

# Self Control and Psychological Well Being among Working and Non-Working Women



**Kamleshkumar S. Kharadi**

Phd. Student,  
Dept. of Psychology,  
Suarashtra University,  
Rajkot, Gujarat, India

**Yogesh A. Jogsan**

Head,  
Dept. of Psychology,  
Suarashtra University,  
Rajkot, Gujarat, India

## Abstract

The present study aims at finding out the level of Self control and psychological well being among working and non-working women. self control scale and psychological well being inventory was used to collect data from a random sample of 60 working and non-working women. Statistical technique such as mean, standard deviation, t-test and coefficient of correlation were employed for the analysis of data. The results revealed that significant differences were indicated regarding self control and psychological well being among working and non-working women. The correlation analysis revealed that self control and psychological well being does have positive impact of self control and psychological well being among working and non-working women.

**Keywords:** Self Control, Psychological Well Being.

## Introduction

Psychologists have developed a “muscle” or “strength” model of self control (Muraven et al. 1998), arguing that self control is a cognitive resource that is temporarily depleted whenever it is exercised, just as a muscle is temporarily fatigued when it is used. Research by Muraven et al. (2006) and others (e.g., Muraven et al. 1998) supports a muscle model of self control, finding that base levels of self control and self control depletion independently predicted student cheating.

This model also implies that self control should grow stronger with regular “exercise”: repeated efforts at self control should make one’s self control stronger over time (Muraven et al. 1998). Geyer and Baumeister (2005:418) argue that “Religious organizations, as an external source of discipline, can be very helpful to people’s personal self control endeavors.” In other words, religion may fortify this psychological muscle of self control by encouraging its repeated use in everyday life. Relatedly, Latimore et al. (2006) argue that self control rests largely on internalized moral principles that are enforced by guilt and painful emotions.

Perhaps the best-known treatment of self control and deviance is Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990). Gottfredson and Hirschi argue that crime and “analogous behaviors” (deviant behavior that resemble crime) are the result of low self control, coupled with criminal opportunity. Further, they argue that:

1. self control largely comes from parental discipline in childhood,
2. absolute levels of self control can change throughout the life course with natural cognitive aging and responsibility, but
3. one’s relative level of self control compared to others’ is largely determined by about age 11–12.2

However, religious socialization and exposure to religious activities would seem to be a potentially important process by which self control could be developed and increased. Indeed, evidence and theory suggest that self control should be pervious to religious influence (Laird et al. 2011; McCullough and Willoughby 2009; Vazsonyi and Jenkins 2010; Walker et al. 2007), even after the late childhood=early adolescence period posited by Gottfredson and Hirschi to be the point at which one’s relative self control stabilizes. Some scholars have moved away from treating self control as a stable individual trait to treating it as a dynamic capacity that is conditioned by social environmental factors, such as prior self control depletion, moral beliefs and choice, or community characteristics (Arneklev et al. 1998; Muraven et al. 2006; Piquero and Buffard 2007; Teasdale and Silver 2009; Tittle et al. 2004; Wikstrom and Treiber 2007). By

implication, adolescents' self control might be affected by their parents' and their own religion (Geyer and Baumeister 2005; McCullough and Willoughby 2009; Vazsonyi and Jenkins 2010).

Religion could thus strengthen self control. Hay and Forrest (2006:740) note that "little is known about the process by which [self control] develops over time." Latimore et al. (2006:348) note that only a small handful of studies address predictors of self control, and "additional information concerning the sources of self control are therefore needed." They theorize that a key source might be moral messages from caregivers and others. Cochran et al. (1998) find that parental attachment contributes to higher self control. Hay and Forrest (2006) find moderate stability in absolute self control and between-individual differences in self control, but they also find that between-individual differences in self control were affected by parental socialization well into adolescence.<sup>3</sup> Pratt et al. (2004) find that both parental socialization and neighborhood conditions predict variation in self control. They argue that community-level control and socialization is equally important as parenting in contributing to the development of self control. These suggestions of malleability of self control past childhood imply that participation in religion might strengthen self control.

The concept of Psychological Well-being is new. Basic researches have been conducted regarding Psychological Well-being. As a result guidance pertaining to the subject of Psychological Well-being can be obtained and the researchers have attempted to develop the methods to measure it. The concept of Psychological Well-being was developed by Can trill. It was considered as knowledge based experience People project their prevalent condition. In comparison to that different situation expected by them, either satisfies the individual or leads him to total dissatisfaction. If he is highly satisfied it guides towards Psychological Well-being. Many definitions have been presented regarding Psychological Well-being. These definitions have been submitted to world health organization. Without raising any question it can be said that inspire of Psychological Well-being psychological illness does exist. No organized attempts have been made in India to provide definition of Psychological Well-being, based on experience.

