Indian Journal of Psychological Science

Internationally
Indexed, Refereed and Peer Reviewed

Editor
Dr. Roshan Lal
Professor of Psychology
Panjab University, Chandigarh

UGC Approved: Emerging Sources Citation Index:
https://mjl.clarivate.com:/search-results?issn=0976-9218

IJPS

The official organ of:
National Association of Psychological Science **(Regd.)**
www.napsindia.org **Email: managingeditorijps@gmail.com, Phone: 9417882789**

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AFFECTING PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING OF RURAL POPULATION

Rahul Tomar* Dr. Bhagat Singh**

ABSTRACT

Psychological Well-Being (PWB) is one of the positive aspects to refers welfare, happiness, interests, and quality of life. The objective of this study was to find out the role of gender, type of family, age, caste-category, socio-economic status, and education level in predicting psychological well-being of rural population. 699 participants from villages of five district of Uttar Pradesh were selected randomly. The Psychological Well-Being scale (Sisodia, D.S. & Chaudhary, P., 2012) used to collect the data. Descriptive statistics, correlation, and stepwise regression analysis were calculated to test the hypotheses. Results showed that middle socio-economic status, nuclear family, age group 34-40 years, education level-Senior Secondary level and gender showed a significant correlation with psychological well-being and significantly predict psychological well-being. The final predictive model was - PWB = 193.741 + 5.202*(Middle SES) - 4.716*(age group 34-40 years) - 3.576*(EL-Senior Secondary level) - 3.441*(Male) + 3.478*(Nuclear Family). On the basis of result and discussion it can be concluded that the factors – like Socio-Economic Status, type of family, age of a person, education level and gender of a person significantly predict the PWB of a person and these factors should be taken into consideration along with other factors when studying PWB.

Keywords: Psychological Well-Being. Gender, Socio-Economic Status, Education Level, Caste-Category,

About the authors: * *PhD Scholar ** Professor (Corresponding author), Dept. of Psychology, Meerut College, Meerut (UP)*

INTRODUCTION:-

Psychological Well-being (PWB) refers to the simple notion of a person's welfare, happiness, advantages, interests, utility, and quality of life (Burris, Brechting, Salsman, & Carlson, 2009). It is a technical term for happiness and quality of life. Psychological well-being also refers to how people evaluate their lives, and the cognitive and affectionate development of a person's life (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2002). At the same time PWB deals with the cultivation of personal strength, and realizes one's true potential. In this way, psychological well-being is related to long-term and lasting happiness (McMahan & Estes, 2011). A positive outlook of life and engaging in meaningful activities improve psychological well-being (Heo, Chun, Lee, & Kim, 2016). Subjective well-being improves with aging (Mroczek & Spiro, 2005). The first research in the field of psychological well-being was done by Ryff (1989) who measured six dimensions: autonomy, environment, mastery, personal development, positive relationships with others, purpose in life, and self-reliance. Good jobs, better physical and mental health, positive life events, healthy interpersonal relationships, and higher incomes are significant correlates of a higher level of life satisfaction (Easterlin, 2006; Lelkes, 2008), while family relationships play an important and central role in shaping a person's well-being during life (Merz, Consedine, Schulze, & Schuengel, 2009). Family and life outside of study are important predictors of well-being (Ryff & Heidrich, 1997). Symister and Friend (2003) found that people's support from their family members may feel enhanced self-esteem and encourage optimism, positive effect, and better mental health.

Over the past 10 years, with the change of social values and norms and family structures have become highly diverse (Bianchi & Casper, 2000). Culture plays a complex role in the natural history and mental-social development of human behavior (Orlandi, 1987). People with poor mental health will not be satisfied with their lives. Relationships between age and well-being have U-shape, because asymmetrical expectations that are felt painful in the middle-aged, but are discarded and experienced profitably with little regret during old age (Guney, 2009).

