Parenting Styles and Quality of Life among Students in Public Secondary Schools in Eastern Uganda

Kamonges Wahab Asad[1]
Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education,
Islamic University in Uganda.
Email:kamongeswahab@gmail.com

Prof.Airat Sulaiman[2]
Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education,
Islamic University in Uganda.
Email:sulaaa@yahoo.co.uk

Ass.Prof.Dr. Matovu Musa[3]
Centre for Postgraduate Studies,
Islamic University in Uganda.
Email:matovumousa@gmail.com

Abstract
The study investigated the influence of Parenting styles on the quality of life among students in public secondary schools, Eastern Uganda. The study sought to examine the extent to which Parenting styles influence the students' quality of life. The study used a correlational research design. A sample size of 368 students were selected from a target population of 9,143 using simple random sampling technique. A questionnaire was used for data collection. It was hypothesized that; There is no statistically significant influence of parenting styles on the quality of life among students in public secondary schools. The findings of the study show that parenting styles alone explains 3.5% of the variations in the outcome variable (students' quality of life). It was concluded that, there was a high influence of authoritative parenting style, low influence of authoritarian and permissive parenting styles and very low influence of neglectful parenting style on the students' quality of life in secondary schools in Eastern Uganda. Secondary school students experienced a high level of general life satisfaction quality of life domain and a high level of physical health quality of life domain and experienced lower levels of quality of life in the home environment quality of life domain, and lower levels of quality of life in the psychological well-being quality of life domain. It was recommended that parents adopt the authoritative parenting style as it facilitates good quality of life of students as they pursue their education endeavors and the school administrators to organize an awareness and sensitization workshops on the influence of the home environment on the quality of life of students as well as educating families regarding awareness on the parenting styles and the quality of life of students in secondary school. The school counsellors based on this result are urged to continue providing the psychological support that students would need at any given point in time for them to remain focused on their goals.

Key Words: Parenting styles, Quality of Life, Secondary School Students

Introduction

The construct parenting style is used to capture normal variations in parents' attempts to control and socialize their children (Baumrind, 1991). Baumrind assumes that normal parenting revolves around issues of control and that the primary role of all parents is to influence, teach, and control their children. WHO (1996) defines quality of life as a person's sense of their place in life in relation to their objectives, aspirations, standards, and concerns as well as the social and cultural context in which they live. The 15 domains of quality of life were discovered by Flanagan (1978) who categorized them into five broad categories: relationships with others, material and physical well-being, social, community, and civic activities, as well as personal growth and fulfillment and enjoyment. Abraham Maslow defined quality of life in terms of the hierarchical need satisfaction level of most of the members of a given society and as such he asserts that the higher the need satisfaction of the majority in a given

society, the greater the quality of life in that society. Students' fundamental needs, such as a sense of success and community participation, are met by the school as an educational institution, and as such, it cannot be viewed as merely a location for teaching and learning. After adjusting for gender, school level, and student average performance using subsequent multilevel modeling. Matejevic et.al (2014) results show a propensity for authoritarian parenting, which was linked to a lack of free time for involvement in extracurricular activities. Love and Thomas (2014) found that authoritative parenting methods significantly raised the levels of self-esteem in college students. Similar findings were reported by Argyriou et.al (2016) who found a statistically significant relationship between authoritarianism and emotional intelligence, but only a moderate association between authoritarianism and emotional intelligence.

