



A Study Of Psychological Well-Being Of Higher Secondary School Adolescents

Ms. Akhitha K Raghu¹, Prof. A. Shahin Sultana^{2*}

¹Ph.D Scholar, Department of Social Work, School of Social Sciences and International Studies, Pondicherry University, Puducherry, India. Email: akhithakr95@gmail.com.

^{2*}Professor, Department of Social Work, School of Social Sciences and International Studies, Pondicherry University, Puducherry, India. Email: shahin.samroh@pondiuni.ac.in

***Corresponding Author:** Prof. A. Shahin Sultana

*Professor, Department of Social Work, School of Social Sciences and International Studies, Pondicherry University, Puducherry, India. Email: shahin.samroh@pondiuni.ac.in

Citation: Ms. Akhitha K Raghu, Prof. A. Shahin Sultana, (2024), A Study Of Psychological Well-Being Of Higher Secondary School Adolescents, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 3(5), 784-788

Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v3oi5.2949

ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to compare the Psychological Well-Being of Higher Secondary School Adolescents. For this, a sample of 636 Higher Secondary School Adolescents from the various types of schools (Private=327, Government=185, and Central Government=126) was drawn using Stratified Sampling Method. All the selected subjects were administered with the Psychological Well-being Scale by Dr. Sisodia and Choudhary (2012). Subsequently, the data was analyzed using the descriptive statistical method by ANOVA test. The obtained findings revealed significant differences between Higher Secondary School Adolescents. The Satisfaction ($F=4.342, p>.05$) and Sociability ($F=7.785, p>.05$) dimensions of well-being were significant across the Type of the schools. Still, the three groups did not differ significantly on the rest of the dimensions: Efficiency, Mental Health, Interpersonal Relationship, and total Psychological Well-Being.

Keywords: Psychological Well-Being, Adolescents, Satisfaction, Efficiency, Sociability, Mental Health and Interpersonal Relationship

Introduction

It is well accepted that good health is a must for each individual's proper growth and development. However, the World Health Organization (WHO) defined Health as "a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or illness" (Ryff & Singer, 1988). Here, the word 'health' refers to "state of well-being in which the people are able to perform effectively and successfully and is able to make a contribution to their society". Well-being is the general phenomenon in everyone's life which shows that life is good. The term "well-being" is also related with the specific variety of goodness like living in a good environment being of worth to the world, being able to cope with life, enjoying life, etc. (Singh & Shyam, 2007). It is based on individual and society as to how they achieve this goal. (Archer, Probert & Gage, 1987) state that it is a process of human functioning that involves the body, mind, and spirit. It is a dynamic process that moves through social and psychological dimensions as well as health-related behaviors. However, (Levi, 1987) characterized the term well-being as a unique perspective portrayed by a sensible measure of congruity between an individual capacity, needs and potential, and environmental demands and opportunities. Psychological well-being was studied earlier in philosophy. As it gained importance, the concept of well-being started developing in other fields of psychology. Now it is a well well-known part of philosophy along with psychology. A wide range of meanings and definitions of well-being exists because of prevailing differences in terms of two basic approaches regarding well-being i.e., the hedonic approach and the eudemonic approach. The first one is the hedonic approach which focuses on happiness in life and defines well-being in terms of pleasure attainment and pain prevention. Whereas, the second approach is the eudemonic approach which focuses on meaning and level of performance in life and human potential. On the other hand, the concept of well-being within positive mental health studies is a complex construct with two main dimensions of well-being i.e., Psychological well-being and Subjective well-being (Cenksever & Akbas, 2007). However, Subjective well-being is indicated by hedonic measures, whereas Psychological well-being is indicated by eudemonic measures (Samman, 2007; Kallay & Rus, 2014). Psychological well-being is concerned with an individual's judgment about his/her frequent happiness, and satisfaction with his/her physical and mental health and it

