The International Journal of **INDIAN PSYCHOLOGY**

Research Paper

Understanding the Correlation and Gender Differences between Self-Esteem and Social Connectedness of Adolescents in the Indian Context

Pritika Thukral[1]*, Jiya Singhal[2], Pragya[3]

ABSTRACT

During Adolescence, life is bursting with incredible energy. This is the phase of life when an individual may observe several drastic physical, emotional, and social changes. Adolescence is the pathway of self-exploration, and this is when adolescents start to organize their perceptions about their levels of self-esteem and social relations. In this study, we aim to compare the strength and direction of the correlation and gender differences between self-esteem and social connectedness among Indian adolescent girls and boys aged 12 to 18 years. The sample includes 120 subjects (60 girls and 60 boys). The sample is chosen through convenient sampling, with the help of Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale and Lee's Social Connectedness Scale-Revised. Further, the analysis of the data shows that self-esteem and social connections have a moderately positive correlation with a strength of 0.634, $p < 0.05$. There are no significant gender differences observed in the levels of self-esteem of adolescents ($\alpha = 0.41$, $p > 0.05$), hence the null hypothesis was accepted. On the other hand, the results ($\alpha = 0.05$, $p < 0.05$) show that there is a significant difference in the levels of social connectedness between adolescent boys and girls in the Indian context, rejecting the hypothesis.

Keywords: *Adolescence, Self-Esteem, Social Connectedness*

The period of transition between childhood to adulthood is adolescence. According to the World Health Organisation, adolescence is a period of development between the ages of 10 and 19, marked by physical, emotional, behavioural, and psychological changes that traces the transition from childhood to adulthood. Puberty engages an adolescent to go through a growth spurt and sexual maturation, this is when the child starts becoming aware of their self, their emotional intelligence develops, and one may start to develop a sense of identity. Our sense of self is an umbrella concept that explains our self-concept and self-esteem. Self-concept is the entirety of taught attitudes, ideas, and self-evaluative judgements that people have about themselves. This system is complicated, organised, and yet dynamic (Wehrle K.& Fasbender U., 2018). While self-esteem is defined as an individual's appraisal or evaluation of self, it refers to the degree to which they feel that they are competitive, and

---

[1]BA (H) Applied Psychology, Student,Sri Aurobindo College (Eve) ,University of Delhi
[2]BA (H) Applied Psychology, Student,Sri Aurobindo College (Eve) ,University of Delhi
[3]BA (H) Applied Psychology, Student,Sri Aurobindo College (Eve) ,University of Delhi
*Corresponding Author

understand their abilities and incompetence (Baumeister R.F. & Bushman J.B., 2008). *I am the measure of my worth, and I say I am worthy - Mathilde Blind,* the "I" represents the concept of self-esteem, in simple words, self-esteem is the way we value, assess, and trust ourselves. Typically, self-esteem is viewed on a spectrum from high to low: Those with high self-esteem feel very affirmative and confident about themselves, whereas those with low self-esteem feel uncertain or indecisive about their decisions and abilities.

The development of self-esteem is linked to one's self-conscience and self-image. There may be ups and downs from one status to another, such as in adolescence or old age, as a result of a change in status and a change in the assignments and duties (Orth, Trzesniewski and Robins, 2010). Coopersmith described self-esteem as negative or positive thought processes towards oneself. He explained that self-esteem is developed and influenced by three essential elements:
1. Parental approval and warmth
2. Clearly stated and upheld boundaries
3. Appreciation for behaviour within these boundaries (Hosogi M. et al., 2012).

There are many different trajectories of the development of self-esteem possible throughout adolescence. (Zimmerman, Copeland, Shope & Dielman, 1997). Self-esteem plays a very important role in development during this period (Minev M. et al., 2018). According to Piaget, an individual enters the formal operational stage around the age of 11 - 12 years, hence the beginning of the development of hypothetico-deductive reasoning skills. With increased scientific and logical thinking, their understanding of self-image significantly determines their levels of self-esteem. Research implies that there is a genuinely reciprocal relationship between people's social relationships and their level of self-esteem throughout all life stages, demonstrating a constructive feedback loop between the constructs (Harris A. M. & Orth U., 2020).

