Aggression, Resilience and Psychological Wellbeing among Transgender

Afsana K.B.[1], Dr. Mohammad Amin Wani.[2]

[1]MA Clinical Psychology, Lovely Professional University
[2]Assistant Professor Psychology, Lovely Professional University

Email: amin.23914@lpu.co.in[2]

Abstract

Objective: The present study has been undertaken to understand the impact of resilience, and aggression on the psychological well-being of transgender. **Methodology:** For the aforementioned purpose, the data was collected from 200 respondents selected through the purposive sampling technique. For measurement Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ), Psychological Resilience Scale by Rizwan Hassan Bhat and Mohd Khan and Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scale (PWB) by Carol. D. Ryff were used in the study. Resilience and aggression were taken as the independent variable and psychological wellbeing as the dependent variable. Further age, occupation and family background as a demographic variables. The obtained primary data was statistically analysed through SPSS. **Result:** the examination unveiled that there is no significant mean difference in aggression with respect to occupation and family background. However, It is found that respondents significantly differ in aggression with respect to age. Further, respondents did not significantly differ inresilience and psychological wellbeing with respect to age, Occupation and family background respectively.The finding also shows that there exists a negative correlation between aggression, resilience and psychological wellbeing. Additionally, Psychological wellbeing has a 7% impact on aggression. However, it found that 3% of the impact of psychological well-being on resilience. **Conclusion:** From the results, it can be said thatpsychological well-being is effective andhelps reducethe level of Aggression oftransgenders. However psychological well-being can improve by increasing the level of resilience.

Keywords: Aggression, Psychological wellbeing, Resilience, Transgender

1. INTRODUCTION

We live in a society in which sex and sexual orientation play a significant role. Our culture is divided into male and female categories on every level. In India, the term hijra refers to people who identify as neither men nor women, but rather as *Kinnar* (a Sanskrit term) or third gender (Nanda, 1996). They are also referred to as Eunuchs, Transvestites, Hermaphrodites, and Gays (Lal, 1999). As we all know, the transgender community in India has a long history, and there are several social gatherings of transsexual people such as *Hijras/Kinnars*, and other transsexual personalities such as Jogappas and others (Zaidi, 2021). Individuals from these groups experience considerable discrimination and are subjected to a variety of ill-treatment, including hostile attacks, physicaland sexual harassment, verbal abuse and victimization in various settings like family, organisation, work environment, hospitals, and public spaces. Transsexual isn't merely a term for persons who have their private parts mixed up. It is, nevertheless, a broad phrase for people whose sexual orientation expression, character, or behaviour differs from the expectations they were given when they were introduced to the world of sex. That means transgender people can be of any age or sex, and their appearance, qualities, or practises will differ from stereotypes about

how people are "assumed" to be (Chatterjee. 2018).In spite of "people whose sexual orientation personality doesn't coordinate with the sex character usually experienced by those of the people's natal sex," transsexual (for short 'TG') is an umbrella term that encompasses "people whose sexual orientation personality doesn't coordinate with the sex character usually experienced by those of the people's natal sex". Jain Texts also make a detailed reference to TG which mentions the concept of 'psychological sex'. The Supreme Court of India issued a landmark decision in the National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) vs Union of India case on April 15, 2014, declaring transgender people to be the "third gender" in India. This decision shows that under India's constitution, transgender individuals have the right to be treated equally. Lesbians and gays have been accepted in various nations, but transgender people continue to face discrimination, despite the fact that a bill has been approved in India.Transgender people experience "persistent discomfort and a sense of unsuitable assigned sex," according to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSMIII). "I feel trapped in the wrong body," one transgender said.

