University Research Resource Journal
Jayoti Vidyapeeth Women's University, Jaipur
Volume – 4, Issue – 1 (January – March - 2021) Page No: 37-49

ISSN: 2581 - 3730

Do cell phones and social media make a family relationship strong

Jv'n Anmol Jangir, B.Tech. Student, Jayoti Vidyapeeth Women's University, Jaipur
Jv' n Associate Professor Dr. Anamika Ahirwar
Jayoti Vidyapeeth Women's University, Jaipur
E-Mail: dranmikaahirwar@jvwu.ac.in

Abstract: Utilizing online media Web destinations is among the most widely recognized actions of the present kids and youths. Due to launching new smartphones at 50% lower price than the original price. The impact of this is that everyone has a smartphone. children interact with smartphones at an early age rather than toys and outdoor games. Most parents are working to provide safety. They provide their children with phones.

However addiction rate of below 3-year-old Childers is alarming to focus on it's increasing with the rate of 3.6% to 4.6%in recent years. Here we focus on the relationship of parents and children affected by smartphones and social media. Parents provide facilities to their children for their safety and for taking care of their kids, but this is one of the major points where their relations get affected.

Abstract: Online media, smartphones.

Introduction

Utilizing online media Web destinations is among the most widely recognized actions of the present kids and youths.[1]According to Navkender Singh, Research Director, IDC India "There are around 450 million cell phone clients when contrasted with 550 million element telephone clients in India. Around 40-45% of highlight telephone clients own a gadget at not as much as Rs 1000. So the expense of possession, the need for web education and the inflexibility that element telephones have is keeping the clients away from purchasing a cell phone".

Due to launching new smartphones at 50% lower price than the original price. The impact of this is that everyone has a smartphone. children interact with smartphones at an early age rather than toys and outdoor games. Most parents are working to provide safety. They provide their children with phones.

[2]However addiction rate of below 3-year-old Childers is alarming to focus on it's increasing with the rate of 3.6% to 4.6%in recent years. Here we focus on the relationship of parents and children affected by smartphones and social media. Parents provide facilities to their children for their safety and for taking care of their kids, but this is one of the major points where their relations get affected.

Literature review.

1. Parent-kids struggle over media use :

Initially found as a way to apply distant parental control 3(Rakow and Navarro, 1993), cell phones and particularly cell phones permit teenagers to impart and to consume media without parental management. Since the time electronic media gadgets turned out to be essential for day-to-day life, kids' media use has been a subject of parental and scholastic concern. The

worries turn around undesired impacts of unseemly substance like publicizing, sex, savagery, and badgering, or of screen time accordingly 4 (Mesch, 2006; Van cave Buick and Van nook Bergh, 2005).5While Parents may attempt to control their kids' media use, young people demand

self-rule and privacy 6 (Hawk, Keijsers, Hale, and Meeus, 2009) and may battle with Parents'

fear and obliviousness concerning new advances7 (Clark, 2009). Children's media use is a field of family struggle and ineffective advanced nurturing can prompt disappointment and weakness in the two Parents and kids 8 (Beyens and Beullens, 2017).

H1

Parents who use smartphones have a positive effect on uncontrollable children.

2. Parents' excessive cell phone use and absence of control :

Parents' media use has different results on kids. It has been set up that Parent' media use predicts their Children ' media use9(Konok, Bunford, and Miklósi, 2019; Lauricella, Wartella, and Rideout, 2015; Xu, Wen, and Rissel, 2015). Aside from that, Parents' media use likewise influences their computerized nurturing severally: When Parents utilize their telephones while collaborating with their kids, this influences kids' confidence and the parent-kid relationship10(Hong et al., 2019). The explanation might be that the cell phone and the kids may go after consideration and Parents will most likely be unable to adequately take care of the kid, particularly on the off chance that they have issues controlling their cell phone use.

Parents' exorbitant cell phone use is decidedly identified with the absence of power throughout Children's cell phone use over the long haul.

H2

The lack of parents' control over children's smartphone use is associated with conflict from (a) children's perspective and (b) parents' perspective over time.

