College student mind-set: Does student-parental relationship influence the student’s mind-set?
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine influence mother and father nurturance on college students fixed and growth mindset. Studies have shown that students who have support of their parents have a better chance of acquiring a growth mindset and attitudes in order to succeed in post-secondary education. Data was collected among 167 adult college students, representing 137 (82%) female and 30 (18%) male participants. The participants completed a demographic survey, the Parental (Father) Nurturance Scale with 24 items, Parental (Mother) Nurturance Scale with 24 items and the Mindset Scale with 20 items. A One-Way ANOVA showed that there was a significant difference in a student’s growth mindset that showed high social supports and life satisfaction for both traditional and non-traditional students.
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INTRODUCTION

Recent studies have shown that student who have the support of their parents have a better chance of acquiring a growth mindset attitude towards learning (Fitzakerley, Michlin, Paton & Dubinsky, 2013). It has shown that a growth mindset is a crucial aspect for an individual to believe that the ability to learn is not fixed. This type of mindset is a key component in successful learning because the individual believes that learning and success are associated with hard work, practice, and determination (Elish-Piper, 2014). There is substantial evidence to support the argument that greater parental involvement yields benefits for children's academic performance (Parcel, Dufur & Zito, 2010). The family resources which children can use are generally regarded as being even more influential in affecting academic performance (Furstenberg, 2004).

Parental contributions, in terms of time spent with their children, the time spent interacting with teachers and school administrators, and supporting the school through volunteerism, have all shown to enhance children's academic success. Even the frequency of parent-child discussions about school issues such as homework, teachers and student relations have shown to significantly affect children's academic performance (Hill et al., 2004). Research has shown greater involvement on the part of parents appears to have substantial benefits for children's performance in the classroom (Blair, 2014).

While it is apparent that characteristics such as the parents' educational achievement or household income might affect the environment and extent of parental participation, it is also necessary to identify that social and cultural factors can also impact (Berthelsen & Walker, 2008). Parental participation has a long-lasting effect upon children's performance, and can even positively influence ultimate levels of educational achievement (Parcel et al., 2010). Even students who may be performing poorly show that higher levels of parental involvement can bring about substantial improvement over time (Galla et al., 2014). Although such influence can vary by the age and grade level of the child, previous studies have suggested that parental involvement may have its greatest impact among elementary school children (Blair, 2014).

The first context children experience is their home; investments that parents make have significant and long-term consequences for children and the researchers have often proposed that parental involvement is best understood through the perspective of social capital theory (Parcel et al., 2010). Parents can help children cultivate a growth mindset and grit in their child/children. It just requires that parents model, encourage, and reinforce a growth mindset and when parents encourage their children they will begin to take on these ideas and incorporate them into the way they approach their schoolwork and goals for life (Furstenberg, 2004). The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between parents and students on aspects of college student’s mindset in their post-secondary education.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Student Parent Relationship

Attachment theory suggests a theoretically and empirically confirmed that background for understanding one’s capability is to bond with significant others and establish caring relationships (Arnett, 2007). According to Guarnieri, Smorti and Tani (2014) understanding attachment relationships through the life period contributes to thoughtful individual differences
in adaptation. A growing body of literature indicates that parent attachment relationships are an essential gauge of individual health and happiness. Individuals who have a history of secure attachment patterns with parents display higher self-development, overall self-esteem and life satisfaction (Roisman, Collins, Stroufe & Egeland, 2005).

The manner in which caregivers respond to children’s attempts for safety and protection contributes to children’s internal working models, or schemas, which effect how they view themselves and the world around them (Ryedell, Bohlin & Thorell, 2005). When parents are reassuring and dependable, children develop a secure attachment to their parents, characterized by internal working replicas of themselves as competent and appreciated and of others as responsible and trustworthy. If parents are unreliable or rejecting, children develop an insecure attachment to their parents, characterized by internal working models of themselves as incompetent and unappreciated and of others as untrustworthy and not dependable (Brown & Whiteside, 2008).

These early experiences with parents and their related schema are proposed to drive expectations for and behavior within imminent close relationships (Parade, Leerkes & Blankson, 2010). The observed evidence to date has shown that parents vary significantly in how they respond to their children’s negative emotions, ranging from sensitive and supportive to harsh and minimizing; and that the method in which parents respond has substantial consequences for child outcomes (Jones, Brett, Ehrlich, Lejuez & Cassidy, 2014).

