International Journal of Application on Social Science and Humanities
Vol. 2, No. 3, August 2024: pp 73-80 ISSN-L 2987-8241 (Electronic Version)

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING AND PRO-ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOR IN STUDENTS

Gabriel Angelo[1], Raja Oloan Tumanggor[2*]

[1]Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta
Email: gabriel.705200089@stu.untar.ac.id
[2]Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta
**Corresponding Author Email: rajat@fpsi.untar.ac.id*

Enter: 11-06-2024, Revised: 08-07-2024, Accepted: 29-08-2024

ABSTRACT

The environmental issues of 2023 are quite diverse, ranging from severe pollution in the DKI Jakarta area and its surroundings to the occurrence of fires in the Bromo area. These issues contribute to global warming on Earth. Many of these problems are a result of detrimental community behaviors towards the environment, which can impact the psychological well-being of the population. Students, as agents of change, play a crucial role in addressing these concerns by engaging in pro-environmental behaviors, ultimately promoting psychological well-being within the community. This study aims to examine the relationship between psychological well-being and pro-environmental behavior in students. The research used quantitative methods, utilizing purposive sampling and snowball sampling approaches. The hypothesis of this study suggests that there is a relationship between psychological well-being and pro-environmental behavior.

Keywords: *Psychological Well-Being, Pro-Environmental Behavior*

1. PREFACE

The growth rate of motor vehicles in the capital city increases quite rapidly every year. As reported by Kompas (2023), in 2022, there were 26,370,535 motor vehicles in DKI Jakarta, which is an increase of 0.28% compared to 2021. The majority of vehicles used by the Indonesian people run on fossil fuels, resulting in emissions that contribute to air pollution. Quoting from Kompas (2023), "Data from IQAir Visual shows that the air quality index (AQI) in Jakarta reached 181 with a particulate matter (PM 2.5) concentration of 11.3 µg/m3 at 07:00–08:00." DKI Jakarta is classified as having very poor air quality, making it one of the contributors to global warming.

Global warming is a phenomenon caused by (a) greenhouse gases; (b) air pollution from fuel and factory waste; (c) the greenhouse effect; (d) excessive use of CFCs; (e) deforestation; (f) methane pollution from livestock; (g) electricity wastage; and (h) plastic waste (Mulyani, 2021). The most noticeable effect in daily life is the unpredictable climate changes. To anticipate the worsening effects of global warming, awareness is needed, especially among university students.

According to Cahyono (2019), within larger society, students have a specific role in the community. This role is not given without reason; students have a greater opportunity to become agents of change. Reflecting on the current environmental conditions, students can channel change through environmental empowerment. The primary behavior that students need to adopt is pro-environmental behavior. Pro-environmental behavior is actions aimed at improving and minimizing damage to the environment (Saputra et al. cited in Putra, 2019).

Pro-environmental behavior is a progressive step to change how society perceives the environment. It can be said that there are interconnected factors between society and the environment(Rifayanti et al., 2018). Looking back, society has been the main cause of

environmental pollution and degradation (Keraf; cited in Palupi & Sawitri, 2017). Therefore, communities have control over shaping the environment positively or negatively. Negative impacts can be anticipated and mitigated through a sense of high responsibility to create a good environment (Rifayanti et al., 2018). Responsibility can start by taking several actions such as (a) reducing waste; (b) using electric transportation; (c) purchasing eco-friendly products; (d) recycling; (e) caring for the environment; and (f) energy efficiency (Kaiser & Fuhrer cited in Ambarfebrianti & Novianty, 2021).

The dimensions of pro-environmental behavior are divided into 6 categories, such as (a) energy conservation; (b) mobility and transportation; (c) waste avoidance; (d) consumerism; (e) recycling; and (f) vicarious social behaviors toward conservation (Kaiser, 2003 cited in Febriyanti, 2016). Having good psychological factors becomes crucial in pro-environmental actions (Febriyanti 2016). Psychological well-being, or psychological well-being, represents an individual's positive and healthy state evident from their psychological condition (Aspinwall dalam Sumakul & Ruata, 2020).