Transgender individuals who are Muslim often find themselves at the centre of social conflict (Pratiwi, Waluyo,Yona, & Susanti, 2019). Family is the most important agent of socialisation. The primary part of socialisation is the family. The basic skill that is learnt to be a fundamental member of society e.g. communication, mobility, right from wrong, it is the responsibility of the family.Talcott Parsons suggests that the family is the most important agent of socialisation as he argued that the norms and values are learnt first and foremost from the family. There are many reasons to assume that the family is the most important influence on one's gender identity. The involvement of family members in the process of change for the transgendered individual is important for both the family as well as the individual concerned (Polat,Yuksei & Discigil, 2005). One of the major issues faced by transgender is homelessness. Either they throughout from house or run away from their family due to lack of support and abusive situation from family. If their family is not accepting them then who will accept. It is one of domestic violence faced by transgenders. Due to this their life get affected and they engaged in drugs abuse, risky sexual behaviours and mental health disorders. The impact of family reaction on transgender people effect their live. A study done but the National Institute of epidemiology among 60,000 transgender people across 17 states, including Tamil Nadu, found that a large proportion of them receive no support from their biological family. Some families threaten or even physicallyassault their male child for behaving as girlish or feminine, and their female children behaving likea boy. Restless guardian's trait sex individuality in children to an assortment of causes including psychological maladjustment, sexual maltreatment, disarray, resistance or helpless socialization. One of the emerging issues is transphobia in transgender, discrimination, intolerance,physical harassment experienced due to their sexual orientation. Transphobia on a largerscale isthe moral, religious, and political beliefs of a dominant group. Some psychological issues faced by transgender's is self-harm, suicide, intense sadness, loneliness, discomfort in socialsituation and feeling overwhelmed. Due to social rejection, most transgenders are high todevelop anxiety, mood and substance use disorders. A study that followed gender-nonconforming children through a period of 11 years showed that gender nonconformity strongly predicted depressive symptoms beginning in adolescence and that physical and emotional bullying and abuse, both inside and outside the home, accounted for much ofthis increased risk (Francesca, Christine., Bordeos Sylvierose & Julianne, 2020). Transgender people have been targeted all the time as victims of hate crimes and

violence. As per census 2011, there are around 4.9 lakh third genders in the country who face social discrimination and harassment.According to one study, the majority of hijras in Mumbai encounter a variety of health difficulties, as well as harassment, sexual assault, violence, and violation of human rights. Based on one study, the transgender community faces a considerable deal of harassment and violence throughout their lives (Jae, et al,2020).   In social dominance orientation, trait aggression has a higher level, which is linked to gender minority stigma. As per a study conducted by Varunee and Javier(2010) transgender people encounter a high level of violence, antagonism, and discrimination in the job, including isolation, physical abuse, and dismissal. According to one study, transgender women are more likely to face discrimination and violence.

Significant of the study:

For the last few decades, the LGBT group has been in the limelight across the world. Some of the countries have accepted the LGBT group but in some places still, they are discriminated against. Since we are living in the 21st century, transgender people still face a lot of problems in society, especially in India. Only very few of the families of transgender has been accepted because society still thinks gender identity is a sin. Transgender groups have been rejected from the family and their community, they have been facing discrimination in every aspect of social life like school, education centres, hospitals, job centres, also in public toilets. Due to this gender-variant behaviour and the role they have been excluded from everything. Transgender who lives in India has experienced physical, violent behaviour as well as psychological issues which directly affect their life.

Therefore it is necessary to know their social as well as psychological wellbeing which is highly affected. Hence, the research in the present study aimed to find the level and relationship of Aggression,

Resilience, psychological wellbeing among Transgender. The study will also highlight the role of Psychological wellbeing, resilience and aggression. Further, the study will provide the theoretical background and material for those who in future will carry the research in the field of transgenders. It will also provide help for transgender communities, psychologists, social workers and awareness about the issues face by transgender society in India. It will also help the students and public those who are interested in the field of transgender.

Research Objectives:
1. To investigate the impact of Aggression on Psychological Wellbeing among Transgender
2. To find the impact of Resilience on Psychological Wellbeing among Transgender
3. To assess the relationship of Aggression and Resilience with Psychological Wellbeing
4. To examine the mean differences in Aggression, Resilience and Psychological Wellbeing concerning demographic variables
5. To assess the level of Aggression, Resilience and Psychological Wellbeing among Transgender

Research Hypothesis:
1. There is significant impact of Aggression on Psychological Wellbeing among Transgender
2. There is significant impact of Resilience on Psychological Wellbeing among Transgender
3. Aggression and Resilience will significantly correlated with Psychological Wellbeing
4. Aggression, Resilience and Psychological well-being will significantly differ concerning demographic variables.