The transition for students from high school to college is often more difficult than historically, students who move into their college years have different family backgrounds, personalities, and precollege familiarities (Conneely, Good & Perryman, 2001). Freshman students often face the added stress of redefining their individuality and finding a new role in a new and different community. College also presents a wider selection and more multifaceted assortment of influences to students’ decision-making ability.

Obst and White (2005) found that social identification factors such as association within groups and ties to these groups predicted a student’s psychological sense of community. The accustomed and emotionally safe environment of home is now replaced by a new, larger, and at times impersonal one. Surrendering the consistent support of parental influence can be problematic for some students. College students find themselves in a period of physical changeover as well as strong psychological transformation, particularly as they attempt to delineate their own values rather than sustain those taught by their parents (Conneely, Good & Perryman, 2001).

According to Ruberman (2014) connection has also been discovered between strong parental relationships and the emerging adult’s ability to self-regulate and successfully transition into college. Strong relationships between emerging adults and parents with an authoritative parenting style have shown an affirmative influence on competence, authoritative parenting predicts better academic, social, and personal-emotional adjustment at university as well as a greater sense of attachment to the institution (Rubin & Kelly, 2015). It was found that both well-being and relationships with parents had an impact on ensuing social and academic adjustment (Daniel, Evans, & Scott, 2001). Insecurely attached children’s developing inadequate adaptation of emotion regulation strategies and cognitive biases put them at a greater risk of developing social complications (Bomsans & Kerns, 2015).

Many new college students also fight with homesickness and loneliness, and as might be predictable in the face of these numerous sources of stress, students often experience regulation difficulties during this first-year transition (Park, Edmondson & Lee, 2012). It was also explored
that the attachment of first-year college students to their parents and found that female students are more attached to their parents compared to young-adult men, but also that students who were more attached felt more competent and had more feelings of comfort and security (Ruberman, 2014).

As students move through the educational system, all of them will face adversity at one time or another, whether it is social or academic in nature. Thus, a central task for parents is to prepare children to respond resiliently when these inevitable challenges arise. Although parents have intuitive strategies for doing so, many of these strategies may be ill- advised, such as praising children for being “smart” to boost their self-esteem or condemning those who behave aggressively as evil bullies. Yeager and Dweck (2012) looked at these adversities through the eyes of children to try to capture the underlying psychology of what causes some children to feel vulnerable, discouraged, or stressed when they face challenges. It has been found that what children need the most is not self-esteem boosting or trait labeling; instead, they need mindsets that represent challenges as things that they can take on and overcome over time with effort, new strategies, learning, help from others, and patience (Rubin & Kelly, 2015).

Shannon, McNamara, and DeGrace (2015) examined the research regarding parental relationships and emerging-adult college students emphasizing the value of parent–child activities and interactions in order to support college students’ development. It appears that keeping parents keenly involved in their college students’ progress is related positively to students’ investment in their educational institution, which in turn has been associated positively to their academic success (Brueck, Mazza & Tousignant, 2012). College programs, activities, and services that promote and strengthen the parent–child relationship will likely improve growth and development among college students. The study suggested that as emerging adults advance toward self-driven interest and participation in academic endeavors, they can benefit from receptive support and positive relationships with their parents.

Shannon, Barry, DeGrace and DiDonato (2015) study demonstrated that parent–child relationships still matter in accounting for emerging-adults’ academic behavior, and it highpoints the possibility for college student researchers to investigate parental influences on student engagement, as well as what other parenting dimensions that may matter for emerging adults’ student engagement. Parade, Leerkes and Blankson (2010) consistent with predictions, attachment security anticipated ease forming new relationships among both minority and white student. Students who were more securely attached to their parents experienced better ease establishing friendships likely because their positive preceding experiences in close relationships made them at ease in seeking out new relationships.

Rawathal, Pillay and Kliwer (2015) reported overall, having parents with greater education had a sturdier positive outcome on family relationships, and this projected more parental backing and positive consequences in children than just income only. Aquilino (1997) proposes from the parents’ standpoint that the past experiences of the parent–child relationship matters when children change from adolescence into adulthood, and that the earlier levels of closeness and conflict set the stage for intergenerational harmony in adulthood.

