

# PSYCHOLOGICAL WELLBEING AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS: AGE GENDER AND EDUCATION

Nand Lal Kumar <sup>1</sup>, Dr. Alka Jaiswal <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, B.R.A. Bihar University, India

<sup>2</sup> Psychology department of MDDM College, B.R.A. Bihar University, India



## ABSTRACT

This study is aimed at find the difference in psychological wellbeing among college students with respect to gender, age and education of students. A standardized questionnaire is used for this study. Data is collected from 217 students of Muzaffarpur district of Bihar using convenient sampling technique. Descriptive and hypothesis testing research approach is adopted and data analysis is done with SPSS 21. The results of study reported that female have higher psychological well-being then male student in Muzaffarpur district of Bihar. It is also inferred that there is no significant difference in satisfaction, efficiency and sociability between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar while significant difference is revealed that female is significantly higher for female students then male students in mental health and interpersonal relationship. In terms of age group, there is no significant difference in psychological wellbeing in different age group of respondents. There is significant difference in sociability for age above 24 is high in comparisons to age group of 16-20 and 20-24. Also, there is significantly high among the age group of 16-20 in comparison to age group of 20-24 in case of interpersonal relationship. Although examining various variables of psychological well-being, the findings indicate that there is no notable disparity in terms of satisfaction, productivity, and mental health. When it comes to educating children, it has been determined that there is no notable disparity in the psychological well-being of pupils at different levels of school. Furthermore, it has been determined that there is no substantial disparity in the measures of psychological wellness among students with varying levels of education.

**Keywords:** Psychological Well-being, Satisfaction, Efficiency, Mental Health, Sociability and Interpersonal Relationship

## Corresponding Author

Nand Lal Kumar,  
[nandlalpatna888@gmail.com](mailto:nandlalpatna888@gmail.com)

DOI  
[10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i2.2024.2184](https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i2.2024.2184)

**Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Copyright:** © 2024 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

With the license CC-BY, authors retain the copyright, allowing anyone to download, reuse, re-print, modify, distribute, and/or copy their contribution. The work must be properly attributed to its author.



## 1. INTRODUCTION

There is a vast range of connotations that can be connected with the word "psychological well-being," which is typically associated with wellbeing. Wellness was described by the majority of research conducted in the past as the absence of mental health issues such as anxiety, depression, and other forms of mental disorders. Psychological wellness encompasses an individual's personal perception of feeling content, happy, and satisfied with their experiences and their position in the workforce. It also includes a sense of accomplishment, usefulness, belongingness, and the absence of distress, dissatisfaction, or fear.

A concern that is shared by educational institutions of higher learning all across the world is the psychological well-being of their student body. There have been a number of studies that have investigated the factors that are connected with the psychological well-being of students; however, there has been a limited amount of research that has focused on the relationship between the overall support for students and psychological well-being.

Within the context of the current study, the significance of psychological well-being among college students is investigated. The experience of happy emotions is beneficial to persons who are resilient in terms of their capacity to recover from stress in an effective manner in their day-to-day lives. This study contributes to a better understanding of the factors that contribute to an individual's psychological well-being throughout their development. The complex interactions that occur between human qualities, social and economic variables, and the physical environment all play a role in determining psychological well-being (also known as psychological health). The purpose of this study is to make an attempt to achieve an understanding of the process of psychological health and resilience in the growth of college students.

#### Elements That Contribute to Psychological Well-Being

Satisfaction refers to the act of fulfilling desires or needs, resulting in a feeling of pleasure, enjoyment, and mental relaxation. Life satisfaction encompasses the gradation of desire and the contentment that comes from possessing and enjoying what one desires.

Efficiency refers to the measure of how effectively resources are utilized in relation to the potential amount that may be achieved. Efficient power and effective agency exemplify the quality of being efficient and producing significant impact or results.

Sociability refers to the inclination or propensity to connect or associate with one's coworkers. Sociability refers to the trait or state of being sociable, which encompasses the act or occurrence of being sociable.

Mental Health - Mental health can be defined as the state of having a satisfactory level of cognitive and emotional well-being, or the absence of a mental condition. The term "mental health" can refer to either of these two alternatives. The whole psychological and emotional condition of an individual undergoing evaluation.