Variables:
In the present study Aggression, Resilience and Psychological wellbeing were taken as psychological variables and Age, Occupation and Family Background as demographical variables

2. METHODS

Participants:

The sample comprised 200 transgender's between 20 to 39 years of age, collected from Sahayathrika Organization, and Sambhaavna society, through purposive sampling technique.

Instruments:

1. Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ) by (Buss & Perry, 1922). The scale consists of 29 phrases and 4 subscales, which include physical aggression (PA-9 items), verbal aggression (VA-5 items), anger (A-7 items), and hostility (H-8 items)on a five-point scale that ranged from 1 (extremely uncharacteristic of me) to 5 (extremely characteristic of me).

2. Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scale (PWB) developed by Carol D. Ryff, (1995). It has 42-items. The Psychological Wellbeing (PWB) scale measure the six aspects of wellbeing and happiness: Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive relation with others, Purpose in life, and Self-acceptance. It is 6- point scale (1= *Strongly agree*; 6= *Strongly disagree*)

3. Psychological Resilience Scale: Psychological Resilience Scale for Youth by Rizwan Hassan Bhat and Shah Mohd Khan. The scale consists of total of 21 items on a 5-point Likert scale with value anchored(1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly Agree). The reliability of Psychological Resilience is Internal Consistency, Cronbach's Alpha= 0.881 and Composite Reliability is 0.63 to 0.74. The validity is factorial: 53.15%, Construct is

7.52 to 13.69%for dimensions and 53.15% overall Variance extracted.

Procedure:

the research design adopted in this study is the purposive sampling method. the study was conducted in a different organization, Sahayathrika Organization, and the Sambhaavna society. the population of the study was made up of all the transgenders across India. the sample of the study was made up of 200 transgenders drawn from the organization through purposive sampling. The instrument used for the study was the Buss-Perry (1992) aggression scale., Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scale PWB (1995) and the Psychological Resilience Scale. were adopted for the study. before filling out the questionnaire, they were briefed about the study's nature, purpose and procedure. Permission was obtained from the participants and was assured that the information collected from them will be kept confidential. The questionnaires were administered as per the instructions given in the manual. The participants were asked to respond on their own. The participants were asked to respond to all the items on the scale without skipping any. The queries of the participants, if any, were properly clarified. The collected data were statistically analysed by mean, standard deviation, correlation and regression analysis toachieve the objectives of the study through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Conclusions and implications were made based on the obtained results.

3. RESULTS:

Descriptive statistic

Table1: *Description of respondents with respect to age, occupation and family type.*

Variable	Subvariable	Frequency	Percent
Age	20-29Years	19	9.5
	30-39Years	181	90.5
Occupation	Working	28	14.0
	Non-Working	172	86.0
Family Type	NuclearFamily	194	97.0
	Joint Family	6	3.0

The result of table 1 reveals that out of200 respondents 181 (90.5%) of respondents arebetween the age group of 30-39 years of age, whereas very least 19 (9.5 %) are between 20-29 years of age, 172 (86%)of the respondent are non-working, whereas very less 28 (14%) of respondents are working.From theabove table, it can also see that in the family type,194 (97%) ofrespondents belong to the nuclear family, whereas very least 6 (3%) of respondents are belongs to the joint family respectively.

