

## Psychological well-being among supervisory staff of private and public undertakings

Amja Ali

Department of Humanities and Social Science, National Institute of Technology, Rourkela, Odisha

Since psychological well-being leads to certain desirable outcomes including economic gain and work performance of various work forces in different organizations. Further Deiner is also of opinion that employees who score high on psychological well-being later earn high income and show better performance at work. Therefore, keeping in view the relevance of psychological well-being at work place, the present research investigation is planned on priority basis to study the effect of psychological well being among supervisory staff of private and public undertakings. The sample of present research investigation is comprised of (N=100) respondents, 50 supervisory staff from each private and public undertakings from different parts of Aligarh, U.P. A highly standardized psychological well-being scale developed by Nishizwa (1996), comprised of 40 items was administered individually to each respondents. The reliability and validity of this scale was found to be 0.7-0.8 and 0.79 respectively. Finally t-test was employed to find out differences between two groups. The finding has far reaching implications in this regard.

Keywords: psychological wellbeing, work performanmce, supervisory staff

Interest in the area of psychological well-being and positive mental health seems to have peaked between the late 1950s and 1970s. Contemporary research conducted on psychological well-being usually involves discerning the variables that enhance or diminish well-being with a specific population through the use of some pre-existent measures of well-being.

Well-being can be defined in various terms but in the psychological sense it is defined as "good mental health". To most people in general it means happiness, a good quality of life and satisfaction. On the other hand well-being has been remaining a hot topic in organizational life. The popular press is full of books that offer guidelines for protecting and promoting employee satisfaction, fulfillment and health (Bakke, 2005; Dalai Lama & Cutler, 2003). Organization that foster employee well-being are honored by awards, such as fortune magazine's annual list of the "100 best companies to work for", and are recognized by current and prospective employees as desirable place to work. The American Psychological Association (2006) is now offering awards to psychologically healthy workplaces, and The Great Place to Work institute (2006) is seeking to document and implement steps for organizations to improve the quality of employees' lives.

Psychological well-being is a subjective term that implies different meanings to different people. A number of researches conducted in the recent past refers that psychological well-being is used throughout the health industry as a kind to catch all phrase meaning contentment, satisfaction with all elements of life, self-actualization, peace and happiness. Thus, a person with "psychological well-being" implies a happy and well satisfied person. An understanding of psychological well-being can be considered as a transcendental requirement for human existence in general. In other words, human beings always and necessarily live on the basis of some understanding of what is better, more desirable, or worthier way of being in the world. Psychological well-being deals with peoples' feeling about everyday experiences in life activities.

Such feelings may range from negative mental states or psychological strains such as anxiety, depression, frustration, emotional exhaustion, unhappiness, and dissatisfaction to a state which has been identified as positive mental health (Jahoda, 1958, war, 1978). Sell and Nagpal (1992) viewed that all indicators of psychological well-being have objective and subjective components. The objective components relate to concerns that are generally known by term "standard of living". While the subjective component is related with the concept of life to subjective well-being.

Subjective well-being refers to what people think and how they feel about their lives in positive manner. People experience subjective well-being when they feel many pleasant and few unpleasant emotions, when they are engaged in different interesting activities, when they experience many pleasures and few pains and when they are fully satisfied with their different walks of lives. The definition of subjective well-being thus stresses pleasant emotional experience. The area of subjective well-being has three hallmarks. First, it is subjective. According to Campbell (1976), it resides within the experience of the individual. Second, subjective well-being includes positive measures. It is not just the absence of negative factors. Third, the subjective well-being measures typically include a global assessment of all aspects of a person's life. On the other hand psychological well-being refers to how people evaluate their lives. These evaluations may be in the form of cognition or in the form of affect. The cognitive part is solely based on the appraisal of one's life and the affective part is based on a hedonic evaluation guided by emotions and feelings such as the frequency with which people experience pleasant/unpleasant moods in reaction to their lives.