A study shows that there is a positive correlation between self-esteem and social connection. According to a study, if a child's connectedness and competencies result in a positive development, it will undoubtedly increase their self-esteem because the companion will always reinforce and instil good values and norms in each other. On the other hand, if the companion rejects or demotivates each other, it will lower the child's self-esteem. Hence, one of the many factors that affect self-esteem can be social connectedness (Kumar R.et al., 2016). The quality of social ties during adolescence is impacted by individual differences in social ability, which are partly influenced by genetic influences on brain structure and function. In this way, throughout the teenage years, the brain and social environment shape one another to affect a person's social position among peers. During this crucial developmental stage, reciprocal interactions between brain development and the social environment may increase, hence stating that the levels of social relations may determine the levels of self-esteem due to reciprocal interactions (Lamblin M.et. al., 2017).

Ultimately, it can be safely presumed that higher levels of self-esteem lead to better levels of social connectedness. The core of social connection is a subjective experience of belonging, which is designed to capture positive social experiences obtained via recent interaction and intentional information provision and attempts to communicate the feeling of being together without engaging in physical contact (Van Bel et al., 2009). A study conducted by Jose E. et. al (2012) implies that those who have higher levels of social connectedness and higher levels of psychological well-being are anticipated in terms of life satisfaction, confidence, positivity, and ambitions, therefore social connections can be said to affect psychological and personal

functioning. Several types of research show that Social Connections are linked to increased happiness and better physiological health. Low social connectivity might make it difficult for certain people to control internalising symptoms (Faro, McKee, Garcia, & Leary O., 2019). A longitudinal study proves that social connectedness (combined across the domains of family, school, peers and neighbourhood) could forecast an individual's psychological well-being but not vice-versa. The study also emphasised that gender and age play a significant role in connectedness (Paul J.E. et. al., 2012).

Apart from social connectedness, our perceptual understanding of gender differences and the social environment may also contribute towards the formation of self-esteem in adolescents. Each adolescent's emotional development happens uniquely, with various patterns for various adolescent populations. The difficulties with emotional development that boys and girls encounter may differ (Gentry J.H & Campbell M., 2002). During adolescence, individuals become more aware of their gender role identity, and the majority of them start following the culturally set norms and the anticipated behaviour. Gender disparities and the influence of societal norms on individual shapes and influences their behaviour and personality. In many studies, it was noted that psychological disorders like anxiety, depression, bulimia, PTSD, etc. are more prevalent in teenage females than males. It was observed that the onset of puberty is early in females as compared to males. Girls are seen to be more emotionally developed than boys. Although development is majorly affected by nurture, girls who might live in a conservative environment had their changes a little later than those who live in a modern family. Despite reporting identical levels of self-esteem in childhood, there is a gender discrepancy, i.e., by adolescence, a difference between teenage boys and girls in terms of self-esteem appears. This gender disparity remains throughout adulthood, but as people get older, it may even start to decrease (Robins W. R.& Trzesniewski H. K., 2005).

One of the most noticeable changes during adolescence is a shift in the centre of the adolescent's universe from the family to the peer group (Gentry J.H & Campbell M., 2002). In order to gain greater levels of autonomy and independence, adolescents become more oriented towards their peers. These peers act as a reference, through which they start forming their self (Bishop & Inderbitzen, 1995). Peer groups are more gender diverse during middle adolescence, especially in the ages ranging from 14 to 16). It is normal to see less uniformity and more acceptance of people's individual diversity in appearance, opinions, and sentiments (Gentry J.H & Campbell M., 2002). Adolescents perceive intimate social connections with friends and romantic partners as new attachment bonds they may rely on during trying times. These new attachment figures can meet needs that earlier models couldn't (Comtois K.D. et. al., 2013). Since it is proved that adolescents' attachment patterns change during this phase and shift towards their peers, the motive of this study is to understand how gender differences among peers impact the levels of self-esteem and social relationships.