Father Nurturance

Over time, parenting practices, and specifically the role of fathers within families, have evolved and adapted to fit with changing societal and cultural norms and expectations (Ramchandani & Iles, 2014). Panter-Brick, et al., (2014) reported that cohort studies have
discovered the overall protecting and encouraging effect of father involvement on children’s social, educational, behavioral, and psychological effects – throughout infancy, childhood, adolescence and adulthood. Dalton, Frick-Horbury and Kitzmann (2006) found proof that fathers’ parenting behaviors were related with the quality of young adults’ interactions with an idealistic partner, and that young adults who provided more positive ratings of the parenting they experienced in childhood also reported better belief in their capability to form secure and close relationships with others.

Fathers that tend to be more engaged with their children when they are less depressed and apprehensive; relationships in their family of origin are positive; the connection between father and mother is cooperative, regardless of whether they are married, cohabiting, separated, or divorced; their relationship with their children includes warmness and proper limits; and social provisions help balance life stresses (Cowan, Cowan, Pruett, Pruett, & Gillette, 2014). Yuan (2014) fatherhood role salience or the state of being prominent may be a factor of nonresident fathers’ involvement with their nonresident children. On the other hand, because they do not live with their children, nonresident fathers have more difficulty maintaining contact with their nonresident children, so nonresident fathers who do not value the fatherhood role may be particularly likely to lose contact with their nonresident children. Young male outcomes are at times more strongly determined by fathering actions. For example, permissive fathering is clearly related to sons’ impulsiveness and alcohol-related problems, whereas authoritative fathering was negatively related to these outcomes for their sons (Barton & Kirtley, 2012).

A number of prevention programs have confirmed effects in reducing substance use and antisocial behaviors amongst youths. Preemptive interventions that aim the family unit or only the parents have revealed encouraging effect sizes and length of effects (Giannotta, Ortega & Stattin, 2013).

Mother Nurturance

The security of the attachment bond among an infant and their mother (the primary caregiver), is considered to be an essential aspect of the early caregiving environment, creating the foundation for succeeding socio-emotional development to convene a range of developmental benefits, such as healthier peer relationships and less behavioral problems and lower rates of affective disorder (Moutsiana et al., 2014). Cooper et al., (2013) when secure children feel appreciated and are allowed to engage in the investigations necessary to improve competencies, their self-esteem and insights of self-efficacy for agentic competencies should be high. Children who have developed mutually positive relationships with their mother, their self-efficacy for communal behaviors should is also high.

Jones, Brett, Ehrlich, Lejuez, and Cassidy (2014) empirical evidence reveals that parents vary significantly in how they respond to their children’s negative emotions; they range from sensitive and supportive to harsh and minimizing. The way in which parents respond has substantial consequences for child outcomes. For example, unresponsive and unsupportive parental responses to children’s negative emotions are linked with lower social and emotional competency, less prosocial behavior, amplified risk for insecure attachment, more complications with emotion regulation, more avoidant coping strategies, and more behavioral problems, while sensitive and supportive parental responses tend to be connected with more positive developmental outcomes secure attachment and greater social and emotional competence.
Students who are free from the sense of guilt, anxiety and remorse stemming from clashes with parents are more likely to compliantly cope with conflicts and fully pledge to career investigation behaviors with conviction, without getting concerned by the beliefs of parents. This is why the degree of freedom from conflicts with mother (the primary caregiver) plays a significant function in the career decision-making process (Changdai, Minchul & Youngkeun, 2013). A parent’s efforts to alienate the other parent from the children is alleged to be a main reason for the distance experienced in parent–child relationships, predominantly in high-conflict families, and has been connected with difficulties in children’s regulation, including internalizing and externalizing behavior problems and school performance (Moné, & Biringen, 2012).

Mak Yee, Jianing, Mingxuan and Bond (2011) emerging adults with secure attachment histories can trust on the trustworthiness of others in times of need, and possess the self-assurance that they can control their social environments. Therefore, they are better prepared to face stressful life challenges and to have a higher level of satisfaction. Jones and Cassidy (2014) a considerable body of empirical work validates that self-reported adult attachment styles influence many significant facets of adult functioning, including social information processing, emotion regulation, coping approaches, defensive methods, unconscious struggles, empathy, and compassion.

**Mind-Set**

The concept of fixed mindset is based on some students understanding that intelligence is fixed, something that they cannot change known as a fixed mindset, while others view intelligence as flexible, something that they can develop over time or a growth mindset (Rattan, Savani, Chugh & Dweck, 2015). A person with a growth mindset trusts that his/her most undeveloped abilities can be advanced through hard work, leading to a love of learning and resilience (Oades, Crowe & Nguyen, 2009).

