



Resilience and Psychological Well-being of Indian College Student Among Joint And Nuclear Families: A Comparative Study

Mohammad Haroon Khan¹ & Dr. Pankaj Singh²

¹Post-Graduate Student, ²Assistant Professor

Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences

Amity University, Noida, India

Abstract: This study aimed to investigate the level of resilience and psychological well-being among Indian college students belonging to joint and nuclear families. The sample comprised 100 college students (50 from joint families and 50 from nuclear families), who completed the 14-item Resilience Scale and the 42-item Psychological Well-being Scale. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, independent t-test, and correlation analysis.

The results showed that college students from joint families had significantly higher levels of resilience compared to those from nuclear families. However, there was no significant difference in psychological well-being between the two family types. Moreover, there was a significant positive correlation between resilience and psychological well-being, indicating that students with higher levels of resilience also had higher levels of psychological well-being.

These findings have important implications for mental health professionals and policymakers, as they highlight the potential benefits of joint family systems in promoting resilience among college students. The study suggests that interventions aimed at enhancing resilience and psychological well-being among college students should take into account family structure and dynamics. Furthermore, the study provides valuable insights into the relationship between resilience and psychological well-being, underscoring the importance of cultivating resilience as a protective factor for mental health.

Keywords: Resilience, Psychological well-being, Comparative study, Family structure, Coping mechanisms, Mental health

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

The structure of families has undergone significant changes over time, with a shift from joint families, where multiple generations live together, to nuclear families consisting of parents and their children. Understanding the dynamics of different family structures is crucial in exploring the factors that contribute to family resilience and psychological well-being. However, there is limited research comparing joint and nuclear families in terms of their resilience and psychological well-being. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the unique implications of family structure for resilience and psychological well-being, aiming to inform interventions and treatments tailored to different family types.

1.2 Resilience

1.2.1 Definition and Conceptualization

Resilience is defined as the ability to cope with stress, adapt to challenges, and recover from adversity. It is a multidimensional construct influenced by various personal and environmental factors. Resilience plays a crucial role in promoting positive outcomes and personal growth.

1.2.2 Factors that Contribute to Resilience

1.2.2.1 Individual Factors

Individual factors, such as self-esteem, optimism, and problem-solving skills, contribute to an individual's resilience. Additionally, the belief in personal improvement through effort and practice, known as a growth mindset, is an essential factor in building resilience.

1.2.2.2 Familial Factors

Familial factors also play a significant role in resilience. The quality of the parent-child relationship, parental warmth and support, and the presence of secure attachment are important contributors to a child's resilience. Additionally, effective communication, problem-solving skills, and the ability to manage conflicts within the family unit positively influence family resilience as a whole.

1.3 Psychological Well-being

1.3.1 Definition and Indicators

Psychological well-being encompasses a person's overall mental state and includes aspects such as life satisfaction, positive emotions, self-acceptance, personal growth, and a sense of purpose and meaning in life. It reflects an individual's subjective evaluation of their own mental health and overall life experience.

1.3.2 Factors Influencing Psychological Well-being

1.3.2.1 Individual Factors

Individual factors that contribute to psychological well-being include self-esteem, self-efficacy, resilience, and the ability to regulate emotions. Positive coping strategies, such as problem-solving skills, emotional regulation, and mindfulness, also play a crucial role in enhancing psychological well-being.

1.3.2.2 Familial Factors

The family environment significantly influences psychological well-being. Supportive and nurturing family relationships, open communication, and a sense of belonging within the family unit are associated with higher levels of psychological well-being. Furthermore, the presence of positive family dynamics, such as shared values, mutual respect, and cohesion, contribute to the overall well-being of family members.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Understanding the unique implications of family structure for resilience and psychological well-being can have important implications for interventions and support services. By identifying the specific factors that contribute to resilience and psychological well-being in joint and nuclear families, professionals can develop targeted interventions to promote positive family functioning and enhance the well-being of individuals within different family contexts. This study aims to bridge the existing research gap in this area and provide valuable insights for practitioners, policymakers, and families themselves.

2. Methodology

2.1 Aim

This study is aimed to compare the levels of resilience and psychological well-being between joint and nuclear families.

2.1 Objectives

The objective of this study is to compare resilience and psychological well-being in joint and nuclear families.

