PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL BEING AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS IN DINDIGUL, TAMILNADU

Authors: Dr.G.Gayathri, Assistant Professor, Anugraha Institute of Social Sciences, Dindigul and

Dr.Bindya Yohannan, Family Counsellor, Parihar vanitha sahaya vani, Bangalore

ABSTRACT:

Education is the tool which is responsible for our societal and personal development. Education has the power to transform our country, society and in any individual. It can give birth to a civilized world. India, one of the fast growing and developing nations of the world, In science and technology, it is doing at par with other developed nations, and markable achievements are being touched. But in health or human growth, most of the population is not clear about the importance of health and human potentials. Many portions of the population are not aware of the positive aspects of human beings that can help them to flourish.

Especially the younger generation i.e. the students who are perusing their education in college both in Under Graduation & Post Graduation shall be considered vital to be focused in understanding the level of psychological well-being. Being with good mental health will address the youth unrest and to utilize their skills in an effective way. This study focus on measuring the level of Psychological well being among college students in Dindigul.

INTRODUCTION:

The Medical Model of Mental Health got shift decades ago from treatment approach to prevention and maintenance approach; gave importance to positive aspects of the human beings. The mental health sector was so strongly dominated by negative aspects of diseases that the promotion of positive aspects of functioning was nearly neglected in the process of treatment (Maddux, 2002). In the year 2000, Seligman & Csikszentmihaly advised against the risk of the existing medical model; reducing people to their problems and disabilities as a consequence of the illness focused approach.

In this regard, they highlighted the basic necessity for a paradigm shift in the field of psychology. This shift resulted in a more holistic framework of mental health, in which the promotion of mental health and positive functioning is an important aspect of the model.

In this way, it becomes obvious that the definition of mental health as the absence of illness is too narrow and needs to be broadened (Seligmann & Csikszentmihaly, 2000). Besides, the World Health Organization renewed its definition of mental health in 2005: Mental health is "A state of well-being in which

the individual realizes his or her abilities, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and fruitfully and can contribute to his or her community." (WHO, 2005).

As a reaction to the above-mentioned paradigm shift that emphasizes the role of strengths and positive functioning, the field of positive psychology, as a science of Well-being and positive emotions, has emerged (Seligman and Csikszentmihaly, 2000). The concept of well-being is a core element of positive psychology. This makes it important to investigate the role of well-being in mental health promotion.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Evidence that suggests that university students are vulnerable to mental health problems has generated increased public concern in Western societies (Stanley and Manthorpe, 2001).

Academics are an integral part of the life of all college students, and without a healthy attitude toward academic goals, students can be plagued with crippling bouts of stress. While academics can be perceived as a positive challenge, potentially increasing learning capacity and competency, if viewed negatively, this stress can be detrimental to the student's mental health (Kumaraswamy, 2013; Murphy and Archer, 1996).

A student reacts to college in a variety of ways. For some students, college is stressful because it is an abrupt change from high school and others separation from home is a source of stress. Although some source of stress is necessary for personal growth to occur , the amount of stress can overwhelm a student and affect the ability to cope (Kumarasamy, 2013).

College students frequently have more complex problems today than they did over a decade ago. The common stressors in college include greater academic demands, changes in family relations, changes in social life, exposure to new people ideas and temptations. Some of the salient problems specific to college students are, time pressure, fear of failure, struggle to establish identity, the pressure of academic excellence and tough competence. Emotional problems such as feel inferior to others, not able to think properly, worrying too much, feel life is not worth living. Feel anxious without any apparent reason (Kumarasamy, 2013).

Academic pressures of meeting grade requirements, test taking, the volume of material to be learned and time management has been shown to be a significant source of stress for students (Crocker and Luhtanen, 2003; Kumaraswamy, 2013; Misra and McKean, 2000).

Among college students, depression has been found to be associated with unhealthy behaviors, such as binge drinking, physical inactivity, poor diet, high stress, anxiety, loneliness, poor body image, interpersonal issues, discrimination, and other mental health symptoms (Schofield et al., 2016).

A study among undergraduate medical students in the United States of America found that 23% had clinical depression and 57% were under psychological stress (Mosely et al., 1994). For example, one study found that only 27.5% of adolescents identified anxiety and 42.4% identified depression as being mental health-related (Olsson & Kennedy, 2010).

Untreated mental disorders have the potential to impact social relationships, productivity and academic success (Hunt and Eisenberg, 2010). This study seeks to explore the experience of the undergraduate students regarding psychological wellbeing and to ascertain their mental health status.