Psychological well-being is considered as a balance between positive effect and negative effect. Positive well-being is an appraisal of the status of one's functioning and outcomes along with several distinct but interrelated dimensions including global, mental and physical health fullness (Myers, 1995). WHO (1998) defines psychological well-being as a positive state of physical, mental and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease or infirmity. Historical perspective of psychological well-being clearly reflects that there are literally dozens of documented factors that affect an individual psychological well-being at work that includes:

- Feeling of accomplishment
- Feeling of using one's abilities to the fullest.
- Recognition of work by superiors.
- Recognition of work by peers.
- Promotional opportunities
- Attractive salaries, wages and incentives and
- Social recognition/ social approvals of workers at workplace

These documented factors of psychological well-being leads to desirable outcomes, including economics ones. In an intensive research made by Diener and his colleagues (1998), People who score high in psychological well-being later earn high income and perform better at work. Psychological well-being is therefore valuable not only because it assesses well-being more directly but also because it is beneficial as a national priority in itself.

The well-being of employees is in the best interest of communities and organizations. The workplace is a significant part of an individual's life that affects his or her life and the well-being of the community. Leaders, managers, supervisors and employees alike believe that making employees happier and healthier increase their effort, contributions and productivity (Fisher, 2003). Human Resource Managers regularly monitor employee well-being through surveys (Rynes et al., 2002), and leaders publicly emphasize their organizations' commitments to employee well-being. For example, General Motors (2006) recently stated, "We are committed to protecting the health and safety of each employee as the overriding priority of this corporation. There will be no compromise of an individual's well-being in anything we do." Even governments have become involved in employee well-being: the Himalya Kingdom of Bhutan has maintained a national happiness index since 1972, which has begun to attract the attention of other governments and the mass media (Revkin, 2005). Extensive evidence indicates that employee well-being has a significant impact on the performance survival of the organization (Danna & Griffin, 1999).

Supervisors in the organization has important role to play. Research indicates that supervisor behavior can affect employee psychological well-being. The earliest empirical findings on the links between supervisor behavior and employee well-being date from the late 1970s when Gavin and Kelley (1978) reported strong associations between employees' self-reports of well-being and perceptions about their supervisory staff. Stout (1984) found that employees whose supervisors were high on both consideration and initiation of job structure reported lower level of stress than employees whose supervisors were low on both these factors. Studies of recent past provide additional support to supervisory importance. Landeweerd and Boumans (1994) found an inverse relationship between supervisors' use of socio-emotional leadership and employees' health complaints. Tapper (2000) Observed that abusive supervision was associated directly with psychological distress.

### Objectives of the Study

Keeping in view the relevance of psychological well-being among workers and side by side at work place, the present research investigation is aimed to study the effect of psychological well-being among supervisory staff of private and public undertaking in this context".

### Hypotheses of the Study

It was hypothesized that supervisory staff of private undertakings would have better psychological well-being as compare to

supervisory staff of public undertakings on good mental health, poor mental health, social support, social stressors, work support, work stressors, personal support, personal stressors and overall psychic well-being dimensions.

## Method

### Participants

The participants of the present research investigation is comprised of (N=100) respondents, 50 supervisory staff from each private and public undertakings. The sample was randomly selected from different organizations located at different parts of Aligarh, U.P. the age range of the respondents varies between 25 to 40 years.

### Instrument

A highly standardized psychic well-being scale developed by Nizishwa (1996) was individually administered at each respondents of the sample. The scale is comprised of eight important dimensions such as; good mental health, poor mental health, social support, social stressors, work support, work stressors, personal support and personal stressors. Each dimension of this scale is consisting of five items. The Cronbach Alpha reliability of this scale was found to be 0.7-0.8 and its test-retest reliability was found to be 0.79 respectively. As far as question of its validity is concerned, its congruent validity was found to be 0.83 and Kozma and Stones' validity was found to be 0.82 respectively.

## Results and Discussion

Table 1: Showing Mean, SD and t-value for supervisory staff of private and public undertakings on overall psychic well-being dimension.

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P
Private	50	114.10	12.25	4.97	<.01
Public	50	104.45	14.76		

\*Significant at 0.01 level.

It is amply clear from table No. 1 that the Mean and SD of supervisory staff of private undertakings was found to be 114.10 and 12.25, while in the case of supervisory staff of public undertakings the Mean and SD was found to be 104.45 and 14.76 respectively, which is significant at 0.01 level. Thus, proves the present underlying major hypothesis of our research that "supervisory staff of private undertakings would have better psychological well-being as compare to supervisory staff of public undertakings on overall psychic well-being dimensions".

Herewith the psychological well-being of supervisory staff of private undertakings refers that they are well adjusted individuals and have mature attitudes toward their life experiences. While at the same time the poor psychological well-being of supervisory staff of public undertakings refers that they have experienced many measurable experiences and frustrations in their day to day life, and suffering from high level job dissatisfaction in their career.

