



SOCIAL WELL-BEING AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

¹Mrs. R. Thanga Selvam, ²Mrs. D. Shunmuga Selvasivasankari, ³Mrs. K. C. Shunmugapriya,

⁴Mrs. R. Ponselvi, ⁵Dr. S. Jeyaparvathi

¹Assistant Professor of Biological Science, ²Assistant Professor of Mathematics, ³Assistant Professor of Education,

⁴Librarian, ⁵Associate Professor of History

Annammal College of Education for Women, Thoothukudi, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract: This study examines the social well-being among college students. The aim of the study was (i) To find the level of social well-being and its dimensions, such as social acceptance, social responsibility, social coherence and social support among college students and (ii) To find out the significant difference between college students in their social well-being and its dimension with respect to gender, type of family, social group member, type of family, locality, subject and mobile usage. A survey method was used for the study. A simple random sampling technique was used for selecting 107 college students from Thoothukudi, Tamilnadu. Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used for analyzing data. The level of social acceptance among college students was found to be moderate. The level of social responsibility, social coherence, social support and social well-being among college students is low, and there is no significant difference between college students in their social well-being and its dimensions with respect to gender, degree, type of family, locality of residence, social group member, subject and mobile usage per day.

Keywords: Social well-being, college students, social acceptance, social responsibility, social coherence and social support

INTRODUCTION

The concept of well-being has received considerable interest in recent years, both in the scientific and lay literature. As such, well-being is frequently cited as a national priority for government policy worldwide (Beddington et al.). However, depending on one's professional and personal prospective, well-being can have different connotations.

According to the World Health Organization viewpoint, social well-being is an essential dimension of health along with physical and mental aspects. It is influential in improving the quality of life, social efficacy, and social performance.

Social well-being is an essential factor that demonstrates society's circumstances and functioning. It contains four domains, which include social acceptance "the construal of society through the character and qualities of other people as a generalized category"; social responsibility "the belief that one is a vital member of society, with something of value to give to the world", and social coherence "the perception of the quality, organization and operation of the social world. It includes a concern for knowing about the world", and social support "the evaluation of the quality of one's relationship to society and community".

Students are considered an impressive social class in sustainable development. Therefore, their social well-being status is a capital for society. College students have the responsibility to provide social services in future. Therefore, their appropriate social well-being status is influential in their efficacy.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The health of society is based on its individual. A person's healthy life is the product of interaction between personal choices and their enveloping socioeconomic environment. In 1948, the World Health Organization identified social well-being as one of several facets of an individual's overall health. Social well-being is defined as an individual's self-report of the quality of their relationship with other people, their neighbourhood, and their communities.

Social well-being is operationalized as an individual's perceptions of their integration into society, acceptance of other people, coherence of society and social events, one's sense of contribution to society, and the potential and growth of society. Learning social skills and membership in a social network enable individuals to interact effectively with others. These are indicators of behavioural health and social well-being. This study aims to measure the Social Well-being and explore its relationship with social demographic variables. Therefore, a study was conducted to know the social well-being among college students.

There are a few studies about the social well-being of college students in Thoothukudi. The present study attempted to investigate the level of social well-being, four domains (social acceptance, social responsibility, social coherence and social support), and some related background variables in college students.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- (i) To find the level of social well-being and its dimensions among college students.
- (ii) To find out the significant difference between college students in their social well-being and its dimensions with respect to gender, degree, type of family, locality of residence, social group member, subject and mobile usage per day.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

- (i) The level of social well-being and its dimensions among college students is moderate.
- (ii) There is no significant difference between male and female college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.
- (iii) There is no significant difference between UG and PG college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.
- (iv) There is no significant difference between joint and nuclear family college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.
- (v) There is no significant difference between rural and urban college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.
- (vi) There is no significant difference between social group member and non-social group member college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.
- (vii) There is no significant difference among commerce, computer science, economics, maths, and zoology subject college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.
- (viii) There is no significant difference among a minimum of 1 hour, 1 - 2 hours and more than 2 hours spent daily on mobile usage by college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

A survey method was used for the study. The study sample has been selected using a Simple random sampling technique. The investigator selected 107 college students from Thoothukudi district. The Social Well-being Scale was constructed and validated by the investigator. The investigator has used descriptive and inferential statistical techniques analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY

Hypothesis (i)

To find out the level of social well-being and its dimensions among college students is moderate.