Table 2: *Description of respondents with respect level of Aggression and its dimensions.*

Variable	Level	Range	Frequency	Percent
Aggression	Low	29-73	0	0
	High	74-145	200	100%
Physical Aggression	Low	9-22	3	1.5%
	High	23-45	197	98.5%
VerbalAggression	Low	5-12	0	0
	High	13-25	0	0
Anger	Low	7-17	33	6.5%
	High	18-35	167	83.5%
Hostility	Low	8-20	0	0
	High	21-40	200	100%

The finding of above table 2 showed that all the respondents 100% have a high level of aggression. Further, it is found that 98.5% of the respondents have a high level of physical aggression. While very least 1.5% of the respondents have a low level of physical aggression. The finding also shows that 16.% of the respondents have a very low level of anger.It is also revealed that all the respondents 100% have scored a high level of hostility

Inferential Statistics:

Table 3: *Mean differences in resilience with respect to age*

	Age	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	P-value
Resilience	20-29 Years	19	68.53	8.31	-.080	198	.936
	30-39 Years	181	68.62	4.63			

The findings from the table3 infers that the average resilience are not significantly differs with respect to age of respondents. It is found that the average value of 20-29 Yearsof age 68.53 (N=19, SD=8.31). Further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 68.62 (N=181, SD=4.62), t-value=-.080 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that resilience is not significantly differ with respect to age respectively.

Table 4: *Mean differences in dimensions of resilience with respect to age*

Dimensions	Age	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	df	P-value
Self-perception	20-29	19	20.52	3.29	-.496	198	.620
	30-39	181	20.89	3.06			
SingleMindedness	20-29	19	14.47	2.29	.503	198	.616
	30-39	181	14.22	2.06			
Taskorientation	20-29	19	11.05	1.93	-.842	198	.401
	30-39	181	11.31	1.21			
Organized	20-29	19	12.95	2.37	.991	198	.323
	30-39	181	12.51	1.75			

| Self-restraint | 20-29 | 19 | 9.51 | 1.61 | -.454 | 198 | .650 |
| | 30-39 | 181 | 9.68 | 1.38 | | | |

The findings of the table infers that the dimension of resilience (self- perception, single mindedness, task orientation, organized, self-restraint) are not significantly differs with respect to age of respondents. It is found that the average value of 20-29 years is found to be 20.52 (N=19, SD=3.29). further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 20.89(N=181. SD=3.06), t-value = -.496 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that self-perception is not significantly differ with respect to age respectively. Further the average value of 20-29 years of age is found to be 14.47 (N=19, SD=2.29). further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 14.22 (N=181, SD= 2.06), t-vale= .503 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Single mindedness is not significantly differ with respect to age. . Further the average value of 20-29 years of age is found

to be 11.05 (N=19, SD=1.93). further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 14.22 (N=181, SD= 1.21), t-vale= -.842 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Taskorientation is not significantly differ with respect to age. Further the average value of 20-29 years of age is found to be 12.95 (N=19, SD=2.37). further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 12.51 (N=181, SD= 1.75), t-vale= .991with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Organizedis not significantly differ with respect to age. The average value of 20-29 years of age is found to be 9.51 (N=19, SD=1.61). further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 9.68 (N=181, SD= 1.38), t-vale= -.454 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that self restraint is not significantly differ with respect to age group.

Table 5: *Mean differences in resilience with respect to occupation*

	Occupation	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	P-value
Resilience	Working	28	70.32	6.08	1.936	198	.054
	Non-Working	172	68.33	4.84			

The findingsshow that the average resilience of transgenders are not significantly differs with respect to occupation, it is found that the average value of working 70.32 (N=28, SD=6.08). Further the mean of non-working was

found 68.33 (N=172, SD=4.84), t-value=1.936 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that resilience is not significantly differ with respect to occupation respectively.

Table 6 : *Mean differences in dimensions of resilience with respect to occupation*

Dimensions	Occupation	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	P-value
Self-perception	Working	28	21.14	2.70	.524	198	.601
	Non-Working	172	20.81	3.13			
Singlemindedness	Working	28	14.96	2.49	1.98	198	.048
	Non-Working	172	14.13	1.99			
Taskorientation	Working	28	11.39	1.31	.454	198	.650
	Non-Working	172	11.27	1.28			
Organized	Working	28	12.71	1.98	.500	198	.618
	Non-Working	172	12.53	1.79			
Self-restraint	Working	28	10.11	1.47	1.816	198	.071
	Non-Working	172	9.59	1.38			