In Psychological Well-being is one of the most important goals which individuals as well as societies strive for. The term denotes that something is in a good state. It doesn't specify what the 'something' is and that is meant by 'good'. Psychological Well-being can be specified in two ways; first by the specifying the 'what' and secondly by spelling out the criteria of wellness.

Psychological Well – being is the subjective feeling of contentment, happiness, satisfaction with life's experiences and of one's role in the word of work, sense of achievement, utility, belongingness and no distress, dissatisfaction or worry, etc. These things are difficult to evaluate objectively, hence the emphasis is on the term 'subjective' Psychological Well-being. It may well be maintained in adverse circumstances and conversely, may be lost in

favorable situation. It is related to but not upon the psychological conditions.

According to Diener and Smith (1999), Psychological or subjective Psychological Well-being as a broad construct, encompassing four specific and distinct components including (a) pleasant or positive Psychological Well-being (e.g. joy, elation, happiness, mental health), (b) unpleasant affect or psychological distress (e.g. guilt, shame, sadness, anxiety, worry, anger, stress, depression), (c) life satisfaction (a global evaluation of one's life) and (d) domain or situation satisfaction (e.g. work, family, leisure, health, finance, self)

Psychological well-being is usually used as a term for all phrases that are related to happiness, satisfaction, self-actualization, peace, and happiness with all elements of life. According to Warr (1978), psychological well-being is a concept that is felt by a person about his/her daily activities. Warr defines psychological well-being as feelings that include negative emotional state and also positive view that is more than just satisfaction. He also implies the importance of the measurement of positive mental indicator that includes certain characteristics such as growth and learning from new experiences and success in the search of value. Meanwhile, Ryff (1995) Describes psychological well-being itself as the evaluation and interpretation that a person makes about themselves. Based on Ryff's definition, psychological well-being can be described as a condition where someone is not only free from distress and mental problems, but also has positive interpretation on his/her self and the past life, ability to manage environment effectively, ability to develop positive relation with other people, certain belief that life has meaning and purpose, and desire to grow and improve individually.

Recent literature continues to urge caution when extrapolating from the physiological to the psychological, particularly as so few studies are exploring the dose-response relation between exercise and psychosocial outcomes. Rejeski reviews only four such studies, with the most significant conclusion derived from this work being that there appears to be a ceiling level in terms of psychosocial effects. More specifically, these studies have suggested that low to moderate levels of aerobic exercise are better than traditional demanding (anaerobic) exercise programmers in terms of enhancing mood and improving psychological functioning.

#### **Problem**

Self control and psychological well being among working and non-working women

#### **Objectives of the Study**

The main objectives of study were as under:

1. To measure the self control among working and non-working women.
2. To measure the psychological well being among working and non-working women.
3. To measure the correlation between self control and psychological well being.

**Null-Hypothesis**

To related objectives of this study null-hypothesis were as under:

1. There is no significant difference in self control among working and non- working women.
2. There is no significant difference in psychological well being among working and non-working women.
3. There is no significant correlation between self control and psychological well being.

**Method**

**Participants**

According to the purpose of present study total 60 samples has been selected. There were (30 working and 30 non-working women) were taken as a sample from different area in Rajkot city (Gujarat).

**Instruments**

Self control scale: To collect the data of self-control scale of Arunkumar Singh and Alpa Sen Gupta was used. They have made English version scale. But investigate has used gujarati version scale made by Yogesh.A.Jogsan.

Psychological well being scale: Psychological well-being scales made by SudhaBhogle (1995).

**Procedure**

The testing was done on a group of sample. The whole procedure of fill the questionnaire was explained to them fully and clearly. The instructions given on the questionnaire were explained to them. It was also made clear to them that their scores would be kept secret. It was checked that none of the subjects left any questions unanswered or that no subject encircled both the answers given against a question.