3. Parental absence of control and struggle

Even though exploration has distinguished a few indicators of the absence of command over kids' media use (or computerized nurturing self-viability), the results remain generally obscure. Proof demonstrates that apparent authority over parental intercession rehearses is related to expanded commitment in the intervention of Children's cell phone use11 (Shin, 2018). Similarly, Parents who don't feel positive about controlling their kids' media use may pull out their duty, and leave kids all alone to learn by experimentation12 (Mascheroni et al., 2016). Consequently, Parents' absence of control may prompt defenselessness in the two Parents and Children.

After-effects of a subjective board concentration throughout 12 years showed that when Parents felt an absence of control, they would in general defeat their powerlessness by self-assertive controlling their kids' media use 13(Paus-Hasebrink, 2018). Such self-assertive activities or rules are commonly conceptualized inside the structure of conflicting nurturing 14(Gardner, 1989).

There is obvious proof that parental irregularity is aversive to the kids and prompts oppositional and in this way conceivably conflictive practices. Based on these discoveries, we can expect that when Parents feel they lose or need authority over their kids' cell phone use, this may identify them struggling with their kids.

H3

The link between tracking parental shortage and conflict is mitigated by the negative impact of parents' use of smart phones. a) We assumed the conflict perceived by the children and b) the conflict perceived by the parents.

Research methodology

1. Inspecting technique and members

There is a study on parents and children's conflict due to smart phones though we see here how smart phones affect family relations. Here we see a survey result which was held in Germany. They completed a two-data board study among parent-kids sets. The delay between the two study data was four months (see for a comparative slack, 15Yao, and Zhong, 2014). The main data was directed in August/September 2018 and the second data in January/February 2019.

They selected members with a private examination surveying organization that gathered a quantity test (in view old enough, sexual orientation and training of Parents) in Germany. The private examination firm enrolled members utilizing two existing boards. For the primary board, the reaction rate was 28% in the principal data. For the subsequent board, the reaction rate was 40% in the principal data. Standard examining was conducted concerning Parents' age and sexual orientation.

As to, our example varied from the appropriation in the German populace in that Parents with college capability or college degree were somewhat over-represented. Parents with mandatory school-leaving proof were marginally underrepresented. Be that as it may, the instructive dispersion was extremely different in our example and Parents of all instructive classifications were addressed in our example. In particular, 0.5% had no proper school degree, 14.9% had necessary school-leaving support, 36.9% had an auxiliary school leaving authentication, 20.8% had a college capability (secondary school graduation), and 25.7% had a college degree. The excess 1.2% showed other school degrees. They additionally evaluated Parents' pay as an intermediary for Parents' socio-segment status. Some 23.6% demonstrated a family pays off under 1,48,441 Rs, 32.2% showed a family pays off under 2,22,661 Rs, 30.8% showed a family pays off under 3,71,102.50 Rs, and 13.4% demonstrated a family pays off more than 3,71,102.50 Rs. Accordingly, although we were unable to set shares for money and schooling, our example was different as to formal instructive degrees and socio-segment status. By and large, contrasted with the overall German population, ladies were somewhat overrepresented, lower instructive degrees (no degree, mandatory school degree) were marginally underrepresented, and higher school degrees (secondary school degree, college degree) were somewhat overrepresented.

To represent Parents' schooling and pay, they repeated all examinations controlling for education and pay utilizing dummy variables. These outcomes are something similar in their importance and directionality to the ones introduced here. Also, payor instruction didn't have huge associations with the results. The online review was spread among Parents who utilized cell phones. They gave them the knowledge that the poll managed their own and their kid's cell phone use and asked them for their consent. Parents finished the initial segment of the survey. A short time later they were approached to give the overview to their kid who possessed a cell phone. They make sure of their namelessness.

In the main study data, 822 parent-kids sets are taken. The example consisted of Parents who matured somewhere in the range of 23 and 69 years (M = 42.94; SD = 7.10) and 57.2% were

ladies. Children were matured somewhere in the range of 10 and 14 years with a mean period of

12.09 (SD = 1.37) and 51.1% were young ladies. In the subsequent overview data, an aggregate of 384 parent-kid sets completed the review with a steady loss pace of 53%. Parents' age mean was 43.57 (SD = 6.89) and 53.4% were ladies. Kids' mean age was 12.37 (SD = 1.48) and 46.6% were young ladies.