relates to various psychological factors including life or work satisfaction (Huppert, 2009). (Diener & Diener, 1995) explained Psychological well-being as the cognitive assessment of various aspects of one's life i.e., emotional self-acceptance, and subjective well-being. Ryff's (1989) model of Psychological well-being consists of six dimensions namely 1. Autonomy, 2. Environmental Mastery, 3. Personal Growth, 4. Positive Relations with others, 5. Purpose in Life, and 6. Self-Acceptance. According to (Bhogle and Prakash, 1995), Psychological well-being covers the real meaning of life, the absence of negative ideas, personal and self-control, self-esteem, positive thinking, satisfaction, absence of tension or worries, and negative thinking. In other words, Psychological well-being is broadly defined as the happiness of one which shows that life is good, meaningful, and pleasant. From the above definitions, it can be concluded that Psychological well-being is a condition or a state of harmonious functioning of the human personality. In other words, Psychological well-being is a state of one's happiness, satisfaction, effectiveness, and harmony brought out by one's level of adjustment with the self as well as the working environment.

Review of Literature

Various studies have been conducted to date to study Psychological well-being. There are no further studies done on the relationship between Adolescent Psychological well-being and the type of school they attend. (Kaplan, 2017) found that higher levels of subjective well-being in school were associated with lower levels of emotional problems in adolescents. (Beri, 2019) found that females and urban students had higher Psychological well-being compared to males and rural students, but no significant difference was found based on the type of school. (Eryilmaz, 2011) developed a subjective well-being model for high school students, highlighting the importance of strategies and needs satisfaction in enhancing well-being. (Wijayanti, 2020) found that various dimensions of the learning environment, such as clear goals, teacher-student interaction, student-student interactions, and a constructivist learning approach, were positively correlated with adolescent subjective well-being in school.

(Pushkarna, 2015) emphasized the importance of schools in promoting well-being among adolescents, as schools provide opportunities for social and emotional well-being, character development, and academic achievement. Psychological well-being holds an important place in the learning process of higher secondary school adolescents. Therefore, considering the above indications in mind the present study has been designed to investigate the relationship between the Psychological well-being of Higher Secondary School students and the Type of Schools in which they are attending.

Objectives of the Study

- To study the Psychological well-being of Higher Secondary School Adolescents from Various types of Higher Secondary Schools.
- To know the Satisfaction of Higher Secondary School Adolescents from Various types of Higher Secondary Schools.
- To learn the Efficiency of Higher Secondary School Adolescents from Various types of Higher Secondary Schools.
- To understand the Sociability of Higher Secondary School Adolescents from Various types of Higher Secondary Schools.
- To study the Mental health of Higher Secondary School Adolescents from Various types of Higher Secondary Schools.
- To find out the Interpersonal relationship of Higher Secondary School Adolescents from Various types of Higher Secondary Schools.

Hypotheses

- Private, Government and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of Psychological Well-Being.
- Private, Government and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of Satisfaction.
- Private, Government and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of Sociability.
- Private, Government and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of Mental Health.
- Private, Government and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of interpersonal relationship.
- Private, Government and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of Efficiency.

Method

In the present research, the descriptive survey method was used. All the Higher Secondary School Adolescents

from various types of schools in Puducherry were considered as the population for the present study. However, the sample for the present study included 636 Higher Secondary School Adolescents (Private=327, Government=185, and Central Government=126) belonging to Puducherry using the Kregcie-Morgan Formula. The data was collected through a random sampling technique and then analyzed by statistical techniques i.e., mean, standard deviation, and ANOVA test.

Measure

The Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWBS-2012) developed by Dr. Devendra Singh Sisodia and Pooja Choudhary was used for the present research. The scale consists of 50 items and covers five dimensions, namely satisfaction, efficiency, sociability, mental health, and interpersonal relationships. The test-retest reliability was found to be 0.87 and the overall consistency value of the scale was 0.90. PWBS has also a sufficient degree of content validity besides the external criteria and the coefficient obtained was 0.94. The scores of each dimension were added separately to have the dimensional scores and the sum total of these scores gave the overall Well-Being score.