Specifically, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

- (a) Are there significant differences in resilience between joint and nuclear families?
- (b) Are there significant differences in psychological well-being between joint and nuclear families?

2.3. Hypotheses

The main hypothesis of the present research is as under-

- 1) There will be no significant difference between individuals of joint and nuclear families with regard to their resilience.
- 2) There will be no significant difference between individuals of joint and nuclear family with regards to their psychological well-being.

2.4 Research Design

The Quantitative research design was adopted which will enable the researchers to systematically observe and collect data on the variables of interest, namely the relationship between bullying, self-esteem, and psychological well-being in adolescents. Questionnaires will be used to gather information from the participants, allowing for the collection of quantitative data that can be analysed to identify patterns and trends. The sample will be selected using probability sampling techniques, such as **random sampling or stratified sampling.**

2.5 Sample

The participants for this study are Indian college students aged 18 years or above, who come from either joint or nuclear families. The sample size for this study is of 100 participants (50 from joint families and 50 from nuclear families) to detect these differences.

2.6. Procedure of Data Collection

Participants were recruited from various colleges in India using convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling technique that involves selecting participants based on their availability and accessibility. To be included in the study, participants were required to provide informed consent and complete the measures of resilience and psychological well-being. Participants who were unable to provide informed consent or have a history of mental illness or cognitive impairment will be excluded from the study.

2.7. Psychological Measures

2.7.1 Resilience

The 14-item Resilience Scale (RS-14) is a self-report measure of resilience developed by Wagnild and Young in 1993. It aims to assess an individual's ability to adapt and thrive in the face of adversity. The RS-14 has been widely used in research studies and clinical settings and has demonstrated good psychometric properties, including high internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and convergent and discriminant validity.

The RS-14 consists of 14 statements that reflect resilience-related characteristics such as self-reliance, perseverance, and adaptability. Respondents rate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The total score on the RS-14 can range from 14 to 98, with higher scores indicating greater levels of resilience.

The RS-14 has been translated into multiple languages and has been used in various populations, including adolescents, adults, and older adults. The scale has also been found to be sensitive to changes in resilience levels following interventions aimed at enhancing resilience.

2.7.2 Psychological Well-Being

The 42-item Psychological Well Being (PWB) Scale is a self-report measure of psychological well-being that was developed by Carol Ryff (1989). The PWB Scale assesses six dimensions of psychological well-being, including:

- **Autonomy:** the extent to which an individual is self-determined and able to make choices that reflect their own values and interests.
- **Environmental Mastery:** the extent to which an individual is able to effectively manage and adapt to their environment.
- **Personal Growth:** the extent to which an individual experiences personal development, growth, and learning.
- **Positive Relations with Others:** the extent to which an individual has positive and satisfying relationships with others.
- **Purpose in Life:** the extent to which an individual has a sense of meaning and purpose in life.
- **Self-Acceptance:** the extent to which an individual has positive attitudes and feelings towards themselves.

The PWB Scale consists of 42 items, with 7 items for each of the six dimensions. Each item is rated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Example items include "I feel that I am in charge of my life," "I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life," and "I have a sense of direction and purpose in my life."

The PWB Scale has been widely used in research on psychological well-being and has been shown to have good reliability and validity in various populations, including college students (e.g., Ryff et al., 2016). However, the lengthy nature of the scale may make it less feasible for use in large-scale studies or clinical settings.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

When studying resilience and psychological well-being in different family structures, ethical considerations are crucial. Informed consent should be obtained, confidentiality maintained, and participants' well-being prioritized. Cultural sensitivity and responsible communication of findings are essential to avoid harm and misrepresentation. By adhering to these ethical principles, researchers can conduct their study with integrity and respect.

3. Results

Table 1- Descriptive Statistics

3.1: Resilience

Variable	Family Type	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Resilience	Nuclear	50	71.78	7.12	0.926
	Joint	50	78.30	9.15	1.42

The sample of 50 participants was taken to see the mean, standard deviation, and standard error in the Resilience differing by significant values among nuclear and joint families.

3.2: Psychological Well being

Variable	Family Type	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Psychological Well Being	Nuclear	50	156.3	22.08	3.3
	Joint	50	169.86	28.5	2.26

The sample of 50 participants was taken to see the mean, standard deviation and standard error in the Psychological

Wellbeing differing by significant values among nuclear and joint families.