According to Ryff as cited in Kurniasari et al. (2019), individuals with psychological well-being are expected to free themselves from interpersonal and intrapersonal problems, have the ability to self-improve, and can positively impact their environment. To achieve psychological well-being, social support from the surrounding community is essential (Harimukhti and Dewi 2014). In this context, it involves support from students to the community to perceive both psychological and environmental well-being.

Recent research focusing on teenagers aged 14-20 states that pro-environmental behavior enhances well-being because a good environment can influence comfort and self-image (Bartolo et al., 2023). This study found a connection between well-being and pro-environmental behavior. Another study conducted in the city of Bandung examined subjective well-being and pro-environmental behavior among the community. The results showed a significant relationship, although the closeness of the relationship was relatively weak (Fadiyah & Yunivianti, 2023).

Previous studies have mainly focused on the relationship between subjective well-being and general well-being with pro-environmental behavior. Well-being itself has a broad meaning and can be further categorized into new variables. This complexity has intrigued researchers to conduct more focused studies on psychological well-being and pro-environmental behavior.

Previous research has suggested that when examining pro-environmental behavior, it is essential to consider the psychological traits and conditions of individuals (Bartolo et al., 2023). This study will focus more on the conditions, given the environmental phenomena that are experiencing changes in terms of climate, temperature, and weather patterns.

According to Sumakul dan Ruata (2020) age, gender, education level, and occupation can be factors influencing psychological well-being. Specifically, education level and age are the focus of the research to examine the relationship between these two variables

2. RESEARCH METHOD

Participant

The criteria for this study include students aged 18 to 25 years residing in DKI Jakarta. A total of 111 participants' data were collected, but only 105 participants were used. Based on their residence, 66 participants were from West Jakarta, 9 participants were from East Jakarta, 5 participants were from Central Jakarta, 15 participants were from South Jakarta, and 10

https://doi.org/10.24912/ijassh.v2i3.34276

participants were from North Jakarta. In terms of age, there were 7 participants aged 18 years, 19 participants aged 19 years, 25 participants aged 20 years, 46 participants aged 21 years, 6 participants aged 22 years, 1 participant aged 23 years, and 1 participant aged 24 years.

Tabel 1
Domicile

Domicile	Frequency	Percent %
Jakarta Barat	66	62.9 %
Jakarta Timur	9	8.6 %
Jakarta Pusat	5	4.8 %
Jakarta Selatan	15	14.3 %
Jakarta Utara	10	9.5 %
	105	100%

Tabel 2
Age

Age	Frequency	Percent %
18	7	6.7 %
19	19	18.1 %
20	25	23.8 %
21	46	43/8 %
22	6	5.7 %
23	1	1.0 %
24	0	0 %
25	1	1.0%
	105	100 %

Method

This type of research is quantitative correlational non experimental. The sampling technique was purposive sampling and snowball sampling. Participants filled out a questionnaire using Google Forms, which was distributed through social media platforms such as Line, WhatsApp, and Instagram.

Measurement

Psychological well-being were measured using Ryff Scale of Psychological Well-being. This tool has undergone adaptation by the Faculty of Psychology at Tarumanagara University. The measurement consists of 27 statements, comprising both positive and negative items, reflecting 6 dimensions of psychological well-being. The 6 dimensions measured in this questionnaire include (a) self-acceptance; (b) personal growth; (c) purpose in life; (d) positive relations with others; (e) environmental mastery; and (f) autonomy. For instance, a positive item in this scale is 'I like most parts of my personality', and a negative item is 'I feel that people are not as willing to listen to me as they are to talk about themselves'. The range of scales using likert scale from 1 to 4, with point 1 disagree (TS) and point 4 agree (S).

Pro-environmental behavior were measured using General Ecological Behavior (GEB) develop by Kaiser et al. 2007 as cited in Ahmad (2019). This measurement has been adapted by the researcher by customizing statements to fit the subjects' needs. The scale consists of 33 items, comprising both positive and negative statements, reflecting 6 dimensions of pro-environmental behavior. The 6 dimensions measured in this questionnaire include (a) energy conservation; (b) mobility and transportation, (c) waste avoidance; (d) consumerism; (e) recycling; and (f) vicarious social behaviors toward conservation. Examples of items from the General Ecological Behavior Scale are “I reuse my shopping bags” and “When I go out, I leave electronic devices such as air conditioners and televisions on".

