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Abstract

The research paper entitled, Influence of Socio-demographic variables on Psychological Well-being among Administrative Service Officers from J & K endeavors to examine the affect of demographic variables on psychological well-being. This descriptive study investigated the effect of socio-demographic factors on the perceived psychological well-being in a population of aging professionals in administrative service sector especially in J&K. The questionnaire survey is used in the present study and was created for a larger study conducted for the administrative service Society on middle Aging. Three hundred (250 men and 50 women) sample as full time employee lists completed a questionnaire survey. An independent t-test showed that there are differences between male and female on the basis of various demographic variables. An ANOVA showed the differences among various group. The discussion suggests that people, who are in their mid age, are having significant association with the psychological well-being.

Key Words: Socio-Demographic variables, Administrative Officer, Mid-life, Psychological Well-being
Introduction

Well-being has been the capacity to actively participate in work and recreation, create meaningful relationships with others, develop a sense of autonomy and purpose of life, and to experience positive emotions (Hatch, Huppert, Abbott, Croudace, Ploubidis, Wadsworth, Richards, & Kuh, 2007).

Psychological well-being is further defined as commitment to existential challenges is perceived (Keyes et al., 2002).

Lexical meaning of well-being is “a contented state of being happy, healthy and prosperous” and it refers “optimal psychological experience and functioning” (Deci & Ryan, 2008, p. 1). Well-being is also defined as “a positive and sustainable state that allows individuals, groups or nations to thrive and flourish” (p. 1331) and well-being is exemplified with happiness, satisfaction, empathy, motivation, interest, physical vitality, satisfying social relationships and resilience (Huppert, Baylis & Keverne, 2004).

Ryff (1995) provided another definition about well-being and explained that well-being acquires more than not being ill but positive self-esteem, mastery, autonomy, positive relationships with other people, a sense of purposefulness and meaning in life, and feelings of continued growth and development. Parallel to Ryff’s definition, Cloninger (2008) stated that authentic well-being involves positive emotions, mature character traits, like self-directedness, cooperativeness, and self-transcendence, life satisfaction, and character strengths and virtues, such as hope, compassion, and courage. In addition self-awareness was pointed as the key to authentic well-being depending on the fact that simulation of the features of well-being diminishes if the features are not internalized, experienced spontaneously and being aware of the self and action (Cloninger, 2008). Besides self-awareness, self-acceptance is shown to be a way to develop well-being (Henry, 2007).
Moore and Keyes (2003) defined well-being in adulthood as a combination of cognitive functioning, behavioral functioning, physical health and mental health. The cognitive functioning component includes positive thought processes whereas restorative sleeping is an example for physical health. In addition, Keyes and Waterman (2003) stated that the level of well-being also indicates how the individual is being involved in communal activities, such as volunteering and voting, and how one feels responsible to others. Researchers also presented people, who report high levels of well-being, consider themselves as “sources of intergenerational transmission of important social skills” (p. 493).

Two approaches for well-being; hedonic and eudaimonic defined by Ryan and Deci (2001).

Hedonic well-being focuses on happiness and defines well-being in terms of pleasure attainment and pain avoidance, whereas eudaimonic well-being focuses on meaning and level of functioning in life and human potential.

**Emotional well-being (hedonic well-being):** The concept of emotional wellbeing emerged from quality of life (QOL) research. Findings from this body of research demonstrated that one’s subjective evaluation of life satisfaction and experience with positive and negative affect are important to one’s sense of psychological well-being (Diener, Sue, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). The balance of positive and negative affect has also traditionally been equated with “happiness” (Bradburn, 1969).

According to the emotional well-being theory, mental health is defined as a multidimensional construct made up of (a) a cognitive component (i.e., general satisfaction with life), and (b) an affective component (states of positive and negative affect) (Keyes & Magyar-Moe, 2003).

Within the body of research on emotional wellbeing, psychological well-being has been defined primarily as a lack of symptom distress. For example, a decrease in depressive or anxiety symptoms, would be equated with improved psychological well-being. Also within this framework, affect is conceptualized to function
on a continuum, with positive affect on one end and negative affect on the other. Thus, positive and negative affect are typically described as highly inversely correlated with one another. With an improvement in positive affect, negative affect is assumed to decrease. In recent years, a newer theory of psychological well-being has emerged that focuses on subjective perceptions of positive functioning.

