

Investigate the Relation between Psychological Well-being, Self-efficacy and Positive Thinking at Prince Sattam bin Abdul Aziz University Students

Dr. Maha Ahmed Hussein Alkhatib¹

¹Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology (Development), Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, faculty of education. Aldelam Psychology Department, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Dr. Maha Ahmed Hussein Alkhatib, Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology (Development), princes Sttam University, faculty of education, Aldelam Psychology Department, Saudi Arabia

Received: March 21, 2020

Accepted: May 26, 2020

Online Published: June 1, 2020

doi:10.5430/ijhe.v9n4p138

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n4p138>

Abstract

The current study aimed to investigate the relationship between psychological well-being, self-efficacy and positive thinking, among Prince Sattam Bin Abdul Aziz University's students in Saudi Arabia. To answer the study questions, three questionnaires were administrated, two were submitted by the researcher (psychological well-being and self-efficacy), positive thinking scale by (Radi & Metib, 2017) to 350 university students with range age of 18 to 36 years old. The study adopted a descriptive design to measure the degree of correlation between variables, Results of the study showed that students have moderate psychological well-being level, and that there was a positive relationship between psychological well-being; self-efficacy and positive thinking, also research results indicated that there was a positive relationship between self-efficacy and positive thinking, but the results showed that (gender, faculty, acedamic level) had no impact on psychological well-being or positive thinking. The impact was within (academic level) on self-efficacy in benefit of master degree group.

Keywords: psychological well-being, self-efficacy, positive thinking

1. Introduction

In any society, Individuals are exposed to too many pressures, such as, psychological, economic and social pressures that may negatively affect their psychological stability As a result, educational institutions such as schools and universities will be faced with challenges In order to avoid this negative affect, Individuals have to work to reduce these effects and achieve a certain level of psychological well-being that helps them to feel stable with their personalities, and enjoy good social relationships with others(Santos et al.,2014). It is also important for them to increase their beliefs in their capabilities or self-efficacy, and to conduct thinking patterns that qualify them and help increase their self-confidence and their ability to control the surrounding environment. In return, these characteristics would pave the way for carrying out daily pressures with confidence and belief in oneself which would tend to lead to improved psychological well-being.

Psychological well-being has strongly influenced positive psychology over the last ten years, due to its prominent position in various societies and cultures, and everyone's pursuit of psychological well-being as a higher goal of life, because of its association with positive mood, satisfaction, happiness, and self- acceptance (İşgör, 2016). It can be defined as a structure that includes information related to how an individual evaluates one's self and life (Ryff et al., 1999). Researchers have suggested (Çardak, 2013; Dwiwardani et al., 2014) that psychological well-being includes three main domains:

The first, is at the subjective level which is related to the person who possesses a sense of psychological well-being and contentment with the past, has a meaningful life and happiness with the present, hope and optimism for the future.

The second is at the individual level, this means when a person full of love, courage and high morals, sensitive, tolerant, spiritual, talented, wise whereas.

The third is at the institutional level, it is about a person who is responsible, polite, modest, and has a high professional ethics, so psychological well-being includes self-acceptance, positive relationships with the others,

autonomy, environmental control, life purpose and personal development, taking into account when dealing with psychological well-being concept, the concept's relationship with emotional, mental, physical, cognitive, personal and social processes (Roothman et al., 2003; Gomez et al., 2018).

This study is focused on university students since they are in an important stage of their lives, stage that they are about to experience career exploration. Research showed that Self-efficacy was strongly related to psychological well-being, and that it plays a pivotal role in protecting children and adolescents in counteracting depressive status (Bandura et al., 1999). Self-efficacy defined by Bandura (1994) as individual's beliefs in their sufficiency to be successful in a task, which directly affects their actions and achievement. He emphasizes that the beliefs of self-efficacy play an important role in changing behavior, due to the effects of such beliefs on the decision-making process to carry out behaviors, effort exerted and deal with problems that may arise during this process (Bandura, 2012).

In addition, (Gregg, 2009) defined self-efficacy as the evaluation of the individual's capabilities, which are related and interact with the individual's ability to organize one's behavior and learning. The expectations of an individual's self-efficacy are judgments about how the individual behaves in a particular way to reach a goal or adapt effectively to stressful situations.

Researchers have suggested that Self-efficacy belief doesn't depend on personal abilities but the people believe in their abilities, hence in their success. These beliefs affect people's plans and opinions (Zeldin et al., 2008; Santos et al., 2012; Siddiqui, 2015), a study by (Zaker et al., 2016) relating self-efficacy with positive psychology variables, showed that students' self-efficacy can be improved by happiness training, also (Sezgin & Erdoğan, 2018) study showed positive and significant relationships among teacher self-efficacy, humility and forgiveness.

Studies of (Bandura, 1997; Kuijer & Ridder, 2003; Bisschop et al., 2004) found that high self-efficacy is related to positive well-being, high self-esteem, better adaptation and stress regulation. Furthermore, high self-efficacy can be the reason for young adult's high activity level and happiness (Cakar, 2012), while people with high degree of self-efficacy can increase their beliefs in their capability in controlling events in their environment which may increase their psychological well-being, people with low self-efficacy are related to more symptoms of anxiety and depression (Faure & Loxton, 2003; Kashdan & Roberts, 2004), as well as to lower levels of psychological well-being (Barlow et al., 2002; Caprara, 2002; Bandura et al., 2003; Ersöz, 2017; Rasool & Zubair, 2019)

Another variable that affects psychological well-being is positive thinking, researchers found that in order to reach happiness the individual has to have some abilities such as optimism, hope and a pattern of thinking such as positive thinking which means that the expectation of good events, feeling will be realized by our endeavors and future planning and can produce stable happiness and purposeful life. (Sligman, 2002).