Table 2- Independent T- test Analysis - (Resilience & Psychological Well Being)

Variable	t-score	Value of p	Level of significance
Resilience	-3.98	.000067	p < .05
Psychological Well Being	-2.66	.004571	p < .05

Table 3: Pearson's Correlations between Resilience & Psychological Well being in Joint and Nuclear Family

Variables	Correlation Value	Outcome
Resilience	r = 0.5197	Moderate positive correlation
Psychological Well Being	0.644	Moderate positive correlation

4. Discussion and Data Analysis

The study was aimed to investigate the impact of family structure (joint vs. nuclear) on the psychological well-being and resilience of college students in India. The study sample included 100 college students, with 50 from each family type. The data were collected through a self-report questionnaire that measured psychological well-being and resilience.

The results of the study indicated that students from joint families had significantly higher scores on both psychological well-being and resilience measures than students from nuclear families. The mean score for resilience was 78.30 for students from joint families and 71.78 for students from nuclear families. The mean score for psychological well-being was 169.86 for students from joint families and 156.3 for students from nuclear families. The t-test analysis showed a significant difference between the mean scores of both family types for resilience ($t = -3.98$, $p < .05$) and psychological well-being ($t = -2.66$, $p < .05$).

Moreover, Pearson's correlations indicated that there was a moderate positive correlation between resilience and psychological well-being in both joint and nuclear family types. The correlation value for resilience was $r = 0.5197$, and for psychological well-being, it was $r = 0.644$.

The findings of the study suggest that family structure may play a significant role in the psychological well-being and resilience of college students in India. The results align with previous research that suggests that individuals from joint families may have better social support and higher levels of family cohesion, which may contribute to their better psychological well-being and resilience. In contrast, individuals from nuclear families may have fewer social resources, which may put them at higher risk for psychological problems.

The findings of the present study align with several previous studies that have investigated the relationship between family structure and psychological well-being of young adults. A study by Hosseini et al. (2021) found that individuals from joint families reported lower levels of psychological well-being compared to those from nuclear families. Similarly, a study by Deshpande and Patil (2019) found that college students from joint families reported lower levels of psychological well-being compared to those from nuclear families.

Moreover, the present study's findings are consistent with studies that have investigated the relationship between resilience and family structure. A study by Shakeri et al. (2020) found that individuals from nuclear families reported higher levels of resilience compared to those from joint families. Another study by Chatterjee et al. (2018) found that adolescents from nuclear families reported higher levels of resilience compared to those from joint families.

Further exploring the relation between family structure and resilience, a study conducted by Raj et al. (2019) in India found that adolescents from joint families reported higher levels of resilience compared to those from nuclear families. This finding is consistent with our study's results, where college students from joint families reported higher levels of resilience compared to those from nuclear families. Similarly, a study conducted by Rana and colleagues (2017) in Pakistan found that individuals from joint families had higher levels of resilience compared to those from nuclear families.

Regarding psychological well-being, a study conducted by Saravanan and colleagues (2018) in India found that college students from nuclear families reported higher levels of psychological well-being compared to those from

joint families. This finding is contradictory to our study's results, where college students from joint families reported higher levels of psychological well-being compared to those from nuclear families. However, it is important to note that the sample size, location, and measurement tools used in both studies were different, which could account for the discrepancies.

Another study conducted by Bagherian-Sararoudi and colleagues (2016) in Iran found that there was no significant difference in the psychological well-being of individuals from joint and nuclear families. This finding contrasts with our study's results, where college students from joint families reported higher levels of psychological well-being compared to those from nuclear families. However, it is important to note that the sample size and measurement tools used in both studies were different, which could account for the discrepancies.

Overall, the present study's results suggest that young adults from joint families may be at a disadvantage when it comes to psychological well-being and resilience compared to those from nuclear families. This finding could have important implications for mental health interventions and support services, particularly in countries where joint families are still prevalent.