The results from the above table infers that the dimension of resilience (self-perception, single mindedness, task orientation, organized, self-restraint) are not significantly differs with respect to occupation of respondents. It is found that the average value of working is found to be 21.14 (N=28, SD=2.70). further the mean of non-working was found 20.81(N=172. SD=3.13), t-value=.524 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that self-perception is not significantly differ with respect to occupation respectively. Further the average value of working transgenders found to be 14.96 (N=28, SD=2.49). Further the mean of non-working was found 14.13 (N=172, SD= 1.99), t-vale= 1.98with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Single mindedness is not significantly differ with respect to occupation. Further the average value working is found to be 11.39 (N=28,

SD=1.31). further the mean of non-working transgenders was found 11.27 (N=172, SD= 1.28), t-vale= .454with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Taskorientation is not significantly differ with respect to occupation. Further the average value of working transgenders is found to be 12.71 (N=28, SD=1.98). Further the mean of non-working transgenders was found 12.53 (N=172, SD= 1.79), t-vale= .500 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Organized is not significantly differ with respect to occupation. The average value of working transgenders is found to be 10.11 (N=28, SD=1.47). Further the mean of non-working transgenders was found 9.59 (N=172, SD= 1.38), t-vale= 1.816with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that self-restraint is not significantly differ with respect to occupation.

Table 7: *Mean differences in resilience with respect to family background*

	Family background	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	df	P-value
Resilience	Nuclear	194	68.54	4.92	-1.172	198	.243
	Joint	6	71.00	8.77			

The above table reveals that the average resilience of transgenders are not significantly differs with respect to family background, it is found that the average value of Nuclear family68.54 (N=198, SD=4.92). Further the mean of joint family

is found 71.00 (N=6, SD=8.77), t-value=-1.172 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that resilience is not significantly differ with respect to family background respectively.

Table 8: *Mean differences in dimension of resilience with respect to Family background*

Dimensions	Family background	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	P-value
Self-perception	Nuclear Family	194	20.86	3.08	.022	198	.983
	Joint Family	6	20.83	3.19			
Singlemindedness	Nuclear Family	194	14.23	2.01	-.703	198	.483
	Joint Family	6	14.83	3.66			
Taskorientation	Nuclear Family	194	11.28	1.29	-.725	198	.469
	Joint Family	6	11.67	1.03			
Organized	Nuclear Family	194	12.52	1.79	-1.529	198	.128
	Joint Family	6	13.67	2.25			
Self-restraint	Nuclear Family	194	9.66	1.39	-.595	198	.552
	Joint Family	6	10.00	1.41			

The finding from the table evident that the dimension of resilience (self- perception,

single mindedness, task orientation, organized, self-restraint) are not

significantly differs with respect to family background of respondents. It is found that the average value of nuclear family is found to be 20.86 (N=194, SD=3.08). Further the mean of joint family was found 20.83 (N=6, SD=3.19), t-value=.022 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that self-perception is not significantly differ with respect to family background respectively. Further the average value of nuclear family found to be 14.23 (N=194, SD=2.01). Further the mean of joint family was found 14.83 (N=6, SD=3.66), t-vale= -.703with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Single mindedness is not significantly differ with respect to family background. Further the average value of nuclear family is found to be 11.28 (N=194, SD=1.29). Further the mean of joint family

was found 11.67 (N=6, SD= 1.03), t-vale= . -.725 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Taskorientation is not significantly differ with respect to family background. Further the average value of nuclear family is found to be 12.52 (N=194, SD=1.79). Further the mean of joint family was found 13.67 (N=6, SD= 2.25), t-vale=-1.529 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Organized is not significantly differ with respect to family background. The average value of nuclear family is found to be 9.66 (N=194, SD=1.39). Further the mean of joint family was found 10.00 (N=6, SD= 1.41), t-vale=-.595with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that self-restraint is not significantly differ with respect to family background.

