman 2007). For our moderately small population (2,813) we aimed in obtaining a larger sample ratio (25%) and sent invitations to 703 students. Susan Canon, Director of Institutional Research at St. Olaf College ran a simple random and anonymous sample for us via a computer system. We elected to use a simple random sample because it provides the most representative sample of our population. Of the 703 invitations sent, 333 responded, yielding a response rate of 47.4%. Among the respondents, 31.2% were males, 64.9% females, and 2 identified as Other. There were also 27.0% first-year students, 22.2% sophomores, 21.3% juniors, 25.2% seniors, and 2 who identified as Other. When asked about race and ethnicity, 87.1% respondents identified as White Non-Hispanic, 3.6% as Asian, 3.3% as Other, 2.1% as Hispanic, and 0.3% as Black or African American.

Ethical Concerns

In order to protect the rights of the respondents, we employed several measures that reduced the potential for any kind of social or psychological harm for participants. Respondents' privacy was protected through anonymity, which allowed the participants to answer thoroughly and honestly without the fear of having their name connected to their answers (Neuman 2007). Though the

survey did not inquire into anything beyond what most people encounter in daily life, the possibility for psychological harm from our survey questionnaire was mitigated with an introductory email and a cover letter that included a statement of risks and implied consent given through completion of the survey, and our professor's contact information. Our sample excluded students under the age of 18 who are considered a special population. Since minors do not have the same rights, responsibilities and knowledge as adults, extra care and protection is needed with this population to avoid causing harm or exploitation (Neuman 2007). In addition, no deception or coercion was used in our study. We carried out an Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval process before the survey invitation was sent to our sample. This process ensured that we conducted a study that respected the legal and ethical obligations of conducting research with human subjects and protected the rights and well-being of all study participants. We followed all requirements set by the St. Olaf College IRB, attaining the required Intermediate Review from one IRB member, Charles Huff, Professor of Psychology, in order to proceed with our research and freely report and/or publish our findings beyond the St. Olaf Community.

RESULTS

From our survey questions we compiled two indexes of peer and parental social support. To create these we used indicators from our univariate results that were clustered on the categories of “strongly agree” or “strongly disagree.” The strong indicators used for the peer social support index were self-disclosure, verbal affirmation, non-verbal affirmation, intimacy and sense of belonging. This distribution of scores is shown in Graph 1. The strong indicators used for the parental social support index were affirmation, intimacy and tangible support. Graph 2 shows the distribution of scores on the parental social support index. These distributions are highly skewed to the left, which indicates that the majority of our respondents perceive high levels of parental and on-campus peer social support.

Graph 1: Distribution of Peer Social Support Index

Graph 2: Distribution of the Parental Social Support Index

Our peer and parental social support indexes did not show a normal curve distribution, thus requiring non-parametric tests. To test our first hypothesis (students with high levels of parental support also have high levels of peer support) we conducted a Spearman's ρ correlation for the relationship between our peer support index our parental support index. A moderately strong relation ship was found ($\rho = .255, p < 0.1$), indicating a significant relationship between the two indexes. Our results state that 25.5 percent of peer support can be explained by parental support. Graph 3 shows a scatter plot between the two indexes with an imposed line of regression. Table 1 shows the Spearman's ρ results for the two indexes.

Graph 3: Scatter plot of Peer and Parental Support Index

Table 1: Spearman’s *rho* Results for the Peer and Parental Indexes

Correlations

			PeerStrong	ParentStrong
Spearman's rho	PeerStrong	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.255**
		Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.000
		N	308	297
	ParentStrong	Correlation Coefficient	.255**	1.000
		Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.
		N	297	315
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).				

To test our second hypothesis (first-year students have higher levels of parental social support than upper-class students), we conducted a Mann-Whitney test between the categories of first-years and seniors, as well as first-years and upper-class students (seniors, juniors and sophomores). No significant relationship was found between first-year and senior parental support ($U = 3107$, $p > 0.05$), indicating no difference between the two categories. Tables 2a and 2b show the ranks and results between the parental support index, first-years, and seniors. No significant relationship was found between first-year and upper-class students parental support ($U = 9059.5$, $p > 0.05$), indicating no difference between the two categories. Tables 3a and 3b show the ranks and results between first-years and upper-class students.