Although the present study's findings contradict the initial hypothesis, the results are consistent with previous research and add to the growing body of evidence on the relationship between family structure and psychological well-being. Our study's results provide further evidence for the association between family structure and resilience and psychological well-being in college students. However, it is important to note that other factors such as cultural and societal norms, family relationships, and support systems could also play a significant role in shaping individuals' resilience and psychological well-being, regardless of family structure.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

The aim of this study was to compare the levels of resilience and psychological well-being among Indian college students from joint and nuclear families. The main hypothesis of the present research is as under:

1) There will be no significant difference between individuals of the joint and nuclear family with regard to their resilience.

2) There will be no significant difference between individuals of the joint and nuclear family with regard to their psychological well-being.

However, the results showed the opposite. The students from nuclear families had significantly higher levels of resilience and psychological well-being compared to those from joint families.

These findings are consistent with previous studies that have shown that family structure does not necessarily determine the well-being of individuals. The results also suggest that students from nuclear families may have better-coping mechanisms and support systems in place to deal with stressors and challenges.

The study used a sample of 100 college students, with 50 from nuclear families and 50 from joint families. Resilience and psychological well-being were measured using standardized scales. Independent t-tests and Pearson's correlations were conducted to analyze the data

Limitations and Future Scope

Although the study has presented significant findings, there are certain limitations that need to be considered. One of the limitations is the sample size, as the study only included 100 participants. A larger sample size could provide a more representative picture of the population. Additionally, the study only focused on college students, and the results may not be generalizable to other age groups.

Another limitation is the self-report measures used in the study, which may have been influenced by social desirability bias. Participants may have responded in a way that they perceived as socially acceptable, rather than providing truthful answers. Moreover, the study was conducted in a specific geographical area, and cultural differences may affect the results when applied to other regions.

The study suggests some avenues for future research, including conducting longitudinal studies to track the impact of family structure on psychological well-being and resilience over time. Future studies could also use a larger and more diverse sample size to obtain more representative findings. Furthermore, it would be useful to explore other factors that may affect psychological well-being and resilience, such as socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and gender.

6. References:

Ahmad, M. & Khalid, R. (2015). Social Support, Resilience, and Psychological Distress: A Pre- and Post-Disaster Longitudinal Study of Survivors of the 2010 Pakistan Flood. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, 20(6), 578-587.

Agarwal, M. & Varma, K. (2018). Comparative Study of Mental Health and Family Functioning in Joint and Nuclear Families. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, 9(5), 756-760.

Agarwal, V., Sethi, S., Usha, R., & Jha, M. (2020). Comparative Study of Psychological Well-Being among Joint and Nuclear Family Adolescents. *Indian Journal of Psychiatric Nursing*, 17(2), 92-97.

Al-Subaie, A. & Al-Habeeb, A. (2017). Perceived Social Support and Coping Styles as Predictors of Resilience among Bahraini College Students. *Mental Health and Prevention*, 6(1), 1-6.

Barnes, J. B. & Raskin, J. D. (2015). Psychological Well-Being in Emerging Adulthood: Examining the Associations Among Personality Traits, Social Support, and Stress. *Journal of Adult Development*, 22(1), 67-79.

Bawa, R. & Chakraborty, D. (2016). A Comparative Study of Psychological Well-Being between Joint and Nuclear Families. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, 7(7), 698-702.

Bjørnsen, H. N. & Espnes, G. A. (2018). How Psychological Well-Being and Resilience may Add to the Understanding of Mental Health Among Norwegian Adolescents. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 25(7-8), 442-452.

Chen, L., Wang, L., Qiu, X., & Wang, J. (2019). A Comparative Study on Resilience, Social Support and Emotional Intelligence of Chinese Adolescents in Urban and Rural Areas. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 47(3), 582-594.

Chen, Y. L., Chen, Y. P., & Tsai, C. Y. (2015). Comparison of the Mental Health of Students in Joint and Nuclear Families in Southern Taiwan. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 22(3), 167-174.

Davydov, D. M., Stewart, R., Ritchie, K., & Chaudieu, I. (2010). Resilience and Mental Health. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(5), 479-495.

Deng, Y. Q., Li, S., Tang, Y. Y., & Zhu, L. H. (2014). Savoring, Resilience, and Psychological Well-Being among University Students in China. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(4), 979-988.

Dimitrov, D. M. (2010). *Statistical Methods for Validation of Assessment Scale Data in Counseling and Related Fields*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.

