Physical Education Students' Psychological Well-Being And Family Environment In Manipur: A Cross-Sectional Study

Dr. Thingbaijam Bimol Singh[1*], Dr. Hidangmayum Surendra Sharma[1],   Dr. Laishram Santosh Singh[2] and Dr. Salam Opendra Singh[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, HOD, Department of Physical Education, Health Education and Sports,
Vice-Principal, Biramangol College, Sawombung, India

[1]AssistantProfessor, D M College of Teacher Education, Imphal, India

[2]Associate Professor, Department of Physical Education & Sports Science, Manipur University, Canchipur, India

[2]Associate Professor, Department of Statistics, Manipur University, Canchipur-India

Corresponding Author: Dr. Laishram Santosh Singh,

Associate Professor, Department of Physical Education& Sports Science, Manipur University, Canchipur-India,

ABSTRACT

Background: The only institution that provides security and support without expecting anything in return is family. An individual's psychological adjustment, problem-solving techniques, sense of self, and capacity for goal-setting are all influenced by their family environment. An individual's psychological well-being is improved by these interaction patterns operating normally.

The objectives: The objectives of this study was to study whether gender differences exist in the psychological well-being of physical education students in Manipur and To study the correlation between family environment and psychological well-being of physical education students in Manipur.

Methodology: A cross-sectional study with a sample of 145 physical education students, comprising 53 males and 92 females, was conducted. These students were enrolled in MPES courses organised by various Manipur University and DM University during the academic session 2021-22. Their ages ranged from 22 to 24 years, and they were assessed with Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scales and the family environment scales (Kumar & Shrivas).

Results: Male physical education students scored higher than their female counterparts in self-acceptance and autonomy, and women scored higher than men in personal growth and positive relations with others. Psychological well-being was significantly correlated with cohesion, expressiveness, care, acceptance, independence, achievement orientation, cultural-

moral-religious aspects, active recreational orientation, and organisation at $P < 0.05$ level. Conflict and control were not significantly correlated with psychological well-being.

Conclusion: It was concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between various domains of family environment with psychological well-being among physical education students. To prevent a potential decline in the psychological well-being and psychological issues among physical education students, we should take the early initiative to uncover any dysfunction in families.

Keywords: Psychological well-being, family environment, physical education students

1. INTRODUCTION

The interfaces inside a family are crucial to a person's growth. It is of the utmost importance that families function well in order to shape an individual's personality and social development. All other social institutions have their roots in the family environment. An individual's psychological well-being is improved when these interactional patterns are in good working order (Kaur, Dhillon, & Kaur, 2015). Parents have a major influence on an individual's life from birth till maturity (Kaur, Maheshwari, & Thapar, 2006). In the teenage years, friends and classmates place a lot of pressure on teenage decisions, yet literature amply demonstrates the parents' continuous influence in guiding individual behaviour and decision-making as they navigate the obstacles of growing up. People's health, development, and growth are all positively impacted by positive parent-offspring connections, effective parenting techniques, shared family duties, and positive parent role modelling, as is widely known. These are the areas where parents may decide to modify things for the better for their children (Aufseeser, Susan, & Brown, 2006). According to studies, people with weak familial support networks are less happy and are more likely to consume drugs (Unger et al., 2002).

A child will be denied the chance to acquire poise and a more adult pattern of behaviour when family interactions are characterised by fights, misunderstandings, and feelings of insecurity (Kaur, Satish, & Pandey, 2016). Lower depression in the teenage years is connected with family coherence and supportive connections among family members. Numerous studies have demonstrated that children who grow up in households where their parents are in a happy, harmonious marriage have fewer issues and are in better health than children who come from divorced or marital-difficult families (Punam & Kumar, 2014). Stressful life experiences include catastrophic occurrences like the loss of loved ones, the divorce of parents, and socioeconomic difficulties like poverty and unemployment, as well as disrupted family structures that include low-income family connections, marital violence, abuse, and overprotection (Manpriya & Maheshwari, 2012). The type of family has a significant impact on an individual growth and adjustment patterns.This impact may be due to the joint family system's larger size, which increases the likelihood that pent-up emotions would be expressed there, as opposed to the nuclear family, which lacks such closeness (Alam, 2017).