Parents who didn't proceed with the subsequent data didn't vary from the individuals who took part in the principal data in regards to their age ($F(1,820) = 1.25$, $p = .264$, $\eta 2 = 0.00$), their absence of control ($F(1,820) = 2.62$, $p = .106$, $\eta 2 = 0.00$), and their apparent parent-kids struggle ($F(1,820) = 1.59$, $p = .208$, $\eta 2 = 0.00$). There were slight contrasts in regards to Parents' sex, i.e., ladies were bound to exit than men, $\chi 2$ (1, $n = 822$) $= 4.23$, $p = .040$. In any case, less men took an interest in the primary data, so we didn't consider ladies' drop out hazardous.

Kids who didn't take an interest in the subsequent data didn't contrast as to their age ($F(1,820) = 0.64$, $p = .426$, $\eta 2 = 0.00$) and their apparent parent-kids struggle ($F(1,820) = 0.61$, $p = .435$, $\eta 2$

$= 0.00$). In any case, young ladies were bound to leave the investigation after the principal data than young men, $\chi 2$ (1, $n = 822$) $= 5.79$, $p = .016$, bringing about a slight underrepresentation of young ladies in the subsequent data.

2. Measures

Parents' excessive use. The estimated parental unreasonable cell phone utilization dependent on the cell phone association scale by 16Knop, Hefner, Schmitt, and Vorderer (2015) that was adjusted to the German language from17 Walsh, White, and Young (2010) and18 Waller and Süss (2012). This scale was recently utilized in an examination among Parents and kids and estimated parental risky association with cell phones 19(Hefner et al., 2019) bringing about high interior consistency ($\alpha = .91$). In our examination, we requested that Parents demonstrate their concurrence with the accompanying assertions on a 5-point scale (1 "totally dissent" to 5 "totally concur"): "I frequently think about my cell phone when I'm accomplishing something different", "I regularly take a gander at my cell phone or check messages on it in the middle of getting things done", "Assuming I see my cell phone lying someplace or get a message, I simply need to take a gander at it—there could be no alternate way", and "I frequently get my cell phone and accomplish something with it, even though I have nothing specific to do on it" ($\alpha = .81$, $M = 2.86$; $SD = 0.95$ at T1).

Parents' absence of control. They evaluated parental absence of control dependent on the parental locus of control scale from 20Lloyd and Hastings (2009). They adjusted four things from the sub-dimension parental control of kid's conduct to quantify the absence of control of cell phone conduct. They requested that Parents express their concurrence with four articulations: "Now and again I feel that I need more command over my kid's cell phone use", "It is normally simpler to permit my kid to utilize the cell phone than to bear a fit of rage", "Once in a while I think that it is hard to control my kids' cell phone use", "At times when I'm worn out, I

let my kid utilize the cell phone, even though I wouldn't regularly permit it". An exploratory factor investigation uncovered one factor for the apparent absence of control at T1 (clarifying 69.53% of the fluctuation) and T2 (clarifying 71.32% of the difference). Moreover, we led a CFA with dormant factors for apparent absence of control at T1 and T2, which uncovered a worthy model fit: $\chi 2/df = 7.86$, CFI = 0.96, TLI = 0.93, RMSEA = 0.09, 90% CI [0.08; 0.11]. We

additionally tried estimation invariance of the things by obliging the things of saw parental control at T1 and saw parental control at T2 as equivalent, which likewise uncovered a satisfactory model fit: $\chi 2/df = 6.63$, CFI = 0.96, TLI = 0.94, RMSEA = 0.08, 90% CI [0.07; 0.10]. A settled correlation model uncovered no huge contrast between the unconstrained and the obliged model (D $\chi 2$ (3) = 1.45, p = .694. The file showed high interior consistency of the four things ($\alpha = .85$; M = 2.52; SD = 1.03 at T1, $\alpha = .87$; M = 2.48; SD = 1.03 at T2).

The negative effect of smartphones perceived by parents. The estimated apparent adverse consequences of Children's cell phone use with adjusted things about Internet use from 21 Nikken and Jansz (2014). We asked Parents their opinion, all in, about the impact of cell phones on kids. On a scale from 1 ("firmly deviate") to 5 ("unequivocally concur"), they requested that Parents demonstrate their concurrence with the accompanying assertions about opposite impacts of cell phone use: The cell phone drives Children to (1) reach out to 'some unacceptable' individuals on the web, (2) become dependent, (3) invest an excessive amount of energy on cell phones, (4) be harassed or have negative encounters ($\alpha = .79$; M = 3.53; SD = 0.79 at T1).