Table 1
Level of social well-being and its dimensions among college students

Dimensions	Low		Moderate		High	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Social Acceptance	0	0	106	99.1	1	0.9
Social Responsibility	106	99.1	0	0	1	0.9
Social Coherence	106	99.1	0	0	1	0.9
Social Support	106	99.1	0	0	1	0.9
Social Well-being	106	99.1	0	0	1	0.9

It is inferred from the above table that among college students, 0% have low, 99.1% have moderate, and 0.9% have high levels of social acceptance.

Among college students, 99.1% have low, 0% have moderate, and 0.9% have high levels of social responsibility.

Among college students, 99.1% have low, 0% have moderate, and 0.9% have high levels of social coherence.

Among college students, 99.1% of them have low, 0% of them have moderate, and 0.9% of them have high levels of social support.

Among college students, 99.1% have low, 0% have moderate, and 0.9% have high levels of social well-being.

Hypothesis (ii)

There is no significant difference between male and female college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Table 2
Difference between college students in their social well-being with respect to gender

Dimensions	College Students	N	Mean	SD	Calculated 't' value	Remark at 5% level
Social Acceptance	Male	47	79.28	376.892	0.990	NS
	Female	60	24.83	4.373		
Social Responsibility	Male	47	74.21	358.134	0.953	NS
	Female	60	24.43	5.094		
Social Coherence	Male	47	123.81	588.774	0.990	NS
	Female	60	38.82	8.408		
Social Support	Male	47	75.00	355.624	0.997	NS
	Female	60	23.28	4.525		
Social Well-being	Male	47	352.30	1679.353	0.984	NS
	Female	60	111.37	17.044		

(At a 5% significance level, the table value of 't' is 1.96.)

It is inferred from the above table that there is no significant difference between male and female college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Hypothesis (iii)

There is no significant difference between UG and PG college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Table 3
Difference between college students in their social well-being with respect to degree

Dimensions	College Students	N	Mean	SD	Calculated 't' value	Remark at 5% level
Social	UG	58	24.00	4.653	1.025	NS
Acceptance	PG	49	78.04	368.969		
Social	UG	58	23.07	5.920	1.013	NS
Responsibility	PG	49	73.80	350.489		
Social	UG	58	39.22	9.311	0.979	NS
Coherence	PG	49	119.86	576.683		
Social Support	UG	58	22.83	4.627	1.017	NS
	PG	49	73.43	348.211		
Social Well-being	UG	58	109.12	18.519	1.005	NS
	PG	49	345.12	1644.299		

(At a 5% significance level, the table value of 't' is 1.96.)

It is inferred from the above table that there is no significant difference between UG and PG college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Hypothesis (iv)

There is no significant difference between joint and nuclear family college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Table 4
Difference between college students in their social well-being with respect to type of family

Dimensions	College Students	N	Mean	SD	Calculated 't' value	Remark at 5% level
Social	Joint Family	17	24.18	4.275	0.442	NS
Acceptance	Nuclear Family	90	53.39	272.338		
Social	Joint Family	17	22.88	6.009	0.440	NS
Responsibility	Nuclear Family	90	50.72	258.673		
Social	Joint Family	17	37.82	9.534	0.465	NS
Coherence	Nuclear Family	90	83.39	425.448		
Social Support	Joint Family	17	21.53	4.823	0.446	NS
	Nuclear Family	90	50.62	256.966		
Social Well-being	Joint Family	17	106.41	20.528	1.029	NS
	Nuclear Family	90	238.12	1213.328		

(At a 5% significance level, the table value of 't' is 1.96.)

It is inferred from the above table that there is no significant difference between joint and nuclear family college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Hypothesis (v)

There is no significant difference between rural and urban college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Table 5
Difference between college students in their social well-being with respect to locality of residence

Dimensions	College Students	N	Mean	SD	Calculated 't' value	Remark at 5% level
Social	Rural	37	25.57	4.318	0.960	NS
Acceptance	Urban	70	61.00	308.864		
Social	Rural	37	22.78	5.266	1.025	NS
Responsibility	Urban	70	58.73	293.271		
Social	Rural	37	38.19	6.903	1.006	NS
Coherence	Urban	70	96.21	482.407		
Social Support	Rural	37	23.05	4.268	1.007	NS

	Urban	70	58.13	291.394		
Social Well-being	Rural	37	109.59	16.414		
	Urban	70	274.07	1375.842	1.000	NS

(At a 5% significance level, the table value of 't' is 1.96.)