Family environment and psychological well-being both have an impact on emotional maturity. Therefore, these two criteria are crucial in determining an individual's level of

emotional development (Easow, 2017). Studying the effects of the family environment on the psychological health of physical education students is pertinent given the significance of psychological functioning for individuals in their everyday lives and future social adaptability.

The present study is an attempt to assess the psychological well-being and family environment of physical education students and to seek a relationship of both. Studying in this field will aid in developing and disseminating practical cognitive and behavioural techniques for the target population, as well as aiding students in physical education in analysing issues related to their family environments.

2. Objectives of Study

- To study whether gender differences exist in the psychological well-being of physical education students in Manipur.
- To study the correlation between family environment and psychological well-being of physical education students in Manipur.

3. Research Methodology

A cross-sectional study design was adopted for the present study. The participants of the study were a randomly chosen group of physical education students (N = 145) who were undergoing MPES courses organised by Manipur University and DM University during the 2021–2022 academic session. The age of the participants ranged from 22–24 years and comprised 53 males and 92 females. The data collection was done after getting consent from the participants, and the subsequent data collection occurred during the month of March 2022.

3.1 Hypotheses of Study

- H_0: No significant gender difference exists among physical education students in psychological well-being as measured by Ryff's scale of psychological well-being.
- H_0: No significant relationship exists between the family environment as measured by the Family Environment Scale (Kumar & Shrivas, 2016) and psychological well-being as measured by Ryff's scale of psychological well-being of physical education students.

3.2 Variables

One for each independent and dependent variable were identified, such as:

- **Dependent variable** – Psychological well being
- **Independent variable** – Family environment

3.3 Measures

The tools used for the present study are:

Family Environment Scale: Family environment scale (Kumar & Shrivas, 2016) was used to assess the 3 major dimensions of family environment, each dimension has five, four and two sub-dimensions respectively such as i) interpersonal relationship (cohesion,

expressiveness, conflict, care, and acceptance); ii) personal growth (independence, achievement orientation, cultural-moral-religious aspects, and active recreational orientation); and iii) system maintenance (control and organisation).Each sub scale has many positive and negative statements. Five response options are provided for each statement like strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. Positive items were scored 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1.Whereas negative items were scored 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Accordingly statements were added to obtain raw scores. Overall Test Reliability Coefficient of the scale is .91.

Psychological Well-being: Psychological well-being was measured using the Ryff Psychological Wellbeing Scale (Ryff, 1989, 2014), which measures six dimensions: autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. Each subscale consists of 7 items, with a mix of positive and negative sentences. Negative items were reverse coded, resulting in higher subscale scores reflecting the presence of more positive appraisals. Each question includes an answer items on a scale from 1 to 6. Response 6 demonstrates a significant level of agreement if the statement is true. Response 6 displays a significant disagreement with the negative assertion. A high score and vice versa reflect a respondent's psychological well-being.

4. Results and Discussion

The data was analysed with the independent sample t-test and person's product moment correlation at IBM SPSS Statistics Version 22. The significant level was set at 0.05 alpha.

Table 2: Means (M), standard deviations (SD) and comparisons for men and women for the well-being scales

Gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	Sig.
Autonomy	Male	53	37.77	2.51	0.26		
	Female	92	35.74	3.20	0.44	4.25*	.000
Environmental Mastery	Male	53	36.09	2.68	0.37		
	Female	92	35.59	2.67	0.28	1.10	.274
Personal Growth	Male	53	32.78	5.83	0.61		
	Female	92	36.09	3.11	0.43	-3.83*	.000
Positive Relations with Others	Male	53	35.51	2.61	0.36		
	Female	92	37.23	2.66	0.28	-3.77*	.000
Purpose in Life	Male	53	35.51	3.12	0.43		
	Female	92	35.57	3.01	0.31	-0.11	.916
Self-Acceptance	Male	53	37.25	2.77	0.32		
	Female	92	34.91	3.11	0.38	4.64*	.000
Psychological well-being	Male	53	215.19	7.06	0.97		
	Female	92	214.85	8.55	0.89	0.25	.806

*Significant at 0.05 level

The results of the independent sample t-test showed statistically an overall insignificant difference in psychological wellbeing between male and female; $t_{(143)} = 0.25$, $p = .806$. The null hypothesis was accepted. The results also showed statistically significant differences in four of the well-being dimensions (see Table 2). Male had mean scores higher than female in autonomy ($t_{(143)} = 4.25^*$, $p = .000$) and self-acceptance ($t_{(143)} = 4.64^*$, $p = .000$), while female scored higher than male in positive relations with others ($t_{(143)} = -3.77^*$, $p = .000$) and personal growth ($t_{(143)} = -3.83^*$, $p = .000$).