Table 2a: Parental Support Ranks for First-year Students Compared to Seniors

Ranks				
	Class Year	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
ParentStrong	First-year	88	79.81	7023.50
	Senior	80	89.66	7172.50
	Total	168		

Table 2b: Parental Support Results for First-year Students Compared to Seniors

Test Statistics ^a	
	ParentStrong
Mann-Whitney U	3107.500
Wilcoxon W	7023.500
Z	-1.387
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.165

--

Table 3a: Parental Support Ranks for First-year Students Compared to Upper-class students

Ranks				
	Class Year Grouped by Sophomores Juniors and Seniors	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
ParentStrong	First-years	88	147.45	12975.50
	Upper-class students	219	156.63	34302.50
	Total	307		

Table 3b: Parental Support Results for First-year Students Compared to Upper-class students

Test Statistics ^a	
	ParentStrong
Mann-Whitney U	9059.500
Wilcoxon W	12975.500
Z	-.863
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.388

We tested the ordinal confounding variables of distance from home and parent contact frequency using a Kruskal-Wallis test. We tested the nominal confounding variable of gender using a Mann-Whitney test. No significant relationship was found between these potential confounding variables and the peer support index, so we cannot conclude that gender, distance from home or parent contact frequency are confounding variables.

However, a significant relationship was found between two of the variables and the parental support index. Using the Mann-Whitney test, we found a significant relationship comparing gender and parental support ($U = 8865.5$, $p < 0.05$), indicating that males and females have different amounts of parental social support. Tables 4a and 4b show the ranks and results for the parental support index compared to gender.

We also conducted a Kruskal-Wallis test comparing our parental social support

index with the frequency of parent contact. A significant relationship was found ($H = 24.29, p < .01$), indicating that higher frequency of parent contact correlates with higher parental support. Tables 5a and 5b show the ranks and results for parent contact frequency compared to parental support.

Table 4a: Ranks Comparing Gender to the Parental Social Support Index

Ranks				
	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
ParentStrong	Male	97	140.40	13618.50
	Female	211	160.98	33967.50
	Total	308		

Table 4b: Results Comparing Gender to the Parental Social Support Index

Test Statistics ^a	
	ParentStrong
Mann-Whitney U	8865.500
Wilcoxon W	13618.500
Z	-1.982
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.048
a. Grouping Variable: Gender	

Table 5a: Ranks for Parent Contact Frequency Compared to Parental Support

Ranks			
	Frequency of Parent Contact	N	Mean Rank
ParentStrong	A couple of times each year	1	4.50
	About once a month	10	99.40
	About once a week	105	136.06
	A few times a week	128	165.44
	About once a day	57	183.54
	Multiple times each day	14	203.36
	Total	315	

Table 5b: Results for Parent Contact Frequency Compared to Parental Support

Test Statistics ^{a,b}	
	ParentStrong
Chi-Square	24.289
df	5
Asymp. Sig.	.000
a. Kruskal Wallis Test	
b. Grouping Variable: Frequency of Parent Contact	

DISCUSSION

From our results, we know that our first hypothesis (students who perceive high levels of parental support also perceive high levels of on-campus peer support) was supported. A possible reason for this is that college students may seek multiple sources of support to fulfill a variety of social needs. For example, a college student may seek support from peers in different ways than they seek support from their parents. If on-campus peers provide academic-related social support and parents provide familial-related support, it could possibly explain the relationship in our results. However, we cannot say that students with high levels of parental support *will have* high levels of peer support. The correlation may signify that there is a social expectation that suggests students with high parental support also have high peer support. We recognize that there is a perception at St. Olaf that students are socially well supported, and this identity of the school may influence how students respond to a survey on social support. Our second hypothesis (first-year students have higher parental support than do upper-class students) was not supported by our results. Factors that might explain this include premature testing of the first-years, adaptive parental relationships among upper-class students, and an overall slant towards high support for both parents and peers. First-years had only been on campus for a few months when surveyed, and this may have influenced their perceptions of parental support. Because this is probably an intense transition period, some first-years may have been adjusting to their new environment and thus relied more or less on their parents. Also, most supportive peer relationships take more than a few months to develop, so first-years may have limited experience with on-campus peer support. On the other hand, we anticipated that upper-class students would become distant from their parents as they matriculated through college. However, a potential reason for high parental support responses among upper-class students could be that their relationship does not

grow more distant, but in fact evolves as students find more similarities in their relationships with parents. Another possible explanation for these results is that because the majority of all students reported high levels of both parental and peer support there was not much variation across class year and gender. There may have also been a tendency among respondents to indicate higher social support because of social acceptability bias.