AIM:

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between the Psychological well-being, among the College Students in Dindigul.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To understand the Socio Demographic profile of college students in Dindigul.
2. To measure the level of the subject variables i.e Psychological Well-being, among the respondents.
3. To understand the influence of certain Socio demographic variables on the subject variables: Psychological well-being among the respondents.
4. To ascertain correlations among the key variables.

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE:

Every study can be disguised on the basis of the objectives and approaches. The Present study tries to determine the relationship between the Psychological well-being among the College Students in Dindigul.

Research Design:

On the demand of the study, descriptive survey research methodology was used for investigating and collection of data to study the relationship among the variables and the Socio Demographic data

i.e. gender, age, degree pursuing, place of living & Participation of the respondents in Co-curricular activities.

Hypotheses:

1. Domicile of the respondents have a influence on the level of Psychological well-being.
2. Level of Psychological well-being among the respondents differ with regard to the Gender of the respondents.

SAMPLING:

The study was conducted at Anugraha College of Social Sciences. It is a Self financing college that was established in 2012. It is arts and science college affiliated to the Madurai Kamaraj University and offers three-year degree programmes and two-year postgraduate courses. The college caters the educational needs of more than 600 students.

The students were briefed about the nature of the study. The students were asked that their participation was entirely voluntary and they could stop filling up questionnaires at any point without assigning any reasons. Informed consent was obtained from students of each year who have expressed their willingness for the study. The universe for the study is 400 under graduate students and 200 PG students, and from that total of 100 students (51 male and 49 female) were taken for the study using random sampling method.

TOOL FOR DATA COLLECTION:

A Socio-demographic information sheet was prepared by the authors to collect background information of the students like Age, Gender, Domicile, No of Siblings, Family income, no of bread winners in the Family etc. The Psychological General Well-Being Index (PGWBI) was developed by Dupuy (1984) and is a multi-dimensional questionnaire used to assess an individual's self-representation of his/her intrapersonal, affective or emotional state. The instrument consists of 22 items, which are subdivided into six categories: anxiety, a depressed mood, a sense of positive wellbeing, self control, general health, and vitality. Since various dimensions or aspects of psychological wellbeing are included in this measuring instrument, it offers a good and comprehensive indication of psychological well-being.

Each of the 22 questions has six possible response categories. Although a total score can be determined for the measuring instrument (the total score can vary between 22 and 132, with a lower score

indicating a lower level of psychological wellbeing), a score can also be determined separately for each subscale, and these will be used in this study.

Statistical technique used:

In order to study the distribution of scores of the college students" descriptive statistics like mean, median, mode, standard deviation, was calculated.

✓ Independent Sample T test was used to compare difference between boys and girls i.e Gender, level of study for the key variable.

✓ Karl Pearson co-relation was used to find out the relationship among the key variable.

✓ One way Anova was used to find out the difference among the Birth order and age of the respondents with regard to the Key variables.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data:

Analysis and interpretation of the obtained data were made by keeping in mind the objectives of the study. The descriptions of calculation and results obtained have been systematically.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Socio-demographic Profile of Respondents:

The majority of the respondents (83%) ranging from the age group of 20 to 22 years. The vast majority came from Rural area (66%) and the remaining from urban background. The majority (65%) of the respondents' studying under graduation course and rest of them are pursuing post graduation. 49% of them had only one sibling, and 24% had two siblings. Majority of the students have only one sibling (66%) and remaining 44% have 2 siblings. The father was the main bread winner of the family in most families, and the majority (52%) were engaged in farming and others were employed as laborers in private concern. They reported total monthly family income ranged from Rupees 5000 to 20,000. The socio-demographic profile shows a lower middle-class background with low income on a whole and their place of residence is in the rural area.

Psychological Wellbeing among College Students

With regard to the various sub-dimensions of psychological wellbeing, Table 1 reveals that the overall psychological general wellbeing for the majority of the students was "high" on the cumulative psychological general wellbeing score (53%) as well as all its sub-dimension namely positive wellbeing (61%), self-control (51%), general health (50%), vitality (55%). Besides, high score for the other dimensions of psychological general wellbeing like anxiety (54%), and depressed mood (56%).

Table 1. Sub-dimensions of Psychological General Wellbeing Index

Sub-dimensions	Low	High	Median
Anxiety	42%	54%	12
Depressed mood	40%	56%	10
Positive wellbeing	34%	61%	10
Self-control	48%	51%	12
General health	50%	50%	8
Vitality	41%	55%	10
Overall psychological general well being	45%	53%	62

Hypothesis No.1: Domicile of the respondents have influence on the level of psychological well-being.