Theoretical Perspective

Several theories support and prove that there is a significant positive correlation between an individual's self-esteem levels and social relations. Various psychological theories prove that others' reactions help us form a notion about ourselves, for example, taking the *sociometer theory* proposed by Leary in 2005 into consideration, it states that a minimum level of social inclusion or belonging is essential for humans to reproduce and survive with self-esteem functioning as a sociometer (Nayler C., 2010). The basic assumption of the theory states that an individual's self-esteem levels determine their existing and potential social relationships in the future (Liu S. & Zhang L., 2016). The theory says that our self-esteem focuses upon long-

term as well as short-term relations, understanding the current relational value and the acceptance from the social environment. The sociometer theory contributes to the study since it offers a theoretical framework to comprehend how the study's focus constructs - social connectivity and self-esteem relate to one another. Another major theory, the *attachment theory* given by John Bowlby, states that the child's levels of self-esteem and positive relationships later in life are determined by the emotional bond between the infants and the caregivers (Feeney, Cassidy, & Ramos-Marcuse, 2008; Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Attachment may differ at different stages of life, during infancy it may be their relationship with their caregivers while for adults this social connectedness may be felt in their romantic partnerships and friendships, both parties comfort one another and meet one another's requirements (Litvinenko I., 2020). A secure attachment bond automatically gives way to strengthen self-esteem. The basis of a relationship lies in the self-esteem of the individual which is eventually related to the caregiver's and parents' unconditional support and trust. An adolescent's self-esteem determines future actions and behaviours required to maintain healthy relationships. Urie Bronfenbrenner, an American psychologist, developed the ecological theory to explain how the social environment affects children's development. According to the ecological systems theory of Bronfenbrenner, children typically become enmeshed in a range of ecosystems, starting with the most private one at home, progressing up to the more significant school system, and finally reaching the largest system, which includes society and culture. The five-tiered levels of external impact used in Bronfenbrenner's ecological model are Microsystem, Mesosystem, Ecosystem, Macrosystem, and Chronosystem. According to the Bronfenbrenner theory, a child's immediate and smallest environment is called a microsystem. As a result, the children's home, school or daycare, peer group, and community surroundings make up the microsystem. Longitudinal research indicated that the single social support variable, perceived peer unpopularity, was a significant predictor of girls' negative learning attitudes and that stress was not important for females (Spencer B. Margaret, et. al. 1997). Another theory that supports the study is the *self-determination theory* given by Richard Ryan and Edward Deci states that an individual's interaction with others is based upon their motivation and personality's interaction with the social environment. Depending on the extent to which one's self-perceptions of autonomy and competence are influenced by external factors (such as rewards and punishments), interpersonal situations (such as criticism or praise from a romantic partner), and internal factors (such as one's own trait-level tendency to feel task-engaged), intrinsic motivation may be enhanced or undermined (Legault L., 2017). The common link between these theories is self-esteem, which is important in determining the maintenance of social relationships in individuals.

Objectives
- To understand the relationship between self-esteem and social connectedness.
- To understand if gender differences affect the levels of self-esteem in adolescents.
- To understand if social relationships are impacted by gender differences in adolescents.

Hypothesis
- There is no correlation between self-esteem and social connectedness.
- In terms of self-esteem, there is no significant difference between males and females.
- There is no gender difference in the levels of social connectedness between girls and boys.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants of the study consist of 120 school-going adolescents (60 girls & 60 boys) who were fluent in English. Participants were between the ages of 12 to 18 years. The participation of the subjects was completely voluntary and consented for.