**Research Design**

The aim of present research was to a study of self control and psychological well being among working and non- working women. For these total 60 were taken as a sample. To check the difference between groups t-test and to check the relation Karl-person correlation 'r' method was used. The result discussion of self control and psychological well being is as under:

**Result & Discussions**

**Table-1**

**Showing the Mean and t-Value of Self control in working and non-working women**

Variable	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig. Level
Working women	30	49.17	2.71	1.68	NS
Non-working women	30	48.93	3.73		

Sig. Level 0.05 = 2.00  
0.01 = 2.66

According to table no-1 indicates that the mean score of self control in working and non-working women are 49.17 and 48.93. The standard deviations for both groups are 2.71and 3.73 respectively. The difference between these two means is not significant at 0.05 level of confidence as the value of t- ratio is 1.68 finding show in that working women are more

affected by self control in comparison to non-working women. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

**Table-2**

**Showing the Mean and t-Value of Psychological Well Being in Working and Non-Working Women**

Variable	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig. Level
Working women	30	24.04	1.92	6.68	0.01
Non-working women	30	21.18	2.65		

Sig. Level 0.05 = 2.00  
0.01 = 2.66

According to table no-2 indicates that the mean score of psychological well being in working and non-working women are 24.04 and 21.18. The standard deviations for both groups are 1.92 and 2.65 respectively. The difference between these two means is significant at 0.01 level of confidence as the value of t- ratio is 6.68 finding show in that working women are more affected by psychological well being in comparison to non-working women. So we can say that second hypothesis was not accepted.

**Table-3**

**Showing the Correlation Self Control and Psychological Well Being among Working And Non-Working Women**

Variable	N	Mean	r
Self control	60	22.61	0.32
Psychological well being	60	49.05	

According to table no-3 indicates the result obtained positive correlation between self control and psychological well being. 0.32 positive correlations were seen.

**Conclusion**

The statistical analysis as mentioned above warranted the following inferences:

Here the first hypothesis was accepted because the significant differences were not seen and second hypothesis was not accepted because the significant differences were seen. Here 0.58 positive correlations between self control and psychological well being.

**Suggestions**

The study can be replicated on a larger sample and on teachers and other categories of other institutions as well as other districts and states. Comparisons can be drawn with the teacher educators studying in universities also taking into account other demographic variables such as, socio-economic status, age, teaching experience, residential backgrounds, education level, etc. to quote a few

**References**

Arneklev, Bruce, J., John K. Cochran and Randy R. Gainey (1998). *Testing Gottfredson and Hirschi's Low Self-control Stability Hypothesis : An Exploratory Study. American Journal of Criminal Justice* 23 : 107-127.

Bhogle, S.(1995).*Development psychological well-being (P.W.B).questionnairejournal ofpersonality and clinical studies.*

- Burch, C. E.(2012). <https://esirc.emporia.edu/handle/123456789/1997>
- Cochran, John, K., Peter B. Wood, Christine S. Sellers, Wendy Wilkerson and Mitchell B. Chamlin (1998). Academic Dishonesty and Low Self-control : An Empirical Test of A General Theory of Crime. *Deviant Behavior* 19 : 227-255.
- Geyer, Anne and Roy F. Baumeister (2005). Religion Morality and Self Control. pp. 412-432 in *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, Edited by Raymond F. Paloutzian and Crystal L. Park, New York : Guilford Press.
- Hay, Carter and Walter Forrest (2006). The Development of Self-control : Examining Self-control Theory's Stability Thesis. *Criminology*, 44 : 739-774.  
<http://www.grossnationalhappiness.com/9-domains/psychological-well-being/>
- Laird, Robert D., Loren D. Marks and Matthew D. Marrero (2011). Religiosity, Self-control and Antisocial Behavior : Religiosity as a Promotive and Protective Factor. *Journal of Applied Development Psychology*, 32 : 78-85.
- Muraven, Mark, Dianne M. Tice and Roy F. Baumeister (1998). Self Control as a Limited Resource : Regulatory Depletion Patterns. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74 : 774-789.
- Muraven, Mark, Greg Pogarsky, and Dikla Shmueli (2006). Self-control Depletion and the Theory of Crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 22 : 263-277.
- Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4, 99-104
- Walker, C. J.(2009)A Longitudinal Study on the Psychological Well-Being of College Students.<http://wellbeingincollege.org/upload/An%20of%20a%20Longitudinal%20Study%20on%20Student%20Well-Being.pdf>
- Warr, P. (1978). A study of psychological well being.*British Journal of Psychology*, 69 (1), 111-121
- Yochi c. & Andrew s. , (2008). Positive Psychological Well-Being and Mortality: A Quantitative Review of Prospective Observational Studies*Psychosomatic Medicine*vol. 70 no. 7,741-756