Results

Table 1: Mean score of difference of the mean of Psychological Well-Being of Higher Secondary School Adolescents with the Type of School

Variable		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Level of Significance
Total Psychological Well-being	Private	327	115.6606	24.65090	2.669	0.70
	Government	185	118.8000	25.81557		
	Central Government	126	112.2063	23.85031		

*p<0.01

Table 1 reveals that the mean scores of the three comparable groups i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents on the measure of Psychological Well-Being are 115.6606, 118.8000, and 112.2063 respectively. The standard deviation values are 24.65090, 25.81557, and 23.85031 respectively. The obtained ANOVA value is 2.669 which is not significant at the level of significance. It can be said that there is no significant difference in the measure of Psychological Well-Being among various types of Higher Secondary School Adolescents and the null hypothesis is accepted i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of Psychological Well-Being.

Table 2: Mean score of difference of the mean of Satisfaction of Higher Secondary School Adolescents with respect to the Type of School

Variable		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	p
Satisfaction	Private	327	23.6606	6.28596	4.342	.013
	Government	185	24.6378	6.75452		
	Central Government	126	22.4921	5.72258		

*p<0.01

Table 2 reveals that the mean scores of the three comparable groups i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents on the measure of Satisfaction are 23.66.6, 24.6378, and 22.4921 respectively. The standard deviation values are 6.28596, 6.75452, and 5.72258 respectively. The obtained ANOVA value is 4.342 which is significant at the level of significance. It can be said that there is a significant difference in the measure of Psychological Well-Being among various types of Higher Secondary School Adolescents and the null hypothesis is rejected i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of Satisfaction.

Table 3: Mean score of difference of the mean of Sociability of Higher Secondary School Adolescents with respect to the Type of School

Variable		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	p
Sociability	Private	327	24.15	6.328	7.785	.000
	Government	185	25.66	6.899		
	Central Government	126	22.74	6.302		

*p<0.01

Table 3 reveals that the mean scores of the three comparable groups i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents on the measure of Sociability are 24.15, 25.66, and 22.74 respectively. The standard deviation values are 6.328, 6.899, and 6.302 respectively. The obtained ANOVA value is 7.785 which is significant at the level of significance. It can be said that there is a significant difference in the measure of Sociability among various types of Higher Secondary School Adolescents and the null hypothesis is rejected i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of Sociability.

Table 4: Mean score of difference of the mean of Mental Health of Higher Secondary School Adolescents with respect to the Type of School

Variable		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	p
Mental Health	Private	327	24.43	6.468	.662	.516
	Government	185	25.11	6.649		
	Central Government	126	24.47	7.093		

*p<0.01

Table 4 reveals that the mean scores of the three comparable groups i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents on the measure of Mental Health are 24.43, 25.11, and 24.47 respectively. The standard deviation values are 6.468, 6.649, and 7.093 respectively. The obtained ANOVA value is 0.662 which is not significant at the level of significance. It can be said that there is no significant difference in the measure of Mental Health among various types of Higher Secondary School Adolescents and the null hypothesis is accepted i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of Mental Health.

Table 5: Mean score of difference of the mean of Interpersonal relationship of Higher Secondary School Adolescents with respect to the Type of School

Variable		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	p
Interpersonal Relationship	Private	327	21.78	6.287	.840	.432
	Government	185	21.65	6.890		
	Central Government	126	20.93	5.579		

*p<0.01

Table 5 reveals that the mean scores of the three comparable groups i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents on the measure of Interpersonal Relationship are 21.78, 21.65, and 20.93 respectively. The standard deviation values are 6.287, 6.890, and 5.579 respectively. The obtained ANOVA value is 0.840 which is not significant at the level of significance. It can be said that there is no significant difference in the measure of Interpersonal Relationships among various types of Higher Secondary School Adolescents and the null hypothesis is accepted i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of interpersonal relationship.