Measures

1. **Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES)**

   The 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale yielded high ratings in reliability areas; internal consistency was 0.77, minimum Coefficient of Reproducibility was at least 0.90 (M. Rosenberg, 1965). The self-report questionnaire features a four-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Agree; 4= Strongly Agree). Items 1,2,4,6,7 are positive items and negative items 3,5,8,9,10 are scored reversely.

2. **Social Connectedness Scale - R (SCS-R)**

   The 20-item social connectedness scale was developed by R.M. Lee and S. Lee has the target population for youth between 14 and 18 years of age (high school). It has high reliability, that is internal consistency α > .92. The scales have been measured on the basis of concurrent, construct, convergent and discriminant validity (Lee, R.M., Draper, M., & Lee, S. (2001). The self-reporting scale uses a six-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3= Mildly Disagree, 4= Mildly Agree, 5= Agree, 6= Strongly Agree). Positive Items 7,9,11,12,13,14,16,17,19,20 were scored directly and Negative Items 1, 2, 3,4,5,6,8,10,15,18 were scored reversely.

Procedure

The data for the study is collected using self-report questionnaires, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and the Social Connectedness Scale-R. Informed consent was obtained from participants' parents or legal guardians as well as from them. When the participants were approached in school settings, appropriate instructions were given. The emphasis on confidentiality, anonymity, and voluntary involvement was made clear in the instructions.

Participants submitted demographic data, including age, gender, and the kind of school. Both the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and Social Connectedness Scale-R were filled out by the participants. While the latter tested social connectivity, concentrating on individuals' subjective sense of belonging and connection, the former evaluated self-esteem. To ensure uniformity, questionnaires were distributed in a group setting with researchers on hand to answer questions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the study may contribute to our understanding of how self-esteem and social connectedness are intertwined and their implications for adolescent well-being and social functioning.

Table 1: Shows the correlation between Self-Esteem and Social Connectedness

Variables	N	Pearson Correlation (r)	Sig (2-tailed)
Self Esteem	120	.634**	.000
Social Connectedness	120	.634**	

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

Table 1 shows that there is a significantly positive correlation between self-esteem and social connectedness among adolescents in the Indian context. The coefficient matrix (r =.634, p < 0.05) shows a relatively moderate correlation between the two variables. It shows that our self-esteem i.e., the feeling of social capability, being valuable, and resilience (Sakiz H. et. al., 2020) are positively correlated with social connectedness which is defined as the sense of connection and belongingness that exists between individuals (Van Bel. et. al., 2009). They are interdependent, hence proving that if individuals have higher self-esteem, they are likely to have stronger and healthier relationships. Therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 2: N, Mean Difference, Mean, SD & Significance values of Girls and Boys in relation to self-esteem

Level of Self Esteem	N	Mean Diff	t	df	Mean	SD	Sig. (2-tailed)
Girls	60	-1.83333	-2.071	112.091	25.7333	5.37687	0.41
Boys	60				27.5667	4.25607	

Table 2 shows that the levels of self-esteem among a sample of adolescents were investigated in this research study, with outcomes between girls and boys being carefully compared. Each group has 60 people, making up the sample. It was discovered that there was a mean difference of -1.83333 in self-esteem between girls and boys. This shows that on average, girls' levels of self-esteem were lower than boys'. In terms of self-esteem, girls scored on average 112.091, with a standard deviation (SD) of 25.7333. Boys, on the other hand, scored on average 27.5667, with a standard deviation of 4.25607. The difference in self-esteem between girls and boys was not statistically significant at the customary threshold (typically p > 0.05), according to the significance level (Sig. 2-tailed) provided in the data of 0.41. The comprehension of gender differences in adolescent self-esteem is aided by these findings.