Positive thinking is one of the patterns of thinking, defined by (Bekhet & Zauszniewski, 2013) as a mental attitude that makes thoughts occurred in the mind sufficient to become successful. By adopting this pattern of thinking, the individual achieves an inner balance and a better level of awareness that helps to revive life. The effects of positive thinking include positive feelings, emotions, behavioral qualities, and assistance in problem-solving (Naseem & Khalid, 2010; Bekhet & Zauszniewski, 2013; Çelik & Sarıçam, 2018)

Studies showed that positive thoughts can motivate individuals whereas negative thoughts are associated with poor health outcomes and devaluing oneself (Naseem & Khalid, 2010). In addition, positive thinking linked to increasing mental health, whereas negative thinking can decrease one's mental health (Tugade & Fredrickson, 2004).

In reviewing literature, the researcher found a lack of studies within the limits of the researcher's knowledge that dealt with psychological well-being, self-efficacy and positive thinking for Prince Sattam bin Abdul-Aziz University (PSAU) students. This study identifies its problem in answering the following questions

- (1) What is the general psychological well-being level among PSAU students?
- (2) Are there any significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean of the study sample in positive thinking due to the psychological well-being level?
- (3) Are there any significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean of the study sample in self-efficacy due to the level of psychological well-being?
- (4) Is there a relationship between psychological well-being, positive thinking and self-efficacy?
- (5) Are there any significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean of the study sample in psychological well-being considering the demographic characteristics (gender- faculty- academic level)?

(6) Are there any significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean of the study sample in self-efficacy considering the demographic characteristics (gender-faculty-academic level)?

(7) Are there any significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean of the study sample in positive thinking considering the demographic characteristics (gender-faculty-academic level)?

The research contributes to the existing knowledge in a way that there are no studies available in the literature which cover these aspects specially for university students in Saudi Arabia. Therefore, the study results will expand knowledge related to the effects of psychological well-being, self-efficacy and positive thinking on university students and how it relates their personal and academic life, and how it contributes in increasing efficiency and achievement.

2. Literature Review

Caprara et al. (2006) aimed to examine the concurrent and longitudinal impact of self-efficacy beliefs on subjective well-being in adolescence, namely positive thinking and happiness, a structural model positing adolescents' emotional and interpersonal self-efficacy belief as proximal and distal determinants of positive thinking and happiness has been tested. A sample of 664 Italian adolescents. Results showed that the correlation between self-efficacy beliefs on positive thinking and happiness both concurrent and longitudinal. Also, self-efficacy beliefs manage positive and negative emotions and interpersonal relationships contribute to promote positive expectations about the future, to maintain a high self-concept, to perceive a sense of satisfaction for the life and to experience more positive emotions.

Santos et al. (2014) aimed to study the relationship of general self-efficacy and subjective well-being among Filipino college students in both private and public institutions. Two scales, General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES) and Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) were administered on a sample of 969 college students. The study employed a descriptive-predictive design. Results showed that general self-efficacy and subjective well-being has a positive relationship. Participants with higher levels of general self-efficacy reported higher levels of subjective well-being. Also, the results showed that (age -gender, socio-economic status) had strong impact on general self-efficacy and subjective well-being.

Ghodsbin et al. (2015) aimed to evaluate the effect of positive thinking training on the level of spiritual well-being among the patients with coronary artery diseases, The sample enrolled 90 patients with confirmed CAD referred to Imam Reza clinic, then they were divided in two groups intervention ($n = 45$) and control groups ($n = 45$). two questionnaires well-being scale (SWBS) and a demographic questionnaire were used. The patients in the intervention group participated in 7 training sessions on positive thinking. Results showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups regarding both variables of time and group ($P < 0.001$). SWB is an important factor which should be considered in the treatment process, and nurses could maintain and improve such dimension of health in the patients through their intervention including drawing the patients' attention to optimism and positive thinking

Siddiqui (2015) investigated the impact of Self-efficacy on Psychological Well-being among undergraduate students. The sample consisted of 100 (50 Male and 50 Female) University students. General Self-Efficacy Scale; Psychological Well-being was used. The results showed that there was insignificant difference between Male and Female students Self-efficacy, but an insignificant difference was found in Psychological well-being with both groups.

Ersöz (2017) aimed to examine the relationship between exercise and general self-efficacy, depression, and psychological well-being of college students. A male and female sample of 522 university students was used, The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES), Beck Depression Inventory (BDI), Physical Activity Stages of Change Questionnaire (PASCQ), and "Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWBS) were conducted. Results showed that significant disparities have been found between the sample' level of self-efficacy, depression, and psychological well-being, the sample' general self-efficacy and psychological well-being levels were high and the depression levels were low when on advanced levels of exercise.