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The description of psychological well-being uses a scale of 1–4 points, so the mean value of the measuring instrument is 71.09. The standard deviation of this measuring instrument is 8.417. The description of the pro-environmental behavior variable uses a scale of 1-5 points, so the mean value is 62. The standard deviation of this measuring instrument is 8.804.

Tabel 3

Overview of psychological well-being and pro-environmental behavior Variables

Overview	Mean	Standard Deviation
PWB	71.09	8.417
GEB	61.96	8.804

The reliability of the Psychological Well-Being (PWB) measurement tool is indicated by a Cronbach's alpha of 0.824 after excluding 4 invalid items. The General Ecological Behavior (GEB) measurement tool has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.718 after excluding 14 items. Both measurement tools are considered reliable as the Cronbach's alpha exceeds 0.6. In the normality test, the Psychological Well-Being variable has a sig.2 (tailed) value of 0.200 > 0.05, and the General Ecological Behavior variable has a sig.2 (tailed) value of 0.178 > 0.05. Since both variables have values greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the variables are normally distributed. Due to the data being normally distributed, Pearson correlation was used for the correlation test.

Table 4

Normality Test Result Psychological well-being and General ecological behavior (One-Sample Kolmogrov-Smirnov Test)

Normality	PWB	GEB
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.200	0.178

When correlation tests were conducted to compare each dimension of psychological well-being with general ecological behavior, it was found that most dimensions of psychological well-being do not have a significant correlation with general ecological behavior among students. However, there is one dimension that shows a moderate correlation, as observed from the Pearson correlation (refer to tables 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10).

https://doi.org/10.24912/ijassh.v2i3.34276

Table 5
Correlation Test of the Self Acceptance (SA) Dimension Variable with General Ecological Behavior

Correlation	Pearson Correlation	Sig. 2 (tailed)
PWB_SA	0.58	0.554
GEB	0.58	0.554

Table 6
Correlation Test of the Personal Relation (PR) Dimension Variable with General Ecological Behavior

Correlation	Pearson Correlation	Sig. 2 (tailed)
PWB_PR	-0.83	0.398
GEB	-0.83	0.398

Table 7
Correlation Test of the Autonomy (A) Dimension Variable with General Ecological Behavior

Correlation	Pearson Correlation	Sig. 2 (tailed)
PWB_A	-0.33	0.737
GEB	-0.33	0.737

Table 8
Correlation Test of the Environmnet Masery (EM) Dimension Variable with General Ecological Behavior

Correlation	Pearson Correlation	Sig. 2 (tailed)
PWB_EM	-0.30	0.764
GEB	-0.30	0.764

Table 9
Correlation Test of the Personal in Life (PIL) Dimension Variable with General Ecological Behavior

Correlation	Pearson Correlation	Sig. 2 (tailed)
PWB_PIL	0.19	0.845
GEB	0.19	0.845

Table 10
Correlation Test of the Personal Growth (PG) Dimension Variable with General Ecological Behavior

Correlation	Pearson Correlation	Sig. 2 (tailed)
PWB_PG	0.18	0.430
GEB	0.18	0.430

The overall correlation shows that the sig.2 (tailed) value is 0.784 > 0.05 with Pearson correlation -0.27, indicating that the Pearson correlation value is far below 0.81 (considered a perfect correlation). It can be concluded that there is no correlation between these two variables, even weak correlation.

Table 11

Correlation Test Results of Psychological Well-Being and General Ecological Behavior

Correlation	Pearson Correlation	Sig. 2 (tailed)
PWB	-0.27	0.784
GEB	-0.27	0.784

DISCUSSION

Recent research focusing on teenagers aged 14-20 states that pro-environmental behavior enhances well-being because a good environment can influence comfort and self-image (Bartolo et al., 2023). This study found a connection between well-being and pro-environmental behavior. Another study conducted in the city of Bandung examined subjective well-being and pro-environmental behavior among the community. The results showed a significant relationship, although the closeness of the relationship was relatively weak (Fadiyah & Yunivianti, 2023).

In this study, the researcher obtained different results compared to previous studies, possibly due to the different well-being variables used. Previous studies focused on overall well-being and subjective well-being, while this study focused on psychological well-being.

Additionally, from the analysis of the measurement tool conducted by the researcher, it was found that there were many items in the general ecological behavior variable that were not valid, thus affecting the lack of relationship between the two variables.