Table 2: The relationship between physical education students' psychological well-being and their family environment

Variables	Well-being	
	r	*p*
Cohesion	0.199*	0.016
Expressiveness	0.201*	0.015
Conflict	0.129	0.122
Care	0.243*	0.003
Acceptance	0.221*	0.008
Independence	0.212*	0.011
Achievement orientation	0.211*	0.011
Cultural, moral, religious aspects	0.253*	0.002
Active recreational orientation	0.254*	0.002
Control	0.123	0.141
Organisation	0.263*	0.001
Family Environment (composite)	0.186*	0.025

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 3: reveals that the psychological well-being of physical education students was significantly positively correlated with the family environment ($r = 0.186^*$, $p = 0.025$). The null hypothesis was rejected. Hence, it can be concluded that a good family environment may have a positive impact on the psychological well-being of physical education students. Moreover, psychological well-being is positively correlated with sub-scales such as cohesion($r = 0.199^*$, $p = 0.016$), expressiveness ($r = 0.201^*$, $p = 0.015$), care ($r = 0.243^*$, $p = 0.003$), acceptance ($r = 0.221^*$, $p = 0.008$), independence ($r = 0.212^*$, $p = 0.011$), achievement orientation ($r = 0.211^*$, $p = 0.011$), cultural-moral-religious aspects ($r = 0.253^*$, $p = 0.002$), active recreational orientation ($r = 0.254^*$, $p = 0.002$), and organisation (r = 0.263^*, p = 0.001) except for conflict ($r = 0.129$, $p = 0.122$) and control ($r = 0.123$, $p = 0.141$). Rajkumari B et al. (2021) globally 10-20% of adolescents experience mental health disorders. The greater part of disease being subclinical, identification has been a big challenge. Social functioning impairment is a sensitive indicator of underlying mental disorder. It forms a baseline for early identification of mental disorders. A total of 25 schools were sampled with females constituting 52.3%. Overall 21.8% had good social adaptive functioning skills whereas

29.6% showed poor skills. Around 36.3% showed poor performance in 'peer relationship domain' and 27.1% showed poor performance in 'self-care/ home domain'. Socio-demographic variables such as age, gender, number of siblings, and education of parents were found to be significantly associated with having 'good social adaptive functioning skill'(p < 0.05). A significant proportion of adolescents face psychosocial issues in their day to day life. Improving social skills will be an effective intervention to reduce mental disorders. Rahul Mandaknalli et al. (2021) Present study was cross-sectional questionnaire-based study, conducted among schools of municipality areas. A self-report questionnaire comprising written informed consent, questions regarding socio-demographic and lifestyle-related information, as well as psychometric scales to assess anxiety were used to collect the data. Results: In present study, prevalence of anxiety was 24 % (108 students). We noted level of anxiety as minimal, mild, moderate, and severe (based on GAD scoring) in 31.48 %, 39.81 % 15.74 % and 12.96 % students respectively. In present study most of students were from 16-18 years age group (53.11 %), boys (59.78 %), lower middle class (53.11 %), nuclear family (73.11 %), living with family (78.67 %) and perceived good relationship with friends (83.56 %). In students with anxiety majority of students were from 16-18 years age group (61.11 %), girls (58.33 %), nuclear family (62.96 %), living with family (62.96 %) and perceived good relationship with friends (56.48 %).