Interpersonal Relations: An interpersonal relationship refers to the link between two or more individuals, which might be temporary or enduring. Certain individuals engage in these kinds of relationships. This association may be based on limerence, love, liking, regular business meetings, or any other type of social commitment.

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A study conducted by Rathi (2007) found that the well-being of male and female students during the adolescent era did not differ significantly from one another.

According to the findings of Gill (2007), there was no distinguishable difference between male and female college students in terms of their psychological well-being.

It was found by Kaur (2015) that there was no significant difference between the psychological well-being of male and female pupils attending secondary schools.

According to Akter (2015), ladies have a higher level of psychological well-being for themselves than males do.

Within the population of college students, Kotar (2013) discovered that there is no statistically significant difference in the mean level of psychological wellness between male and female students.

According to Stone and Mackie (2013), it indicates that an individual is able to independently assess his or her own level of happiness. There are a variety of approaches to well-being that are connected to one another.

While Ryff and Keyes (1995) and Roothman and colleagues (2003) discovered that there was no difference between males and girls in terms of spirituality.

## 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

- To study the significant difference in psychological wellbeing between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar.

- To study the significant difference in dimensions of psychological wellbeing between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar.
- To study the significant difference in psychological wellbeing in different age group of students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar
- To study the significant difference in dimensions of psychological wellbeing in different age group of students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar.
- To study the significant difference in psychological wellbeing in different education level of students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar
- To study the significant difference in dimensions of psychological wellbeing in different education level of students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar.

### **3.2. RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS**

- H1: there is significant difference in psychological wellbeing between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar
- H2: there is significant difference in Satisfaction between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar
- H3: there is significant difference in Efficiency between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar
- H4: there is significant difference in Mental Health between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar
- H5: there is significant difference in Sociability between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar
- H6: there is significant difference in Interpersonal relationship between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar
- H7: there is significant difference in psychological wellbeing in different age group of students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar
- H8: there is significant difference in dimensions of psychological wellbeing in different age group of students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar.
- H9: there is significant difference in psychological wellbeing in different education level of students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar
- H10: there is significant difference in dimensions of psychological wellbeing in different education level of students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar.

### **3.3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS**

- Research design – Descriptive and Hypotheses testing research design adopted for this study.
- Population – Male and female college going students of Muzaffarpur district of Bihar.
- Sample – Data is collected from 217 college going students of Muzaffarpur district of Bihar.
- Research Instrument - Sisodia and Choudhary (2012) developed and standardised the scale of psychological wellbeing. A five-point scale is used to evaluate each of the fifty items. (1) Satisfaction, (2) Efficiency, (3) Sociability, (4) Mental Health, and (5) Interpersonal Relationships are the five subscales that make up the overall scale.
- Sampling technique – A convenient sampling technique is used for data collection.
- Data Analysis – SPSS will be used for data analysis and interpretations.
- Statistical tests – Descriptive analysis, Reliability analysis, Independent sample t-test and One-way Anova are used for this study.

## 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### 4.1. SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

Sample is described in terms of age, gender and education.

**Table 1.** Age group of respondents

Age	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
16-20	71	32.7	32.7
20-24	122	56.2	88.9
Above 24	24	11.1	100.0
Total	217	100.0	

From Table 1, it is reported that the highest number of respondents are in the age group of 20- 24 followed 16-20 and least number of respondents are above the age of 24.

**Table 2.** Gender of respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female	109	50.2	50.2
Male	108	49.8	100.0
Total	217	100.0	

From Table 2, it is reported that the almost equal number of respondents are belonging to male and female gender although slightly higher.

**Table 3.** Education of respondents

Education	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Intermediate	17	7.8	7.8
Graduation	182	83.9	91.7
Post Graduation	18	8.3	100.0
Total	217	100.0	

From Table 3, it is reported that the highest number of respondents are graduation students followed by post-graduation then intermediate.

### 4.2. RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

Reliability test is conducted to measure the reliability of instrument used in this study.