Akhter (2015) found significant gender differences in psychological well-being among students. Similar results were also found by Waghmare (2016); Larson, et. al. (2008); Kotar (2013); Khanbani, Aaghaee, and Parvar (2014); Sridevi and Govind (2018); Ryff and Keyes (1995); Tony and Akhila (2005); Fuller, Edwards, Vorakitphokatorn and Semsri (2005); Pravitha and Sembiyan (2012). Singh, (2016) also found significant gender differences in mental health of college students. But Kantariya (2017) found no gender difference in psychological well-being.

Parents' educational level, income, occupation, and relationships with family members affect students' psychological well-being (Daraei 2013; Dadhania, 2015). Ryff (1989) revealed in his study that the feeling of belonging to a community, safety, happiness, identification with social class and hobbies are subjective social indicators of psychological well-being. Waghmare (2017) in his study found that female students have higher psychological well-being, self - efficiency, mental health and interpersonal relationships than male students. Social role, externally generated role and variety were significantly correlated with well-being (Mazzucchelli & Purcell, 2015).

In their study Sinha and Singh (1998) found that upper caste students were better adjusted at home than backward caste students. In one study, Bajpai (2001) found that Scheduled Tribe girls were least accommodated compared to girls from backward and general caste. Results of study by Kumar and Singh (2017a) found that a significant difference between caste and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction of general and OBC was significantly higher to that of scheduled caste subjects. In another study Kumar and Singh (2017b) found an interaction effect of caste category with gender on job satisfaction. Results showed no significant gender differences, whereas caste categories significantly affected the job satisfaction of primary school teachers. High income correlates with subjective well-being (Diener & Oishi, 2000; Kahneman & Deaton, 2010). Wang & Geng, (2019) in his study found that socioeconomic status was significantly associated with physical health, but not with psychological health. Another study (Ugwu, 2012) found that socio-economic status significantly predicted psychological well-being.

Indian Constitution groups the different castes/jati into four broader categories viz the Scheduled Castes (SC), the Scheduled Tribes (ST), the Other Backward Caste (OBC) and rest castes as General category for implementation of reservation in government job and education institution (Maheshwari, 1997). This typology simplifies the study of various groups on the basis of Caste i.e jati. The same terminology is used in this paper;

As it is clear from the above review that there are a lot of factors which affect Psychological Well - Being (PWB). There are many studies related to gender, age, Socio-Economic Status (SES), and education level (EL). But there are a few studies related to PWB, caste category and type of family.

So in the present study researchers tried to find out the role of socio-demographic factors such as gender, age, type of family, socio-economic status, caste category, and education level, in predicting psychological well-being especially in rural populations.

Hypotheses:- On the basis of results of previous studies on psychological well-being, the following hypotheses were formulated -

- Gender, Age, Socio-Economic Status (SES) and Education Level (EL) significantly predict the psychological well being of peoples living in rural areas.
- Type of Family and Caste-Category do not significantly predict the psychological well-being of peoples living in rural areas.

METHODOLOGY:-

For this study, 55 villages -12 from Aligarh district, 12 from Bulandshahr district, 7 from Meerut district, 4 from Hapur district and 20 from Bijnor district of Uttar Pradesh State were selected randomly for the study. The inclusion criteria for subjects were that they

must be free from any major physical and mental illness, they must be of 20 to 40 years of age and they must have the reading and writing ability of Hindi language (devnagri

lipi). To have the appropriate representation from each demographic factor stratified random sampling technique was used in this study.

The subjects with any known major physical and mental illness, below 20 years and above 40 years and cannot read and write Hindi language were not included in the study. As this study was 'No Risk –for the participant' study, so no ethical permission was required for it. Even then the researcher took a written permission for the study from the head of the department of psychology of the college.

Sample:-

Primarily there were 742 subjects who were randomly selected for the study. But 43 subjects did not fill the test completely so they were excluded from the final analysis. Thus finally there were 699 subjects whose data was used for final analysis. Out of these 699 subjects, there were 53.20% male; 46.80 % female; 23.60% belongs to High SES; 34.20% belongs to Middle SES; 42.20% belongs to Low SES group; 61.90% have joint family; 38.10% have nuclear family; 31.60% from General caste category; 42.60% from OBC category; and 25.80% from SC category; 43.6% belong to 20 to 26 year old; 30% belongs to 27 to 33 year old and 26.3% belongs to 34-60 year old; 42.30% have education level Above Senior Secondary level i.e above 12th class; 39.90% have education level Senior Secondary level i.e. 12th class; and 17.70% have education level below senior Secondary level i.e upto 10th class or secondary level.