Niaraki and Hassan (2013) reported a significant impact of parenting style on the psychological health and self-concept and that authoritative parenting style was associated with better quality of life than authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Otu, Charles, and Yaya (2020) emphasized that, it is crucial to understand that the trauma COVID-19 creates might affect people in numerous ways, at the individual and communal levels, and result in mental health difficulties for many. This is because COVID-19 produced a very dangerous worldwide environment. Additionally, Kanekar and Sharma (2020) noted that the widespread COVID-19 epidemic has been a significant source of stress, anxiety, and suffering for the general public. Li and Zhong (2022) found that, a thorough indicator of an individual's health and well-being is their quality of life. College students' quality of life is influenced by a variety of demographic, psychological, physiological, behavioral, and academically significant elements. Significant disparities between children raised by authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles and also between authoritative and permissive parenting styles, according to Niaraki and Rahimi (2013). Additionally, they studied how parenting styles such as authoritative, permissive, and authoritarian affected kids' quality of life, mental health, and self-perception. Children raised in authoritative households have higher levels of life satisfaction than children reared in authoritarian or permissive households, according to numerous assessments of the association between parenting styles and total life satisfaction. Various parenting philosophies have varying effects on children's emotional health and sense of fulfillment, according to research by Qiuzhi et al. (2016).

Authoritarian parenting is characterized by little empathy and unreasonable expectations, whereas permissive parenting has reasonable demands. Kamonges (2020) documented that, such parents give their kids little room to express their emotions is a sign of a strained parent-child bond. Students raised by high authoritative parents also had somewhat higher college GPAs and more learning-focused aspirations than students raised by low authoritative parents (Rego, 2015). Similar results were discovered by Akhter et al. (2020) observed that as parental authority increased, children's agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience increased while their neuroticism decreased. Berge et al. (2016) examined how parenting styles affected adolescents' substance use and discovered that negligent parenting style was associated with negative substance use outcomes across the board, fewer instances of drinking, friendships with disturbed children, delinquent behavior, and parental offering of alcohol were all associated with more authoritative parenting styles.

Renzalo et al. (2016) studied the quality of life among young people taking part in public engagement projects in Kampala. They identified three factors: living conditions and way of life, social connections, and personal independence. The three factors were identified using linear regressions. The quality of life dimensions according to the OECD (2014) are mobility, housing conditions, culture and leisure, work-life balance, health, education, environmental quality, and political involvement. Additionally, the negative impacts of social and physical exclusion, the lockdown procedures that went along with them and school closings have hampered the education industry and are predicted to have a lasting impact on the educational system (Nicola et al., 2020). Indirect repercussions of the global epidemic include disrupted education and a lack of chances to attend schools, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, Zar et al. (2020). Most studies of students' quality of life as a dependent variable have only been carried out in a small number of areas.

Objective: Examine the influence of Parenting styles on the students' quality of life. The indices of quality of life this study examined included; psychological wellbeing, home environment, physical health and general life satisfaction of students in secondary schools.

Hypothesis: H_o 1: There is no statistically significant influence of parenting styles on students' quality of life

Measures

The study sought to examine the extent to which Parenting styles influence the students' quality of life. The study used a correlational research design. A sample size of 368 students were selected from a target population of 9,143 using simple random sampling technique. A questionnaire tool was used for data collection. The content validity index was employed to check for the validity of the Questionnaire that was found to be 0.83 and the Cronbach alpha coefficient of correlation was calculated to check for reliability and was found to be 0.82. It was hypothesized that; There is no statistically significant influence of parenting styles on the students' quality of life in public secondary schools. A questionnaire tool was used for data collection. The descriptive statistics of mean, standard deviation and simple linear regression analysis were used to analyse the data.

Results of the Study

Below are the results of the study arrived at using descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviations, correlation analysis and simple regression analysis.

Table 1: ***Responses on Parenting Styles***

Response	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
Authoritative	365	21.1	3.85	High Influence
Authoritarian	365	18.1	3.51	Low Influence
Permissive	365	16.5	3.13	Low Influence
Neglectful	365	13.8	4.66	Very low Influence
Valid N (listwise)	365			

