

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING AMONG ADOLESCENTS IN RELATION TO ACADEMIC SELF-CONCEPT AND THEIR FAMILY STRUCTURE

Dr. Franky Rani¹ , Ms. Monika Luthra²

¹Assistant Professor ,Department of Education, G. N. D. U.

²Research Scholar, Department of Education, G. N. D. U.

Email- Luthramonikaa@gmail.com

Abstract

Human development is characterized by several distinct and unique stages beginning with conception and ending at death. Like all stages of human growth and development, adolescence is an important stage. The present study comes under the domain of descriptive research. A sample of 200 students (100 girls and 100 boys) of IXth grade randomly selected from govt. and private schools were taken for study. Psychological well-being test by Sisodia and Choudhary (2005) and self-concept test by Saraswat (1971) as research tools were used to collect the data. Two-way ANOVA, t-test was used to analyses the data. Results showed that Self-concept of adolescent students belonging to nuclear family and joint family were not found different. Secondary school students differ significantly on Psychological well-being across gender. Psychological Well-being of male is higher than female students and adolescent students belonging to nuclear family and joint family were not found different.

Keywords: Psychological Well-being, Self-concept, Family structure

INTRODUCTION

Psychologists emphasized the importance of the promotion of positive mental health and adaptation in children in addition to the treatment of established psychological disorders (Huebner, 1991a, 1997; Phillips, 1993; Seligman, 1998). Proponents of positively focused orientations have identified various domains of positive psychological outcomes, including a sense of subjective well-being. Wissing and Van Eeden (1997) described well-being as a combination of specific qualities, such as a sense of coherence, satisfaction with life, affect balance, and a general attitude of optimism or positive life orientation. Okun & Stok (1987) reported that psychological well-being is equal to the good life or satisfaction with life in a hedonic sense. It has been regarded as synonymous with mental health and quality of life. It is based on subjective experiences and has both positive and as well as negative effects. Levi (1987) expressed that well-being is a harmony between individual's abilities, need and expectations and environmental demands and opportunities. Psychological Well-being is a description of the state of people's life situation (McGillivray, 2007). Some researchers conceptualize psychological well-being in terms of affective processes (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffen, 1985; Karnmann & Flett, 1983). Goldberg and Hillier (1979) and Suominen et al.(2000) emphasis on physical processes and focusing on the connection between good physical health and high quality of life. Other researchers (Epstein, 1992; Ingram & Wisnicki, 1988; Martin & Rubin, 1995; Stephens et al., 1999) described that the key indicator of psychological well-being is life satisfaction. As Rowlinson and Felner (1988) found that daily hassles and major life events to be associated with adjustment, with hassles predicting over and above the effects attributable to major life events. Thus they suggested that daily hassles and major life events represent conceptually distinct sources of life stress, each of which can make an independent contribution to the individual's overall level of functioning. Colton (1985) found that major life events were rated as more stressful than hassles; however, interpersonal hassles explained more of the variance in stress ratings than did major life events.

To the maintenance of subjective well-being successful coping with stressful life events is crucial (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). Successful coping is facilitated by both external resources or interpersonal factors, such as social support (Sarason, Sarason, & Pierce, 1990; Zhou, Sedikides, Wildschut, & Gao, 2008), and internal resources or intrapersonal factors, such as psychological states and personality characteristics (Taylor, 1995; Watson, David, & Suls, 1999). One of the intrapersonal resources is self-concept. The sum total of the individual's thoughts and feelings about him or herself as an object is self-concept and Self-concept is related to indices of psychological distress inversely (e.g., anxiety, negative effect, rumination) and related to subjective well-being positively. The self-concept is associated with psychological well-being (Campbell et al., 1996; De Cremer & Sedikides, 2005; Lavalley & Campbell, 1995; Slotter, Gardner, & Finkel, 2010). It refers to "the extent to which self-beliefs are clearly and confidently defined (Campbell et al., 1996)". Self-concept fluctuates with environmental influences (Nezlek & Plesko, 2001).

Homel and Burns (1989) reported in his study that social environment exerts both a direct and indirect influence on psychological well-being. Among the factors which have a direct link are the home, the street and the neighborhood. Boghle & Prakash (1995) conducted a study on that person high on psychological well-being not only carries high level of life satisfaction, self-esteem, positive feelings and attitudes but also manage tension, negative thoughts, ideas and feelings with more efficiency.

Many efforts are being made in contemporary society to empower all individuals to achieve self-actualization and utilize their full potential, so Gender differences in psychological well-being are important. Crose et al. (1992) pointed that gender differences do exist in almost every aspect of health and health care. Peerzada (2015) explored the study on a comparative study of modernization of male and female higher secondary school students found that male higher secondary school students have significantly higher mean scores in terms of modernization. Laumann (2006) reported on adolescents with physical disabilities who are actualizing their potential are described as exhibiting autonomous functioning and resistance to enculturation. Purohit (2006) revealed that mothers with supportive conformity and innovative styles have shown significant positive relationship with the intellectual self-concept of girls. Naik (2012) conducted an analytical study on self-concept and gender concluded that family from small to big have some effect on the self-concept of individual.