**Positive functioning (eudemonic well-being):** Traditional notions of psychological well-being have focused primarily on a lack of symptom distress to indicate improved mental health (Bierman, Fazio, & Milkie, 2006; García, Ramírez, & Jariego, 2002; Simon, 2002), thereby neglecting aspects of positive functioning (Ryff, 1989). According to the positive functioning domain, psychological well-being is thought to be more than a presence of positive affect and absence of negative affect. Instead, positive and negative affect are described to function independently and are moderately correlated with one another. Investigators have drawn this conclusion and state that lack of psychological distress does not necessarily lead to enhanced psychological well-being (Fava, 1997; Keyes, 2005b; Rafanelli et al., 2000; Ruini et al., 2003; Ryff et al., 2006).

On the other hand, well-being literature designated two dimensions for well-being which are subjective and psychological well-being. Subjective well-being was defined as the individual’s self-assessment related to life events and emerges as a result of the feeling of mastery, experiencing pleasurable activities and positive relations (Diener, Sapyta, & Suh, 1998). In addition, subjective well-being was defined as the balance of positive and negative affect and satisfaction (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002). Whereas, Bradburn (1969) defined psychological well-being in terms of positive and negative affect while Keyes et al. (2002) considered psychological well-being as the perceived commitment to existential challenges. When these approaches are considered together, subjective well-being, which emphasizes happiness, overlaps the hedonic approach while psychological well-being, which underlines the use of human potential, matches the eudaimonic approach (Deci & Ryan, 2008).
The perspective of positive functioning emerged from humanistic and developmental psychological theories, as well as existential philosophy (Ryff & Singer, 1998). According to this perspective, psychological well-being (sometimes referred to as eudemonia), is defined as a reflection of one’s perception to be able to face and deal with life’s challenges (i.e., positive functioning). This meaning given to a multitude of aspects of positive functioning, often described as “dimensions.” More specifically, psychological well-being reflects the subjective perspective that one is functioning well in six major areas of life.

To confine the elements of psychological well-being, Ryff (1989) developed a six dimensional model, the dimensions being, self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth, model. Ryff established this model with an eudaimonic approach, based on the theories of scientists, namely Erikson, Maslow, Rogers, Allport, Neugarten, Bühler, Jung, Jahoda and Frankl (Ryff & Singer, 2008). Each dimension formed one of the six subscales on the instrument entitled, the Scales of Psychological Well-Being (SPWB; Ryff, 1989).

According to Ryff (1989) psychological well-being is active engagement in a number of existential challenges. Psychological well-being is a multidimensional construct comprised of six areas of positive functioning: Autonomy, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, Personal Growth, Environmental Mastery, and Self-Acceptance. Thriving in life depends on the degree one sees himself or herself competently functioning in these areas. Definitions of the six constructs of positive functioning are:

- **Autonomy** stands for the degree to which someone is, “self-determining and independent; able to resist social pressures to think and act in certain ways; regulate behavior from within; and evaluate self by personal standards” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072). Autonomy refers to the obedience of an individual to others.
• **Purpose in Life** stands for the degree to which someone, “has goals in life and a sense of directedness; feels there is meaning to present and past life; holds beliefs that give life purpose; and has aims and objectives for living” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072). Purpose in life refers whether an individual has aims for living and believes the meaning of life.

• **Positive Relations with Others** stands for the degree to which someone, “has warm, satisfying, trusting relationships with others; is concerned about the welfare of others; is capable of strong empathy, affection, and intimacy; and understands the give and take of human relationships” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072). They summarize the key theories on personality. Individuals who are reported to have positive relations with others are able to establish warm and trusting relations, experience empathy and intimacy as well as understanding the dynamics of a relationship.

• **Personal Growth** stands for the degree to which someone, “has a feeling of continued development; sees self as growing and expanding; is open to new experiences; has sense of realizing his or her potential; sees improvement in self and behavior over time; and is changing in ways that reflect more self-knowledge and effectiveness” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072). Personal growth and indicates an individual’s competence for development and exploration.

• **Environmental Mastery** stands for the degree to which someone, “has a sense of mastery and competence in managing the environment; controls complex array of external activities; makes effective use of surrounding opportunities; and is able to choose or create contexts suitable to personal needs and values” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072). Environmental mastery are concerning how an individual relates with social environment.