Table 1 provides a summary of the responses on the four parenting styles. Authoritative parenting ranked high with (M=21.1, SD=3.85) followed by authoritarian parenting with (M=18.1, SD=3.51), permissive parenting style was represented by (M=16.5, SD=3.13) and neglectful parenting style had (M=13.8, SD=4.66). When parenting in an authoritative manner, it's important to pay attention to the child's requirements and feelings, consider their opinions, show empathy and affection when they're upset, let them explain how they feel about a certain behavior, and encourage them to talk about their problems, explaining the reasons behind expectations, taking the child's preferences into consideration when making plans, and respecting the child's opinions. In addition to other traits, children raised with an authoritative parenting approach tend to be more resilient, cooperative, confident, disciplined, achievement-oriented, self-regulated, mature, and responsible (Sulaiman, 2020). Conversely, Jinot (2018) found that parents who were too strict may not provide enough love and affection to their children, while parents who were too permissive may have children who exhibit socially unacceptable behavior at school. Matejevic et.al (2014) results show a propensity for authoritarian parenting, which was linked to a lack of free time for involvement in extracurricular activities. Thus, the use of authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles was widely practiced by parents in Eastern Uganda.

This section contains responses on the four dimensions of quality of life. The interpretation of the responses is based on George and Mallery table of interpretation of the mean range as indicated below: The interpretation of the means obtained was based on the ranking by George and Mallery (2003) given as: (3.26-4.00, Very high influence), (2.51-3.25, High influence), (1.76-2.50, Moderate influence) and (1.00-1.75, Low influence).

Table 2: ***Responses on*** *Psychological Wellbeing Quality of Life Dimension*

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
I am mentally alert	365	3.11	.917	High Influence
I enjoy learning	365	3.54	.705	Very High Influence
I am free from stress	365	3.17	.839	High Influence
I am free from loneliness	365	2.91	.923	High Influence
I feel worried or distressed	365	2.07	.975	Moderate Influence

I have positive memories	365	2.94	.992	High Influence
Personal beliefs affect my life positively	365	2.55	1.059	High Influence
Valid N (listwise)	365			
Overall Mean		**2.90**	**.916**	**High level**

Table 2 show the respondents responses on Psychological Wellbeing Quality of Life Dimension. Very high responses were obtained on the items of; they enjoy learning, they are free from stress and that they are mentally alert. High responses were obtained on the items; students have positive memories and that they are free from loneliness and low responses were obtained on the items of; having feelings of worry or distress and that students' personal beliefs affect their life positively.

Based on the mean values shown in table 2, it was found out that the average statistical mean for all the responses under the psychological well-being quality of life dimension was 2.90 indicates the students experienced high levels of psychological well-being implying that they are mentally alert, have positive memories, do not get worried and are free from loneliness. This results are reiterated by Singh and Mangula (2018) who observed that general punishment and psychological abuse were significant predictors of depression which may help to explain why parents who physically or verbally discipline their children are more likely to suffer from depression. Similarly, Raturi & Cebotari (2023) discovered that girls and boys with the mother absent domestically or abroad are equally or more likely to have greater levels of psychological well-being. When parents move away from each other and divorce, girls report feeling better. Boys' psychological susceptibility is more likely to be increased by parental divorce and migration. Morrelli et al. (2020) observed that, the World Health Organization emphasized how the lockdown had a negative impact on psychological well-being, particularly for children. Parents also reported on their children's emotional regulation and negativity. The results suggested those parents' perceptions of their own competence in handling parental responsibilities may act as a buffer for their kids' emotional wellbeing. As the study result has revealed high psychological well-being of students in secondary schools in Eastern Uganda, the school counselors and teachers need to strengthen the provision of guidance and counseling services so as to enhance further the students psychological well-being by reducing students stress levels and encouraging them to seek for psychosocial support services most of the time.

Table 3: ***Responses on*** *Home Environment Quality of Life Dimension*

Items	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**Remark**
I feel safe and secure at home	365	3.12	.906	High Influence
I enjoy living alone at home	365	2.06	1.036	Moderate Influence
The home provides a pleasant environment	365	3.09	.906	High level
There is cooperation at home	365	3.16	.852	High Influence
I relate well with parents in social activities	365	3.24	.849	High Influence
The home creates time for recreation activities	365	2.92	.918	High Influence
I receive social support from home	365	3.14	.880	High Influence
Valid N (listwise)	365			
Overall Mean		**2.96**	**.907**	**High Influence**

Table 3 show the respondents responses on home environment quality of life dimension. The participants gave very high responses on the items; relating well with parents in social activities, there is cooperation at home, have received social support from home, they felt safe and secure at home and that the home provides a pleasant environment which reflects a high response thus agreed. A high response was also obtained on the item; the home creates time for recreation activities and lastly, students enjoy living alone at home which reflects a moderate response.