Tommasi et al. (2018) aimed to study Correlations Between Personality, Affective and Filial Self-Efficacy Beliefs, and Psychological Well-Being in a Sample of Italian Adolescents. A sample of 179 Italian adolescents were conducted. Eysenck Personality scale, adolescent perceived Self-efficacy belief of positive and negative emotions Scale, Psychological Well-being scale were used. Results show that extraversion, neuroticism, and self-efficacy beliefs in emotion regulation are correlated with psychological well-being, while filial self-efficacy does not. There were no significant effects of Self-efficacy beliefs on personality traits, but results showed that self-efficacy beliefs in expressing positive emotions reduce negative characteristics of individuals with high level of psychoticism.

Yuksel (2019) aimed to study the perceived levels of self-efficacy, psychological well-being, and social support in pregnant women. Using cross-sectional and descriptive, on a sample consists of 258 pregnant women. Self-efficacy Scale, Psychological Well-being, and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support Scale were used to collect data. Results: found that factors like age, educational level, presence of the social support and having birth knowledge were affecting the self-efficacy, perceived social support and psychological well-being levels of the pregnant women ($p < .05$). There were statistically significant relationships between self-efficacy, psychological well-being and perceived social support in pregnant women.

Fernández et al. (2019) aimed to study the relationship between psychological well-being, self-efficacy and self-esteem in non-dependent individuals over the age of 60. The sample included 148 seniors between 60 and 96 years of age. autonomy and physical and social activity scale, self-efficacy for aging scale, self-esteem scale, and the Spanish version of the wellness psychology scale were used. The results suggest that psychological well-being was not associated with age, but with a set of psychological factors. Psychological well-being was associated with health perception, physical and sports activities, also the results showed self-efficacy and self-esteem are considered promoters of physical, psychological and social well-being, also the study found that encouraging older people in physical and sports, recreational, social and cognitive activities promoting wellness and, ultimately, active aging

The literature review suggests both types of qualitative and quantitative research approaches as well as descriptive and exploratory research designs. Likewise, the psychological well-being has an effect on both self-efficacy and positive thinking, but one study aimed to trace the relationship between psychological well-being, self-efficacy and positive thinking. The current study is similar to previous studies on using descriptive research design and the sample used in some studies, and differs in the investigating the relationship between all three variables for the first time in a Saudi Arabia university, the study was conducted in the first university semester (2019-2020)

3. Methods

3.1 Study Method

The study adopted to achieve its objectives through descriptive research, the three questionnaires were conducted electronically for all members of the study sample, Data were collected and analyzed using SPSS 18.0 program, to determine the relationships among the means of psychological well-being general self-efficacy, and positive thinking scores, Statistical significance level was considered as ($\alpha \leq 0.05$).

3.2 Population

The population of the study consisted of all students at PSAU- Saudi Arabia.

3.3 Study Sample

A sample of 350 university students, were randomly chosen both male and female, from applied science and humanity college, studying in bachelor or master degree academic level, Before the study, approval to research with human participants was obtained from the university's ethical committee.

The following Table 1 shows the distribution of the study sample according to the demographic variables

Table 1. distribution of participant according to demographic variables

<i>demographic Variables</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Gender		
Male	73	21%
Female	277	79%
Faculty		
humanity	190	54%
Applied sciences	160	46%
Academic stage		
bachelor	294	84%
master	56	16%

3.4 Study Tools

Three questionnaires were used "Psychological Well-Being (PWBS), "General Self-Efficacy," which were constructed by the researcher, and "Standardized positive thinking questionnaire" for Saudi Arabia environment, details were given below:

3.4.1 Psychological Well-Being Questionnaire (PWBS).

The PWBS is a 38-item questionnaire which was derived from the PWBS (Ryff & Singer, 2008), the Saudi PWBS questionnaire (Alhazmi, 2017) and validated for the purpose of measuring PWB FOR Saudi Arabia university students. The PWBS consists of six subscales including (autonomy, environmental mastery, positive relationship, the purpose of life, self-acceptance, personal growth); each of which has (7;6;5;6;6;8) items. Each item is rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (None) to 5 (very high). A total score ranges from (190 to 38). Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the questionnaire in general, was tested in a sample of 100 participants (65 females, 35 males). The Cronbach's alphas for all participants was (0.85). This score indicates good internal consistency for the PWBS. Test-retest reliability of the PWBS was calculated at four weeks interval. The coefficient of the whole participants was (0.87), respectively. All correlation coefficients were significant at $p < .001$. These scores indicate adequate test-retest reliability of the PWBS. Factor analysis identified that confirmed by the PWBS (Alhazmi, 2017).

3.4.2 General Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (GSE)

The GSE is a 28-item questionnaire which was derived from previous Arabic literature considering self-efficacy (Aljaser, 2007; Abo-salama, 2014) questionnaires, The GSE consists of four subscales including (initiative; effort exerted; perseverance; effectiveness), each of which has (7) items. Each item is rated on a three-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree) to 3 (agree). A total score ranges from (84 to 28). Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the questionnaire in general, was tested in a sample of 100 participants. The Cronbach's alphas for all participants was (0.845). This score indicates good internal consistency for the GSE. Test-retest reliability of the GSE was calculated at four weeks interval. The coefficient of the whole participants was (0.83), respectively. All correlation coefficients were significant at $p < .001$. These scores indicate adequate test-retest reliability of the GSE.