• **Self-Acceptance** stands for the degree to which someone, “possesses a positive attitude toward the self; acknowledges and accepts multiple aspects of self including good and bad qualities; and feels positive about past life” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072). Self-acceptance defines how an individual acknowledges positive
and negative aspects of own personality and is pleased about past experiences. Lachman and Bertrand (1994) observed how personality affects the midlife experience that can inform research in this area. Not the entire aspects of personality are steady. The self plays an essential function in midlife, helping as a resource for negotiating the physical changes and social stresses that may be encountered. No individual is resistant to the complexities of midlife. Yet, those who experience a sense of mastery and control are better capable to meet the challenges head on and find useful strategies for dropping or dealing with stress.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY
The study is purely descriptive in nature and seeks to identify the factors responsible for and its outcomes among middle aged administrative service officers related to well-being, studying the impact of demographic variables on psychological well-being of mid-life administrative service officers. The present study intends to survey only mid-life administrative service officers who confront challenging situations which demand skills of a higher order for meeting them successfully.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
1. To study the socio-demographic variables which influence administrative service officers
2. To find out the differences of Psychological well-being among mid-life administrative service officers on demographics basis
LITERATURE REVIEW

Well-being is generally separated into two dimensions; subjective well-being and psychological well-being. Subjective well-being is usually defined as happiness and absence of problematic events, while psychological well-being includes individual development, self-actualization, attempting to grow up (Waterman, 1993, as cited in Kuzucu, 2006). Similarly, Keyes and colleagues (2002) specified subjective well-being as the balance of positive and negative affect, and satisfaction whereas psychological well-being is how commitment to existential challenges is perceived. Although subjective well-being and psychological well-being are usually accepted as separate dimensions there are other perspectives. Keyes and Waterman (2003) supposed that psychological well-being is one of the three aspects of subjective well-being, other two aspects are social and emotional well-being. Moreover, Keyes and colleagues (2002) found that the two dimensions are distinct but still have overlapping aspects, which are environmental mastery and self acceptance. These overlapping aspects were not considered as being related to subjective well-being theoretically but the relation was statistically proven.

Furthermore, when eudaimonic and hedonic well-being perspectives are considered, subjective well-being, which emphasizes happiness, overlaps the hedonic approach while psychological well-being, which underlines the use of human potential, matches the eudaimonic approach (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

Dimensions of psychological well-being

Ryff (1989) developed a six dimensional theory of psychological well-being. Keyes and Ryff (1998) stated that this theory analyzed psychological well-being from a eudaimonic perspective and combined the psychological functioning theories which are Maslow’s conception of self actualization, Rogers’ fully functioning person, Jung’s individuation formation and Allport’s depiction of maturity. In addition,
Erikson’s, Buhler’s and Neugarten’s theories on adult development were included as well as Jahoda’s mental health approach. The six dimensions of Ryff’s theory are self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth.

**Self-Acceptance** stands for the degree to which someone, “possesses a positive attitude toward the self; acknowledges and accepts multiple aspects of self including good and bad qualities; and feels positive about past life” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072). Self-acceptance defines how an individual acknowledges positive and negative aspects of own personality and is pleased about past experiences. Self-acceptance is considered as a dimension of psychological well-being since it is accepted as one of the criteria needed for embodiment of mental health (Jahoda), self actualization (Maslow), optimal functioning (Rogers) and maturity (Allport).

**Positive Relations with Others** stands for the degree to which someone, “has warm, satisfying, trusting relationships with others; is concerned about the welfare of others; is capable of strong empathy, affection, and intimacy; and understands the give and take of human relationships” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072). Since ability to love (Jahoda), to feel empathy (Maslow), to develop warm relations (Roger) and feeling responsible to other people (Erikson) are considered as aspects of positive functioning, positive relations with others became one of the six dimensions. Individuals who are reported to have positive relations with others are able to establish warm and trusting relations, experience empathy and intimacy as well as understanding the dynamics of a relationship.

Autonomy stands for the degree to which someone is, “self-determining and independent; able to resist social pressures to think and act in certain ways; regulate behavior from within; and evaluate self by personal standards” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072).