Tools used:-

- Psychological Well-Being (PWB) questionnaire (Sisodia, D.S. & Chaudhary, P., 2012). It is a five-point rating scale containing 50 items. This scale has test-retest reliability 0.90 and validity 0.94. Higher scores represent the higher PWB.
- Udai Pareek revised Socio-Economic Status Scale (Singh, Sharma & Nagesh, 2017) was used to assess the SES for rural populations. This scale has nine different factors which assess the socioeconomic status of the individual. On the basis of the total scores subjects were divided into three categories viz- low, middle and high SES.

RESULTS:-

To test the hypotheses data was analyzed with the help of SPSS-17 software. Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and stepwise regression analysis methods were used by the researchers.

Table -1 showed the descriptive statistics of socio-demographic variables of rural peoples on PWB. The mean of PWB scores for male and female was 190.89 and 194.30 with SD 22.34 and 23.69 respectively. The mean scores of PWB of subjects belonging to the nuclear family was 194.68 (SD=22.84) and joint family was 191.13 (SD=23.08).

The mean and standard deviation of scores of PWB of high, middle and low socio-economic status was 191.36 (SD = 21.72), 196.28 (SD = 22.16) and 190.04 (SD = 24.09) respectively. The mean scores of PWB of 20-26 year age group was 192.87 (SD = 22.96), 27-33 year age group was 194.90 (SD = 22.83) and 34-40 year age group was 189.10 (SD 23.09). The mean scores of PWB of General category was 191.22 (SD = 22.33), OBC category was194.04 (SD = 22.99) and SC category was 191.46 (SD = 23.92). The mean scores of PWB of subjects with EL-Upto High School was 194.31 (SD = 26.00), with EL-Intermediate was 190.14 (SD = 21.30) and with EL-Above Intermediate was 193.43 (SD = 18.51).

Table-1

Showing means score and Standard deviation of PWB across socio-demographic factors

Variables		Mean	SD
Gender	Male	190.89	22.34
	Female	194.30	23.69
Type of Family	Nuclear	194.68	22.84
	Joint	191.13	23.08
Socio-economic Status(SES)	High SES	191.36	21.72
	Middle SES	196.28	22.16
	Low SES	190.04	24.09
Age	20-26 Year	192.87	22.96
	27-33 Year	194.90	22.83
	34-40 Year	189.10	23.09
Caste-Category	General	191.22	22.33
	OBC	194.04	22.99
	SC	191.46	23.92
Educational Level (EL)	Up to Secondary level	194.31	26.00
	Senior Secondary level	190.14	21.30
	Above Senior Secondary level	193.41	18.51

Table -2 showed the correlation values between PWB and various predictors. Correlation of PWB with gender was -0.074 (p = 0.051), with type of family was 0.075 (p = 0.048), with SES-1 i.e. high SES was -0.027 (p = 0.472), with SES-2 i.e. middle SES was 0.119 (p = 0.002), with Caste-1 i.e. general caste was -0.037 (p = 0.323), with caste-2 i.e. OBC was 0.058 (p = 0.123), with EL-1 i.e. above intermediate was 0.068 (p = 0.073), with EL-2 i.e. intermediate was 0.083 (p = 0.028), with Age gp-2 i.e. 26-33 years was 0.069 (p = 0.069), and with Age gp-3 i.e. 34-40 years was -0.088 (p = 0.020).