**Table 4.** Reliability results

S.N.	Variable	Dimension	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Psychological well being		50	0.811
1a.		Satisfaction	10	0.778
1b.		Efficiency	10	0.787
1c.		Sociability	10	0.744
1d.		Mental health	10	0.758
1e.		Interpersonal Relation	10	0.734

From Table 4, it is reported that Cronbach's Alpha is above .7 for all dimensions of psychological wellbeing and variable itself.

### 4.3. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Descriptive analysis is conducted to study the level of variable and its dimensions and reported in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Descriptive results

Variable / Dimensions	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
PWB	217	134.00	248.00	183.447	18.4081
Satisfaction	217	22.00	50.00	37.686	4.9910
Efficiency	217	18.00	50.00	36.903	5.9810
Mental Health	217	20.00	50.00	35.663	5.9529
Sociability	217	19.00	50.00	35.539	6.1410
Interpersonal relationship	217	20.00	50.00	37.654	6.3212

From Table 5, the mean of PWB is 183.447 with range of 134 to 248. The highest mean is reported for satisfaction (37.686) with range of 22 to 50; followed by interpersonal relationship (37.654) with range of 22 to 50 then efficiency (36.903) with range of 18 to 50. Out five dimensions, low mean is reported for sociability and mental health with range of 19 to 50 and 18 to 50 respectively.

#### 4.4. TEST OF DIFFERENCE

Test of difference is conducted to study the difference in variable and dimensions based on classification of demographic factors.

##### 4.4.1. INDEPENDENT SAMPLE T-TEST

Independent sample t-test is conducted to study the difference in psychological wellbeing between male and female students.

**Table 6.** Group statistics of psychological wellbeing (PWB)

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PWB				
Female	109	187.1927	22.19838	2.12622
Male	108	179.6667	12.56832	1.20939

From Table 6, it is reported that female students are high in psychological wellbeing as compared to male students.

**Table 7.** Independent sample t-test results of psychological wellbeing

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
PWB	EVA	14.599	.000	3.069	215	.002	7.52599	2.45194
	EVNA			3.077	171.109	.002	7.52599	2.44610

[ EVA- Equal variances assumed and EVNA - Equal variances not assumed]

From Table 7, the value of p is less than 0.002 which is less than 0.05. it means there is significant difference in psychological wellbeing between male and female students. From Table 6 and Table 7, it is interpreted that there is significant difference in psychological wellbeing in male and female students. Thereby, the proposed alternate hypothesis H1 is accepted and null is rejected. It is inferred that female have higher psychological well-being then male student in Muzaffarpur district of Bihar.

**Table 8.** Group Statistics of dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing

Dimensions	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Satisfaction	Female	109	38.0734	5.52219	.52893
	Male	108	37.2963	4.38191	.42165
Efficiency	Female	109	37.4220	6.22018	.59579
	Male	108	36.3796	5.71065	.54951
Mental Health	Female	109	36.7064	6.18436	.59235
	Male	108	34.6111	5.54140	.53322

Sociability	Female	109	35.8532	6.18215	.59214
	Male	108	35.2222	6.11163	.58809
Interpersonal relationship	Female	109	39.1376	6.37046	.61018
	Male	108	36.1574	5.93290	.57089

From table 8, it is reported that mean of female students are higher for all five dimensions of psychological wellbeing then male students.

**Table 9. T-test results of dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	M. D.	S.E.D.
Satisfaction	EVA	2.487	.116	1.148	215	.252	.77710	.67714
	EVNA			1.149	205.226	.252	.77710	.67643
Efficiency	EVA	.455	.501	1.286	215	.200	1.04239	.81083
	EVNA			1.286	213.764	.200	1.04239	.81051
Mental Health	EVA	.367	.545	2.628	215	.009	2.09531	.79740
	EVNA			2.629	212.866	.009	2.09531	.79700
Sociability	EVA	.523	.470	.756	215	.450	.63099	.83460
	EVNA			.756	214.999	.450	.63099	.83456
Interpersonal relationship	EVA	.176	.675	3.565	215	.000	2.98021	.83588
	EVNA			3.567	214.182	.000	2.98021	.83561

[ EVA- Equal variances assumed, EVNA - Equal variances not assumed, M.D.- Mean Difference and S.E.D. - Std. Error Difference]

From Table 9, the value of p is more than .05 for satisfaction, efficiency and sociability while less than .05 for mental health and interpersonal relationship. Based on results of table 8 and 9, it is interpreted that there is no significant difference in satisfaction, efficiency and sociability while there is significant in mental health and interpersonal relationship. Thereby, the proposed alternate hypotheses H2, H3 and H5 are rejected while hypotheses H2 and H5 are accepted. It is inferred that there is no significant difference in satisfaction, efficiency and sociability between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar while significant difference in mental health and interpersonal relationship. It is also inferred that female are significantly higher for female students then male students.