The overall mean score of 2.96 indicates the students' quality of life was high as a result of the influence of the home environment. This implies that the home environment was contributing enough to the improvement of the students' quality of life most especially in the aspects of creating time for recreation activities and also enjoying the company of other siblings. This results therefore calls for the need for the parents to create more time for children to engage in recreational and social activities at home as these activities tend to enhance quality of life. On the contrary, in their study of quality of life

among undergraduate university students for COVID 19, Cheah et al. (2022) found that male students scored considerably worse than female students in the environmental quality of life areas. Additionally, unhealthy lifestyle, psychological discomfort, and academic failure are linked to low quality of life among students (Malibary et al., 2019). Thus, the results of this study call for the parents to continue creating and maintaining a conducive home environment that promotes quality of life in children.

Table 4: ***Responses on*** *Physical Health Quality of Life Dimension*

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
I have enough time for sleep and rest	365	2.91	.943	High Influence
I have the energy to undertake activities	365	3.03	.867	High Influence
I have access to quality medical care	365	3.06	.910	High Influence
I need medication to function in my daily life	365	3.07	1.008	High Influence
Valid N (listwise)	365			
Overall Mean		**3.01**	**.931**	**High Influence**

Table 4 indicates the responses on Physical Quality of life dimension. The participants gave very high responses on the items; they needed medication to function in daily life, having access to quality medical care and having the energy to undertake activities. Lastly, the time for sleep and rest which reflects a high response.

Considering the mean values shown in table 4,it was found that the average statistical mean for all the responses under the physical quality of life domain was 3.01 which reflects a high level of agreement which signified that the students experienced a high quality of life on the physical health dimension of quality of life meaning that students have enough time for sleep and rest, have the energy to undertake activities, have access to quality medical care and do not need medication to function in my daily life. This results are supported by Niaraki and Hassan (2012) reported a significant impact of parenting style on the psychological health and self-concept and that authoritative parenting style was associated with better quality of life than authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Richard et al. (2023) observed that having a long-term health condition, a worsening of lifestyle choices connected to the pandemic, or an unpleasant family environment were correlated with being seriously harmed by a global epidemic, while a prior anti-SARS-CoV2 infection was not. The likelihood of participants displaying poor health-related quality of life and poor mental health was higher for those who had experienced a serious pandemic impact. Increasing physical inactivity as a result of travel limitations has detrimental effects on physical wellness, health behaviors, emotional wellness, and general well-being, according to Fan, Menhas, and Laar (2023) consequences of pandemic prevention efforts. Sany et al. (2023) overall health status and life satisfaction exhibited the strongest correlation with quality of life when compared to other variables. The findings suggest that focusing on general health, subjective norms, optimism, and attitudes may offer viable approaches to enhance quality of life. Similarly, living in rural as opposed to urban settings and having a higher level of positivity were shown to be significantly related with a better physical quality of life, whereas having a higher level of negative religious coping was found to be significantly connected with a lower physical quality of life, according to Berdida and Grande (2023).

It is observed that a high quality of life on the physical health dimension signifies that the parents took good care of their children as they received timely and good medical care whenever they experienced any sickness. Secondly the results also implied that, the students were equally more concerned on their physical health status as they participated in activities that could boost their physical status. It is thus, a good idea to keep encouraging students to engage in physical exercises that could enhance their health status such as athletics, games and sports and other related activities.