It is inferred from the above table that there is no significant difference between rural and urban college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Hypothesis (vi)

There is no significant difference between social group member and non-social group member college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Table 6

Difference between college students in their social well-being with respect to social group members

Dimensions	College Students	N	Mean	SD	Calculated 't' value	Remark at 5% level
Social	Yes	74	24.76	4.379		
Acceptance	No	33	102.55	449.790	0.993	NS
Social	Yes	74	23.05	5.314		
Responsibility	No	33	98.42	427.021	1.014	NS
Social	Yes	74	38.65	8.008		
Coherence	No	33	160.24	702.641	0.994	NS
Social Support	Yes	74	23.22	4.439		
	No	33	97.09	424.385	1.000	NS
Social Well-being	Yes	74	109.68	16.600		
	No	33	458.30	2003.774	0.999	NS

(At a 5% significance level, the table value of 't' is 1.96.)

It is inferred from the above table that there is no significant difference between yes and no social group member college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Hypothesis (vii)

There is no significant difference among commerce, computer science, economics, maths, and zoology subject college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Table 7

Difference between college students in their social well-being with respect to subject

Dimensions	Source of variation	Sum of squares	Mean square variance	df	Calculated 'F' value	Remarks
Social	Between	189716.525	47429.131	4		
Acceptance	Within	6423727.662	62977.722	102	0.753	NS
Social	Between	166684.320	41671.080	4		
Responsibility	Within	5800116.110	56863.883	102	0.733	NS
Social	Between	444162.318	111040.579	4		
Coherence	Within	15696509.290	153887.346	102	0.722	NS
Social	Between	166104.529	41526.132	4		
Support	Within	5723157.471	56109.387	102	0.740	NS
Social Well-being	Between	3677499.012	919374.753	4		
	Within	127599985.86	1250980.25	102	0.735	NS
		7	4			

(For 4,102 df, at 5% significance, the table value of 'F' is 2.447)

It is inferred from the above table that there is no significant difference among commerce, computer science, economics, maths, and zoology subject college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Hypothesis (viii)

There is no significant difference among a minimum of 1 hour, 1 - 2 hours and more than 2 hours spent daily on mobile usage by college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

Table 8**Difference between college students in their social well-being with respect to mobile usage per day**

Dimensions	Source of variation	Sum of squares	Mean square variance	df	Calculate d 'F' value	Remarks
Social Acceptance	Between	144787.726	72393.863	4	1.164	NS
	Within	6468656.461	62198.620	102		
Social Responsibility	Between	128959.437	64479.719	4	1.149	NS
	Within	5837840.993	56133.086	102		
Social Coherence	Between	354353.147	177176.573	4	1.167	NS
	Within	15786318.461	151791.524	102		
Social Support	Between	133910.810	66955.405	4	1.210	NS
	Within	5755351.190	55339.915	102		
Social Well-being	Between	2892502.088	1446251.04	4	1.172	NS
	Within	128384982.790	1234470.988	102		

(For 4,102 df, at 5% significance, the table value of 'F' is 2.447)

It is inferred from the above table that there is no significant difference among a minimum of 1 hour, 1 - 2 hours and more than 2 hours spent daily mobile usage by college students in their social well-being and its dimensions.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

1. College students have a moderate level of social acceptance. Furthermore, they have a low level of social responsibility, social coherence, social support and social well-being.
2. No significant difference exists between college students in their social well-being and its dimensions with respect to gender, degree, type of family, locality of residence, social group member, subject and mobile usage per day.

INTERPRETATION OF THE STUDY

1. College students have a moderate level of social acceptance. This may be because it is necessary for their future society.
2. College students have a low level of social responsibility, social coherence, social support and social well-being. If college students have high social well-being status, they can be more effective in society. Based on this study, these students' social well-being level is not high.
3. No significant difference exists between college students in their social well-being and its dimensions with respect to gender, degree, type of family, locality of residence, social group member, subject and mobile usage per day. This may be due to the social connections made by the students with their family and society. The students may be getting more opportunities to involve social activities and they receive support from their family and educational institutions in all endeavors. This may be the lead for more social acceptance, social responsibility, social coherence, social support and social well-being.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

To help college students develop social well-being, social acceptance plays a significant role in fostering social well-being. It encompasses the feeling of belonging, being valued, and being included within a community or social group. When individuals are socially accepted, they tend to have a more positive self-image. Feeling valued and appreciated by others boosts self-esteem and self-worth, contributing to better mental health. Social responsibility promotes a sense of interconnectedness, empathy, and collective action which may enhance positive roles in the future development of society. Social coherence indicates personal belief in a meaningful life. Living with families may positively affect this concept; therefore, this relationship is reasonable. Social support enhances quality of life and provides a buffer against adverse life events.

CONCLUSION

The results of our study showed that the social well-being status of Thoothukudi district college students needed to be more satisfactory. Because social well-being has an essential impact on social health status, it has important implications for the policy-making of the Thoothukudi Education Department. Designing and conducting programs to promote social well-being, for example, preparing facilities for social-oriented student programmes can be helpful. Evaluating the social well-being of college students of Thoothukudi colleges with their background variables seems useful.