#### 4.4.2. ONE WAY ANOVA

One – way Anova is conducted to test the difference in variables with age group and education in following sections.

##### 4.4.2.1. ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR PWB WITH AGE GROUP OF RESPONDENTS

In this analysis, difference in psychological wellbeing is studied in terms of age group of respondents.

**Table 10. Descriptive results of PWB**

Age Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
16-20	71	185.4507	22.54506	2.67561	180.1144	190.7870
20-24	122	182.7295	16.19613	1.46633	179.8265	185.6325
Above 24	24	181.1667	15.32451	3.12810	174.6957	187.6376
Total	217	183.4470	18.40814	1.24963	180.9840	185.9100

From Table 10, the highest mean is reported for the age group of 16-24 followed by 20-24 then above 24.

**Table 11. Anova Results of PWB**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	472.656	2	236.328	.695	.500
Within Groups	72720.985	214	339.818		
Total	73193.641	216			

From Table 11, it is reported that value of p is .05 which indicated least possibility of significant difference in PWB with respect to age group. It would be checked from multiple comparisons results.

**Table 12. Multiple comparisons results**

Dependent Variable: PWB							
(I) Age			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
LSD	16-20	20-24	2.72120	2.75165	.324	-2.7026	8.1450
		above 24	4.28404	4.35261	.326	-4.2954	12.8635
	20-24	16-20	-2.72120	2.75165	.324	-8.1450	2.7026
		above 24	1.56284	4.11637	.705	-6.5510	9.6767
	Above 24	16-20	-4.28404	4.35261	.326	-12.8635	4.2954
		20-24	-1.56284	4.11637	.705	-9.6767	6.5510

From table 12, it is reported that value of p is more than .05 for all pairs of age group Thereby, the proposed alternate hypothesis H7 is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference in psychological wellbeing in different age group of respondents.

#### 4.4.2.2. ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR DIMENSIONS OF PWB WITH AGE GROUP OF STUDENTS

In this analysis, difference in dimensions of psychological wellbeing is studied in terms of age group of students.

**Table 13. Descriptive results of Dimensions of PWB with age group of students**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Satisfaction	16-20	71	38.591	5.4943	.6520	37.291	39.892
	20-24	122	37.336	4.8474	.4388	36.467	38.204
	Above 24	24	36.791	3.7990	.7754	35.187	38.395
	Total	217	37.686	4.9910	.3388	37.018	38.354
Efficiency	16-20	71	37.887	5.5896	.6633	36.564	39.210
	20-24	122	36.303	6.2070	.5619	35.190	37.415
	Above 24	24	37.041	5.7670	1.177	34.606	39.476
	Total	217	36.903	5.9810	.4060	36.103	37.703
Mental Health	16-20	71	35.408	6.3145	.7494	33.913	36.903
	20-24	122	35.745	5.5231	.5000	34.755	36.735
	Above 24	24	36.000	7.1139	1.452	32.996	39.004
	Total	217	35.663	5.9529	.4041	34.867	36.460
Sociability	16-20	71	34.507	6.7799	.8046	32.902	36.111
	20-24	122	36.532	5.6673	.5131	35.517	37.548
	Above 24	24	33.541	5.7102	1.165	31.130	35.952



	Total	217	35.539	6.1410	.4168	34.717	36.360
Interpersonal relationship	16-20	71	39.056	6.9813	.8285	37.403	40.708
	20-24	122	36.811	6.0073	.5438	35.734	37.888
	Above 24	24	37.791	5.2168	1.064	35.588	39.994
	Total	217	37.654	6.3212	.4291	36.808	38.500

From table 13, the descriptive results are reported for five dimensions of psychological wellbeing with respect of different age group of students.