Kimani (2009) & Combs (1959) expressed that self-concept is positively related to academic performance. This means that a learner with a higher self-concept will perform better in academic tasks than a learner whose self-concept is low. Purkey (1970) agreed that self-concept has a strong relationship with academic performance. Anithai and Parameswari (2013) showed a significant positive relationship of home environment components (protectiveness, conformity, reward and nurturance) with self-concept. Singh, Mitra and Upadhyay (2010) investigated that family environment of slum area is significantly poorer than the urban areas and self-concept is also lower of slum's adolescent. So it can be concluded that, for the positive development of adolescents in terms of higher self-concept a good environment is essential prerequisite. This study was conducted to understand and analyze the psychological well-being of adolescent students in relation to academic self-concept and their family structure.

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant relationship between psychological well-being and self-concept of adolescent students.
2. (a) There is no significant difference of psychological well-being of adolescent students with respect to gender.
(b) There is no significant difference of psychological well-being of adolescent students with respect to self-concept.
(c) There is no significant interaction effect of gender and self-concept on psychological well-being of adolescent students.
3. (a) There is no significant difference in psychological well-being of adolescent students with respect to type of family

(b) There is no significant interaction effect of type of family and self-concept on psychological well-being of adolescent student.

METHOD

➤ **DESIGN OF STUDY**

The study falls under the domain of descriptive research as it intends to study of psychological well-being among adolescent students in relation to their self-concept and type of family.

➤ **PARTICIPANTS**

The participants were 200 students from IXth grade, consisted of 100 boys and 100 girls. The sample was randomly selected from govt. and private schools of Amritsar city.

➤ **PROCEDURE**

In order to conduct the study, 200 students from class IXth class were selected through random sampling technique, keeping in view the requirement of the study. Co-efficient of correlation of psychological well-being, self-concept was used. The mean well-being along with SDs in self -concept, gender, type of family and factorial design (2*3) was used for analysis of the result. After that students were categorized on the basis type of school & gender. Two-way ANOVA t-Test was used.

➤ **INSTRUMENTS**

The following two tools were used for this study.

- Psychological well-being by Sisodia and Choudhary (2005)
- Self-concept by Saraswat (1971)

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

RESULTS

The Data has been analyzed under the following headings:

(a) HYPOTHESIS-I

(A) There is no significant relationship between psychological wellbeing and self-concept of adolescent students. The result of this analysis is being reported in table 1

TABLE.1

Variables	Total sample (n)	d.f. (n-2)	Coefficient of correlation (r)
Psychological Well-being	100	198	.178
Self concept	100		

The table 1 shows that the coefficient of correlation of psychological well-being and self-concept is 0.178, therefore significant at 0.05 levels. Thus, it can be concluded that self-concept and well-being are significantly related with each other. Thus null hypothesis; “There is no significant relationship between psychological well-being and self-concept of adolescent student” was rejected. It means there is significant relationship between psychological well-being and self-concept of adolescent students.

Hypothesis-Ii

(a). There is no significant difference in psychological well-being of adolescent students with respect to gender. The result of this analysis is being report in table 2

TABLE-2

MEAN AND S.Ds OF PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL BEING AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN GENDER X SELF CONCEPT FACTORIAL DESIGN 2 *3 (N=200)

Variables								
Self-concept	Gender							
	Boys			Girls			Total	
	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD
High self concept	29	184.52	21.214	25	19.40	192.40	102.04	106.80

Average self	45	181.02	17.922	47	184.68	25.729	19.51	21.82
Low self concept	26	176.54	18.479	28	177.21	24.179	176.87	21.32
Total	100	180.69	19.205	100	127.09	80.76	99.47	49.98

TABLE-3
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (GENDER X SELF CONCEPT) ON PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL BEING

TESTS OF BETWEEN-SUBJECT EFFECTS					
Source	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Self-concept	3611.476	2	1805.738	3.578	.030
Gender	776.76	1	776.76	1.539	.216
Gender* self-concept	354.052	2	177.026	.351	.705
Error	97909.608	194	504.689		
Total	6777991.000	200			

Level of significance 0.05

(a) There exists no significant difference in psychological well-being among adolescent students with respect to gender. The result of this analysis is being reported in table 3.

From table 3 it can be seen that f-value for the main effect of gender (A) on psychological well-being of secondary school students came out to be 1.539 which is insignificant at the 0.05 level of significance. Thus the hypothesis: “There is no significant difference in psychological well-being of boys and girls secondary school student” is accepted. It may therefore said that boys and girls did not significantly differ on their psychological well- being scores.