Donnelly, R., & Hinterlong, J. (2015). The Relationship between Resilience and Adult Attachment Styles in College Students. *Journal of College*

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84(4), 822–848. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822>

Folkman, S., & Greer, S. (2000). Promoting psychological well-being in the face of serious illness: when theory, research and practice inform each other. *Psycho-Oncology*, 9(1), 11–19. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1099-1611\(200001/02\)9:1<11::aid-pon430>3.0.co;2-i](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1611(200001/02)9:1<11::aid-pon430>3.0.co;2-i)

Frydenberg, E. (2017). *Adolescent coping: Advances in theory, research and practice*. Routledge.

Gillham, J. E., Reivich, K. J., Jaycox, L. H., & Seligman, M. E. (2011). Prevention of depressive symptoms in school children: A research update. *Psychology in the Schools*, 48(3), 271–281. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20535>

Grotberg, E. H. (2003). The international resilience project. *Children & Society*, 17(4), 287–298. <https://doi.org/10.1002/chi.773>

Hanson, N. R. (2016). *Resilient: How to grow an unshakable core of calm, strength, and happiness*. Harmony.

Herrera, L. M., Lee, J. W., Nanyonga, R., & Laufgraben, J. L. (2016). Family functioning and psychological well-being of South African adolescents living in poverty. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 71, 86–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2016.10.023>

Hodges, E. V. E. (2011). Person–environment fit in the family context: Developmental perspectives. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (pp. 401–424). Guilford Press.

Kremen, A. M., & Block-Lerner, J. (2018). *Positive psychology in practice: Promoting human flourishing in work, health, education, and everyday life*. John Wiley & Sons.

Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., & Peterson, S. J. (2010). The development and resulting performance impact of positive psychological capital. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21(1), 41–67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20034>

Masten, A. S. (2014). Global perspectives on resilience in children and youth. *Child Development*, 85(1), 6–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12205>

McLeod, J. (2011). *An introduction to counselling* (5th ed.). Open University Press.

Peterson, C. (2006). *A primer in positive psychology*. Oxford University Press.

Chandra, P. S., & Kondapuram, N. (2019). Association between psychological resilience and positive mental health in school-going adolescents. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 8(7), 2275-2281.

Chmitorz, A., Kunzler, A., Helmreich, I., Tüscher, O., Kalisch, R., Kubiak, T., & Lieb, K. (2018). Intervention studies to foster resilience—A systematic review and proposal for a resilience framework in future intervention studies. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 59, 78-100.

Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and anxiety*, 18(2), 76-82.

de Terte, I., Stephens, C., & Keown, K. (2017). Developing and validating the Flourishing in Adversity Scale. *Journal of personality assessment*, 99(6), 596-608.

Folkman, S., & Greer, S. (2000). Promoting psychological well-being in the face of serious illness: when theory, research and practice inform each other. *Psycho-Oncology: Journal of the Psychological, Social and Behavioral Dimensions of Cancer*, 9(1), 11-19.

Karatzias, T., Shevlin, M., Fyvie, C., Hyland, P., Efthymiadou, E., Wilson, D., ... & Roberts, N. (2019). Evidence of distinct profiles of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and Complex Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (CPTSD) based on the new ICD-11 Trauma Questionnaire (ICD-TQ). *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 256, 412-420.

- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child development*, 71(3), 543-562.
- Masten, A. S., & Tellegen, A. (2012). Resilience in developmental psychopathology: Contributions of the Project Competence Longitudinal Study. *Development and psychopathology*, 24(02), 345-361.
- Norris, F. H., Tracy, M., & Galea, S. (2009). Looking for resilience: Understanding the longitudinal trajectories of responses to stress. *Social Science & Medicine*, 68(12), 2190-2198.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081.
- Wang, Y., Chen, X., Liang, Y., Chen, X., & Liu, D. (2018). The relationship between resilience and posttraumatic stress disorder among adult burn patients: The mediating role of coping style. *Burns*, 44(6), 1516-1524.
- Windle, G., Bennett, K. M., & Noyes, J. (2011). A methodological review of resilience measurement scales. *Health and quality of life outcomes*, 9(1), 8.
- Kumar, A., & Singh, R. (2017). Family structure and psychological well-being of adolescents. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, 8(3), 227-230.
- Khan, A., Husain, I., & Bhatti, S. (2019). Role of resilience in mental health and well-being among university students. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 34(2), 457-474.