**Table 14. Anova results of dimensions of PWB with age group**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Satisfaction	Between Groups	92.357	2	46.178	1.869	.157
	Within Groups	5288.335	214	24.712		
	Total	5380.691	216			
Efficiency	Between Groups	113.132	2	56.566	1.590	.206
	Within Groups	7613.836	214	35.579		
	Total	7726.968	216			
Mental Health	Between Groups	8.165	2	4.082	.114	.892
	Within Groups	7646.278	214	35.730		
	Total	7654.442	216			
Sociability	Between Groups	291.843	2	145.922	3.976	.020
	Within Groups	7854.074	214	36.701		
	Total	8145.917	216			
Interpersonal relationship	Between Groups	226.681	2	113.341	2.886	.058
	Within Groups	8404.397	214	39.273		
	Total	8631.078	216			

From Table 14, it is reported that value of p is .05 which indicated least possibility of significant difference in satisfaction, efficiency and mental health while there is possibility of significant difference in sociability and interpersonal relationship with respect to education. It would be checked from multiple comparisons results.

**Table 15. Multiple Comparison of dimensions of PWB with Age Group**

Dependent Variable				Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Satisfaction	LSD	16-20	20-24	1.2554	.742	.092	-.2071	2.718
			Above 24	1.7998	1.173	.127	-.5137	4.113
		20-24	16-20	-1.2558	.7420	.092	-2.718	.2071
			Above 24	.54440	1.110	.624	-1.643	2.732
		Above 24	16-20	-1.799	1.173	.127	-4.113	.5137
			20-24	-.5444	1.110	.624	-2.732	1.643
Efficiency	LSD	16-20	20-24	1.5840	.8903	.077	-.1709	3.339
			Above 24	.84566	1.408	.549	-1.930	3.621
		20-24	16-20	-1.584	.8903	.077	-3.339	.1709
			Above 24	-.7383	1.331	.580	-3.363	1.887
		Above 24	16-20	-.8456	1.408	.549	-3.621	1.930
			20-24	.73839	1.331	.580	-1.887	3.363
Mental Health	LSD	16-20	20-24	-.3374	.8922	.706	-2.096	1.421



			Above 24	-.5915	1.411	.676	-3.373	2.190
		20-24	16-20	.33745	.8922	.706	-1.421	2.096
			Above 24	-.2541	1.334	.849	-2.885	2.376
			16-20	.59155	1.411	.676	-2.190	3.373
		Above 24	20-24	.25410	1.334	.849	-2.376	2.885
Sociability	LSD	16-20	20-24	-2.025*	.9043	.026	-3.808	-.243
			Above 24	.96538	1.430	.500	-1.854	3.784
		20-24	16-20	2.0257*	.9043	.026	.2433	3.808
			Above 24	2.9911*	1.352	.028	.3246	5.657
		Above 24	16-20	-.9653	1.430	.500	-3.784	1.854
			20-24	-2.991*	1.352	.028	-5.657	-.324
Interperson al relationship	LSD	16-20	20-24	2.2448*	.9354	.017	.4010	4.088
			Above 24	1.2646	1.479	.394	-1.652	4.181
		20-24	16-20	-2.244*	.9354	.017	-4.088	-.401
			Above 24	-.9801	1.399	.484	-3.738	1.778
		Above 24	16-20	-1.264	1.479	.394	-4.181	1.652
			20-24	.98019	1.399	.484	-1.778	3.738

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

From table 15, it is reported that value of p is more than .05 for all pairs of age group except sociability and interpersonal relationship. It is inferred that there is no significant difference in satisfaction, efficiency and mental health. There is significant difference in sociability for age above 24 is high in comparisons to age group of 16-20 and 20-24. Also, there is significantly high among the age group of 16-20 in comparison to age group of 20-24 in case of interpersonal relationship. Thereby, the proposed alternate hypothesis H8 is partially accepted.

#### 4.4.2.3. ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR PWB WITH EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS

In this analysis, difference in psychological wellbeing is studied in terms of education of students.