As we stated in our literature review, previous studies suggested a link between parental and peer support, but none explicitly researched that relationship.

Therefore, our results do not directly compare to previous research because we specifically analyzed the parental and peer support relationship. However, our results do compare to some previous studies in less direct ways. For example, our results coincide with Rutger and Engels (2002), which found a correlation between cohesive parental relationships and high peer attachment in Dutch adolescents. Two other studies postulated that parental support encourages a greater social disposition and level of outgoingness in students which then helps them seek out relationships with peers, and/or creates healthy socialization habits (Holahan et al. 1994; Conneely 2001). Our results could be used in conjunction with these theories because their results were similar to ours. Previous research regarding social support networks and time stated that, during the process of adolescents maturing into adulthood, peer support may increase and parental support may decrease (Helsen, Vollebergh, and Meeus 2000). Our findings differ from these results because we found no relationship between class year and levels of support from either peers or parents.

CONCLUSION

We looked at the direct relationship between social support that college students receive from parents and on-campus peers. We found that, overall, respondents had high levels of social support from both parents and on-campus peers. More specifically, we found that 25% of peer support can be explained by high levels of parental social support. In addition, we found no distinct relationship between these networks of parental and peer support and possible confounding variables such as class year, gender, parent contact frequency or distance from parents' home.

Previous literature examined either parental support or peer support, but none focused on a direct relationship between the two variables. Our study adds to the scientific body of knowledge by filling in this gap and analyzing the relationship between parental and peer support received among college students.

This can be useful information for the St. Olaf Counseling Center because our findings could help counselors better assess issues involving parental and peer social support. Additionally, our results could be used by the St. Olaf College administration as a promotional tool since levels of high social support from both parents and peers could emphasize the community environment of the college.

A strength of our study includes using pre-tested indicators adapted from Hale et al. (2005). Additionally, we tested multiple indicators of social support and achieved a moderate response rate and an even distribution across class year from our survey.

One limitation of our study is that it exhibited low external validity because our results apply only to the St. Olaf College student body. The majority of St. Olaf students are Caucasian, middle to upper-middle class and Protestant Christian. Because of these restrictions, we cannot generalize from our sample to populations other than St. Olaf College. We also had a higher female response rate relative to the male/female ratio of the college. Additionally, academic rigor and strong notion of community at St. Olaf could have affected students' reported levels of social support. In recognizing these latter limitations, our results should be accepted with some caution.

Future studies could be conducted in different settings such as a larger urban university or a more diverse environment where one could look more closely at the impact of race and socioeconomic status on parental and peer support. In addition, the relationships between other social networks of support could be examined (ex. work colleagues, student organizations or specific student support groups). Lastly, future studies could analyze in greater depth the relationships between gender, parental support, and parent contact frequencies. These were the only confounding variables we tested that showed a statistically significant relationship for parental support.

WORKS CITED

Bohus, Steve, Caleb Chan and Robert Woods Jr. 2005. "Psychological Sense of Community among Students on Religious Collegiate Campuses in the Christian Evangelical Tradition." *Christian Higher Education* 4:19-40.

Cash, Thomas, Tejal A. Jakatdar and Emily Fleming Williams. 2004. "The Body Image Quality of Life Inventory: Further Validation with College Men and Women." *Body Image* 1:3. (Retrieved from ScienceDirect College Edition on September 18, 2009.)

Conneely, James F. 2001. "Balancing the Role of Parents in the Residential Community." *New Directions for Student Services* 94:51-61.