Table 6: Mean score of difference of the mean of Efficiency of Higher Secondary School Adolescents with respect to the Type of School

Variable		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	p
Efficiency	Private	327	21.64	5.603	.034	.967
	Government	185	21.74	5.502		
	Central Government	126	21.58	5.859		

*p<0.01

Table 6 reveals that the mean scores of the three comparable groups i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents on the measure of Efficiency are 21.64, 21.74, and 21.58 respectively. The standard deviation values are 5.603, 5.502, and 5.859 respectively. The obtained ANOVA value is 0.034 which is not significant at the significance level. It can be said that there is no significant difference in the measure of Efficiency among various types of Higher Secondary School Adolescents and the null hypothesis is accepted i.e., Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the measure of Efficiency.

Discussion and Conclusion:

The obtained findings of the study revealed that Private, Government, and Central Government School Adolescents showed significant differences on the two dimensions of Psychological Well-Being namely Satisfaction and Sociability. The Government School Adolescents obtained higher mean scores when compared to Private and Central Government School Adolescents on two dimensions of Psychological Well-Being i.e., Satisfaction and Sociability. However, the Government School Adolescents do not differ significantly on the Satisfaction and Sociability dimensions of Psychological Well-Being. From these results, it can be concluded that Adolescents in Government Higher Secondary Schools do not feel as good as Adolescents from Private and Central Government Higher Secondary Schools. The results also showed that the overall Psychological Well-Being of Government Higher Secondary School Adolescents was better than that of Private and Central Government Higher Secondary School Adolescents. This is because the facilities, resources, and environment provided to the Government Higher Secondary School Adolescents are much better than the Private and Central Government Higher Secondary School Adolescents. The obtained results support the findings of (Kamaruddin, 2015) and (Pushkarna, 2015) who found no significant mean difference in the Psychological Well-Being of Private, Government, and Central Government Higher Secondary School Adolescents. This clearly tells us that the type of school is one of the factors that affect the total Psychological Well-Being and its dimensions of Adolescents from Private, Government, and Central Government Higher Secondary Schools. This study helped us to understand the Adolescents studying in varied schools and the challenges they face. It also provides an overview for the kind of interventions necessary at this juncture. Scope for social work practice in the school setting is also of great demand and this study reveals the need for the same.

References

1. Archer, J. (1987). College students' attitudes toward wellness. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28(4). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ362074>
2. Beri, N. (2019). Psychological Well-Being Among Adolescents: A Differential Study. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Psychological-Well-Being-Among-Adolescents%3A-A-Study-Beri-Pathak/c640e31a623e41e4544ed8f7cc317a209013a0a9>
3. Bhogle S, Prakash IJ. Development of the psychological well-being (PWB) Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Clinical Studies* 1995; 11:5-9.
4. Cenkseven F, Akbas T. Investigation of predictors of subjective and psychological well-being in university students. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi* 2007;27(3):43-65.
5. Diener E, Diener M. Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1995; 68:653-663.
6. Eryilmaz, A. (2011). A Model of Subjective Well-Being for Adolescents in High School. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 13(2), 275–289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-011-9263-9>
7. Huppert FA. Psychological well-being: Evidence regarding its causes and consequences. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-being* 2009; 1:137-164. Ryff CD Singer B. Contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry* 1998;9(1):1-28.
8. Kaplan, Y. (2017). School-Specific Subjective Wellbeing and Emotional Problems among High School Adolescents. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/School%E2%80%93Specific-Subjective-Wellbeing-and-Emotional-Kaplan/f527ca281420152ea76085af082fb6ec36d38222>
9. Pushkarna, M. (2015). Adolescent's Well-Being and Role of School. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Adolescent's-Well-Being-and-Role-of-School-Pushkarna-Veeraraghavan/ffa2886c653002df12e0654583a1c9576fd8fd98>
10. Ryff CD. Happiness Is Everything, or Is It? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1989;57(6):1069- 1081.
11. Singh R, Shyam R. *Psychology of Well-being*, New Delhi: Global Vision Publishing House 2007.
12. Sisodia DS, Choudhary P. *Manual of Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWBS)*. National Psychological Association: Agra 2012.
13. Wijayanti, P. a. K. (2020). Factors Affecting Subjective Well-Being in School. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Factors-Affecting-Subjective-Well-Being-In-School-Wijayanti-Yudiana/67d88538478adf68ec92f1181b8f881e56266c91>