**Table 16. Descriptive results of PWB with education of students**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Intermediate	17	178.882	13.7244	3.3286	171.825	185.938
Graduation	182	183.851	17.9937	1.3337	181.219	186.483
Post Graduation	18	183.666	25.6583	6.0477	170.907	196.426
Total	217	183.447	18.4081	1.2496	180.984	185.910

From table 16, the descriptive results are reported for psychological wellbeing with respect of different education of students.

**Table 17. Anova results of dimensions of PWB with education**

PWB					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	384.881	2	192.441	.566	.569
Within Groups	72808.759	214	340.228		
Total	73193.641	216			

From Table 17, it is reported that value of p is .05 which indicated least possibility of significant difference in PWB with respect to education. It would be checked from multiple comparisons results.

**Table 18. Multiple Comparison of PWB with Education**

Dependent Variable:	PWB						
(I) Education			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
LSD	Intermediate	Graduation	-4.96930	4.6779	.289	-14.190	4.251
		Post Graduation	-4.78431	6.2381	.444	-17.080	7.511
	Graduation	Intermediate	4.96930	4.6779	.289	-4.251	14.190
		Post Graduation	.18498	4.5575	.968	-8.798	9.168
	Post Graduation	Intermediate	4.78431	6.2381	.444	-7.511	17.080
		Graduation	-.18498	4.5575	.968	-9.168	8.7984

From table 18, it is reported that value of p is more than .05 for all pairs of education of students. It is inferred that there is no significant difference in psychological wellbeing in different level of education of students. Thereby, the proposed alternate hypothesis H9 is rejected.

#### 4.4.2.4. ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR DIMENSIONS OF PWB WITH EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS

In this analysis, difference in dimensions of psychological wellbeing is studied in terms of education of students.

Table 19. Descriptive results of Dimensions of PWB with education of students

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Satisfaction	Intermediate	17	37.2941	5.2053	1.262	34.617	39.970
	Graduation	182	37.8736	4.8308	.3580	37.167	38.580
	Post Graduation	18	36.1667	6.2895	1.482	33.038	39.294
	Total	217	37.6866	4.9910	.3388	37.018	38.354
Efficiency	Intermediate	17	36.5294	6.1554	1.492	33.364	39.694
	Graduation	182	36.6978	5.9092	.4380	35.833	37.562
	Post Graduation	18	39.3333	6.3431	1.495	36.179	42.487
	Total	217	36.9032	5.9810	.4060	36.103	37.703
Mental Health	Intermediate	17	33.4118	5.3509	1.297	30.660	36.163
	Graduation	182	35.7692	5.8998	.4373	34.906	36.632
	Post Graduation	18	36.7222	6.8066	1.604	33.337	40.107
	Total	217	35.6636	5.9529	.4041	34.867	36.460
Sociability	Intermediate	17	35.1765	6.7197	1.629	31.721	38.631
	Graduation	182	35.7802	5.9913	.4441	34.903	36.656
	Post Graduation	18	33.4444	7.0060	1.651	29.960	36.928
	Total	217	35.5392	6.1410	.4168	34.717	36.360

Interpersonal relationship	Intermediate	17	36.4706	7.2897	1.768	32.722	40.218
	Graduation	182	37.7308	6.1067	.4526	36.837	38.623
	Post Graduation	18	38.0000	7.6849	1.811	34.178	41.821
	Total	217	37.6544	6.3212	.4291	36.808	38.500

From table 19, the descriptive results are reported for five dimensions of psychological wellbeing with respect of education of students.

**Table 20. Anova results of dimensions of PWB with Education**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Satisfaction	Between Groups	50.568	2	25.284	1.015	.364
	Within Groups	5330.123	214	24.907		
	Total	5380.691	216			
Efficiency	Between Groups	116.353	2	58.177	1.636	.197
	Within Groups	7610.614	214	35.564		
	Total	7726.968	216			
Mental Health	Between Groups	108.406	2	54.203	1.537	.217
	Within Groups	7546.036	214	35.262		
	Total	7654.442	216			
Sociability	Between Groups	91.793	2	45.897	1.219	.297
	Within Groups	8054.124	214	37.636		
	Total	8145.917	216			
Interpersonal relationship	Between Groups	27.035	2	13.518	.336	.715
	Within Groups	8604.043	214	40.206		
	Total	8631.078	216			

From Table 20, it is reported that value of p is .05 which indicated least possibility of significant difference in dimensions of PWB with respect to education. It would be checked from multiple comparisons results.