**Environmental Mastery** stands for the degree to which someone, “has a sense of mastery and competence in managing the environment; controls complex array of external activities; makes effective use of surrounding opportunities; and is able to choose or create contexts suitable to personal needs and values” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072). Environmental mastery are concerning how an individual relates with social
environment. Autonomy refers to how an individual survives independently whereas mastery refers to the ability to manipulate environment due to personal needs. Independency and self-evaluation according to self standards are needed in order to evaluate one as autonomous. Whereas, feeling of being able to manage daily events as well as change context due to individual needs are the characteristics of environmental mastery. Specifying a purpose for life and having a plan accordingly are defined as an feature of maturity by Allport. Therefore, purpose in life is regarded as the forth dimension of psychological well-being based on Allport and other theorists’ view point.

**Purpose in life** refers whether an individual has aims for living and believes the meaning of life. *Purpose in Life* stands for the degree to which someone, “has goals in life and a sense of directedness; feels there is meaning to present and past life; holds beliefs that give life purpose; and has aims and objectives for living” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072).

**Personal Growth** stands for the degree to which someone, “has a feeling of continued development; sees self as growing and expanding; is open to new experiences; has sense of realizing his or her potential; sees improvement in self and behavior over time; and is changing in ways that reflect more self-knowledge and effectiveness” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1072). The final dimension is personal growth and indicates an individual’s competence for development and exploration. Being open to new experiences, perceiving self as changing and growing as well as using personal potential are characteristics of Personal growth.

Supporting the dimensions defined by Ryff (1989) viz, autonomy, competence and relatedness are also found to be related to well-being in studies conducted in the frame of Self-Determination Theory. Self-determination theory defines these three traits as basic psychological needs. More specifically competence is found to be the need that should be fulfilled most consistently for well-being since competence-need fulfillment is positively and uniquely related to self-esteem and positive affect (Patrick, Knee, Canevello & Lonsbary, 2007). In addition Sheldon and Niemiec (2006) interpreted that the experience of balanced autonomy, competence and relatedness-need fulfillments arose higher levels of well-being. In addition,
autonomy was pointed out as a factor leading psychological well-being by Sheldon and his colleagues (2004). Researchers administered three studies to test how the content of goals and the drives underlying these goals affect the psychological well-being. These studies suggested that the goals from extrinsic forces done for reasons Recently, Wissing and Van Eeden (2002) attempted to achieve an empirical clarification of the psychological well-being and administered 10 questionnaires to a diverse sample. The researchers concluded that psychological well-being had a multidimensional composition with regard to affective, behavioral and cognitive aspects of self and life domains such as intrapersonal and interpersonal relations and social network. The indicators of the general psychological well-being were defined as sense of coherence, satisfaction with life and affect-balance.

In addition, **Gender differences** on psychological well-being are a common topic studied generally in terms of gender roles. Roothman, Kirsten and Wissing (2003) conducted a study to find how psychological well-being varies due to gender. The researchers administered 13 instruments to measure general, affective, cognitive, physical, spiritual, self and social aspects of psychological well-being and concluded that females and males reported differences. Roothman et al. (2003) observed that men scored significantly higher on cognitive, physical and self aspects, whereas women scored significantly higher on somatic symptoms, expressing affect and spiritual aspects but there was no difference between men and women regarding social dimension. When the results were evaluated together, researchers concluded that men scored higher than women and explained that difference with the “socially disadvantaged position historically held by women” (p. 216). Mills and his colleagues (1992) similarly stated that women reported significantly lower levels of psychological well-being than men did as a result of the study about effects of gender, family satisfaction and economic strain on psychological well-being.

Psychological well-being has been studied with various samples including university students, married couples, military officers and cancer patients. The studies on university students focused on the predictors of psychological well-being, the relation between social support and psychological well-being as well as the
effect of personal differences on psychological well-being (Aydın, 1999; Cenkseven 2004; Cirhinlioglu, 2006).

Psychological well-being represents satisfaction with life and a lack of psychological distress (i.e., lack of negative affect). Under the theory of positive functioning, however, psychological well-being refers more to aspects of human development and existential life challenges (Keyes et al., 2002).