REFERENCE

- [1] Abdollah Tabar H. et al. (2008). A Study of Social Well-being among Students. *Refahj*. 8 (30 and 31), 171-190.
- [2] Alireza Salehi, et al. (2017). Social Well-Being and Related Factors in Students of School of Nursing and Midwifery. *International Journal Community Based Nurs Midwifery*. 5(1): 82–90.
- [3] Alpidou, M. Costin, D. and Morris, J. (2011). The relationship between Facebook and the well-being of undergraduate college students. *Cyber Psychology, Behaviour and Social Networking*. Vol.14., No.04., pp. 183-189
- [4] Atlas, S.H. John, (2001). *Modernization and Social Change*. Sydney: Agnus and Robertson Publishers.
- [5] Biranchi Narayanan Dash, (2004). *Teacher Education in the Emerging Indian Society*, Vol.1. New Delhi: Neelkamal Publication Pvt. Ltd.
- [6] Fagan, R.W. (1994). Social Well-Being in University Students. *J Youth Adolescence* 23, 237–249.
- [7] Ma Sining (2022). A study of social well-being among university students. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*. 27:492–504.
- [8] Sining, M., Sharaai, A.H. & Wafa, W. A study of social well-being among university students. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 27, 492–504 (2022).
- [9] Thanavathi, C. (2012). *Teacher Education*. Thoothukudi: Perumal Publication.
- [10] P. Udhayakumar, P. Illango (2023) Psychological Wellbeing among College Students. (2023). *Journal of Social Work Education and Practice*, 3(2), 79- 89. <https://www.jswep.in/index.php/jswep/article/view/58>.
- [11] Sining, M., Sharaai, A.H. & Wafa, W. A study of social well-being among university students. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 27, 492–504 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-022-02029-w>
- [12] Maryam Ghasemisarukolai, Hossein Kordi and Parvaneh Danesh (2021). A Study on Social Well-Being and Effective Factors in Faculty Members of Payame Noor University, Tehran. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal* Volume 0, Issue 0 ISSN: 2151-6200 <https://www.hilarispublisher.com/open-access/a-study-on-social-wellbeing-and-effective-factors-in-faculty-members-of-payame-noor-university-tehran-78886.html>
- [13] Salehi A Md Mph, Marzban M Ms, Sourosh M, Sharif F, Nejabat M Md, Imanieh MH Md. Social Well-Being and Related Factors in Students of School of Nursing and Midwifery. *Int J Community Based Nurs Midwifery*. 2017 Jan;5(1):82-90. PMID: 28097181; PMCID: PMC5219568. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5219568/>
- [14] https://www.academia.edu/10373756/Social_Well_being_and_its_relationship_with_Study_Habits_of_Secondary_School_Students&nav_from=7a8f1a90-0733-4b24-8e59-0b447b148f64&rw_pos=0
- [15] Rehman R, Hussain M, Syed F, Khan R (2014).. Social wellbeing: a positive energy for wellness in medical students. *J Postgrad Med Inst* 2014; 28(2):165-71. https://www.academia.edu/21246218/SOCIAL_WELLBEING_A_POSITIVE_ENERGY_FOR_WELLNESS_IN_MEDICAL_STUDENTS?sm=b

- [16] Shunmuga Selvasivasankari D, Jeyaparvathi S, Thanga Selvam R. A study on the dietary habits of college students. International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts. March 2020: Volume 8, Issue 3, ISSN: 2320-2882. Pg:1791-1795.
- [17] Shunmuga Selvasivasankari D, Thanga Selvam R. Impact of Yogic Exercises on Physical Wellness of Women in Thoothukudi. Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies. July-Sept, 2016: Volume 5, Issue 17, ISSN 2278-8808, Pg: 326-332.
- [18] Thanga Selvam R, Shunmuga Selvasivasankari D, Nagalakshmi A. Effect of Yogic Exercises and Meditation on Emotional Wellness and Spiritual Wellness of Women in Thoothukudi. International Journal of Research Granthaalayah. September, 2016: Volume 4 , Issue 9, ISSN 2394-3629, Pg: 58.
- [19] Thangadurai R, Thanga Selvam R. Student – Teacher Relationship as Perceived by Students of Standard XI in Relation to their Achievement in Chemistry. International Journal of Education & Humanities (A peer reviewed journal). July-August 2018: Volume VIII , Number 4, ISSN 2277-2405, Pg: 301.