(b) There is no significant difference of psychological well-being of adolescent students with respect to self- concept. The result of this analysis is being reported in table 3.

From table 3 it can be seen that f-value for the main-effect of self-concept (A) on psychological well-being of secondary school students came out to be 3.578 which is significant at the 0.05 level of significance. It indicates that secondary school students differ significantly on psychological well-being across self-concept. So the hypothesis” there is no significant difference of psychological well-being of adolescent student with respect to self-concept secondary school student” is rejected.

(c) There is no significant of interaction effect of gender and self-concept on psychological well-being of adolescent student. The results of this analysis are being reported in table 3.

From table 3 it can be seen that F –value for the interaction effect of gender and self-concept of secondary school students came out to be .351 which is insignificant at the 0.05. This indicates that interaction effects of gender are independent of self-concept of secondary school students. Hence the hypothesis “There is no significant interaction effect of gender and self-concept on psychological well-being of adolescent student” has been accepted.

Hypothesis-iii

(A)There is no significant difference in psychological well-being of adolescent students with respect to type of family. The results of analysis are being reported in table 4.

The mean psychological well-being score along with their SDs in self-concept & type of family factorial design (2&2) are provided in table 4.

TABLE 4

Variables	
Self-concept	Family types

	Nuclear			Joint			Total	
	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD
High self concept	37	187.49	21.742	17	189.65	18.645	188.57	20.19
Average self	55	182.51	23.787	37	183.46	19.944	182.98	21.86
Low self concept	28	175.14	25.420	26	178.77	23.585	176.95	24.5
Total	200	182.33	23.808	80	183.25	21.051	182.83	22.18

TABLE-5
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (TYPE OF FAMILY X SELF CONCEPT) ON PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL BEING

Source	Type 111 sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Family-type	221.168	1	221.168	.434	.511
Self-concept	3389.332	2	1694.666	3.327	.038
Family type* self-concept	60.323	2	30.161	.059	.943
Error	98896.104	194	509.310		
Total	6777991.000	200			
Corrected total	102498.395	199			

Level of significance 0.05

(a) There is no significant difference in well-being of adolescent students with respect to type of family. The result of this analysis is being reported in table 5.

From table 5 it can be seen that f-value for the main effect of type of family (A) on psychological well-being of secondary school students came out to be .434 which is insignificant at the 0.05 level of significance. It indicates that secondary school students didn't differ significantly on psychological well-being across type of family. So, the hypothesis "There is no significant difference in well-being of adolescent students with respect to type of family" is accepted. It may therefore said that Students live in Joint family didn't differ on psychological well-being than their counterparts.

(b) There is no significant interaction effect of family and self-concept on psychological well-being of adolescent student. The result of this analysis is being reported in table 5.

From table 5 it can be seen that F-value for the interaction effect of type of family and self-concept of secondary school students came out to be .059 which is insignificant at the 0.05. This indicates that interaction effect of type of family is independent of self-concept of secondary school students. Hence the hypothesis: "There is no significant interaction effect of type of family and self-concept on psychological well-being of adolescent student" is accepted.

Discussion

It has already been pointed out that parents have a vital role to play in the development of a child; physical, cognitive, social, moral etc. Any educational research is worthwhile if the results produce fruitful educational implications. As so far the present investigation is concerned, it can be claimed that useful information obtained could be useful in enhancing the educational success of the students. The result of the study indicates that there is a significant difference in self-concept of adolescent students with respect to gender and self-concept of high, average and low parental involvement, which indicates that females have

better self-concept as compared to males and students with high psychological well-being have better self-concept as compared to students with average and low psychological well-being. So parents and teachers should equally involve male students in the social activities so that the self-concept of male students will also improve and parents who are less involved must be involved in the social activities of students so that self-concept of students will be improved. Such programs should be developed for children in school in which parents can also participate. The interaction and cooperation of parents and teachers can help in creating a wholesome environment for children for their development. Parents and teachers should be aware about well-being the children possess, different aspects of psychological well-being and about the environment provided to the children at home or home and even about the development of the self-concept of their children. The government may plan some special programs commonly for teachers, educational institutions and parents to spread the awareness about the importance of self-concept in the children as well as the psychological well-being and academic achievement. Parents which have appeared to differentiate high and low performing children on Cognitive and self-concept were willingness to devote time with children, academic guidance to children, verbal communication and use of reward. Planning and organizing planned cultural activities, consistency of management at home, helping the child to differentiate and become aware of him-self and improving nature of discipline are some of the other factors associated with well-being, of which parents should be made aware.