In students with anxiety statistically significant difference was noted for 16-18 years age group, girls, nuclear family, students living with family and students perceiving good relationship with friends. In lifestyle-related factors, no regular physical activity, sleeping dissatisfaction and smoking were significantly associated with anxiety in students. Anxiety is a critical issue in adolescent life, early detection and adequate intervention is crucial to reduce overall burden and disability associated with psychiatric disorder in adolescent population. Devi AB et al., (2019) study is to evaluate the psychological well-being of adolescence in a school setting and its relation with their socio-demographic details. Two English medium, school was chosen for collecting the data. 200 participants out of which 100 are males and 100 are females are taken up. Self-prepared semi-structured proforma and Ryff Psychological well-being scale was used. Descriptive statistics was used for the analysis of data. Chi-square and t-test was used to test the association between variables. Certain parameters in the socio-demographic details are found to be associated with psychological well-being. All the socio-demographic factors are found to be statistically insignificant with respect to autonomy except that of parental occupation (p-value=0.028). Age category is found to be significant with personal growth (pvalue=0.006). Positive relations with others are found to be significant with the parameters of age category (pvalue=0.007), parental psychological distress (p-value=0.42) and school change (p-value=0.026). Purpose in life is found to be significant with age category (p-value=0.047), school change (p-value=0.038) and parental psychological distress (p-value=0.010). Self-acceptance is found to be

significant with family type (pvalue=0.008). Environmental mastery is found to be insignificant with all the socio-demographic dimensions.

5. CONCLUSION

It was concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between various domains of the family environment and psychological well-being among physical education students. To prevent a potential decline in the psychological well-being and psychological issues among physical education students, we should take the early initiative to uncover any dysfunction in families. The present study was cross-sectional in nature and limited to a group of physical education students. As a result, more research should be done longitudinally and with a large sample size on different populations to assess the relationship of family environment on psychological well-being.

REFERENCES:

- Alam, M. (2017) Study of impact of family on the adjustment of adolescence. *International Journal of Indian Psychology, 4,* 191-200.

- Aufseeser, D., Susan, J., Brown, B. (2006). The family environment and adolescent well-being exposure to positive and negative family influences. Child Trends, NAHIC, 1-10.

- Bishwalata Rajkumari, Konjengbam Erora, Shyami Tarao (2021): Assessment of Social Functioning among Adolescent School Children in Manipur: A Crosssectional Study *Indian Journal of Youth and Adolescent Health,* Volume 8, Issue 2 - Pg. No**. 1-7**; 8(2)

- Devi AB Dr. R.,Dr. LN Thomson (2019): Psychological wellbeing of adolescence in a school setting and its relation with their socio-demographic details. *Journal of Emerging   Technologies and Innovative Research,* June 2019, Volume 6, Issue 6

- Easow, R.J. (2017). Level of psychological well-being among adolescents in a selected high school at Tumkur. *IOSR Journal of Nursing and Health Science, 6,* 74-8.

- Kaur, M., Dhillon, S.S., & Kaur, R. (2015). A study of relationship of family environment with mental health of adolescents of Sirsa District. *International Journal of Applied Research, 1,* 472-475.

- Kaur, M., Maheshwari, S.K. Thapar, S. (2015). Child and parent relationship of school going children. *International Journal of Health Science and Research, 5,* 430-439.

- Kaur, S., Satish, T.M., Pandey, D.K. (2016) Relationship of depression, family environment and self-concept among adolescents. *Indian Journal of Psychological Science,7,*103-111.

- Manpriya, K., & Maheshwari, S.K. (2012). A study to assess the domestic violence and its potential causes and triggers among married women residing in selected rural and urban area of district Faridkot, Punjab. *Baba Farid University Nursing Journal, 2,* 27-31.

- Punam, B.D., Kumar, M. (2014). Relationship between family environment and wellbeing: A study of adolescents. *International Journal of Information and Futuristic Research, 29,* 271-276.

- Rahul Mandaknalli, Ragini Malusare (202. A cross-sectional study on the prevalence of   anxiety among municipality school area. *Med Pulse International Journal of Psychology.* June; 18(3): 19-22. http://www.medpulse.in

- Unger, J.B., Ritt-Olson, A., Teron, L., Huang, T., Hoffman, B.R., Palmer, P., (2002). Cultural values and substance use in a multi ethnic sample of California adolescents. *Add Res Theory, 10,* 257-279.