Table 2: Showing Mean, SD and t-value for supervisory staff of private and public undertakings on good mental health dimension.

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P
Private	50	20.15	4.40	11.14	<.01
Public	50	12.20	6.01		

\*Significant at 0.01 level.

It is amply clear again from table No. 2 that the Mean and SD of supervisory staff of private undertakings was found to be 20.15 and 4.40, while in the case of supervisory staff of public undertakings the Mean and SD was found to be 12.20 and 6.01 respectively, which is significant at 0.01 levels. Thus, proves the present underlying minor hypothesis of our research that “supervisory staff of private undertakings would have better psychological well-being as compare to supervisory staff of public undertakings on good mental health dimension”.

In this case good mental health of supervisory staff of private undertakings clearly indicates that they are fully satisfied with their organizational as well as personal life. While at the same time poor mental health shown by supervisory staff of public undertakings clearly indicates that they are neither fully satisfied with their organizational life nor with their personal life of their own. Hence, they are suffering from poor mental health and career dissatisfaction.

Table 3: Showing Mean, SD and t-value for supervisory staff of private and public undertakings on poor mental health dimension.

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P
Private	50	12.95	5.12	10.42	<.01
Public	50	17.80	5.92		

\*Significant at 0.01 level.

In this case table No. 3 indicates that the Mean and SD for supervisory staff of private undertakings was found to be 12.95 and 5.12, while in the case of supervisory staff of public undertakings the Mean and SD was found to be 17.80 and 5.92 respectively, which is significant at 0.01 level. And thus, proves the present underlying minor hypothesis of our present research that “supervisory staff of private undertakings would have better psychological well-being as compare to supervisory staff of public undertakings on poor mental health dimension”.

From the above mentioned findings it is quite obvious that supervisory staffs of private undertakings are getting lesser poor mental health because of the fact that they got job freedom and independent decision making authority and at the same time they are residing in a highly conducive and cordial atmosphere. While at the same time result shown by supervisory staff of public undertaking is also side by side quite obvious because of the reason that mostly supervisory staff of public undertakings have not been provided much job freedom in their respective organizations. It is also the ground reality that they are suffering from decision making in curtailment on the part of their career life by their superiors. Thus, because of their bitter and painful career experiences with their superiors they are getting poor mental health.

Table 4: Showing Mean, SD and t-value for supervisory staff of private and public undertakings on social support dimension.

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P
Private	50	19.25	4.74	9.95	<.01
Public	50	11.65	5.01		

\*Significant at 0.01 level.

In this case table No. 4 indicates that the Mean and SD of supervisory staff of private undertakings was found to be 19.25 and 4.74, while in the case of supervisory staff of public undertakings the Mean and SD was found to be 11.65 and 5.01 respectively, which is significant at 0.01 level. Thus, proves the present underlying minor hypothesis of our present research that “supervisory staff of private undertakings

would have better psychological well-being as compare to supervisory staff of public undertakings on social support dimension”.

The above mentioned table of present result clearly indicates that supervisory staff of private undertakings are getting better social support from their superiors as compared to supervisory staff of public undertakings because of the fact that private undertakings are by and large getting more supportive and highly cooperative working environment at work place as compared to supervisory staff of public undertakings at their workplace. Thus, social support has been identified by researcher as important dimensions for various private organizations.

Table 5: Indicates Mean, SD and t-value for supervisory staff of private and public undertakings on social stressors dimension.

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P
Private	50	10.15	3.45	11.95	<.01
Public	50	18.05	5.27		

\*Significant at 0.01 level.

Table No. 5 indicates that the Mean and SD for supervisory staff of private undertakings was found to be 10.15 and 3.45, while in the case of supervisory staff of public undertakings the Mean and SD was found to be 18.05 and 5.27 respectively, which is significant at 0.01 level. Thus, proves the present underlying minor hypothesis of the present research that “supervisory staff of private undertakings would have better psychological well-being as compare to supervisory staff of public undertakings on social stressors dimension”.

The above mentioned result clearly indicates that the supervisory staff of private undertakings are getting lesser social stressors as compared to supervisory staff of public undertakings because of an open fact that supervisory staff of private undertakings are getting more favorable and supportive working organizational environment on the one hand and on the second they are getting more cooperative attitudes by their superiors and thirdly they are getting better job authority and autonomy as compared to supervisory staff of public undertakings. Hence, supervisory staff of public undertakings by and large suffering from social stressors in this regard.