Table - 2

Showing Correlations between PWB and Various Predictors (N=699)

	Gender	Type of Family	SES-1	SES-2	Caste-1	Caste -2	EL-1	EL-2	Age Gp-2	Age Gp-3
PWB	-0.074	0.075	-0.027	0.119	-0.037	0.058	0.068	-0.083	0.069	-0.088
p value	**0.051**	**0.048**	0.472	**0.002**	0.323	0.123	0.073	**0.028**	0.069	**0.020**

Table- 3 showed that ANOVA for regression was F (5, 693) = 5.338; p < 0.001. The value of R = 0.193, R square = 0.037 and adjusted R square was = 0.030 with standard error of estimate 22.684.

Table-3

Showing the summary of stepwise regression analysis of psychological well-being

Model	Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	193.741	1.813		106.871	< .001
SES-2 (Middle vs Other)	5.202	1.820	.107	2.858	**.004**
Age Gp-3 (33-40 vs O	-4.176	1.953	-.080	-2.138	**.033**
EQ-2 (Senior Secondary level vs Other)	-3.576	1.761	-.076	-2.031	**.043**
Gender	-3.441	1.720	.075	2.001	**.046**
Type of Family	3.478	1.769	-.073	-1.966	**.050**
R	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Standard Error Of Estimate**	**F (5, 693)**	**Sig.**
0.193	0.037	0.030	22.684	5.338	**<0.001**

The results of stepwise regression indicated (Table-3) that the model explained only 3.7% of variance and that the model was a significant predictor of PWB. While Middle SES (Beta =+5.205, p = 0.004), Age group 34-40 years (Beta = -4.716, p = 0.033), Education Level – Senior Secondary (Beta = -3.576, p = 0.043), Male gender (Beta = -3.441, p = 0.046) and Nuclear Family (Beta = 3.478, p = 0.050) contributed significantly to the model while Upper SES (Beta = 0.029, p = 0.825), General Caste (Beta = -0.024, p = 0.986), OBC caste (Beta = 0.038, p = 0.978), EL- above Senior Secondary level (Beta = 0.041, p = 0.503), and age group 27-33 (Beta = 0.049, p = 0.836) did not. The final predictive model was -

PWB = 193.741 + 5.202*(Middle SES) - 4.716*(age group 34-40 years) - 3.576*(EL Senior Secondary level) - 3.441*(Male) + 3.478*(Nuclear Family)

DISCUSSION:-

Results indicate that middle SES significantly predicts PWB. It means that subjects belonging to middle SES have significantly higher PWB in comparison to high and low SES subjects. It was also clear that the middle SES had a significant positive correlation with PWB and the mean value of PWB of middle SES was higher than that of high and low SES groups. These findings are consistent with the results of Daraei (2013); Wang and Geng (2019); Easterlin (2006) and Lelkes (2008). The research by Barger, Donoho, and Wayment (2009) clarified that SES increases psychological well-being in various aspects.

The reason behind this significance may be that the people with middle SES in the rural population are more satisfied with their position in the society. They have small families, better education, satisfactory economic condition, and satisfactory social as well as political recognition which give them a sense of satisfaction that increases their PWB.

Results indicated that age group-3 i.e 34-40 years, negatively predicted the PWB. It means that people of age group 34-40 years had significantly lesser PWB in comparison to the people belonging to age groups 20-26 years and 27-33 years. It was also clear from the correlation table that there was a significant negative correlation between PWB and 34-40 years of age. It is clear from table-1, that the mean of PWB of age group 34-40 years was lowest among the three groups while the mean of PWB of age group 26-33 years was higher than that of age group 20-26 years. This is the age when a person faces many challenges related to their younger children. Either they are separated from the parents and living with their spouses or they are choosing a different employment to that of family occupation. So at this stage people have to revise their future plan related to family and economy. These situations may be responsible for their lower PWB in comparison to other age groups. These findings are consistent with the results of Heo, Chun, Lee., & Kim. (2016),

Mroczek & Spiro (2005), and Sinha & Singh (1998). Other researchers Guney (2009) revealed that age and well-being have U-shape correlation, because asymmetrical expectations that are felt painful in the middle-aged, but are discarded and experienced profitably with little regret during old age. In another study Schwandt (2015) found that age and psychological well-being have U-shape correlation, which may be caused by unmet expectations that are felt painfully in midlife but beneficially abandoned and experienced with less regret during old age.