The Ryff’s (1989) conceptualization that improved PWB would reflect the perception of functioning well in life (Ryff, 1989). The purpose of the study was to identify factors important in women’s PWB. Factors included: age, household income, education, marital status, race/ethnicity, perceived social support, psychological distress, and PWB. The design of the study was a secondary data analysis based on an existing study, “The Psychological Well-Being of Women Pre- and Post- a Breast Cancer Diagnosis.” Women recalled for a diagnostic mammogram, but not diagnosed, were included in the study (N = 2,746).

Measures used included: a demographic questionnaire, Scales of psychological well-being (Ryff, 1989); Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scales (Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995); and a Visual Analog Scale of Perceived Social Support. Findings showed that income, education, and perceived social support showed statistically significant different PWB scores in the positive direction. Married women scored higher PWB scores than women of other types of marital status, but neither age nor race/ethnicity showed differences in outcome scores.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

SAMPLE AND QUESTIONNAIRE
Data were collected using the questionnaire instrument. Questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 300 mid-life administrative service officers located in J&K State. Middle aged employees in administrative cadre working in different departments were surveyed. In the Questionnaire, Likert five point scale was employed to determine scores, where respondents were asked to rate each attribute on 5-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, The data so collected was subjected to Factor Analysis. Census survey is to be adopted for collecting data. The statements/items for the questionnaire were formed after consulting relevant literature and some relevant research conducted in the area. Besides attitudes scale, the survey questionnaire also included a section to capture the general profile of respondents. They were asked about their demographic background including age, education level, marital status, and preference of job, year of experience and income level. The present study has used tools t-test, one-way ANOVA.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS
Data collection from the employees of administratives services in this current research study had been arranged and compiled in various tables to facilitate statistical analysis. The systematic arranged data had been used to calculate measures of central tendency, differences and factor analysis. The Tabulation and the graphical presentation are carried out using MS Excel. Descriptive and inferential statistics is carried out using SPSS 16.0.
The main aim of the current study is to analyse the influence of demographic variables on psychological well-being. The researcher wants to delineate whether socio-demographic variables has any influence on psychological well-being. The major variables of the current research study were as follows:

- Socio-demographic variables
- Psychological Well-being

**Plan of Analysis**

Data analysis begins with an account of profile of the respondents and responding organizations. This is followed by estimation of response rate. Subsequent section follows estimation of Unidimensionality and reliability of each construct. Unidimensionality was assessed using factor analysis. Tabulation and the graphical presentation are carried out using MS Excel. Descriptive and inferential statistics is carried out using SPSS 16.0. Following statistical techniques were deployed in the present study:

- Independent t-test
- ANOVA

A total of 300 questionnaires were distributed yielding a response rate of 90 % and same were considered for the analysis.

**Profile of Respondents and Responding Organizations**

**Profile of Respondents**

**Gender:** Almost 80.00 percent are with male category and the remaining 20.00 percent are female category out of the total 300 sample respondents from administrative service officers. According to the above analysis it is clear that the organization is maintaining unequal gender-wise distribution.
Table: Respondent Profile-Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age: Age of the employees is one of the important factors in any research study. Mental maturity, understanding of people and the organization, analytical abilities, emotional balance and judgment etc. aspects are the function of individual age and exposure.

The table 2 analyses the age wise distribution of sample employees among the selected organization. Out of the total employees, 38 percent are in 35-39 years age group, 18 percent are in 40-45 years age group, 18 percent are in 46-50 years age group and remaining are in the age group of above 50 years. The analysis indicates that a major group of employees from all the selected organizations was in the middle age i.e. between 35-45 years.

Table 5.3: Respondent Profile- Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35-39 YEARS</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45 YEARS</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 YEARS</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50 YEARS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational Qualifications: Regarding the qualifications of the sample employees from the selected organizations are shown in Table No 3. Out of the total sample employees, 45.5 percent are with UG qualification, 46 percent are with PG and 8.5 percent are with above PG qualification.