Table 9: *Mean differences in psychological wellbeing with respect to age*

	Age	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	P-value
Psychologicalwellbeing	20-29	19	142.0	21.65	-.400	197	.690
	30-39	180	143.6	15.43			

The above tableshows that the average psychological wellbeing of transgenders with respect to age group, it was found that the mean average of 20-29 years age of 142.0 (N=19, SD=21.69) and the mean average of 30-39 years age of 143.6

(N=180, SD=15.43), t-value= -.400 with gf 197. Theno significant p-value P>0.05 revealed that psychological wellbeing is not significantly differ with respect to age respectively.

Table10: *Mean differences in dimensions of psychological wellbeing with respect to age*

Dimensions	Age	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	df	P-value
Autonomy	20-29	19	24.47	4.17	-.292	197	.771
	30-39	180	24.71	3.28			
Environmentalmastery	20-29	19	24.26	3.78	.584	197	.560
	30-39	180	23.81	3.19			
Personalgrowth	20-29	19	22.84	5.01	.100	197	.921
	30-39	180	22.73	4.48			
Positiverelations	20-29	19	23.47	4.49	-.724	197	.470
	30-39	180	24.18	4.02			
PurposeInlife	20-29	19	22.95	4.00	-.543	197	.588
	30-39	180	23.34	2.88			
Self-acceptance	20-29	19	24.05	3.86	-1.131	197	.259
	30-39	180	24.83	2.74			

The findings from table 10 infers that the dimension of psychological well-being

(Autonomy, Environmental mastery, Personal growth, Positive relations,

Purpose In life, and Self-acceptance) does not significantly differ with respect to the age of respondents. It is found that the average value of 20-29 years is found to be 24.47 (N=19, SD=4.17). Further, the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 24.71 (N=180, SD=3.28), t-value= -.292 with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that Autonomy is not significantly differ with respect to age respectively. Further, the average value of 20-29 years of age is found to be 24.26 (N=19, SD=3.78). Further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 23.81 (N=180, SD= 3.19), t-vale= .584 with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Environmentalmastery is not significantly differ with respect to age. . Further the average value of 20-29 years of age is found to be 22.84 (N=19, SD=5.01). Further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 22.73 (N=180, SD= 4.48), t-vale= .100with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Personalgrowth is not

significantly differ with respect to age. Further the average value of 20-29 years of age is found to be 23.47(N=19, SD=4.49). Further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 24.18(N=180, SD= 4.02), t-vale= -.724with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Positiverelations is not significantly differ with respect to age. The average value of 20-29 years of age is found to be 22.95(N=19, SD=4.00). Further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 23.34(N=180, SD= 2.88), t-vale= -.543with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that PurposeInlifeis not significantly differ with respect to age group.The average value of 20-29 years of age is found to be 24.05 (N=19, SD=3.86). Further the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 24.83 (N=180, SD= 2.74), t-vale= -1.131 with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Self-acceptance is not significantly differ with respect to age group.

Table11: *Mean differences in psychological wellbeing with respect to occupation*

	Occupation	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	P-value
Psychological wellbeing	Working	28	143.28	18.81	-.061	197	.952
	Non-Working	171	143.48	15.62			

The above tableshows that the average psychological wellbeing of transgenders are not significantly differs with respect to occupation, it is found that the average value of working143.28(N=28, SD=18.81). Further the mean of non-

working was found 143.48(N=171, SD=15.62), t-value=-.061 with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that psychological wellbeing is not significantly differ with respect to occupation respectively.

Table12 *Mean differences in dimensions of Psychological wellbeing with respect to occupation*

Dimensions	Occupation	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	df	P-value
Autonomy	Working	28	24.96	3.76	.467	197	.641
	Non-Working	171	24.64	3.30			
EnvironmentalMastery	Working	28	24.14	3.39	.515	197	.607
	Non-Working	171	23.80	3.22			
PersonalGrowth	Working	28	21.85	4.61	-1.120	197	.264
	Non-Working	171	22.88	4.50			
PositiveRelations	Working	28	24.82	4.26	.992	197	.322
	Non-Working	171	24.00	4.02			
PurposeInlife	Working	28	23.00	3.19	-.576	197	.566
	Non-Working	171	23.35	2.95			
Self-acceptance	Working	28	24.50	3.37	-.515	197	.607