**Table 21. Multiple Comparison of dimensions of PWB with Education**

Dependent Variable				Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Satisfaction	LS D	Intermediate	Graduation	-.57951	1.26569	.648	-3.0743	1.9153

Psychological Wellbeing Among College Students: Age Gender and Education

			Post Graduation	1.12745	1.68785	.505	-2.1995	4.4544
		Graduation	Intermediate	.57951	1.26569	.648	-1.9153	3.0743
			Post Graduation	1.70696	1.23312	.168	-.7237	4.1376
		Post Graduation	Intermediate	-1.12745	1.68785	.505	-4.4544	2.1995
			Graduation	-1.70696	1.23312	.168	-4.1376	.7237
Efficiency	LS D	Intermediate	Graduation	-.16839	1.51241	.911	-3.1495	2.8127
			Post Graduation	-2.80392	2.01686	.166	-6.7794	1.1715
		Graduation	Intermediate	.16839	1.51241	.911	-2.8127	3.1495
			Post Graduation	-2.63553	1.47349	.075	-5.5399	.2689
		Post Graduation	Intermediate	2.80392	2.01686	.166	-1.1715	6.7794
			Graduation	2.63553	1.47349	.075	-.2689	5.5399
Mental Health	LS D	Intermediate	Graduation	-2.35747	1.50598	.119	-5.3259	.6110
			Post Graduation	-3.31046	2.00829	.101	-7.2690	.6481
		Graduation	Intermediate	2.35747	1.50598	.119	-.6110	5.3259
			Post Graduation	-.95299	1.46722	.517	-3.8450	1.9391
		Post Graduation	Intermediate	3.31046	2.00829	.101	-.6481	7.2690
			Graduation	.95299	1.46722	.517	-1.9391	3.8450
Sociability	LS D	Intermediate	Graduation	-.60375	1.55585	.698	-3.6705	2.4630
			Post Graduation	1.73203	2.07480	.405	-2.3576	5.8217
		Graduation	Intermediate	.60375	1.55585	.698	-2.4630	3.6705
			Post Graduation	2.33578	1.51581	.125	-.6521	5.3236
		Post Graduation	Intermediate	-1.73203	2.07480	.405	-5.8217	2.3576
			Graduation	-2.33578	1.51581	.125	-5.3236	.6521
Interpersonal relationship	LS D	Intermediate	Graduation	-1.26018	1.60809	.434	-4.4299	1.9095
			Post Graduation	-1.52941	2.14446	.477	-5.7564	2.6976
		Graduation	Intermediate	1.26018	1.60809	.434	-1.9095	4.4299
			Post Graduation	-.26923	1.56671	.864	-3.3574	2.8189

		Post Graduation	Intermedia te	1.52941	2.1444 6	.47 7	-2.6976	5.756 4
			Graduation	.26923	1.5667 1	.86 4	-2.8189	3.357 4

From table 21, it is reported that value of p is more than .05 for all pairs of education of students. It is inferred that there is no significant difference in dimensions of psychological wellbeing in different level of education of students. Thereby, the proposed alternate hypothesis H10 is rejected.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study is conducted with 217 college going students with almost equal number of respondents are belonging to male and female gender. It is composed with the highest number of respondents are in the age group of 20-24 followed 16-20 and least number of respondents are above the age of 24. It is reported that the highest number of respondents are graduation students followed by post-graduation then intermediate.

Based on descriptive results, it is revealed that the mean of PWB is 183.447 with range of 134 to 248. The highest mean is reported for satisfaction (37.686) with range of 22 to 50; followed by interpersonal relationship (37.654) with range of 22 to 50 then efficiency (36.903) with range of 18 to 50. Out five dimensions, low mean is reported for sociability and mental health with range of 19 to 50 and 18 to 50 respectively. It is concluded that overall psychological well-being is above average among college going students in in Muzaffarpur district of Bihar.