Table 3: N, Mean Difference, Mean, SD & Significance values of Girls and Boys in relation to social connectedness

Levels of Social Connectedness	N	Mean Diff	t	df	Mean	SD	Sig. (2-tailed)
Girls	60	-6.33333	-1.981	118	71.2667	18.88221	.050
Boys	60				77.6000	16.01609	

Table 3 shows that in this study, a sample of teenagers' degrees of social connectedness was evaluated, with results between girls and boys being compared explicitly. Each group has 60 people. The researchers discovered a mean difference of -6.33333 between girls and boys, which shows that boys outperform girls in terms of social relations. Social connectedness for girls had a mean score of 71.2667 and a standard deviation (SD) of 18.88221. Boys, on the other hand, had a mean score of 77.6000 and a standard deviation that was slightly greater at 16.01609. The difference in social connectedness between girls and boys was statistically significant, according to the significance level (Sig. 2-tailed) stated in the data, which was .05, $p \leq 0.05$.

The results show that there is a positive correlation between the level of self-esteem and social connectedness among Indian adolescents (r = 0.634, p > 0.05). The study shows that there exists a positive correlation between self-esteem and social connectedness among Indian

adolescents. The correlation is relatively moderate, which shows that as social connectedness increases, self-esteem levels also increase. The findings support the idea that these two dimensions are interwoven and mutually reinforcing by showing a considerably positive association between self-esteem and social connectedness. This result is consistent with earlier studies that highlighted the value of self-esteem in developing healthy social interactions (Sakiz et al., 2020; Van Bel et al., 2009). Self-esteem and social connectivity appear to have a moderately favourable association, according to the correlation coefficient ($r = 0.634$, $p > 0.05$). This suggests that the possibility of developing stronger and healthier social ties increases as self-esteem levels do. Adolescents are more likely to engage in healthy social interactions and build lasting relationships with others if they feel socially capable, useful, and resilient. On the other hand, those with poor self-esteem may find it challenging to make and keep friends (Sakiz et al., 2021). The findings of the study align with the sociometer theory since the positive correlation between self-esteem and social connectedness suggests that individuals' self-esteem acts as an internal gatekeeper for social relationships.

Examining gender differences in self-esteem, the results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the degree of self-esteem in girls and boys ($\alpha = 0.41$, $p > 0.05$). These findings are supported by certain previous research which suggests that despite gender differences, their levels of self-esteem are alike. These results emphasize the importance of considering individual experiences and cultural factors beyond gender in shaping self-esteem among adolescents (Jain & Dixit, 2014). Hence, this makes the results coherent with the attachment theory, since it emphasizes on the early emotional bonds that may later determine self-esteem. A study was conducted by Minev M. et. al. 2018 to observe the self-esteem levels in students with higher levels of academic achievements. They found that girls have significantly more negative attitudes towards themselves compared with boys, hence proving that there is a difference in self-esteem between girls and boys regardless of their academic achievements. On the contrary, our study refutes this result since there is no statistically significant difference between the level of self-esteem in girls and boys as stated by a significance level of .41. Certain factors like cultural background, sample size, etc may be responsible for the contradictory findings. Further, it is observed that the mean scores between girls (25.7333) and boys (27.5667) show that girls are more susceptible to having lower levels of self-esteem and this result is supported by another study, which states that boys have higher self-esteem than girls (Zaidi U.,2006). This result is validated with reference to the self-determination theory that states that an individual's interactions with others are influenced by their motivation and personality interacting with the social environment, thus this environmental interaction and the difference in the societal expectations from boys and girls may be a reason for the difference in the levels of self-esteem in boys and girls, their psychological needs for autonomy, competence and relevance are reciprocated differently by the society.

On the other end, social connectedness ($\alpha = 0.05$, $p \leq 0.05$) shows that there is a significant difference in the maintenance of social relations among different genders. Collectivism is one significant aspect of Asian, and especially Indian culture that has an impact on how families work (Chadha et.al., 2013), which may be considered as a variable that may influence an adolescent's social relations with others. The mean difference between boys and girls is -6.33333. The mean value of boys' social connectedness is 77.6000 as compared to that of girls i.e., 71.2667, while the difference is statistically significant at 0.05, $p < 0.05$. This shows that the levels of social connectedness and the social interactions of boys may differ from girls and vice-versa within their social settings and that boys have better social relationships as