Seen parent-kid conflict (kids' point of view). They estimated the kids' detailed struggle with a scale adjusted from Nelissen and Van cave Bulck (2018). On a 4-point scale (1 - "never", 2 - "about once per week", 3 - "a few times each week", 4 - "consistently"), Children were posed two inquiries: "A few Parents set principles with regards to the cell phone. When you currently consider your parents, how precise are the accompanying sentences? (1) Is there a debate with your people about cell phone use?; (2) Is there a question with your people about specific applications?" ($r = 0.59$, $p < .001$; $\alpha = .72$; M = 1.55; SD = 0.70 at T1, $r = 0.65$, $p < .001$; $\alpha = .77$, M = 1.55; SD = 0.71 at T2).

Seen parent-kids struggle (Parents' viewpoint). They estimated parent-detailed struggle with a similar scale adjusted from Nelissen and Van cave Bulck (2018).They asked Parents the accompanying: "Bringing up kids is some of the time a test for Parents. What resembles it for you?; (1) Is there a question with your kids about cell phone use?; (2) Is there a debate with your kid about specific **applications**?" ($r = 0.57$, $p < .001$; $\alpha = .71$; M = 1.54; SD = 0.67 at T1, $r = 0.62$, $p < .001$; $\alpha = .75$; M = 1.54; SD = 0.68 at T2).

Data analysis.

After examining the information in R utilizing the lavaan bundle 22(Rosseel, 2012). They directed a way of examination with noticed factors. They utilized the powerful Maximum Likelihood assessor because of slight skewness in the reliant factors. Changes in the outcomes are immaterial when the vigorous, as opposed to the non-powerful Maximum Likelihood estimator, is utilized. The estimated model fit dependent on the SEM cut-off standards for the proportion of chi-squared to a degree of freedom ($\chi 2/df$), Tucker-Lewis-Index (TLI), comparative fit index (CFI), and the root means the square error of approximation (RMSEA) fit indexes (23 Schreiber, Stage, King, Nora, and Barlow, 2006). Keeping general principles, CFI or TLI esteems higher than 0.90 and RMSEA esteems lower than 0.08 recommend adequate model fit (24 Byrne, 2001). In our weakened model, we controlled for auto-backward impacts (i.e., baseline measures) of all relevant factors to clarify changes in the results over the long run. They additionally included control factors for Parents' age and sex, and kids' age and sex.

In this data, we analyze how phones make people adductive whether it can be any adult or kid. Here we analyze that education matters means parenting depends upon education.

Results.

Their theorized model is portrayed in Figure A.1. Relationships between our fundamental free and ward factors are displayed in Table A.1. The outcomes are introduced in Table A.2 and Figure A.2. Their guessed model showed a decent model fit: CFI = 0.98; TLI = 0.89, $\chi 2/df$ = 3.16; p = .004; RMSEA = 0.08, 90% CIs [0.05; 0.11].

In the first place, we expected that Parents' unreasonable cell phone usage would be decidedly connected with the lack of control over Children's cell phone use. They discovered help for this speculation (b = 0.13, SE = 0.04, β = 0.12, p = .004) showing that Parents' unreasonable cell phone use at Time 1 decidedly influenced Parents' lack of control at Time 2.

Then, they expected to find that Parents' absence of command over kids' cell phone usage would be identified with cell phone-related struggle from Children's and Parents' viewpoint. Our outcome showed a positive connection between Parents' lack of control at Time 1 d kids' revealed conflict at Time 2. In this way, they could declare our H2a (b = 0.11, SE = 0.03, β = 0.161, p = .002). Following H2b, our outcomes showed a positive relationship of Parents' lack of control at Time 1 with saw parent-kid struggle from the Parents' point of view. Thus, they affirmed our H2b (b = 0.10, SE = 0.03, β = 0.15, p = .007).

At last, concerning our H3a and H3b, they discovered no balance impact of seeming poor consequence of cell phones on the connection between Parents' absence of command over Children ' cell phone use and struggle – neither on kid revealed struggle (b = −0.01, SE = 0.03, β = −0.02, p = .715), nor on parent-announced clash (b = −0.02, SE = 0.03, β = −0.03, p = .468).