Gutshall (2013) those of us who trust our overall capacity can be improved or changed through effort and persistence tend to seek challenges, exhibit effort, and recover from mistakes while, those of us who believe our ability is fixed tend to sidestep making mistakes, believe that demonstrating effort signals little ability, and recover poorly from setbacks. Students with fixed and growth mindsets also have diverse responses to failure. Fixed mindset students regard failures as confirmation that they are inept. Since there is not much they can do to modify their capabilities, they are more probable to quit or cheat. By contrast, growth mindset students regard failures as a chance to correct and develop themselves. Having a fixed mindset can result in a devastating response to failure, mainly in the face of prolonged challenges or setbacks (Lee, Heeter, Magerko, & Medler, 2012).

People differ in positions of how much they believe self attributes such as intelligence and personality can change—some believe these characteristics are fixed and absolute whereas others believe these characteristics change with determination and learning (Schroder, Dawood, Yalch, Donnellan & Moser, 2015). Growth mindsets foster better learning and accomplishment in students from elementary school through college, particularly during challenging transitions or during challenging courses. When students with growth mindsets pursue to learn and develop their abilities, follow challenges, value effort, and are resilient to obstacles; in comparison, students with fixed mindsets sidestep challenges which could reveal lasting deficiencies, dislike effort, and give up more easily when facing setbacks. Growth mindsets especially benefit
underachieving students, underrepresented minorities, and women in math and science. Hence, growth mindsets can narrow achievement gaps (Rattan, 2015).

Dweck (2007) when we have monitored students over challenging school transitions or classes, we find that those with growth mind-sets outperform their classmates with fixed mind-sets—even when they move in with equal skills and familiarity. Students with a fixed mindset, if they find the testing more challenging, are more likely to accept a lower score than trying harder on the test. Students with a growth mindset, compared to students with a more fixed mindset, are more self-assured in their ability to alter the future academic outcomes, therefore more agreeable to try to learn information to do well (McCutchen, Jones, Carbonneau & Mueller, 2016). Such children seek evaluation and good mentoring, take on challenges and flourish in the face of struggles (Hohnen & Murphy, 2016).

Understanding that the brain actually changes during learning and that one can influence such changes with effort has become the groundwork for many philosophies of change and their application. Understanding how learning and memory are built from one’s own repetitive and significant experiences adds to students’ metacognitive knowledge, a crucial component for educational success (Fitzakerley, Michlin, Paton, & Dubinsky, 2013). Galla et al. (2014) noted that academic diligence can be defined as working diligently on academic tasks which are advantageous in the long-run but monotonous in the moment, especially in comparison to more enjoyable, less effortful diversions. Important work not only encourages learning in the immediate state, but also promotes a love of learning and resilience in the aspect of obstacles (Dweck, 2010).

The benefits of growth mindset training have been replicated with large samples of high school, community college, and university students across the United States who received as little as one or two online mindset sessions. This means that the time, effort, and cost of scaling up can be minimized, while still delivering faithful and psychologically potent interventions (Rattan, Savani, Chugh & Dweck, 2015). When identifying which individuals are likely to be successful, the most obvious contenders are those who have a desire for their long-term goals and persist towards their achievement even in the face of difficulties (Hill, Burrow & Bronk, 2016).

There is far more work to make the growth mindset display in a learning culture that favors those students who have been promoted from prior advantages in their development (Scripp & Flax, 2013). The need for grit arises when environments lack serious supports for success. It often arises as a way for the emerging adult to cope with suffering and for culture to justify social letdown through instructing the individual that their situation — poverty, for instance — is related to a fundamental discrepancies. It has the potential to teach the student, through individual metrics such as standardized tests, with the belief that failure is due to an intrinsic deficiency rather than to systemic inequality (Stokas, 2015).

An entity mindset is associated with performance goals like the concern for children demonstrating competence, whereas an incremental mindset is associated with mastery goals or the concern with developing competence. Parents holding a performance goal are less positively involved in their children’s learning than are parents holding a mastery goal. Thus, it is likely that such goals underlie the effects of parents’ ability mindsets on the quality of their involvement (Moorman & Pomerantz, 2010).

Brazee and Lopp (2012) higher education is commonly regarded as an essential step for those looking to pursue professions in the knowledge era. Maria Montessori defined the goal of education as the development of a whole human being, oriented to the environment, and
modified to his or her time, place, and culture. Her educational philosophy, established in the early 1900s, is fundamentally one of human progress, focusing on the inborn behaviors she observed in children, including exploration, order, imagination, manipulation, repetition, and communication (Grant, 2015).