Table 5: ***Responses on*** *General Life Satisfaction Quality of Life Dimension*

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
I feel I am fulfilling my ambitions	365	2.99	.885	High Influence
I feel capable of getting all the things I desire	365	3.07	.911	High Influence
I regard my life as interesting	365	3.20	.854	High Influence

I feel that life is meeting my expectations	365	2.94	.849	High Influence
I regard my life as pleasant	365	2.94	.943	High Influence
I am satisfied with my life	365	3.04	1.044	High Influence
Valid N (listwise)	365			
Overall Mean		**3.02**	**.914**	**High Influence**

From the results in Table 5 show the respondents responses on General life satisfaction Quality of life dimension. The participants provided very high responses on the items; they regarded life as being interesting, they were capable of getting all the things they desired and that they were satisfied with life. The participants equally gave high responses on the items; they felt they were fulfilling their ambitions and that they felt that life is meeting expectations. Considering the mean values shown in table 5, it was found out that the average statistical mean for all the responses under the general life satisfaction quality of life domain was 3.02 which reflect a high level of agreement. It is worth noting that the following features of general life satisfaction quality of life domain were highlighted: feeling of fulfilment of ambitions, feelings of capability of getting all the things desired, regarding life as being interesting, having a feeling that life is meeting expectations, regarding life as being pleasant and lastly being satisfied with life.

Basing on the average statistical mean score of 3.02, the students in public secondary schools experienced a high level quality of life on the dimension of general life satisfaction. This therefore signifies that students at their personal level, other factors held constant enjoyed a high quality of life characterized by fulfilment of ambitions, getting things they needed, meeting their expectations, regarding life as being pleasant and being generally satisfied with life. This is contrary to the findings of Abdullah et al. (2020), who found that irritation about study interruptions and residing in locations with a high incidence of COVID 19-related cases were both strongly linked to lower levels of quality of life. Qiuzhi et.al (2016) reported that various parenting philosophies had varying effects on the children's emotional health and sense of fulfilment. Besides Smith (2006) reported that children with strong parental roles had more positive personalities and experienced lower levels of anxiety. Similarly, children raised in authoritative households have high levels of life satisfaction than children reared in authoritarian or permissive households (Niaraki & Rahimi,2013). The school counselors based on this result are urged to continue providing the psychological support that students would need at any given point in time for them to remain focused on their goals.

Table 6: ***Responses on Quality of life***

Response	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
Psychological well-being	365	2.90	.916	High level
Home environment	365	2.96	.907	High level
Physical health	365	3.01	.933	High level
General life satisfaction	365	3.02	.914	High level
Valid N (listwise)	365			

Table 6 provides a summary of responses on the four quality of life dimensions. General life satisfaction (M=3.02, SD=.91), Physical health (M=3.01, SD=.93), Home environment (M=2.96, SD=.91), Psychological well-being (M=2.90, SD=.91). It is observed from table 22, that the students Quality of life was high on all the four dimensions based on the average statistical means.

Table 7: ***ANOVA for Parenting Styles and Students' Quality of Life***

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	564.483	1	564.483	13.294	.000[b]
	Residual	15412.996	363	42.460		
	Total	15977.479	364			

a. Dependent Variable: students' Quality of life
Predictors: (Constant), Parenting Style

Results in Table 7 indicate the ANOVA for parenting styles and students' quality of life. The F-ratio in the ANOVA table tests whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. The table shows that the independent variables statistically significantly predict the dependent variable, ((F (1,363) = 13.294 p = .000). (i.e., the regression model is a good fit of the data).

Table 8: ***Coefficients for Parenting Styles and Students Quality of Life***

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	39.112	2.962		13.204	.000
	Parenting Style	.181	.050	.188	3.646	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Students' Quality of life

Unstandardized coefficients indicate how much the dependent variable varies with an independent variable when all other independent variables are held constant. Consider the effect of parenting styles in this case. The unstandardized coefficient, for parenting styles is equal to 0.181 (see Coefficients table). This means that for each increase in parenting styles, there is an increase in the students' quality of life.