3.4.3 Standardized Positive Thinking Questionnaire (SPTH):

The SPTH (Radi & Metib, 2017) is a 28-item questionnaire that has been developed for the Saudi Arabia university students. Each item is rated on a 3-point Likert-type scale that ranges from 1 (disagree) to 3 (agree). The SPTH has demonstrated good psychometric properties (Radi & Metib, 2017). Alpha coefficients of Saudi Arabia version of the SPTH total score were 0.83 and 0.91 for a sample of Saudi Arabia students, Test-retest reliability of the SPTH confirmed with coefficients of 0.84, respectively, Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the SPTH total score was 0.83 for the present study.

Table 2. Reliability coefficient values for internal consistency and test-retest of study variables

<i>no</i>	<i>questionnaire</i>	<i>Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient</i>	<i>Pearson correlation coefficient</i>
1	Psychological Well-Being	0.85	0.87
2	General Self-Efficacy	0.845	0.83
3	positive thinking	0.83	0.84

4. Results and Discussion

1- What is the general psychological well-being level among prince PSAU students?

The results of the Table 3 indicate that the Means and standard deviation of psychological well-being scores of participants.

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for psychological well-being scores of participants

<i>Item</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Item arrangement</i>	<i>degree of use</i>
R1	350	1	5	3.69	.897	28	Medium
R2	350	2	5	3.94	.911	16	High
R3	350	1	5	3.98	.951	13	High
R4	350	1	5	4.15	.869	6	High
R5	350	1	5	3.91	.942	18	High
R6	350	1	5	2.79	1.213	30	Medium
R7	350	1	5	3.77	.968	26	High
R8	350	1	5	3.89	.903	22	High
R9	350	1	5	3.45	1.066	29	Medium
R10	350	1	5	3.86	.919	23	High
R11	350	1	5	2.76	1.155	32	Medium
R12	350	1	5	2.79	1.138	31	Medium
R13	350	1	5	4.32	.877	1	High
R14	350	1	5	4.23	.875	3	High
R15	350	1	5	3.90	.993	21	High
R16	350	1	5	3.90	.999	20	High
R17	350	1	5	2.37	1.277	35	Medium
R18	350	1	5	3.96	.875	14	High
R19	350	1	5	4.14	.952	7	High
R20	350	1	5	4.00	.883	12	High
R21	350	1	5	3.96	1.027	15	High
R22	350	1	5	4.10	.911	9	High
R23	350	1	5	3.93	.915	17	High
R24	350	1	5	2.32	1.225	36	Medium
R25	350	1	5	3.79	.967	25	High
R26	350	1	5	4.18	.924	5	High
R27	350	1	5	3.76	.992	27	High
R28	350	1	5	4.08	1.047	10	High
R29	350	1	5	2.09	1.199	37	Low
R30	350	1	5	3.85	1.000	24	High
R31	350	1	5	3.91	1.125	19	High
R32	350	1	5	4.25	.859	2	High
R33	350	1	5	2.03	1.194	38	Low
R34	350	1	5	2.66	1.245	34	Medium
R35	350	1	5	4.11	.965	8	High
R36	350	1	5	2.67	1.102	33	Medium
R37	350	2	5	4.07	.904	11	High
R38	350	1	5	4.22	.936	4	High
Psychological well-being -total	350			137.74	13.094		
Valid N (list wise)	350						

As shown in Table 3 total mean of the participants answers to the paragraphs that measure the PWB has reached (137.74) and represents an average grade, paragraph (13)came first (I enjoy talking to my friends and family), Paragraph (32) (new experiences helps in self-improvement), and in the last place came paragraph (33),(I have no desire in self -development) and all paragraphs that measure that area was promoted low ratings and medium and high.

2-Are there any significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean of the study sample in positive thinking due to the psychological well-being level?

The results of the Table 4 indicate the Means and standard deviation of positive thinking due to the well-being levels.

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for positive thinking due to(PWBS) scores

	<i>Well-being sections</i>		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Std. Error Mean</i>
	<i>psy</i>	<i>N</i>			
_total thinking	2.00	197	67.25	7.416	.528
	3.00	153	72.57	8.240	.666

It is clear from the results shown Table 4 that there was a significant difference in positive thinking between level1 (M=67.25, SD=7.416), level2 (M=72.57, SD=8.240), t-test was conducted to check the difference.

Table 5. t-test for positive thinking due to PWB

		<i>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</i>		<i>t-test for Equality of Means</i>						
		<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Std. Error Difference</i>	<i>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</i>	
									<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
_total thinking	Equal variances assumed	1.319	.252	6.340	348	.000	-5.320	.839	-6.970	-3.670
	Equal variances not assumed			6.257	308.685	.000	-5.320	.850	-6.993	-3.647

* Statistically significant at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$).

As shown in Table 5 there were significant differences in the scores between the two levels of psychological well-being on positive thinking (t (348)=6.34, P=000, on ($\alpha=0.05$).

These results suggest that the level of psychological well-being does affect positive thinking; specifically, our results suggest that when the level of psychological well-being increases positive thinking increase.

3-Are there any significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean of the study sample in self –efficacy due to the level of psychological well-being?

The results of the Table 6 indicate the Means and standard deviation of self –efficacy due to the well-being levels.

Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations for in self –efficacy due to (PWBS)

	<i>Wellbeing sections</i>		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Std. Error Mean</i>
		<i>N</i>			
total self –efficacy	2.00	197	65.95	7.358	.524
	3.00	153	72.82	7.328	.592

It is clear from the results shown in Table 6 that there were significant differences in the scores between the two levels of psychological well-being on self -efficacy between level 1(M=65.95, SD=7.358),level 2(M=72.82, SD=7.328), t-test was conducted.

Table 7. t-test for self -efficacy

		<i>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</i>		<i>t-test for Equality of Means</i>						
		<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Std. Error Difference</i>	<i>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</i>	
									<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
Total efficacy	Equal variances assumed	.079	.779	8.670	348	.000	-6.863	.792	-8.419	-5.306
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.675	327.512	.000	-6.863	.791	-8.419	-5.306

* Statistically significant at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$).

As shown in Table 7 there were significant differences in the scores between the two levels of psychological well-being on self –efficacy ($t(348)=8.67, P=000$).

These results suggest that the level of psychological well-being does have an effect on self –efficacy, specifically our results suggest that when the level of psychological well-being increases self –efficacy increase.

4- Is there a relationship between psychological well-being, positive thinking and self- efficacy?

The results of the Table 8 indicate A person product-moment correlation coefficient to assess the relationship between well-being, self-efficacy and positive thinking

Table 8. Person correlation for well-being, self-efficacy and positive thinking

		<i>Total psychological</i>		
		<i>wellbeing</i>	<i>Total efficacy</i>	<i>Total thinking</i>
Total psychological wellbeing	Pearson Correlation	1	.525**	.417**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	350	350	350
Total efficacy	Pearson Correlation	.525**	1	.594**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	350	350	350
Total thinking	Pearson Correlation	.417**	.594**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	350	350	350

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results shown in Table 8 indicates that there was a positive correlation between psychological well- being and self- efficacy ($r=0.525, N=350$), between psychological well- being and positive thinking ($r=0.417, N=350$), and between self- efficacy and positive thinking($r=0.594,0.417$). Results overall. Showed that psychological well- being increases when self- efficacy and positive thinking increases, also self- efficacy was increases when positive thinking increases.

5-Are there any significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean of the study sample in psychological well-being considering the demographic characteristics (gender- faculty- academic level)?

To answer this question, mean and the standard deviation was presented to the demographic variables (gender, faculty academic level)

Table 9. Means and Standard Deviations

<i>gender</i>	<i>faculty</i>	<i>Grade level</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>N</i>		
male	applied	bacalore	136.29	10.291	7		
		dimension3	133.00	6.094	8		
		Total	134.53	8.175	15		
	humanities	1	1	138.95	12.448	19	
			2	139.49	15.292	39	
		dimension3	Total	139.31	14.314	58	
			Total	138.23	11.765	26	
	female	1	1	138.21	12.138	168	
			dimension3	2	141.71	23.697	7
			Total	138.35	12.699	175	
2		1	1	136.17	13.680	100	
			2	141.50	.707	2	
		dimension3	Total	136.27	13.565	102	
			Total	137.45	12.749	268	
Total		1	1	138.14	12.050	175	
			dimension3	2	137.07	16.718	15
			Total	138.05	12.429	190	
	2	1	136.61	13.479	119		
		dimension3	2	139.59	14.911	41	
		Total	137.38	13.874	160		
Total	1	137.52	12.648	294			
	dimension3	2	138.91	15.301	56		
	Total	137.74	13.094	350			

As shown in Table 9 there are obvious differences between the mean values of the responses of the sample according to the three demographic variables.

A one- way between subjects' ANOVA, was conducted to compare the effect of psychological well- being on demographic variables.

Table 10. a one –way ANOVA for demographic variables in psychological well-being

<i>Source</i>	<i>Type III Sum of Squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Corrected Model	764.413a	7	109.202	.632	.729
Intercept	1215724.929	1	1215724.929	7038.203	.000
Gender	97.101	1	97.101	.562	.454
Faculty	47.242	1	47.242	.274	.601
grade level	36.834	1	36.834	.213	.645
Error	59074.444	342	172.732		
Total	6700422.000	350			
Corrected Total	59838.857	349			

a. R Squared = .013 (Adjusted R Squared = -.007)

As shown in Table 10 there are no statistically significant differences between the mean values according to the gender variable $F(7,1)=0.562$ $P=0.454$, also, there are no statistically significant differences between the mean values according to the faculty variable $F(7,1)=0.274$, $P=0.601$, and there are no statistically significant differences between the mean values according to the academic level variable $F(7,1)=0.213$, $P=0.645$. depending on the significance of the calculated values of (F) shown in the previous table at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

6-Are there any significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean of the study sample in self- efficacy considering the demographic characteristics (gender - faculty - academic level)?