compared to girls. The result also implies that boys are more affected by their relationships with friends, parents, and surroundings as compared to girls. Despite the difference, the findings are marginally significant. Even if the data point towards a possible gender gap, it is crucial to interpret these results with caution because the evidence does not reach the standard cutoff for statistical significance. It might be essential to conduct additional studies with a bigger sample size to support and reinforce these findings. A study conducted by Mckenzie S. and others in 2018 provides a rich insight into men and their social connectedness, taking their mental health into consideration. The results show the varying nature of men, with one being comfortable with forming social relations, while others retreat from seeking social support, hence we cannot generalize the results of the current study. The study implies that men may or may not form emotional and supportive relationships. Their social relationships might depend upon other factors like their culture, self-esteem levels, financial status, etc. Another study guided by Lee M. R. & Robbins B. S. in 2011 stated that women feel more socially connected in relationships that focused on dependable alliance rather than advice. While men's social connectivity was aided by interactions that prioritized affirmation of self-worth but lacked dependable alliance or opportunity for nurturance contributed to social connectedness. This expresses and explains the difference in understanding of social connectedness between boys and girls. This also shows why gender differences prevail in their social relations.

The results show no significant gender difference in self-esteem ($\alpha = 0.41$) and a significant difference in social connectedness ($\alpha = 0.05$). This suggests that factors other than gender, such as cultural background, family dynamics, and personal experiences, may play a significant role in influencing these constructs. It is crucial to recognize the diversity within the adolescent population and acknowledge that individual differences and contextual factors can impact self-esteem and social connectedness. The ecological theory supports this result since it poses that an individual's development is influenced by multiple systems including several levels of interactions. This shows that interpersonal relationships and cultural values place a role in shaping the perceptions of self and social interactions.

CONCLUSION

Adolescence is the most influential phase of life, where an individual's self-esteem may lose balance and require support. Their thought processes, feelings and behaviours are influenced by cognitive, emotional and physical changes during this phase. Parental overprotectiveness, the culture around us and their personal relationships influences their levels of self-esteem.

The present study aimed to investigate the relationship between self-esteem and social connectedness amongst Indian adolescents, especially gender differences. The study included a sample of 120 adolescents, consisting of 60 girls and 60 boys, aged between 12 to 18 years.

The findings revealed a significant and moderately positive correlation between self-esteem and social connectedness ($r = 0.634$, $p > .05$) among Indian adolescents. The results show that self-esteem and social connectedness are interdependent and mutually reinforcing as suggested by sociometer and attachment theory. While, in terms of gender differences, the results indicate no significant difference in self-esteem in girls and boys ($\alpha = 0.41$, $p < 0.05$) of Indian context, hence indicating that both girls and boys have homogeneous levels of self-esteem. On the other hand, results of social connectedness show a statistically significant difference between girls and boys ($\alpha = 0.05$, $p < 0.05$). Thus, indicating that boys and girls have differences in terms of social connectedness but that difference is mild.

Overall, the contribution of the study was to understand the dynamics of self-esteem and social connectedness. In conclusion, this study highlights the need of taking self-esteem and social connectedness into account as key components in understanding teenage well-being and social development. The study adds to the body of knowledge on teenage psychology and offers insights that can guide therapies and programmes designed to boost Indian adolescents' positive self-esteem and create strong social bonds.

Limitations
The limitation of this study is that it is a time-constrained study and the sample size was small, making it difficult to generalise the findings. It only covers the adolescent population of Delhi, India. The sample has been collected through convenient sampling, therefore a biased selection of the sample is prevalent. The reliance on the self-report questionnaires may have also included potential biases including social desirability and response distortions. Due to a lack of resources and no availability of the Hindi adaptations for the above-mentioned tests, the sample is collected from English medium schools only, thereby limiting the generalisation of the sample.