Conclusions and Recommendation

Based on overall mean scores for the quality of life dimensions, secondary school students experienced a high level of general life satisfaction quality of life domain and a high level of physical health quality of life domain. The secondary school students experienced lower levels of quality of life in the home environment quality of life domain, and lower levels of quality of life in the psychological well-being quality of life domain. There was a weak and significant relationship between parenting styles and students' quality of life. Parenting styles alone explains 3.5% of the variations in the outcome variable (students' quality of life). Students' personality alone explains 5.8% of the variations in the outcome variable (students' quality of life). It was recommended that parents adopt the authoritative parenting style as it facilitates good quality of life of students as they pursue their education endeavors and the school administrators to organize an awareness and sensitization workshops on the influence of the home environment on the quality of life of students as well as educating families regarding awareness on the parenting styles and students' personality traits and specifically the influence of these variables on the quality of life of students in secondary school.

References

Abdullah, MFI., Mansor, N.S., Muhamad, M.A. & Teoh, S.H. (2021). Quality of Life and Associated Factors among University Students during the COVID 19 Pandemic:A Cross sectional Study.*BMJ Open*. Pages 1-12.

Akhter,N.,Noor,A.E., & Iqbal,S. (2020). Impact of Parents Authoritative Style on Personality Traits of Children:A Case Study of Elementary Class Students in Pakistan. *Journal of Elementary Education, 29*(2), 37-50.

Amin, M. (2005). *Social Science Research:Conception Methodology and Analysis.* Kampala: Makerere University Press.

Argyriou,E.,Bakoyyannis,G.,& Tantaros,S. (2016). Parenting Style and Trait Emotional Intelligence in Adolescence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology.*, 42-49.

Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence., 11*, 56-95.

Berdida,J.D.E., Angelo,R.N., & Grande, R.N. (2022). Academic Stress,COVID 19 Anxiety and Quality of Life among Nursing Students:The Mediating Role of Resilience. *International Nursing Review*, 34-42.

Berge, J. H. (2016). *Role of Parenting Styles in Adolescent Substance Use:Results from a Swedish Longitudinal Cohort Study.* Stockholm: Lund University.

Cheah, M. H. J., Chin, Y. S., Abu Saad, H., Lim, P. Y., Chan, Y. M., & Shariff, Z. M. (2022). Factors predicting health-related quality of life of the Malaysian B40 school-aged children living in urban poor flats in the central region of Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 31(4), 740–747.

Fan,X.,Menhas,R., &Laar, R.A. (2023). Repercussions of Pandemic and Preventive Measures of General Well-being,Psychological Health,Physical Fitness and Health Behavior:Mediating Role of Coping Behavior. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 2437-2454.

Flagnan, J. (1978). A Research Approach to Improving our Quality of Life. *American Psychologist, 33*, 138-147.

George,D. &Mallery, P. (2003). *Using SPSS for Windows Step by Step A Simple Guide and Reference.* (4th ed.). London: Pearson Education.

Group, WHOQOL. (1996). *What quality of life?The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment (WHOQOL).Development and General psychometric Properties.* Geneva: Social Science and Medicine.

Jinot, B. (2018). The Causes of Lack of Discipline among Secondary School Learners in Mauritius. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 9*(1), 35-46.

Kamonges, W. (2020). Parental Guidance Skills and Students Discipline Management in Secondary Schools in Kapchorwa,Uganda. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Education.*, 62-77.

Kanekar,A. & Sharma,M. (2020). COVID 19 and Mental Well-being:Guidance on the Application of Behavioral and Positive Well-being Strategies. *Heath Care, 8*(336), 1-7.

Li,H., & Zhong,B. (2022). Quality of Life among College Students and its Associated Factors:A Narrative Review. *Health Policy and Methodology Science:Public Health*, 1-11.

Love,K.M., & Thomas,D.M. (2014). Parenting Styles and Adjustment Outcomes among College Students. *Journal of College Student Development., 55*(2), 139-150.

Matejevic,M.,Jovanovic,D.,& Jovanovic,M. (2014). Parenting Style,Involvement of Parents in School Activities and Adolescents Academic Achievement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 128*, 288-293.