Kleinfeld (2009) higher educational achievement increases the skilled labor force, labor efficiency and economic development. A higher education even affects points of happiness. Since the 1970s, happiness has increased between college graduates but declined among people with only a high school education or less. When people understand a larger deeper meaning of their world, they cooperate with each other and their environment. They change as persons as an outcome of their learning (Sullivan, 2013).

Purpose in life has been interconnected to having a more adaptive personality profile such as being conscientious or emotionally stable, instead of being viewed as just a component of psychological well-being, the findings support the notion that purpose serves a force that arranges and excites goals, manages behaviors, and offers a sense of meaning (Hill, Burrow & Bronk, 2016).

**METHOD**

**Research Questions**

RQ1. Is there a difference in father and mother parental nurturance between students with high and low social support?
RQ2. Is there a difference in father and mother parental nurturance between students with dissatisfied and satisfied life?
RQ3. Is there a difference in mindset between student with dissatisfied life and those with satisfied life?
RQ4. Is there a difference in mindset between traditional and non-traditional students?

**Materials**

The instruments used in this study consisted of The Parental (Father) Nurturance Scale, a 24-item scale in Likert format. The Parental (Mother) Nurturance Scale which was made up of 24 items, which measured on a 1 to 5 scale, 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. The Mindset scale, a 20-item scale in Likert format evaluating what best described how that statement applies to the students beliefs. Individual student totals were tabulated with a high score -indicated growth mindset and a low score of - indicated fixed mindset. The demographic questions looked at age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, parent marital status, life satisfaction, financial wellbeing, and social system support.

**Procedure**

The study was approved by Institutional Review Board on research objectives, description of participants, and procedures, consent and confidentiality. The data was collected by from classes that professors gave permission to pass out surveys during their class time. Professors were given copies of the survey so they were able to see what the survey consisted of before passing it out in their classrooms. Participants took 10 to 15 minutes to complete the
survey and give it to the investigator. Each participant was asked to complete three questionnaires and one demographic information sheet. The data was entered individually into SPSS after every class collection for data analysis.

RESULTS

Data in this study was collected from 169, male 30 (18%) and female 137 (82%) college students from different majors of study. The age of participants ranges between minimum 19 years to maximum age of 38 years with mean age of 23 years. Convenient stratified sample was used in this study as participants were individuals selected from college classrooms with the permission of the instructors during instructional time.

RQ1. Is there a difference in father and mother parental nurturance between students with high and low social support?

Table 1. Parental Nurturance and Social Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Social</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24.90764</td>
<td>86.9318</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4907.570</td>
<td>11.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Social</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19.58519</td>
<td>99.2645</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>446.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>21.75444</td>
<td>95.9758</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Social</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.22027</td>
<td>93.8222</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6055.709</td>
<td>21.547</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Social</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14.22665</td>
<td>107.4250</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>281.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>17.78352</td>
<td>103.7152</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One way ANOVA was computed comparing father and mother parental nurture between high and low social support. A significant difference was found on father nurture (F (1,163) = 11.002, p < .05) between low and high social support. This analysis revealed the student with high social support showed a difference with students with low social support on father nurture (m = 99.264, sd = 19.585) than student who had low social support (m= 86.932, sd 24.908). A significant difference was also found on mother nurture (F (1,163) = 21.547, p < .05) between low and high social support. This analysis revealed the student with high social support showed a difference with student with low social support on mother nurture (m = 107.425, sd = 14.226) than student who had low social support (m = 93.822, sd = 14.226). Tukey’s HSD was used to determine the nature of the difference between high and low social supports.

RQ2. Is there a difference in father and mother parental nurturance between students with dissatisfied and satisfied life?