Table 6: Showing Mean, SD and t-value for supervisory staff of private and public undertakings on work supports dimension.

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P
Private	50	19.50	4.75	13.82	<.01
Public	50	10.15	5.10		

\*Significant at 0.01 level.

Table No. 6 indicates that the Mean and SD for supervisory staff of private undertakings was found to be 19.50 and 4.75, while in the case of supervisory staff of public undertakings the Mean and SD was found to be 10.15 and 5.10 respectively, which is significant at 0.01 level. Thus, proves the present underlying minor hypothesis of the present research that “supervisory staff of private undertakings would have better psychological well-being as compare to supervisory staff of public undertakings on work support dimension”.

The above said findings clearly indicates that supervisory staff of private undertakings are getting better work support as compared to supervisory staff of public undertakings because of the fact that supervisory staff of private undertakings are getting more rewarding

job experiences, better work support and at the same time experiencing better quality of life as compared to supervisory staff of public undertakings. Regardless, supervisory staff of public undertakings has also been found by and large suffering from poor work support from their immediate supervisors and also suffering from powerlessness and job discontentment. Hence, the obtained findings are quite obvious.

Table 7: Showing Mean, SD and t-value for supervisory staff of private and public undertakings on work stressors dimension.

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P
Private	50	12.30	4.15	10.92	<.01
Public	50	19.40	4.96		

\*Significant at 0.01 level.

Table No. 7 indicates that the Mean and SD for supervisory staff of private undertakings was found to be 12.30 and 4.15, while in the case of supervisory staff of public undertakings the Mean and SD was found to be 19.40 and 4.96 respectively, which is significant at 0.01 level. Thus proves the present underlying minor hypothesis of the present research that “supervisory staff of private undertakings would have better psychological well-being as compare to supervisory staff of public undertakings on work stressors dimension”.

The above said findings clearly indicates that supervisory staff of private undertakings are suffering from less work stressors as compared to supervisory staff of public undertakings because of the hidden ground that supervisory staff of private undertakings are getting better promotional avenues, best career development opportunities and at the same time more friendly and congenial working atmosphere while contradictory to it supervisory staff of public undertakings are suffering from high work pressure poor and disfavorable working environment and less supportive attitudes of their immediate superiors.

Table 8: Showing Mean, SD and t-value for supervisory staff of private and public undertakings on personal support dimension.

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P
Private	50	17.95	4.30	12.97	<.01
Public	50	11.20	5.72		

\*Significant at 0.01 level.

Table No. 8 indicates that the Mean and SD for supervisory staff of private undertakings was found to be 17.95 and 4.30, while in the case of supervisory staff of public undertakings the Mean and SD was found to be 11.20 and 5.72 respectively, which is significant at 0.01 level. Thus, proves the present underlying minor hypothesis of the present research that “supervisory staff of private undertakings would have better psychological well-being as compare to supervisory staff of public undertakings on personal support dimension”

The above said findings indicate that supervisory staff of private undertakings are getting more better personal support as compared to supervisory staff of public undertakings because of the fact that supervisory staff of private undertakings are getting more supportive work culture and receiving more benevolent treatment given by their immediate superiors and other high ups managerial staff of their respective organizations. While in the case of supervisory staff of public undertakings, supervisors are getting by and large non personal supportive treatment given by their immediate supervisors. Regardless, public sector supervisory staff are also facing a lot of personal organizational problems and also suffering from abominable work culture. Hence, the obtained result is quite obvious and reasonable in this regard.

Table 9: Showing Mean, SD and t-value for supervisory staff of private and public undertakings on personal stressors dimension.

Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P
Private	50	12.35	4.53	9.84	<.01
Public	50	18.95	6.72		

\*Significant at 0.01 level.