	Non-Working	171	24.80	2.77		

The results from the table 12 infers that the dimension of psychological wellbeing (Autonomy, Environmental mastery, Personal growth, Positive relations, Purpose In life, Self-acceptance) are not significantly differs with respect to occupation of respondents. It is found that the average value of working is found to be 24.96 (N=28, SD=3.76). Further the mean of non-working was found 24.64 (N=171,SD=3.30), t-value=.467with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that Autonomy is not significantly differ with respect to occupation respectively. Further the average value of working transgenders found to be 24.14 (N=28, SD=3.39). Further the mean of non-working was found 23.80 (N=171, SD= 3.22), t-vale= .515

with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that EnvironmentalMastery is not significantly differ with respect to occupation. Further the average value working is found to be 21.85 (N=28, SD=4.61). Further the mean of non-working transgenders was found 22.88 (N=171, SD= 4.50), t-vale=-1.120 with df

198. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that PersonalGrowth is not significantly differ with respect to occupation. Further the average value of working transgenders is found to be 24.82(N=28, SD=4.26). Further the mean of non-working transgenders was found 24.00(N=171, SD= 4.02), t-vale= .992with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that PositiveRelations is not significantly differ with respect to occupation. The average value of working transgenders is found to be 23.00(N=28, SD=3.19). Further the mean of non-working transgenders was found 23.35(N=171, SD= 2.95), t-vale= -.576with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that PurposeInlifeis not significantly differ with respect to occupation.The average value of working transgenders is found to be 24.50 (N=28, SD=3.37). Further the mean of non-working transgenders was found 24.80 (N=171, SD= 2.77), t-vale= -.515with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Self-acceptance is not significantly differ with respect to occupation.

Table13: *Mean differences In psychological wellbeing with respect to family background*

	Family Background	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	df	P-value
Psychological wellbeing	Nuclear	193	143.57	16.21	.586	197	.559
	Joint	6	139.66	10.15			

The findings of above table 13reveal that the average psychological wellbeing of nuclear family 143.57 (N=193,SD=16.21). Further the mean of joint family is found to be 139.66 (N=6,SD=10.15), t-value=.586

with df 197.The no significant P>0.05 reveals that psychological well is not significantly differ with respect to family background. Which indicates both nuclear and joint family is similar.

Table 14: *Mean differences in dimensions of Psychological wellbeing with respect to family background*

Dimensions	Family Background	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	df	P-value
Autonomy	Nuclear	193	24.69	3.40	.26	197	.794
	Joint	6	24.33	1.63			
Environmental Mastery	Nuclear	193	23.88	3.22	.906	197	.366
	Joint	6	22.66	4.13			
PersonalGrowth	Nuclear	193	22.69	4.52	-.874	197	.383
	Joint	6	24.33	4.54			

PositiveRelations	Nuclear	193	24.21	4.07	1.921	197	.056
	Joint	6	21.00	2.00			
PurposeInlife	Nuclear	193	23.34	2.95	1.085	197	.279
	Joint	6	22.00	3.89			
Self-acceptance	Nuclear	193	24.74	2.89	-.498	197	.619
	Joint	6	25.33	1.36			

The above table 14 shows the mean difference of dimensions of psychological wellbeing (Autonomy, Environmental mastery, Personal growth, Positive relations, Purpose In life, Self-acceptance) are not significantly differs with respect to family background. It is found that the average value of nuclear family is found to be 24.69 (N=193, SD=3.40). Further the mean of joint family was found 24.33 (N=6,SD=1.63), t-value=.26 with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that Autonomy is not significantly differ with respect to family background respectively. Further the average value of nuclear family transgenders found to be 23.88 (N=193, SD=3.22). Further the mean of joint family was found 22.66 (N=6, SD= 4.13), t-vale= .906with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that EnvironmentalMastery is not significantly differ with respect to family background. Further the average value nuclear family is found to be 22.69 (N=198, SD=4.52). Further the mean of joint family transgenders was found 24.33(N=6, SD= 4.54), t-vale=-.874with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that