This study also has limitations, including the lack of direct monitoring of the distribution time by the researcher. The content of the psychological well-being measurement tool primarily focuses on psychological well-being with social environment rather than the natural environment.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Based on this study, it can be concluded that there is one dimension of the psychological well-being variable with a Pearson correlation of 0.58. The results show that the Pearson correlation falls within the range of 0.41 to 0.60, which is considered moderate. However, when viewed overall, there is no significant relationship between the two variables according to this measurement tool.

The hypothesis and assumption of the researcher, which suggested a relationship between well-being and subjective well-being with pro-environmental behavior, implied that psychological well-being would also have a connection. However, this study proved otherwise, showing that this assumption did not hold true.

https://doi.org/10.24912/ijassh.v2i3.34276

Recommendations

Based on the discussion and conclusions drawn in this study, there are several recommendations for future research. Firstly, future researchers can retest the relationship between psychological well-being and pro-environmental behavior. However, careful consideration of the measurement tools, especially for pro-environmental behavior, is essential. Secondly, future research would benefit from including dimensions related to human interaction with nature, not just the social environment, within the items of psychological well-being. It is advisable to maintain students as the study subjects.

One limitation of this research is the absence of demographic data such as gender. Future studies should consider including demographic data, specifically gender-related information.

Acknowledgement

The researcher would like to thank Tarumanagara University, especially the Faculty of Psychology, for providing opportunities for researchers to conduct research and publish the results of this study. Not to forget, the researcher also thanked all participants, namely students in the final semester of 2023 who were willing to voluntarily participate in this research.

REFERENCE

Ambarfebrianti, M. & Novianty, A. (2021). The relationship between value orientation and pro-environmental behavior among adolescents. *Ecopsy Journal*, *8*(2): 149–64.

Aranditio, S. (2023, Mei 02). Jakarta Returns to Crowdedness After Eid Al-Fitr Holiday. *Kompas.Id.*

Bartolo, M. G., Servidio, R., Palermiti, A. L., Nappa, M. R., & Costabile, A. (2023). Pro-Environmental Behaviors and Well-Being in Adolescence: The Mediating Role of Place Attachment. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *20*(10), 5759. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20105759.

Cahyono, H. (2039). The role of students in society. *De Banten-Bode: Journal of Community Service, 1*(1).

Fadiyah, R. P. & Yunivianti, M. (2023). The Relationship Between Subjective Well-Being and Pro-Environmental Behavior in the City of Bandung. *Bandung Conference Series: Psychology Science, 3*(2).

Febriyanti, C. (2016). Development of the measurement scale for pro-environmental behavior: General Ecological Behavior (GEB) Scale. *Journal of Psychological and Educational Measurement in Indonesia*, *5*(2).

Harimukhti, M. T., & Dewi, K. S. (2014). Exploration of psychological well-being in early adulthood individuals with visual impairments. *Jurnal Psikologi Undip, 13*(1): 64–77.

Indraswari, D. L. (March 23, 2023). The Increasingly Difficult Traffic Jams in Jakarta. *Kompas.Id.*

Kurniasari, E., Rusmana, N., & Budiman, N. (2019). Overview of psychological well-being among university students. *Journal of Innovative Counseling, 3*(2)*:* 52–58.

Mulyani, A. S. (2021). Global warming: causes, impacts, and mitigation strategies. *Repository of Kristen Indonesia University.*

Palupi, T., & Sawitri, D. R. (2017). The relationship between attitude and pro-environmental behavior from the perspective of the theory of planned behavior. *Proceedings of the Biology Education Conference, 14*(1)*:* 214–17.

Putra, R. P. (2019). Pro-environmental behavior of student organization leaders who love nature. *Jurnal Cognicia, 7*(3).

Rifayanti, Rina, Adella Saputri, Ade, Karunia Arake, and Widya Astuti. 2018. 'The Role of Role Models in Shaping Pro-Environmental Behavior.' *Psikostudia: Journal of Psychology, 7*(2): *12–23.*

Sumakul, Y., & Ruata, S. (2020). Psychological well-being during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Psychology Humanlight, 1*(1).

https://doi.org/10.24912/ijassh.v2i3.34276