- Cramer, Sheran and Tracy L. Kulm. 2006. "The Relationship of Student Employment to Student Role, Family Relationships, Social Interactions and Persistence." *College Student Journal* 40:927-938.
- Dennis, Phinney and Lizette I. Chuateco. 2005. "The Role of Motivation, Parental Support, and Peer Support in the Academic Success of Ethnic Minority First-Generation College Students." *Journal of College Student Development* 46.3:223-236.
- El-Guebaly, Naly. 2007. "Investigating the Association between Moderate Drinking and Mental Health." *Annals of Epidemiology* 17(5S):S55-S62.
- Ellison, Christopher G. and Linda K. George. 1994. "Religious Involvement, Social Ties, and Social Support in a Southeastern Community." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 33:1. (Retrieved from Academic Search Premier on September 21, 2009.)
- Engels, Rutger C.M.E., Maja Dekovic, and Wim Meeus. 2002. "Parenting Practices, Social Skills and Peer Relationships in Adolescence." *Social Behavior and Personality* 30(1):3-18.
- Eshbaugh, Elaine. 2008. "Brief Report: Gender, Social Support, and Loneliness Among Residential Hall Students." *The Journal of College and University Student Housing* 35(2):24-33.
- Falci, Christina and Clea McNeely. 2009. "Too Many Friends: Social Integration, Network Cohension and Adolescent Depressive Symptoms." *Social Forces* 87:2031-61.
- Garcia, Gina Ann. 2005. "The Relationship of Perceptions of Campus Climate and Social Support to Adjustment to College for Latina Sorority and Non-sorority Members." University of Maryland, College Park, MD. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hale, Cara, James Hannum, and Dorothy Espelage. 2005. "Social Support and Physical Health: The Importance of Belonging." *Journal of American College Health* 53(6):276-284.
- Hall, K.M., M.M. Irwin, K.A. Bowman, W. Frankenberger, and D. Jewett. "Illicit use of prescribed stimulant medication among college

- students.” *Journal of American College Health* 53(4):167-174.
- Halpenny, Ann Marie, Sheila Greene, and Diane Hogan. 2008. “Children’s Perspectives on Coping and Support Following Parental Separation.” *Child Care in Practice* 14.3: 331-325.
- Harter, Susan, Donna B. Marold, Nancy R. Whitesell, and Gabrielle Cobbs. 1996. “A Model of the Effects of Perceived Parent and Peer Support on Adolescent False Self Behavior.” *Child Development* 67.2: 360-374.
- Helsen, M., W. Vollebergh, and W. Meeus. 2000. “Social Support from Parents and Friends and Emotional Problems in Adolescence.” *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 29(3): 319-335.
- Hertel, James B. 2002. “College Student Generational Status: Similarities, Differences and Factors in College Adjustment.” *The Psychological Record* 52:3-18.
- Hesse-Biber, Sharlene, Margarate Marino and Diane Watts-Roy. 1999. “A Longitudinal Study of Eating Disorders among College Women: Factors That Influence Recovery.” *Gender and Society* 13: 385-408. (Retrieved from JSTOR on September 20, 2009.)
- Holahan, Charles J., David P. Valentiner and Rudolf H. Moss. 1994. “Parental Support and Psychological Adjustment during the Transition to Young Adulthood in a College Sample.” *Journal of Family Psychology* 8(2): 215-223.
- Kraut, Robert, Sara Kiesler, Bonka Boneva, Jonathon Cummings, Vicki Helgeson, and Anne Crawford. 2002. “Internet Paradox Revisited.” *Journal of Social Issues* 58:49-74.
- Lu, Luo. 1997. “Social Support, Reciprocity, and Well-Being.” *Journal of Social Psychology* 137(5).
- McNeal Jr., Ralph B. 2001. “Differential Effects of Parental Involvement on Cognitive and Behavioral Outcomes by Socioeconomic Status.” *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 30:171-79.
- Neuman, W. Lawrence. 2004. *Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. New York: Pearson.

- Park, Crystal L. 2004. "Positive and Negative Consequences of Alcohol Consumption in College Students." *Addictive Behaviors* 29(2): 311-321.
- Pittman, Laura D., and Adeya Richmond. 2008. "University Belonging, Friendship Quality, and Psychological Adjustment During the Transition to College." *Journal of Experimental Education* 76: 343-62.
- Prouteau, Lionel and François-Charles Wolff. 2008. "On the Relational Motive for Volunteer Work." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 29(3): 314-35.
- Subrahmanyam, Kaveri, and Gloria Lin. 2007. "Adolescents on the net: Internet use and well-being." *Adolescence* 42(168).
- Tierney, William G. and Kristan M. Venegas. 2006. "Fictive Kin and Social Capital: The Role of Peer Groups in Applying and Paying for College." *American Behavioral Scientist* 49(12): 1687-1702.
- The Research Advisors. 2006. "Sampling Size Table." research-advisors.com Retrieved Dec. 1, 2009 <http://research-advisors.com/tools/SampleSize.htm>.
- Valery, Joan and Patricia O'Connor. 1997. "The nature and amount of support college-age adolescents request and receive from parents." *Adolescence* 32(126): 323-336. (Retrieved from Academic Search Premier on September 22, 2009.)