Results also indicated that education level-2 i.e. Senior Secondary level, negatively predicted PWB. It means that people with Senior Secondary educational level had significantly lesser PWB in comparison to the people who have EL upto Secondary level and above Senior Secondary level. The scores of PWB of subjects with EL Senior Secondary level had a significantly negative relationship. It is clear from table-1 that the mean scores of EL-Up to Secondary level was highest among three groups and while subjects with EL Senior Secondary level had the lowest mean among the three groups. In Indian education system Senior Secondary level i.e 12th class is a gateway for higher education. It gives a lot of opportunities to explore in the field of education both traditional as well as professional. It may be that the subjects who had only EL-Senior Secondary level tried to explore the opportunities but failed to avail it or were unsuccessful in achieving that. So the feeling of that failure or unsuccessful may have impacted their PWB. In rural society the main occupation of people is farming and labor work. For this it is a general belief that no higher education is needed for farming and labor work meaning that if you are illiterate or have EL upto Secondary level, it is a good choice to do farming or labor work but if you have EL higher to that it is not for you to do. So this may be a cause of the highest PWB among subjects with EL upto Secondary level only. These findings are consistent with the results of Dadhania, (2015), Corey & Keyes (1998 and Keyes, Shmotkin & Ryff (2002)

Results indicated that gender negatively predicted PWB, means that when we move from female to male there was a decrease in PWB by 3.441 points. It is clear from table-1 that the mean score of female was higher than male. It means that female subjects have significantly higher PWB in comparison to male subjects. In Indian rural society male and females have different roles and responsibilities and there is a clear division of work for the two. Females mostly have to do the household work and work related to pet animals at home. While male have to do work related to farming or earning livelihood for family. The females are engaged all day in performing their duty and

this gives them a sense of satisfaction and meaning to life. So this may be the cause of higher PWB among females in rural areas. Findings of this study are in congruence with the study by Waghmare (2016); Larson, et. al. (2008); and Akhter (2015).

Results indicated that the nuclear family positively predicted PWB. It means that when we move from the joint family to the nuclear family there is an increase in PWB by 3.478 points. It is clear from table-1 that the mean scores of the nuclear family were higher than the joint family. There was also a significant positive correlation between type of family and PWB. It means that the subjects living in nuclear families have significantly higher PWB in comparison to the subjects living in joint families. In Indian' society especially in rural societies there was a tradition of joint family. As the main occupation was farming and labour work so to do that work there is a need of large man power. Therefore joint family means large man power. But in the last 10 years due to the fast pace of urbanization, industrialization and globalization a large number of people move from rural to urban in search of jobs and better education. This large scale migration from rural to urban areas forces the people to leave their joint family and live in nuclear families. As they found it best both economically as well as socially to live in a nuclear family. Though there are also joint families in rural areas, their way of living also changes. Now there are nuclear families within joint families. Means family members in joint families are sharing the house and land but not the money which they earn from the job. This Economic freedom enhances their way of living at large. So this may be the reason that the subjects living in nuclear families have better PWB in comparison to that of joint family.

On the basis of the results discussed above we accept our first hypothesis that gender, age, socio-economic status (SES) and Education Level (EL) significantly predict the psychological well being of rural peoples. As we found that type of family significantly predicted the PWB but caste category did not predict the PWB among the rural population so we partially accept our second hypothesis that type of family and caste-category do not significantly predict the psychological well-being of rural people.

CONCLUSIONS:-

On the basis of the above findings it can be concluded that middle socio-economic status and nuclear family have a positive correlation with psychological well-being and significantly predict PWB while age group 34-40 years, education level- Senior Secondary level and male gender showed a negative correlation with psychological well-being and significantly predict psychological well-being. Caste category did not predict the psychological well being among rural Indian population. All the predictors predicted only 3.7% variance in psychological well-being. Socio-economic status had the highest beta weight. Subsequently comes the age, education level, gender and type of family. So it can be concluded that all the above factors should be taken into consideration along with other factors when studying psychological well-being. As PWB is significantly related with quality of life, life satisfaction, physical health related issues so it should be studies at large level to know the exact effect of changing social and economic environments especially among rural populations.