Future directions and implications
The future implications of this study include conducting studies with larger sample sizes to improve generalizability, implementing longitudinal research to look at how self-esteem and social connectedness develop over time, incorporating qualitative methods to look at cultural factors and unique experiences, designing intervention programmes to encourage positive self-esteem and social connectedness among Indian adolescents, and taking the impact of the online environment into consideration.

REFERENCES
Allen, K., Ryan, T., Gray, D., McInerney, D., & Waters, L. (2014). Social Media Use and Social Connectedness in Adolescents: The Positives and the Potential Pitfalls. *The Educational and Developmental Psychologist, 31*(1), 18-31. doi:10.1017/edp.2014.2

American Psychological Association. (2002). Developing Adolescents: A Reference for Professionals. https://www.apa.org/pi/families/resources/develop.pdf

Bel Van T. D. et. al. (2009, January). (PDF) *Social connectedness: Concept and measurement* [Paper presentation] (n.d.). Intelligent Environments 2009– Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Intelligent Environments, Barcelona, Spain. DOI:10.3233 /978-1-60750-034-6-67

Bel, Daniel & Smolders, Karin & Ijsselsteijn, Wijnand & De Kort, Yvonne. (2009). Social connectedness: Concept and measurement. *Australasian Conference on Interactive Entertainment, 2,* 67-74. DOI:10.3233/978-1-60750-034-6-67

Bhardwaj A. & Agrawal G. (2013). Gender Difference in Pre-adolescents' Self-esteem. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research, 2.* Corpus ID: 149344900

Blum R.et.al.(2021, February).(PDF)*Connectedness, Positive Values and Contributions to Society: three building blocks of adolescent well-being. https://www.bmj.com/content/ 379/bmj-2021-069213*

Cameron, J.J., Stinson, D.A. (2017). Sociometer Theory. In: Zeigler-Hill, V., Shackelford, T. *(eds) Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences.* Springer, Cham. https:// doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_1187-1

Chadda, R. K., & Deb, K. S. (2013). Indian family systems, collectivistic society and psychotherapy. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, *55*(Suppl 2), S299–S309. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.105555

Comtois K. D., Cyr C., Pascuzzo K., Lessard M., & Poulin C. (2013). Attachment Theory in Clinical Work with Adolescents. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Behaviour*, 01(03). https://doi.org/10.4172/2375-4494.1000111

Fatima M. et.al. (2018). Relationship between self-esteem and social anxiety: Role of social connectedness as a mediator. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 15*(2), 12-17. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324771430_Relationship_between_Self-Esteem_and_Social_Anxiety_Role_of_Social_Connectedness_as_a_Mediator

Ford, M. B., & Collins, N. L. (2015). Self-Models and Relationship Threat. *SAGE Open, 5*(3). n, https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015593991

Harris, M. A., & Orth, U. (2020). The link between self-esteem and social relationships: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 119*(6), 1459–1477. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000265

Hepper E., (2006) (PDF) Self-Esteem. *Encyclopedia of Mental Health*, *4*(2), 80-91. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301662815_Self-Esteem

Hierometer and Sociometer Theories of Self-Regard. *Front. Psychol. 7:334.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00334

Hosogi, M., Okada, A., Fujii, C., Noguchi, K., & Watanabe, K. (2012). Importance and usefulness of evaluating self-esteem in children. *BioPsychoSocial Medicine, 6*, 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/1751-0759-6-9

Jain, S., & Dixit P. (n.d.). (2014) Self Esteem: A Gender-Based Comparison and the Causal Factors Reducing It among Indian Youth. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention, 3*(4), 9-15 http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v3(4)/Version-3/C03403009015.pdf

Jose, P. E., Ryan, N., & Pryor, J. (2012). Does Social Connectedness Promote a Greater Sense of Well-Being in Adolescence Over Time? *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 22(2), 235-251. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2012.00783.x

Josephs A. R. et. al. (1992). (PDF) Gender and Self-Esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*(3), 391-402. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/21751337_Gender_and_Self-Esteem