Concerning control factors, they found that Parents' age was adversely identified with kids' announced struggle over time (b = - .01, SE = 0.004, β = −0.08, p = .042). That is, the more seasoned the Parents were, the more uncertain kids were to encounter cell phone-related clashes with their people. Furthermore, we found that Children ' age was contrarily identified with parent-detailed struggle over time (b = - .05, SE = 0.02, β = −0.10, p = .015). This implies that Parents experienced less struggle about cell phone use when their kids were older.

	M (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Parents' excessive use (T1)	2.86 (0.95)	1							
2.Parents' absence of control.(T1)	2.52 (1.03)	.32**	1						
3.Parents' absence of control. (T2)	2.48 (1.03)	.36**	.73**	1					
4. Perceived negative impact (T1)	3.53 (0.79)	.02	.29**	.26**	1				
5. Child-reported conflict (T1)	1.55 (0.70)	.18**	.44**	.42**	.26**	1			
6. Child-reported conflict (T2)	1.55 (0.71)	.23**	.41**	.48**	.23**	.61**	1		
7. Parent-reported conflict (T1)	1.54 (0.67)	.21**	.57**	.45**	.32**	.71**	.54**	1	
8. Parent-reported conflict (T2)	1.54 (0.68)	.22**	.46**	.58**	.25**	.57**	.74**	.62**	1

	Parents' lack of control (T2)			Child-reported conflict (T2)			Parent-reported conflict (T2)		
Predictor	***b***	***SE***	***β***	***b***	***SE***	***β***	***b***	***SE***	***β***
Parents' age (T1)	0.00	0.01	0.01	−0.01*	0.00	−0.08	−0.00	0.00	−0.03
Parents' gender (T1)	0.06	0.08	0.03	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.11	0.06	0.08
Children's age (T1)	−0.01	0.03	−0.02	−0.01	0.02	−0.02	−0.05*	0.02	−0.10
Children's gender (T1)	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.03
Parents' excessive use (T1)	0.13**	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.03	0.05
Parents' lack of control (T1)	0.68**	0.04	0.68	0.11**	0.04	0.16	0.10**	0.04	0.15
Perceived negative impact (T1)				0.06	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.4	0.00
Child-reported conflict (T1)				0.44**	0.06	0.45			

Parent-reported conflict (T1)				0.48**	0.07	0.48	
Parents' lack of control (T1) * Perceived	−0.01	0.03	−0.02	−0.02	0.03		−0.0

negative impact (T1)			
R2	0.53	0.36	0.39

Conclusion.

These impediments, in any case, they accept their discoveries bear a few significant ramifications for Parents and analysts the same. With regards to the viewpoint of Parents, they might be ignorant that their own unnecessary cell phone use can have direct ramifications for circumstances in which there is "battling about the cell phone" with their Children. In this way, Parents should be better instructed about the impacts of their practices and the restricted assets they may have as an outcome of extreme cell phone use. Effectively open intercession programs, online schooling stages, or simple-to-utilize applications straightforwardly focusing on parental cell phone use in a family setting may assist Parents with bettering see how their practices may shape family struggle.

Exploration on the impacts of cell phone use is called to take a more exhaustive viewpoint, including not exclusively Parents' guideline and intervention methodologies and how Children see them yet in addition Parents' cell phone use propensities, their accessible psychological and passionate assets following from their cell phone use, and their sensations of an absence of control. In general, they infer that both, kids' and Parents' cell phone use, should be viewed while clarifying innovation-related family clashes.

Reference page.

1. https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/tech/hardware/overall-india-handset-market-growth-to-fall-in-2020/articleshow/72950192.cms
2. International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, Vol. 4, No. 2, March 2014, The Conceptual Model on Smartphone Addiction among Early Childhood, Cheol Park and Ye Rang Park
3. .L.F. Rakow, V. Navarro, Remote mothering and the parallel shift: Women meet the cellular telephone Critical Studies in Media Communication, 10 (1993), pp. 144-157, 10.1080/15295039309366856
4. G.S. Mesch, Family characteristics and intergenerational conflicts over the Internet 9, Information, Communication & Society (2006), pp. 473-495, 10.1080/13691180600858705