Table 5.4: Respondent Profile- Educational Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE PG</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family Income:

Table 5.5: Respondent Profile- Family Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPTO Rs 100000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100000-200000</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.5% of respondents are having family income in the range of Rs. 1 lac per annum. 56.5% of respondents are having income level 1-2 lac, 30% are having 2-3 lac and 4% are having income level above 3 lacs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200000-300000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300000-400000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital status: Table 5.6: Respondent Profile - Marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPARATED</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVORCED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the marital status of the sample employees from the selected organization are shown in Table. Out of the total 300 sample respondents, 57 percent are married, 30 percent are single, 10 are separated and the remaining 3 percent are divorced category.
Experience:

Table 5.7: Respondent Profile- Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 5 YEARS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 YEARS</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 YEARS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 YEARS</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE 20 YEARS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of Service: Employees with sufficiently long service in an organization develop high level of commitment and feel a sense of belongingness to the organization. They nurture the organization's culture; understand organizational goals and objectives which have either a direct or indirect relationship with employee's length of service in the enterprise. Hence an attempt is made to study the length of service. Categorization of the respondents on the basis of the service put in by them in their respective organizations.

The Table No. 6 analyses the experience wise distribution of sample employees. Out of the total employees, a majority group 11 percent of respondents are below 5 years experience, 31 percent are in 5-10 years experience and the remaining 25 percent are in 10-15 years, 23 percent are in 15-20 experience and remaining 10 percent are having above 20 years experience in the organization. The analysis infers that a major group of employees from all the selected organizations was in the experience of between 5-10 years in their respective unit.

Reasons of preference of Job:
Table 5.8: Respondent Profile - Reasons of preference of Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER CHOICE</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 7 shows the opinions of respondents on the preference of job. It can be viewed from the table that 70 percent of employees are working on their own preference and remaining 30 percent are in their job due to economical need.

Expected Salary:

Table 5.9: Respondent Profile - Expected Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upto Rs 50000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51000-60000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61000-70000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71000-80000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 80000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table No. 8 shows the opinions of respondents on the salary expectation. It can be viewed from the table that 4 percent of employees are having salary expectation up to 50000, 10 percent are having in between 51-60 thousand, 40 percent of respondents are expecting between 61-70 thousand, 25 percent are having 71-80 thousand and remaining 21 percent are expecting above 80 thousand salary.

**Hypotheses testing**

The aims and objectives of any research study are the motivating forces for the construction of hypotheses. Various parameters of the study are pooled into segments and for each one of these combinations a hypothesis is formed. According to Best and Kahn (1989) “The research hypothesis is a formal affirmative statement predicting a single research outcome, a tentative explanation of the relationship between two or more variables.” Hypotheses are tested by applying statistical techniques and tools, which are mostly classified as parametric and non-parametric techniques. For the purpose of testing the hypotheses formulated in the present study, parametric techniques have been used.

For the current research study an effort has been made to study of socio-demographic variables and its impact on psychological well-being.

**Hypothesis testing**

The hypothesis formulated by the researcher for the present study:

**Category I: Hypotheses for Establishing Differences**

- Demographic key variables has significant impact on Psychological Wellbeing

**Category II: Hypotheses for Establishing Psychological Differences on the Basis of Demographic Variables**

Also there are twelve sub-hypothesis formulated by the researcher for the present study to know the Psychological wellbeing differences among administrative service officers.
$H_B1$: There is significant difference in the Psychological wellbeing of administrative service officers on the basis of gender between groups from different departments.

Analysis: It is evident from the above table that Psychological wellbeing has Significant differences on the dimension Gender $t = 39.117$, $p<0.05$ between groups from different administrative services (Mean= 52.94, SD= 4.317).
Conclusion: Hence, there is a significant difference in Psychological wellbeing among the administrative officers with respect to gender.

$H_A2$: There is significant difference in the Psychological wellbeing of administrative service officers on the basis of Age among groups from different departments.

Analysis: It is evident from the above table that mid-life crisis and psychological well-being has Significant differences on the dimension Age $F = 2.10$, $p<0.05$ among groups from different administrative services (Mean= 48.54, SD= 4.185).
Conclusion: Hence, there is a significant difference in Psychological wellbeing among the administrative officers with respect to age.

$H_B3$: There is no significant difference in the Psychological wellbeing of administrative service officers on the basis of Qualification among groups from different departments.
Analysis: It is evident from the above table that psychological well-being has no significant differences on the dimension Qualification $F = .932$, $p>0.05$ among groups from service sector (Mean= 53.50, SD= 5.195).

Conclusion: Hence, there is no significant difference in Psychological wellbeing among the administrative officers with respect to Qualification.

$H_B4$: There is no significant difference in the Psychological wellbeing of administrative service officers on the basis of Religion among groups from different departments.