Based on hypothesis testing results, it is concluded that female have higher psychological well-being then male student in Muzaffarpur district of Bihar. It is inferred that there is no significant difference in satisfaction, efficiency and sociability between male and female students at Muzaffarpur district of Bihar while significant difference in mental health and interpersonal relationship. It is also inferred that female are significantly higher for female students then male students.

There is no substantial variation in psychological wellness among responders of different age groups. There is a notable disparity in sociability between individuals above the age of 24 and those in the age groups of 16-20 and 20-24. Moreover, there is a notable disparity in interpersonal relationships between the age group of 16-20 and the age group of 20-24, with a higher prevalence observed among the former. Across all characteristics of psychological well-being, it has been determined that there is no notable disparity in levels of satisfaction, effectiveness, and mental health.

Regarding the education of students, it has been determined that there is no notable disparity in the psychological well-being of students at various levels of education. Furthermore, it has been determined that there is no notable disparity in the measures of psychological wellness among students of varying educational levels.

The research findings can be utilized by the administration of higher education institutions, as well as by faculty members, students, and their families. For students to acquire knowledge, enhance their skills, and explore novel concepts, educational institutions consider it crucial for students to actively participate and maintain optimal physical well-being. By engaging in various activities, they are capable of facilitating these outcomes. Initially, they can motivate faculty members to design activities and/or assignments that are centered around collaboration. As a consequence of this, students would have a multitude of opportunities to collaborate with each other. Additionally, kids might be encouraged to establish their own clubs.

Moreover, the findings have implications for the instructional personnel. To cultivate a sense of purpose among student team members, foster their ability to offer psychological and emotional support to each other, and encourage their willingness to speak up, when necessary, faculty members can establish positive team norms and actively interact with students.

### 5.1. LIMITATION AND FUTURE SCOPE OF STUDY

The participants in this study are limited to one hundred individuals who are currently enrolled in various colleges located in the Muzaffarpur region of Bihar. The study will focus on two variables: physical and psychological wellbeing.

It is recommended that such a study be carried out using a high sample size in order to get better generalization. Additionally, it is recommended that a significant amount of attention be paid to the incorporation of pertinent and topical aspects such as culture, family environment, and individual personality features.

## CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

## REFERENCES

- Akhter, S. (2015). Psychological well-being in students of Gender difference. *The International Journal of Indian psychology*, 2 (4).
- Bhoge, S. and Prakash, I.J. (1995). Development of the psychological well-being Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Clinical Studies*, 11, 5-9.
- Bryant, A.N. (2007). Gender differences in spiritual development during the college years. Springer Science. Doi:10/1007/s11199-007-9240-2.
- Devendra, S.S., and Choudhary Pooja, (2012) Psychological well-being scale and Manual, National Psychological Corporation, Agra. (India).
- Diener, E. and Smith, H. (1999). Subjective well being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological bulletin*, 125, 276-302.
- Fujita, F., Diener, E., & Sandvik, E. (1991). Gender differences in negative affect and wellbeing: The case for emotional intensity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 427-434.
- Gill, N. (2007). A study of psychological well-being among college students of Haryana in Relation to coping Behaviour. M. Phil. Dissertation in Education, Chowdhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa.
- Honmore, V., M., and Jadhav, M.G., (2015) Psychological well-being, Gender and Optimistic Attitude among college students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3, 1, 174-184.
- Jeannie A. Perez. (July 2012). Gender Difference in Psychological Well-being among Filipino College Student Samples. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 2 No. 13 ;84-93.
- Kaur, J. (2015). Well being improves mental health of school students. *International Journal in Multidisciplinary and Academic Research (SSIJMAR)*, 2,3, 1-5.
- Kotar, A. B., (2013) A comparative study of psychological well-being among Art's and science college students. *Acme International Journal of multidisciplinary Research*, I, 9-12.
- Ryff, C. & Keyes, C. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69 (4), 719-727.
- Stone, A.A.; Mackie, C. (2013). Introduction. *Subjective Well-Being: Measuring Happiness, Suffering and other Dimensions of Experience*. National Academia Press. US.
- Waghmare, R. D. (2017). Gender Differences between Psychological Well-Being. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Vol. 4, (4), DIP:18.01.123/20170404, DOI:10.25215/0404.123.