Lamblin, M., Murawski, C., Whittle, S., & Fornito, A. (2017). Social connectedness, mental health and the adolescent brain. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 80*, 57–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.05.010

Lee, R. M., & Robbins, S. B. (2000). Understanding Social Connectedness in College Women and Men. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *78*(4), 484-491. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2000.tb01932.x

Lee, R. M., Draper, M., & Lee, S. (2001). Social connectedness, dysfunctional interpersonal behaviors, and psychological distress: Testing a mediator model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *48*(3), 310–318. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.48.3.310

Legault, L. (2017). Self-Determination Theory. In: Zeigler-Hill, V., Shackelford, T. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_1162-1

Litvinenko, I. (2020, October 7). Attachment Styles and Self-Esteem.*[Bachelor's thesis, SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities]ResearchGate.* https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344515669_Attachment_Styles_and_Self-Esteem

Mahadevan N. et. al.(2016, March 30). Winners, Losers, Insiders, and Outsiders: Comparing

Mann, M. (2004). *S*elf-esteem in a broad-spectrum approach for mental health promotion. *Health Education Research, 19*(4), 357–372. https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyg041

Minev M. et.al (2018). Self-Esteem in Adolescents. *The Journal of Supercomputing, 16*(2), 114-118. DOI:10.15547/tjs.2018.02.007

Nayler, C. (2017, March 24). *What is Self-Esteem? 3 Theories on the Function of Self-Esteem.* PositivePsychology.org.uk. http://positivepsychology.org.uk/self-esteem-theory/

Riggers-Piehl, T., Lim, G., & King, K. (n.d.) (2018). Fostering Academic and Social Engagement: An Investigation into the Effects of All-Girls Education in the Transition to University. *Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles.* https://heri.ucla.edu/pub/NCGS-ResearchReport_final.pdf

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.* In fetzer.org. *https://fetzer.org/sites/ default/files/images/stories/pdf/selfmeasures/Self_Measures_for_Self-Esteem_Rose nberg_Self-Esteem.pdf*

Sakız, Halis & Mert, Abdullah & Sarıçam, Hakan. (2021). Self-esteem and perceived social competence protect adolescent students against ostracism and loneliness. *Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools*, *31*, 94-109. DOI:10.1017/jgc.2020.25

Yelpaiz, İ., Deniz, M. E., & Satici, B. (2021). Association between Social Connectedness and Well-Being: A Study of the Mediating Role of Psychological Vulnerability. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 11*(62), 367–382. https://doi.org/10.17066/ tpdrd.1001712

Zaidi, Uzma. (2006). Gender Differences in Self-esteem. *Pakistan Journal of Psychology.*

APPENDIX

Correlations

[DataSet1] C:\Users\Pritika\Desktop\FINAL DATA AND VARIABLE SHEET.sav

Correlations

		SCT	SET
SCT	Pearson Correlation	1	.634**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	120	120
SET	Pearson Correlation	.634**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	120	120

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

→ **T-Test**

[DataSet1] C:\Users\Pritika\Desktop\FINAL DATA AND VARIABLE SHEET.sav

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SET	girls	60	25.7333	5.37687	.69415
	boys	60	27.5667	4.25607	.54946

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper	
SET	Equal variances assumed	6.725	.011	-2.071	118	.041	-1.83333	.88530	-3.58646	-.08021	
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.071	112.091	.041	-1.83333	.88530	-3.58742	-.07925	

T-Test

[DataSet1] C:\Users\Pritika\Desktop\FINAL DATA AND VARIABLE SHEET.sav

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SCT	girls	60	71.2667	18.88221	2.43768
	boys	60	77.6000	16.01609	2.06767

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper	
SCT	Equal variances assumed	5.852	.017	-1.981	118	.050	-6.33333	3.19649	-12.66325	-.00341	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.981	114.940	.050	-6.33333	3.19649	-12.66500	-.00167	