Morrelli,M.,Cattelino,E.,Baiocco,R.,Trumello,C.,Babore,A.,Candelori,C.,& Chirumbolo,A. (2020). Parents and Children during the COVID 19 Lockdown:The Influence of Parenting Distress and Parenting Self-efficacy on Childrens Emotional Well-being. *Front.Psychol*, 1-10.

Mugenda,O.M., & Mugenda,A.G. (1999). *Research Rethods:Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches.* Nairobi: Acts Press.

Networks, C. P. (2001). *Quality of Life Indicators in Canada:A Citizens' Prototype.* Otawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

Niaraki,F.R., & Rahimi,H. (2013). The Impact of Authoritative,Permissive and Authoritarian Behavior of Parents on Self-concept,Psychological Health and Life Quality. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences., 2*(1), 78-85.

Nicola,M.,Alsafi,Z.,Sohrabi,C.,Kerwan,A.,Al-jabir,A.,Iosifidis,C.,Agha,R. (2020). The Socioeconomic Implications of the Coronavirus Pandemic (COVD 19). *International Journal of Surgery, 78*, 185-193.

OECD. (2014). *Hows Life in Your Region?Measuring Regional and Local Well-being for Policy Making.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Otu, A.,Charles,C.H., & Yaya,S. (2020). Mental Health and Psychological Well-being during the COVID 19 Pandemic :The Invisible Elephant in the Room. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 2-5.

Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS-Survival Manual,A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using IBM SPSS.* (6th, Ed.) New York: McGraw Hill Education.

Qiuzhi, X.,Weiqiao, F.,Paul,W., & Fanny,M.C. (2016). Parenting Styles as Predictors of Life Satisfaction among Chinese Secondary Students. *Asia Pacific Education Researcher, 25*(3), 423-432.

Raturi,R. & Cebotari,V. (2023). The Impact of Parental Migration on Psychological Migration of Children in Ghana. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 49*(1), 192-211.

Rego, T. (2015). The concept of Authoritative Parenting and It's Effects on Academic Achievement. *Journal of Psychology and Clinical Psychiatry., 3*(6), 1-5.

Renzalo, A.M.N.,Kamara,J.K., and Kamanga,G. (2016). The Ugandan Youth Quality of Life Index:Assessing the Relevance of Incorporating Perceived Importance into the Quality of Life Measure and Factors Associated with the Quality of Life among Youth in Slum Areas of Kampala ,Uganda. *Global Health Action, 9*(1), 1-18.

Richard,V.,Dumont,R.,Lorthe,E.,Loizeau,A.,Baysson,H.,Zaballa,M.,Pennacchio,F.,Barbe,R.P.,Posfay -Barbe,K.M.,Guessous,I.,Stringhini,S., & SEROCOV-KIDS Study group. (2023). Impact of COVID 19 Pandemic on Child and Adolescents:Determinants and Association with Quality of Life and Mental Health-across Sectional Study. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health,* 1-11.

Sany,S.B.T.,Aman,N.,Jangi,F.,Lael-Monfared,E.,Tehrani,H. & Jafari,A. (2023). Quality of Life and Life Satisfaction among University Students:Exploring Subjective Norms, General Health,Optimism and Attitude as Potential Mediators. *Journal of American college of Health, 71*(4), 1045-1052.

Singh, A. & Mangula, M. (2018). Early Trauma Experiences, Parenting Styles and Personality patterns in Individuals with Depression from India. *International Journal of Culture and Mental Health., 11*(2), 146-156.

Sulaiman, A.A. (2020). *Sexuality Education and Couple Guidance (3rd ed).* Lagos: Atlantic Press.

Zar,H.J.,Dawa, J.,Fischer,G.B.,Castro-Rodriguez,J.A. (2020). Challenges of COVID 19 in Children in Low and Middle Income Countries. *Paediatric Respiratory Reviews, 35*, 70-74.