Table No. 9 indicates that the Mean and SD for supervisory staff of private undertakings was found to be 12.35 and 4.53, while in the case of supervisory staff of public undertakings the Mean and SD was found to be 18.95 and 6.72 respectively, which is significant at 0.01 level. Thus, proves the present underlying minor hypothesis of the present research that “supervisory staff of private under takings would have better psychological well-being as compare to supervisory staff of public undertakings on personal stressors dimension”

It is also pretty clear from the above mentioned findings that supervisory staff of private undertakings are suffering from less personal stressors on the part of their organizational life as compared to supervisory staff of public undertakings because of the ground reality that supervisory staff of private undertakings by and large have been found well skilled, highly competitive, competent and self motivating towards an organizational culture and not suffering from any kind of social stressors on their parts. While at the same time contradictory to above said statement, supervisory staff of public undertakings by and large are suffering from inadequate job related knowledge, skills and attitudes. Regardless, they are also suffering from job related obsolescence, personal job related inefficiency and outside and inside environmental organizational stressors. Hence, the obtained result in this context is also highly desirable.

## Conclusion and Suggestions

Indeed, well-being of individuals is highly needed to survive them in a most difficult period of work and working environment. It is of utmost important to conclude that positive psychological well-being of an individual can leads to the successful task at hand and finally to the organizational success. This study highlighted some important mind storming findings which clearly suggest that management of government undertakings are in urgent need to provide different required facilities to their supervisors so that their level of psychological well-being can be improved. Though the sample of this study is quite limited but it may have its own far-reaching implications in its wider perspectives. Further, more studies are also required taking larger samples of different population in the field of psychological well-being to catch up the fast growing technological impact and its implications on individuals' psychological well-being and mental health.

## References

- American Psychological Association. (2006). *Psychologically healthy workplace awards*. Retrieved on August 31, 2006 from <http://www.phwa.org/>
- Bakke, D. W. (2005). *Joy at work: A revolutionary approach to fun on the job*. Seattle, WA: PVG.
- Campbell, A. (1976). Subjective measures of wellbeing. *American Psychologist*, 31, 117-124.
- Dalai Lama, H. H., & Cutler, H. C. (2003). *The art of happiness at work*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 357-384.
- Diener, E., Sapyta, J., & Suh, E. (1998) subjective well-being is essential to well-being. *Psychological enquiry*, 9, 33-37.
- Fisher, C. D. (2003). Why do lay people believe that satisfaction and performance are correlated? Possible sources of a commonsense theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(6), 753-777.
- Gavin, J.F. and Keelly, R. F. (1978). The psychological climate and reported well-being of underground miners: An exploratory study. *Human Relations*, 31, 567-581.
- General Motors Corporation. (2006). *GM global health and safety*. Retrieved on August 31, 2006 from [http://www.gm.com/company/gmability/workplace/200\\_health/index.html](http://www.gm.com/company/gmability/workplace/200_health/index.html)
- Great Place to Work Institute. (2006). Retrieved August 31, 2006 from <http://www.greatplacetowork.com/>.

- Jahoda, M. (1958). *Current concepts of positive mental health*. New York: Basic Books.
- Landeweerd, J. A., and Boumans, N. P. G. (1994). The effect of work dimensions and need for autonomy on nurses' work satisfaction and health. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 207-217
- Myers, D.G, & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy? *Psychological Science*, 6, 10-9.
- Revin, A. C. (2005). A new measure of well-being from a happy little kingdom. *The New York Times*, October 4. Retrieved on August 31, 2006 from [http://www.nytimes.com/2005/10/04/science/04happ.html?ex\\_1286078400&en\\_a4c0250cf8730dca&i\\_5088&partner\\_rssnyt&emc\\_rss](http://www.nytimes.com/2005/10/04/science/04happ.html?ex_1286078400&en_a4c0250cf8730dca&i_5088&partner_rssnyt&emc_rss)
- Rynes, S. L., Colbert, A. E., & Brown, K. C. (2002). HR professionals' beliefs about effective human resource practices: Correspondence between research and practice. *Human Resource Management*, 41(2), 149-174.
- Sell, P., and Nagpa, L. R. (1992). *Assessment of subjective well being: The subjective well-being Inventor (SUBI)*. Regional health paper, SEARO, New Delhi: WHO Regional office for South East Asia.
- Stout, J. K. (1984). Supervisors structuring and consideration behaviors and workers' job satisfaction, stress, and health problems. *Rehabilitation Bulletin*, 28, 133-138.
- Warr, P.B. (1978). A study of psychosocial well-being, *British Journal of Psychology*, 69, 111-121.
- World Health Organization. Definition of Health. [Online] 1998. Available from: <http://URL://www.who.ch/aboutwho/definition.htm>