REFERENCES:-

Akhter, S. (2015). Psychological well-being in students of gender difference. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(4), 154-161. DIP:B00337V2142015

Bajpai, S. (2001). Caste and Belongingness and Adjustment of high school girls. *Indian Psychological Review*, 56 (1), 46-50.

Barger, S. D., Donoho C. J., & Wayment H. A. (2009). The relative contributions of race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, health, and social relationships to life satisfaction in the United States. *Quality of Life Research*, 18, 179–189. doi: 10.1007/s11136-008-9426-2

Bianchi, M. S., & Casper, M. L. (2000). American families. *Population Bulletin*, 55, 3–42.

Burris, J., Brechting, E., Salsman, J., & Carlson, C. (2009). Factors

associated with the psychological well being and distress of university students. *Journal of American College Health*, 57 (5), 536-544. doi 10.3200/JACH.57.5.536544

Corey, L., & Keyes, M. (1998). Social Well-Being. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61(2), 121-140. doi: 10.2307/2787065

Dadhania, D. A. (2015). Mental Health and Psychological Well-being in Adolescence Boys and Girls. *International Journal of Public Mental Health and Neurosciences*, 3 (2), 10-12.

Daraei, M. (2013). Social Correlates of Psychological Well-Being among Undergraduate Students in Mysore City. *Social Indicator Research*, 114, 567–590. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0162-1

Diener, E., & Oishi, S. (2000). 'Money and happiness: Income and subjective well-being across nations in E. Diener & E. M. Suh (Eds.), *Culture and subjective well-being*. pp. 185–218, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2002). Subjective Well-Being: The Science of Happiness and Life satisfaction. In C. R. Snyder and S. J. Lopez (Ed) *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Easterlin, R. A. (2006). Life cycle happiness and its sources: Intersections of psychology, economics, and demography. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 27(4), 463-482. doi: 10.1016/j.joep.2006.05.002

Fuller, T., Edwards, N. J., Vorakitphokatorn, S., & Semsri, S. (2005). Gender Differences in the Psychological Well-Being of Married Men and Women: An Asian Case. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 45, 355 - 378. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2004.tb00016.x·

Guney, S. (2009). *Life satisfaction of university students in Turkey*. 1st world positive psychology conference, Pennsylvania, USA, 18-23 June.·

Heo, J., Chun, S., Lee, S., & Kim, J. (2016). Life Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being of Older Adults with Cancer Experience: The Role of Optimism and Volunteering. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 83(3), 274-289. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091415016652406

Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107, 16489–16493. doi:10.1073/pnas.1011492107.

Kantariya, A. S. (2017). Impact of Gender on Psychological Well-Being among Post-Graduate Students. *Psychology Behavior Science International Journal*, 2, 1-3. doi: 0.19080/PBSIJ.2016.02.555578

Keyes, C. L. M., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 1007–1022. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.1007

Khanbani, M., Aaghaee, A., & Parvar, M. (2014). Examining the Relationship between Gender and Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Sociological Research*, 5, 53-58. doi:10.5296/jsr.v5i1.5436·

Kotar, A. B. (2013). A comparative study of psychological well-being among Art's and science college students. *Acme International Journal of multidisciplinary Research*, 1, 9-12.

Kumar, A. & Singh, B. (2017a). Caste Categories and Job Satisfaction. *South Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4 (6), 27-35. URL-

http://sajms.com/volume-4-issue-6/caste-categories-job-satisfaction/

Kumar, A., & Singh, B. (2017b). Gender, Caste Categories and Job Satisfaction. *Saudi Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 2, 804-809. doi: 10.21276

Larson, J., Dahlin, F. A., Billing, E, Arvin, V. M., Murray, V., & Wredling, R. (2008).The impact of gender regarding psychological well-being and general life situation among spouses of stroke patients during the first year after the patients' stroke event: A longitudinal study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 45, 257–265, doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.08.021