To test this Hypothesis One way Anova has been applied and Table.No.2 indicates the significant statistical difference on PGWBI dimensions such as anxiety, positive wellbeing, and overall psychological general wellbeing. The resulting F values were not significant with the other PGWBI sub-dimensions namely depressed mood, self-control, general health and vitality and it shall be concluded that Psychological well being variable do not differ according to the domicile of the students.

Table 2. Domicile and dimensions of PGWBI

Domicile	df	X	Statistical Sig
Anxiety	2	G1= 18.8000	F= 3.458 $P < 0.05$
		G2= 12.5000	
	97	G3= 9.5556	Significant
Depressed mood	2	G1= 9.8267	F= 1.738
		G2= 10.9375	
	97	G3= 9.5556	$P > 0.05$ Not Significant
Positive wellbeing	2	G1= 10.0933	F= 6.523 $P < 0.05$
		G2= 12.5000	
	97	G3= 7.4444	Significant
Self-control	2	G1= 11.6667	F= 0.309 $P > 0.05$
		G2= 11.0625	
	97	G3= 11.2222	Not Significant
General health	2	G1= 8.7200	
		G2= 9.7500	F= 0.878 $P > 0.05$
	97	G3= 8.2222	Not Significant
Vitality	2	G1= 10.9333	F= 0.039 $P > 0.05$
		G2= 10.8750	
	97	G3= 10.6667	Not Significant
Overall psychological general well being	2	G1= 62.0400	F= 3.650 $P < 0.05$
		G2= 67.6250	
	97	G3= 56.6667	Significant

G1= Rural   G2= Urban G3= Semi-urban

Hypothesis 2: Level of Psychological well-being among the respondents differ with regard to the Gender of the respondents.

To compare the status of the gender on the key variables, *t*-test was applied. It is seen that there is no gender-based significant difference noticed in the PGWS sub-dimensions such as anxiety, self-control, general health, psychological general wellbeing and total psychological general wellbeing score. The mean score comparison for the sub-dimensions of psychological general wellbeing indicates a higher mean among the male students with respect to anxiety, self-control, general health, vitality and total psychological general wellbeing.

There is, however, a significant difference for respondents classified according to their gender and other PGWBI sub-dimensions like depressed mood and positive well-being. The mean score shows that the female students have high depressed mood score compared to their male counter parts and female students have high positive wellbeing score than the male students.

Table 3. Gender and dimensions of Psychological General Wellbeing index

Gender	X	S.D	Statistical Inference
Anxiety Male	11.1569	2.64875	t= 0.677 P>0.05 Not significant
Female	10.7551	3.26299	
Depressed Mood Male	9.4902	2.52486	t= 2.219 P<0.05 significant
Female	10.4849	1.95703	
Positive Wellbeing Male Female	9.0196	3.47845	t= 3.648 P<0.05 significant
	11.5102	3.34242	
Self-control Male	11.6667	2.36361	t= 0.458 P>0.05 Not significant
Female	11.3878	3.61603	

General Health Male	9	3.44674	t= 0.512 P>0.05 Not significant
Female	8.6735	2.89675	
Vitality Male	10.8824	2.79748	t= 0.066 P>0.05 Not significant
Female	10.9184	2.62866	
Overall psychological well being			t= 1.220 t= 0.066 P>0.05 Not significant
Male	61.2157	9.7986	
Female	63.7347	10.84315	

Correlation among the subject Dimensions among the Key variables:

Pearson correlation coefficients were applied among the subject dimensions studied as well as with other numerical background variables such age. (Table.4) shows a highly significant positive correlation between the positive well-being and depressed mood scores. Highly significant positive correlation is seen between general health and anxiety, depressed mood and self-control scores as well. There is a significant correlation between the vitality and anxiety, positive wellbeing, self-control scores as well as the overall psychological general wellbeing and anxiety, depressed mood, positive well-being, self-control, general health and vitality scores. In terms of the background variable, age did not enter into any significant correlation with any of the PGWBI sub-dimensions.