5. .J.V. Van den Bulck, B.V. Van den Bergh, The child effect in media and communication research: A call to arms and an agenda for research Annals of the International Communication Association, 29 (2005), pp. 35-48, 10.1080/23808985.2005.11679043
6. S.T. Hawk, L. Keijsers, W.W. Hale III, W. Meeus,Mind your own business! Longitudinal relations between perceived privacy invasion and adolescent-parent conflict Journal of Family Psychology, 23 (2009), pp. 511-520, 10.1037/a0015426
7. L.S. Clark, Digital media and the generation gap Information, Communication & Society, 12 (2009), pp. 388-407, 10.1080/1369118090282384
8. Beyens, K. Beullens, Parent-child conflict about children's tablet use: The role of parental mediation 19, New Media & Society (2017), pp. 2075-2093, 10.1177/14614448166550
9. V. Konok, N. Bunford, Á. Miklósi, Associations between child mobile use and digital parenting style in Hungarian families Journal of Children and Media (2019), pp. 1-19, 10.1080/17482798.2019.1684332
10. W. Hong, R.D. Liu, Y. Ding, T.P. Oei, R. Zhen, S. Jiang, Parents' phubbing and problematic mobile phone use: The roles of the parent-child relationship and children's self-esteem, Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 22 (2019), pp. 779-786, 10.1089/cyber.2019.0179
11. W. Shin, Empowered parents: The role of self-efficacy in parental mediation of children's smartphone use in the United States Journal of Children and Media, 12 (2018), pp. 465-477, 10.1080/17482798.2018.1486331
12. .G. Mascheroni, S. Livingstone, M. Dreier, S. Chaudron, Learning versus play or learning through play. How parent's imaginaries, discourses, and practices around ICTs shape children's (digital) literacy practices Media Education, 7 (2) (2016), pp. 261-280, 10.14605/MED721606
13. .Paus-Hasebrink, Ingrid, Mediation practices in socially disadvantaged families G. Mascheroni, C. Ponte, A. Jorge (Eds.), Digital parenting. Challenges for families in the digital age, Nordicom, Göteborg (2018), pp. 51-60
14. F.E. Gardner, Inconsistent parenting: Is there evidence for a link with children's conduct problems?Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology,17(1989), pp,223-233. 10.1007/BF00913796
15. M.Z. Yao, Z. Zhong Loneliness, social contacts, and internet addiction: A cross-lagged panel study Computers in Human Behavior, 30 (2014), pp. 164-170, 10.1016/j.chb.2013.08.007
16. K. Knop, D. Hefner, S. Schmitt, P. Vorderer Mediatisierung mobile Handy- und mobile Internetnutzung von Kindern und Jugendlichen. Schriftenreihe Medienforschung der Landesanstalt für Medien NRW Band 77 [Mediatization of mobile phone and mobile Internet use by children and young people, Vol. 77, Publication Series Media Research of the State Media Authority NRW, Leipzig (2015) (Vistas)
17. .S. Walsh, K.M. White, R.M. Young Needing to connect: The effect of self and others on young peoples involvement with their mobile phones Australian Journal of Psychology, 62 (2010), pp. 194-

203, 10.1080/00049530903567229

18. G. Waller, D. Süss Handygebrauch der Schweizer Jugend: Zwischen engagierter Nutzung und Verhaltenssucht [Mobile phone usage among Swiss adolescents: Between engagement and behavioral addiction] ZHAW, Zurich (2012)
19. .D. Hefner, K. Knop, S. Schmitt, P. Vorderer Rules? Role model? Relationship? The impact of parents on their children's problematic mobile phone involvement Media Psychology, 22 (2019), pp. 82-108, 10.1080/15213269.2018.1433544
20. T. Lloyd, R.P. Hastings Parental locus of control and psychological well-being in mothers of children with intellectual disability Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability, 34 (2009), pp. 104-115, 10.1080/13668250902862074
21. T. Lloyd, R.P. Hastings Parental locus of control and psychological well-being in mothers of children with intellectual disability Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability, 34 (2009), pp. 104-115, 10.1080/13668250902862074
22. Y. Rosseel lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling Journal of Statistical Software, 48 (2012), pp. 1-36, 10.18637/jss.v048.i02
23. .J.B. Schreiber, A. Nora, F.K. Stage, E.A. Barlow, J. King Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory analysis results: A review The Journal of Educational Research, 99 (2006), pp. 323-337, 10.3200/JOER.99.6.323-338

.B.M. Byrne Structural equation modeling with AMOS, EQS, and LISREL: Comparative approaches to testing for the factorial validity of a measuring instrument International Journal of Testin