Lelkes, O. (2008). *Happiness across the life cycle: Exploring age-specific preferences*. Retrieved 02 aug 2020 from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24115445_Happiness_across_the_life_cycle_Exploring_age-specific_preferences

Maheshwari, S.R. (1997). Reservation Policy in India: Theory and Practice. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 43 (2), 662-679. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0019556119970335

Mazzucchelli, T. G., & Purcell, E. (2015). Psychological and Environmental Correlates of Well-being Among Undergraduate University Students. *Psychological Well-Being*, 5(6). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13612-015-0033-z·

McMahan, E. A., & Estes, D. (2011). Hedonic Versus Eudaimonic Conceptions of Well-being: Evidence of Differential Associations with Self-reported Well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 103(1), 93-108. doi: 10.1007/s11205-010-9698-0

Merz, E.M., Consedine, N. S., Schulze, H. J., & Schuengel, C. (2009). Well-being of adult children and ageing parents: Associations with intergenerational support and relationship quality. *Ageing & Society*, 29, 783–802. doi:10.1017/s0144686x09008514

Mroczek, D. K., & Spiro, A.III. (2005). Change in Life Satisfaction During Adulthood: Findings From the Veterans Affairs Normative Aging Study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88 (1), 189–202. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.189·

Orlandi, M. A. (1987). Promoting health and preventing disease in health care settings: An analysis of barriers. *Preventive Medicine*, 16(1), 119–30. doi: 10.1016/0091-7435(87)90011-9

Pravitha, R., & Sembiyan, R. (2012). Psychological Well-Being among Adolescents in the Current Scenario. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 36-41.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Ryff, C. D., & Heidrich, S. M. (1997). Experience and well-being: Explorations on domains of life and how they matter. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 20*, 193–206. doi:10.1080/016502597385289.

Ryff, C. & Keyes, C. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 69, 719-727. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719

Schwandt, H. (2015). Unmet Aspirations asaan Explanation for the Age U-

shape in Wellbeing. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 122, 75-82. doi: 10.1016/j.jebo.2015.11.011·

Singh, B. (2016). Gender, Education Stream and Mental Health. *Global Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5 (3), 18-27.

Singh, T., Sharma, S. & Nagesh, S. (2017). Socio-economic status scales updated for 2017. *International Journal Research in Medical Science*, 5(7), 3264-3267. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.18203/2320-6012.ijrms20173029·

Sinha, B. P. & Singh, A. K., (1998). Effect of parent's affection and competence: the home adjustment of school students. *Indian Psychological Review,* 50 (2), 106-112.·

Sridevi.S, Govind, K. (2018). Psychological well- being, Gender Optimistic attitude among students. *International Journal of Research Culture Society*, 2(4), 36 – 39.

Symister, P., & Friend, R. (2003) The influence of Social support and problematic support on optimism and depression in chronic illness: A Prospective study evaluating self esteem as a meditator. *Health Psychology*, 22, 123-129. doi:10.1037/0278-6133.22.2.123

Tony, J., & Akhila, T. (2005). Resilience and Psychological Wellbeing Among Psychology Students and Engineering Students- A Comparative Study. *International Journal Scientific Research*, 4 (6), 498-499.

Ugwu, F. O. (2012). Psychological well-being: Contributions of perceived prevalence of financial crime, socio-economic status and gender among unemployed youth in Southeastern Nigeria. *Ife Psychologia*, 20 (1), 275-293.

Waghmare, R. D. (2016). A Study of Psychological Well Being Among Male and Female College Students. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(7), 26-31. DIP: 18.01.118/20160303.Waghmare, R. D. (2017). Gender differences between psychological well-being. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*. 4(4), 23-30. DIP: 18.01.123/20170404

Wang, J., & Geng, L. (2019). Effects of Socioeconomic Status on Physical and Psychological Health: Lifestyle as a Mediator. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16 (2), 1-9. doi: 10.3390/ijerph16020281

Paper received: 18the Sept, 2022,
Revision received: 15th November, 2022
Paper Accepted: 28th November, 2022