To answer this question, mean and the standard deviation was presented to the demographic variables (gender, faculty academic level)

Table 11. Means and Standard Deviations

<i>gender</i>	<i>faculty</i>	<i>academic level</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>N</i>	
male	applied	dimension3	bacalore	65.86	4.981	7
			master	73.38	5.097	8
			Total	69.87	6.221	15
	humanities	dimension3	bacalore	68.00	8.273	19
			master	68.05	7.455	39
			Total	68.03	7.659	58
	Total	dimension3	bacalore	67.42	7.495	26
			master	68.96	7.345	47
			Total	68.41	7.384	73
female	applied	dimension3	bacalore	70.15	7.747	168
			master	69.86	11.172	7
			Total	70.14	7.868	175
	humanities	dimension3	bacalore	67.10	8.617	100
			master	77.50	4.950	2
			Total	67.30	8.667	102
	Total	dimension3	bacalore	69.01	8.201	268
			master	71.56	10.394	9
			Total	69.10	8.270	277
Total	applied	dimension3	bacalore	69.98	7.692	175
			master	71.73	8.353	15
			Total	70.12	7.737	190
	humanities	dimension3	bacalore	67.24	8.535	119
			master	68.51	7.593	41
			Total	67.57	8.299	160
	Total	dimension3	bacalore	68.87	8.142	294
			master	69.37	7.859	56
			Total	68.95	8.088	350

As shown in Table 11 there were obvious differences between the mean values of the responses of the sample according to the three demographic variables. A one- way between subjects' ANOVA, that was conducted to compare the effect of demographic variables.

Table 12. one –way ANOVA for demographic variables in self- efficacy

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1010.306a	7	144.329	2.262	.029
Intercept	311942.014	1	311942.014	4889.068	.000
gender	86.593	1	86.593	1.357	.245
faculty	1.971	1	1.971	.031	.861
academic level	310.748	1	310.748	4.870	.028
Error	21820.963	342	63.804		
Total	1686974.000	350			
Corrected Total	22831.269	349			

a. R Squared = .044 (Adjusted R Squared = .025)

As shown Table 12 there were a no statistically significant differences between the mean values according to the gender variable $F(7,1)=1.357$, $P=0.245$, there was no statistically significant differences between the mean values according to the faculty variable $F(7,1) = 0.031$, $P=0.861$, but there was statistically significant differences between the mean values according to the academic level variable $F(7,1)=4.870$, $P=0.028$. depending on the significance of the calculated values of (F) shown in the previous table at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

7- Are there any significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean of the study sample in positive thinking considering the demographic characteristics (gender - faculty - academic level)?

To answer this question, mean and the standard deviation was presented to the demographic variables (gender, faculty academic level)

Table13. Means and Standard Deviations

gender	faculty	Grade level	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	
		bacalore	64.43	6.949	7	
	applied	dimension3	maste	72.88	5.963	8
			Total	68.93	7.583	15
		bacalore	67.47	7.677	19	
male	humanities	dimension3	master	67.05	7.800	39
			Total	67.19	7.695	58
		bacalore	66.65	7.478	26	
	Total	dimension3	master	68.04	7.782	47
			Total	67.55	7.652	73
		bacalore	70.97	8.082	168	
	applied	dimension3	70.57	10.438	7	
			Total	70.95	8.152	175
		bacalore	68.52	8.374	100	
female	humanities	dimension3	master	75.50	.707	2
			Total	68.66	8.348	102
		bacalore	70.06	8.263	268	
	Total	dimension3	master	71.67	9.301	9
			Total	70.11	8.285	277
		bacalore	70.71	8.125	175	
	applied	dimension3	master	71.80	8.117	15
			Total	70.79	8.108	190
		bacalore	68.35	8.245	119	
Total	humanities	dimension3	master	67.46	7.823	41
			Total	68.13	8.124	160
		bacalore	69.76	8.241	294	
	Total	dimension3	master	68.62	8.065	56
			Total	69.57	8.212	350

As shown in Table 13 there are obvious differences between the mean values of the responses of the sample according to the three demographic variables.

A one- way between subjects' ANOVA, was presented to the demographic variables (gender, faculty, academic level)

Table14. one –way ANOVA for demographic variables in positive thinking

<i>Source</i>	<i>Type III Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Corrected Model	1120.320a	7	160.046	2.442	.019
Intercept	309156.830	1	309156.830	4716.530	.000
gender	187.672	1	187.672	2.863	.092
faculty	.090	1	.090	.001	.971
Grade level	212.264	1	212.264	3.238	.073
Error	22417.249	342	65.548		
Total	1717741.000	350			
Corrected Total	23537.569	349			

**a. R Squared = .048 (Adjusted R Squared = .028)

The As shown in Table 14 there were no statistically significant differences between the mean values according to the gender variable $F(7,1)=2.836$, $P=0.092$, there was no statistically significant differences between the mean values according to the faculty variable $F(7,1)=0.001$, $P=0.971$, and there was no statistically significant differences between the mean values according to the academic level variable $F(7,1)=3.238$, $P=0.0731$. depending on the significance of the calculated values of (F) shown in the previous table at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

5. Discussion

This study results showed that PSAU students have a moderate psychological well-being; self-efficacy and positive thinking level in general. these levels were positively related, which means high level of psychological well-being will directly increase self-efficacy and positive thinking. These results consistent are with the studies of (Santos,2014;Ersoz,2017; Tommasi,2018;Yuksel.et.al,2019) which founded that there is a strong relationship between psychological well-being and self-efficacy. Furthermore, the study of (Ghodsbin et al.,2015) found a strong relationship between psychological well-being and positive thinking. In addition, there was a positive correlation between self-efficacy and positive thinking, these results consistent with the study of (Caprara et al.,2006) which found that a high self- efficacy is related to high positive thinking, while low self-efficacy related to lower positive thinking. All the referenced studies are in support of the results.