References

1. Bhogle, S., & Parkash, I., J.(1995). Development of the psychological well-being (PWB) questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Clinical Studies*, 11, 5-9.
2. Campbell, J. D., Assanand, S., & Di Paula, A. (2003). The structure of the self-concept and its relation to psychological adjustment. *Journal of Personality*, 71, 115–140.
3. Campbell, J. D., Trapnell, P. D., Heine, S. J., Katz, I. M., Lavallee, L. F., & Lehman, D. R. (1996). Self-concept clarity: Measurement, personality correlates, and cultural boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 141–156.
4. Colton, J.A. (1985). Childhood stress: Perceptions of children and professionals. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 7, 155–173
5. Crose, R, Nicholas, D. R., Gobble, D. C. & Frank, B. (1992). Gender and wellness: A multidimensional systems model for counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 7, 149- 156.
6. Diener, E., Emmons, R A., Larsen, R. J. & Griffen, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
7. Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276–302.
8. Glidden, L.M., Billing F.J., & Jobe, B.M. (2006). Personality, Coping Style and Well-being of Parents rearing children with developmental disability, *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 50 (12), 949 –962.
9. Goldberg, D. P. & Hillier, Y. F. (1979). A scaled version of the General Health Questionnaire. *Psychological Medicine*, 9, 139-145.
10. Homel, R., & Burns, A.(1989).Environment Quality and the Well-Being of Children. *Social Indicators Research*, 21(2), 133-158.
11. Huebner, E.S. (1991a). Initial development of the Student's Life Satisfaction Scale. *School Psychology International*, 12, 231– 240.
12. Kammann, N. R. & Flett, R. (1983). Affectometer 2: A scale to measure current levels of general happiness. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 35(2), 259-265.
13. Laumann, E., Paik, A., Glasser, D., Kang, J. H., Wang, T., Levinson, B.(2006). A cross-national study of subjective sexual well-being among older women and men: Finding from the global study of sexual attitudes and behaviour. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 35(2), 143-159.
14. Lavallee, L. F., & Campbell, J. D. (1995). Impact of personal goals on self-regulation processes elicited by daily negative events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 341–352.

15. Levi, L. (1987). Fitting work to human capacities and needs: Improvements in the contents and organization of work. *Psychological Factors at Work*.
16. Lu, L. (2000). Gender and conjugal differences in happiness (Electronic version). *Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(1).
17. McGillivray, M. (2007). Human Well-Being: Issues, Concepts and Measures. In Mark McGillivray, Human Well-Being: Concept and Measurement. *UNU Winder*.
18. Naik, D.p. (2011), Analytical Study of family self concept and Gender. *Golden Research Thought, 2* (1)34.
19. Nezlek, J. B., & Plesko, R. M. (2001). Day-to-day relationships among self-concept clarity, self-esteem, daily events, and mood. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 201–211.
20. Okun, M. & Stock, W. A. (1987) Correlates and Components of Subjective Well Being. *Journal of American Psychology, 71* 492-497.
21. Peerzada N. (2015). Modernization of Male & Female Higher Secondary School Students- A Comparative Study. *Academia Arena: 5* (2). <http://www.sciencepub.net/academia>.
22. Phillips, B.N. (1993). Educational and psychological perspectives on stress in students, teachers, and parents. *Clinical Psychological Publishing Company*.
23. Purkey, W. W., & Schmidt, J. (1987). The inviting relationship: An expanded perspective for professional counseling. *Englewood Cliffs*.
24. Purohit, P. (2006). Spiritual intelligence: A contemporary concern with regard to living status of senior citizens. *Journal of Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 32*(3), 227-233.
25. Rowlinson, R.T., & Felner, R.D. (1988). Major life events, hassles, and adaptations in adolescence: Confounding in the conceptualization and measurement of life stress and adjustment revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 432–444.
26. Sarason, I. G., Sarason, B. R., & Pierce, G. R. (1994). Social support: Global and relationshipbased levels of analysis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11*, 295–312
27. Seligman, M. (1998). What is the good life? *American Psychological Association Monitor, 29* (10), 2.
28. Slotter, E. B., Gardner, W. L., & Finkel, E. J. (2010). Who am I without you? The influence of romantic breakup on the self-concept. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 147–160.
29. Suominen, S., Helenius, H., Blomberg, H., Uutela, A. & Koskenvuo (2000). Sense of Coherence as a predictor of subjective state of health. Retrieved from <http://www.ktt1.helsinki.fi/tero/posterit.htm>.
30. Taylor, S. E. (1995). Health psychology. *McGraw-Hill*.
31. Watson, D., David, J. P., & Suls, J. (1999). Personality, affectivity, and coping. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Coping: The psychology of what works*, 119–140. *Oxford University Press*.
32. Wissing, M. P. & Van Eeden, C. (1997). Psychological well-being: A fortigenic conceptualization and empirical clarification. *Paper presented at the Third Annual Congress of the Psychological Society of South Africa, Durban, South Africa*.