Table 2. Parental Nurturance with dissatisfied and satisfied life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>88.2500</td>
<td>22.80147</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2748.393</td>
<td>5.984</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>98.1318</td>
<td>21.04102</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>459.298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>95.9758</td>
<td>21.75444</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>94.0556</td>
<td>19.00217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4296.498</td>
<td>14.722</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>106.4109</td>
<td>16.51969</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>291.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>103.7152</td>
<td>17.78352</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One way ANOVA was computed father and mother parental nurture between high satisfied and dissatisfied with life students. A significant difference was found on father nurture (F (1,163) = 5.984, \( p < .05 \)) between a satisfaction and dissatisfied of life. This analysis revealed the student with a satisfied life showed a difference (\( m = 98.1318, sd = 21.04102 \)) than student who had dissatisfied life on father nurture (\( m=88.2500, sd 22.80147 \)). A significant difference was also found on mother nurture (F (1,163) = 14.722, \( p < .05 \)) between a satisfied and dissatisfied life. This analysis revealed the student with a satisfied life showed a difference on mother nurture nurturance (\( m = 106.4109, sd = 16.5197 \)) than student who had dissatisfied life on mother nurture nurturance (\( m = 94.0556, sd 19.0022 \)). Tukey’s HSD was used to determine the nature of the difference between satisfied and dissatisfied life.

RQ3. Is there a difference in mindset between student with dissatisfied life and those with satisfied life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32.0833</td>
<td>3.46719</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.126</td>
<td>1.731</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32.9692</td>
<td>3.60434</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>12.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>32.7771</td>
<td>3.58342</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.9167</td>
<td>3.98121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139.268</td>
<td>8.454</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30.1374</td>
<td>4.07952</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>16.474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>29.6587</td>
<td>4.14899</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ4. Is there a difference in mindset between traditional and non-traditional students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>32.6014</td>
<td>3.40146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.245</td>
<td>1.978</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33.6429</td>
<td>4.33943</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>12.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>32.7771</td>
<td>3.58342</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>29.3597</td>
<td>4.29696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.102</td>
<td>4.393</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.1429</td>
<td>2.95289</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>16.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>29.6587</td>
<td>4.14899</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One way ANOVA was computed comparing the students who had a growth or a fixed mindset between traditional and non-traditional students. A significant difference was found with students that had a fixed mindset ($F(1,163) = 4.393, p < .05$) with traditional and non-traditional students. This analysis revealed the difference on non-traditional students with a fixed mindset ($m = 29.360, sd = 4.297$) and traditional students with a fixed mindset of ($m = 31.143, sd = 2.953$). There was no difference on growth mindset between traditional students ($m=32.6014, sd= 3.4015$) and Non-traditional students ($m=33.643, sd=4.339$). Tukey's HSD was used to determine the nature of the difference between students with a fixed mindset with traditional and non-traditional students.

**DISCUSSION**

The study found that students who had high support from parental nurturance showed high levels of life satisfaction. Parental nurturance enable students in college life and also they acquired skills and attitudes needed to succeed in their private and professional lives as adults. Nevertheless the quality of the mother-child relationship the nearer children were to their fathers, the happier, and more gratified and less distressed (Amato, 1994).

Our study showed a substantial amount of a student’s life satisfaction. Both the mother and father played a significant role in student’s life satisfaction. The more secure the student feels within the relationship, the less effort the student’s brain has to invest in reducing stress that may be generated from other aspects on life (Hohnen & Murphy, 2016).

The study indicates that the relationship that students have with their father and/or mother shows a significant difference in a student’s mindset. Decades of research have establish that different beliefs (or mindsets) about the plasticity of one’s ability can result in diverse learning performance and outcomes (Lee, Heeter, Magerko, & Medler 2012). The growth mindset is based on the belief that one’s skills, strengths and abilities can be refined through effort and determination. A fixed mindset thinks that intelligence is fixed and, these students begin to avoid new experiences because they begin to form a fear of failure. As individuals, we have a natural propensity to want to find answers fast when faced with a problem, and we become very uncomfortable under the indecision and uncertainty that exemplifies unscripted problems (Cavagnaro, & Fasiluddin, 2016).

The study also indicated that students both traditional and nontraditional who had a fixed mindset showed a substantial difference. One can decline thoughts and actions connected with the mindset, or one can strengthen beliefs and actions associated with different ways to solve problems (Haager, Kuhbandner & Pekrun, 2014). The students with a fixed mindset showed a significant a high level of life dissatisfaction. However this study found with both traditional and nontraditional students with a growth mindset showed no substantial difference.

**CONCLUSION**

The results of the study showed that students who had high support from parental nurturance exhibited high levels of life satisfaction. Adapting to college is a major transition in an adult’s life. When looking at the parent and child relationships they are one of the longest lasting predictors for social bonds between human existences. Relationships between parents and students are significant and important correspondingly when it came to a student’s mindset.
This study demonstrated the importance of both traditional and non-traditional student’s growth mindsets when it came to having a strong social support from their parents.
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