Analysis: It is evident from the above table that psychological well-being has no significant differences on the dimension Religion $F = 4.713$, $p>0.05$ between groups from service sector (Mean= 45650, SD= 5.195).

Conclusion: Hence, there is no significant difference in Psychological wellbeing of the administrative officers with respect to Religion.

$H_B5$: There is significant difference in the Psychological wellbeing of administrative service officers on the basis of marital status among groups from different departments.

Analysis: It is evident from the above table that psychological well-being has observed significant differences on the dimension Marital status $F = 1.882$, $p<0.05$ among groups from administrative service (Mean= 56.23, SD= 3.230).

Conclusion: Hence, there is a significant difference in Psychological wellbeing among the administrative officers with respect to Marital status.
H₆: There is significant difference in the Psychological wellbeing of administrative officers on the basis of Language among groups from different administrative departments.

Analysis: It is evident from the above table that psychological well-being has significant differences on the dimension Language $F = 3.115$, $p > 0.05$ among groups of officers from different administrative departments (Mean= 55.40, SD= 4.187).
Conclusion: Hence, there is a significant difference in Psychological wellbeing among the administrative officers with respect to Language.

H₇: There is no significant difference in the Psychological wellbeing of administrative officers on the basis of Family income among groups from different administrative departments.

Analysis: It is evident from the above table that psychological well-being has no Significant differences on the dimension Family income $F = .232$, $p > 0.05$ among groups of officers from different administrative departments (Mean=43.43, SD=3.210).
Conclusion: Hence, there is no significant difference in Psychological wellbeing among the administrative officers with respect to Family income.

H₈: There is no significant difference in the Psychological wellbeing of administrative officers on the basis of earning members among groups from different administrative departments.
Analysis: It is evident from the above table that psychological well-being has observed not any Significant differences on the dimension Earning members $F = 2.212, p>0.05$ among groups from different administrative services ($\text{Mean}=43.43, \text{SD}=3.210$).
Conclusion: Hence, there is no significant difference in psychological well-being among the administrative officers with respect to Earning members.

$H_{B9}$: There is significant difference in the psychological well-being of administrative officers on the basis of Preference of job among groups from different administrative departments.

Analysis: It is evident from the above table that psychological well-being has observed Significant differences on the dimension Preference of job $F = 2.711, p>0.05$ among groups from administrative service ($\text{Mean}=43.50, \text{SD}=3.195$).
Conclusion: Hence, there is a significant difference between psychological well-being among the administrative officers with respect to Preference of job.

$H_{B10}$: There is significant difference in the mid-life crisis of administrative officers on the basis of Experience among groups from different administrative departments.

Analysis: It is evident from the above table that psychological well-being has observed Significant differences on the dimension Work Experience $F = 6.236, p<0.05$ among groups from administrative service ($\text{Mean}=43.50, \text{SD}=3.195$).
Conclusion: Hence, there is a significant difference in psychological well-being among the administrative officers with respect to Work Experience.
H_{B}^{11}: There is significant difference in the psychological well-being of administrative officers on the basis of Salary among groups from administrative departments.

Analysis: It is evident from the above table that psychological well-being has observed significant differences on the dimension Salary F = 3.065, p<0.05 among groups from administrative service (Mean=43.50, SD=3.195).

Conclusion: Hence, there is a significant difference in psychological well-being among the administrative officers with respect to Salary.

H_{B}^{12}: There is significant difference in the Psychological wellbeing of administrative service officers on the basis of Job Location between groups from different departments.

Analysis: It is evident from the above table that psychological well-being has observed significant differences on the dimension Job Location F = 2.118, p<0.05 among groups from administrative service (Mean=43.50, SD=3.195).

Conclusion: Hence, there is a significant difference in psychological well-being among the administrative officers with respect to Job Location.
### Table 4.2: Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological well-being Vs Gender</td>
<td>39.117</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological well-being Vs Age</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological well-being Vs Qualification</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological well-being Vs Religion</td>
<td>4.713</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological well-being Vs Marital status</td>
<td>1.882</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>3.115</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>2.212</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>2.711</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>6.236</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>Test Performed</td>
<td>Results*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_B1$</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>Not Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_B3, H_B4, H_B7, H_B8$</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_B2, H_B5, H_B6, H_B9, H_B10, H_B11, H_B12$</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Not Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at $p<0.05$
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