Table 4. Inter correlation matrix for Subject Dimensions

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Anxiety	1						
Depressed Mood	.233[*]	1					
Positive Wellbeing	0.157	.377[*]	1				
Self-control	.382[*]	0.131	0.056	1			
General Health	.326[*]	.297[*]	0.01	.290[*]	1		
Vitality	.276[*]	0.133	.271[*]	.234[*]	-0.043	1	
Overall Psychological	.677[*]	.585[*]	.568[*]	.600[*]	.543[**]	.520[**]	1
[*]**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level: ** Correlation is significant**							

DISCUSSION:

The major findings concludes that there is a high level of overall psychological general well-being. Higher levels of student anxiety and depressed mood stage has also been reported by other studies (e.g., Beiter, Nash, McCrady, Rhoades, Lincomb, Clarahan & Sammut, 2014). It may be because newly faced social and intellectual challenges may cause emotional pressure, which may lead to an increased risk for depression, anxiety, and stress (Bayram & Bilgel, 2008). The anxiety level was high with the rural students, whereas the urban students had better positive wellbeing and overall psychological general wellbeing.

No significant gender differences in terms of anxiety, general health, self-control, vitality and overall psychological general well-being were seen in this study. However, the gender of the students differentiated them in terms of depressed mood and positive wellbeing. A higher level of depressed mood score was found among the female students. Similarly, previous studies have investigated mental distress among college students using other survey methods, and rating scales found higher levels of depression

among female students (Adewuya et al., 2006). Highly significant positive correlation is seen between the student's general health and their anxiety, depressed mood state and self-control. The students with good health status tent to have better mental health status and self-control. Vitality has a significant positive correlation with anxiety, self-control and general health of the students. Highly significant positive correlation is also seen between the overall psychological general wellbeing of the students and their anxiety, depressed mood state, positive wellbeing, self-control, general health, and vitality.

CONCLUSION:

The high rates of anxiety and depression among the college students have major implications, not only with psychological morbidity that will have adverse effects on general well-being, development, educational attainment and quality of life of the students.

- The findings suggest that the undergraduate and post graduation students need extra measures from their college to deal with anxiety and depression that they experience.
- Setting up students counselling center in colleges with the help of mental health professionals like a psychiatric social worker, psychologist and psychiatrist will help the student to deal more effectively with mental health issues.
- Life skill training programmes shall be organized to the students often so as to address their emotional & psychological need.
- The colleges can survey on a regular basis to evaluate the general wellbeing of the students. This kind of survey would help the college authorities to understand the health needs of their students and design the new programmes at the college level to improve the self-efficacy and wellbeing of the students.

References:

Adewuya AO, Ola BA, Olutayo OA, Mapayi BM, Oginni OO (2006) Depression amongst Nigerian university students. Prevalence and socio-demographic correlates. Sos Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol, 41,674–678. doi:10.1007/s00127-006-0068-9

Bayram, N., & Bilgel, N. (2008). The prevalence and socio-demographic correlations of depression, anxiety and stress among a group of university students. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol, 43 (8), 667–672. doi: 10.1007/s00127-008-0345-x

Beiter, R., Nash, R., McCrady, M., Rhoades, D., Linscomb, M., Clarahan, M., Sammutn, S. (2014). The prevalence and correlates of depression, anxiety and stress in a sample of college students. Journal of Affective Disorders, 173(2015), 90–96. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2014.10.054

Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R.K. (2003). Level of self-esteem and contingencies of selfworth: unique effects on academic, social, and financial problems in college students. Personal. Soc. Psychol. Bull, 29(6), 701–712. doi: 10.1177/0146167203029006003

Kumaraswamy, N., 2013. Academic stress, anxiety and depression among college students- a brief review. International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1(5), 135- 143.

Maddux, J. E. (2002). Self-efficacy: The power of believing you can. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 277–287). Oxford University Press.

Misra, R., & McKean, M. (2000). College students' academic stress and its relation to their anxiety, time management, and leisure satisfaction. American Journal of Health Studies, 16(1), 41.

Murphy, M., & Archer, J. (1996). Stressors on the college campus: a comparison of 1985–1993, J. Coll. Stud. Dev. 37(1), 20–2

Olsson, D. P., & Kennedy, M. G. (2010). Mental health literacy among young people in a small US town: Recognition of disorders and hypothetical helping responses. Early Intervention in Psychiatry, 4(4), 291–298. doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-7893.2010.00196.x

Schofield, M.J., Halloran, P., McLean, S.A., Knauss, F. C., & Paxton, S.J. (2016). Depressive symptoms among Australian university students: Who is at risk?. Australian Psychologist, 51(2), 135-144. doi: 10.1111/ap.12129

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5

Stanley, N., & Manthorpe, J. (2001) Responding to students' mental health needs: impermeable systems and diverse users. J Ment Health, 10(1), 41–52. doi:10.1080/2-09638230020023606