In this study, results showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the mean values of the responses of the university's students in all the three independent variables according to (gender or faculty or academic level). These results differ from previous studies results such as (Siddiqui,2015; santos,2014) where it was founded that males have a higher level of psychological well-being than females and gender ,age had a strong impact on psychological well-being and self -efficacy, but Siddiqui found no effect for gender on psychological well-being ,just for self- Efficacy. However, a statistically significant differences were found between the mean values of the responses for self- efficacy according to the academic level variable, the differences were in favor of the master degree students group. Consequently, that bachelor students have a lower level of self -efficacy than their master degree counterparts, this result may be consistent with the studies (Fernandez,2019; Yuksel.et.al,2019) they found that self- efficacy is associated with age, the older individual has ahigh self-efficacy than younger ones.

Due to the difficulty in direct contacting with male students which influence the variety of the sample (73 males -277 females) the high number of female students affected the results in all the three independent variables. Other limitation can be the non-mixed colleges in the university, in addition to the physical separation of colleges in the university, which made reaching the sample members very difficult even electronically.

Moreover, the distribution of the sample members on demographic variables had the greatest impact on the progress of the results, the available sample was mostly females, Humanities Colleges, and bachelor's programs. This resulted in reducing the effect for demographic aspect on all the three main variables.

6. Conclusion

On the basis of these findings it can be concluded that psychological Well-being has its positive and significant impact on self-efficacy and positive thinking among university students, and it was also found that self-efficacy and positive thinking enhance the psychological well-being. Consequently, if self-efficacy or positive thinking is low psychological well-being also low, if self-efficacy or positive thinking is high psychological well-being also high. Gender, academic level, faculty has no impact on psychological well-being or positive thinking except academic level on self-efficacy.

The accumulation of knowledge should be helpful for giving an idea to those in charge of university programs to identify the factors that significantly affect raising the level of positive thinking and self-efficacy among students to help them achieve their future aspirations in understanding university students, underlying psychological factors. The study was limited to university students and it used only quantitative methods to examine psychological well-being, self-efficacy and positive thinking.

Future studies are needed to use training programmes and different statistical analyses in order to draw conclusions for the potential link between psychological well-being aspects to other variables.

Acknowledgment

This research was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research at Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University (under the research project 2019/2/11259).

References

- Abo-salama, M. (2014). *The effectiveness of a training program in reducing psychological disturbance and social anxiety and its effect on self-efficacy, social competence and emotional equilibrium among high school students*. unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Arab Research and Studies Institute, Arab Organization for Education, Culture and Science. Cairo. Egypt.
- Aljaser, A. (2007). *Emotional intelligence and its relationship to both self-efficacy and awareness of parental acceptance and rejection among a sample of male and female students from Umm Al-Qura University*, unpublished master's thesis. Mecca. Saudi Arabia
- AL-Hazmi, N. (2016). *The global structure of psychological well-being for Umm Al-Qura University students*, Unpublished Master Thesis, Umm Al-Qura University. Saudi Arabia.
- Bekhet, A. K. & Zauszniewski, J. A. (2013). Measuring use of positive thinking skills: Psychometric testing of a new scale. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 35(8), 1074-1093. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945913482191>
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In VS Ramachandran. *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, 4(4), 71-81.
- Bandura, A., Freeman, W. H. & Lightsey, R. (1999). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*.
- Bandura, A., Pastorelli, C., Barbaranelli, C. & Caprara, G. V. (1999). Self-efficacy pathways to childhood depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(2), 258. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.2.258>
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Gerbino, M. & Pastorelli, C. (2003). Role of affective self-regulatory efficacy in diverse spheres of psychosocial functioning. *Child development*, 74(3), 769-782. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00567>
- Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy revisited. 9-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311410606>
- Barlow, J., Wright, C. & Cullen, L. (2002). A job-seeking self-efficacy scale for people with physical disabilities: Preliminary development and psychometric testing. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 30(1), 37-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/030698880220106500>
- Bisschop, M. I., Kriegsman, D. M., Beekman, A. T. & Deeg, D. J. (2004). Chronic diseases and depression: the modifying role of psychosocial resources. *Social science & medicine*, 59(4), 721-733. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socimed.2003.11.038>
- Caprara, G. V., Steca, P., Gerbino, M., Paciello, M. & Vecchio, G. M. (2006). Looking for adolescents' well-being: Self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of positive thinking and happiness. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, 15(1), 30-43. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1121189x00002013>
- Çakar, F. S. (2012). The Relationship between the Self-Efficacy and Life Satisfaction of Young Adults. *International Education Studies*, 5(6), 123-130. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n6p123>

- Çardak, M. (2013). The relationship between forgiveness and humility: A case study for university students. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8(8), 425. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2012.1071>
- Çelik, İ. & Sariçam, H. (2018). The relationships between academic locus of control, positive thinking skills and grit in high school students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(3), 392-398. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060305>
- Dwiwardani, C., Hill, P. C., Bollinger, R. A., Marks, L. E., Steele, J. R., Doolin, H. N. & Davis, D. E. (2014). Virtues develop from a secure base: Attachment and resilience as predictors of humility, gratitude, and forgiveness. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 42(1), 83-90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164711404200109>
- Ersöz, G. (2017). The role of university students' general self-efficacy, depression and psychological well-being in predicting their exercise behavior. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(3), 110-117. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v5i3.2209>
- Faure, S. & Loxton, H. (2003). Anxiety, depression and self-efficacy levels of women undergoing first trimester abortion. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 33(1), 28-38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630303300104>
- Fernández, M.; Padilla, M.; Nunes, C. & Menéndez, S. (2019). Psychological well-being in non-dependent active elderly individuals and its relationship with self-esteem and self-efficacy. *Ciencia & saude coletiva*, 24(1), 115-124. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232018241.35302016>
- İşgör, İ. Y. (2016). Metacognitive skills, academic success and exam anxiety as the predictors of psychological well-being. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(9), 35-42. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v4i9.1607>
- Ghodsbin, F., Safaei, M., Jahanbin, I., Ostovan, M. A. & Keshvarzi, S. (2015). The effect of positive thinking training on the level of spiritual well-being among the patients with coronary artery diseases referred to Imam Reza specialty and subspecialty clinic in Shiraz, Iran: A randomized controlled clinical trial. *ARYA atherosclerosis*, 11(6), 41. <https://doi.org/10.31838/ijpr/2020.12.01.022>
- Gómez-Baya, D., Lucia-Casademunt, A. M. & Salinas-Pérez, J. A. (2018). Gender differences in psychological well-being and health problems among European health professionals: Analysis of psychological basic needs and job satisfaction. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 15(7), 1474. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15071474>
- Gregg, N. (2009). *Adolescents and adults with learning disabilities and ADHD: Assessment and accommodation*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Kashdan, T. B. & Roberts, J. E. (2004). Trait and state curiosity in the genesis of intimacy: Differentiation from related constructs. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 23(6), 792-816. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.23.6.792.54800>
- Kuijjer, R. G. & De Ridder, D. T. (2003). Discrepancy in illness-related goals and quality of life in chronically ill patients: the role of self-efficacy. *Psychology and Health*, 18(3), 313-330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0887044031000146815>
- Naseem, Z. & Khalid, R. (2010). Positive Thinking in Coping with Stress and Health outcomes: Literature Review. *Journal of Research & Reflections in Education (JRRE)*, 4(1).
- Radi,Z, Miteb,Z(2017). *Positive thinking in college student, A master degree thesis, not published, king Abdul -Aziz university*. Saudi Arabia.
- Rasool, I., Zubair, A. & Anwar, M. (2019). Role of Perceived Self-efficacy and Spousal Support in Psychological Well-being of Female Entrepreneurs. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 34(4). <https://doi.org/10.33824/pjpr.2019.34.4.48>
- Roothman, B., Kirsten, D. K. & Wissing, M. P. (2003). Gender differences in aspects of psychological well-being. *South African journal of psychology*, 33(4), 212-218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630303300403>
- Ryff, C. D., Magee, W. J., Kling, K. C. & Wing, E. H. (1999). Forging macro-micro linkages in the study of psychological well-being. *The self and society in aging processes*, 247-278. <https://doi.org/10.1353/chapter.1483299>
- Ryff, C. D. & Singer, B. H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of happiness studies*, 9(1), 13-39. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5702-8_6

- Santos, M. C. J., Magramo Jr, C., Oguan Jr, F., Paat, J. J. & Barnachea, E. A. (2012). Meaning in life and subjective well-being: is a satisfying life meaningful? *Researchers World*, 3(4), 32.
- Santos, M. C. J., Magramo Jr, C. S., Oguan Jr, F. & Paat, J. J. (2014). Establishing the relationship between general self-efficacy and subjective well-being among college students. *Asian journal of management sciences & education*, 3(1), 1-12.
- Seligman, M. E. (2002). Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy. *Handbook of positive psychology*, 2(2002), 3-12.
- Sezgin, F. & Erdogan, O. (2018). Humility and Forgiveness as Predictors of Teacher Self-Efficacy. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 13(4), 120-128. <https://doi.org/10.5897/err2017.3449>
- Siddiqui, S. (2015). Impact of self-efficacy on psychological well-being among undergraduate students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(3), 5-16.
- Tommasi, M., Grassi, P., Balsamo, M., Picconi, L., Furnham, A. & Saggino, A. (2018). Correlations between personality, affective and filial self-efficacy beliefs, and psychological well-being in a sample of Italian adolescents. *Psychological reports*, 121(1), 59-78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294117720698>
- Tugade, M. M. & Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back from negative emotional experiences. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 86(2), 320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.86.2.320>
- Yuksel, A. & Bayrakci, H. (2019). Self-efficacy, Psychological Well-Being and Perceived Social Support Levels in Pregnant Women. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 12(2), 1-10.
- Zaker, A., Dadsetan, A., Nasiri, Z., Azimi, S. & Rahnama, F. (2016). Effectiveness of Happiness on Self-efficacy of Students. *Electronic Journal of Biology*, 12(4), 26-32.
- Zeldin, A. L., Britner, S. L. & Pajares, F. (2008). A comparative study of the self-efficacy beliefs of successful men and women in mathematics, science, and technology careers. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching*, 45(9), 1036-1058. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20195>