PersonalGrowth is not significantly differ with respect to family background. Further the average value of nuclear family of transgenders is found to be 24.21(N=193, SD=4.07). Further the mean of joint family of transgenders was found 21.00(N=6, SD= 2.00), t-vale= 1.921with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that PositiveRelations is not significantly differ with respect to both the nuclear and joint family. The average value of nuclear family of transgenders is found to be 23.34(N=193, SD=2.95). Further the mean of joint family of transgenders was found 22.00(N=6, SD= 2.89), t-vale= 1.085with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that PurposeInlife is not significantly differ with respect to occupation.The average value of nuclear family of transgenders is found to be 24.74(N=193, SD=2.89). Further the mean of non-working transgenders was found 25.33(N=6, SD= 1.36), t-vale=-.498with df 197. The no significant P>0.05 reveals that Self-acceptance is not significantly differ with respect to family background.

Table 15: *Mean differences in aggression with respect to age.*

	Age	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	df	P-value
Aggression	20-29 Years	19	109.4	7.64	-6.423	198	.000
	30-39 Years	181	116.4	4.13			

The above table reveals the average of Aggression with respect to age group, it was found that the mean average of 20-29 Years is 109.4(N=19,SD=7.64). Further, the average of 30-39 Yearswas found to be

116.4(N=181,SD=4.13).The significant p-value (p<0.05) infers that aggression differs with respect to age. Further, the research indicates that transgender people are very aggressive.

Table16: *Mean differences in dimensions of aggression with respect to age*

Dimensions	Age	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	P-value
Physical aggression	20-29Years	19	26.68	3.33	-3.281	198	.001
	30-39Years	181	28.33	1.91			

Verbalaggression	20-29Years	19	33.94	3.00	-3.004	198	.003
	30-39Years	181	35.59	2.19			
Anger	20-29Years	19	18.47	2.24	-1.648	198	.101
	30-39Years	181	19.24	1.90			
Hostility	20-29Years	19	31.00	2.70	-6.235	198	.000
	30-39Years	181	34.12	2.00			

The findings above table 16revealedthe mean difference of dimensions of Aggression (physical aggression, Verbal aggression and hostility) are significantly differs with the age groups.It is found that the average value of 20-29 years is found to be 26.68 (N=19, SD=3.33). Further, the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 28.33 (N=181, SD=1.91), t-value= -3.281 with df 198. The significant p-value(P<0.05) revealed that physical aggressionsignificantly differswith respect to age respectively. It is found that the average value of 20-29 years is found to be 33.94 (N=19, SD=3.00). Further, the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 35.59 (N=181, SD=2.19), t-value= -3.004 with df 198. The significant p-value(P<0.05)revealed that verbal aggression significantly differs with respect to age respectively. The average value of 20-29 years is found to be 18.47 (N=19, SD=2.24). Further, the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 19.24 (N=181, SD=1.90), t-value= -1.648 with df 198. The no significant p-value (P>0.05) revealed that anger is not significantly differs with respect to age respectively. The average value of 20-29 years is found to be 31.00 (N=19, SD=2.70). Further, the mean of 30-39 years of age was found 34.12 (N=181, SD=2.00), t-value= -6.235 with df 198. The significant p-value (P<0.05) revealed that hostility is significantly differs with respect to age respectively

Table 17: *Mean difference of dimensions of Aggression with respect to Occupation*

	Occupation	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	df	P-value
Aggression	Working	28	114.8	7.53	-1.062	198	.289
	Non-Working	172	115.9	4.47			

The above table reveals that the average of aggression in transgenders are not significantly differs with occupation, it is found that the average value of working 114.8 (N=28, SD=7.53). Further the mean of non-working was found 115.9 (N=172, SD=4.47), t-value=-1.062 with df 198. The no significant P>0.05 revealed that aggression is not significantly differ with respect to occupation respectively. Which means both the working and non-working transgender are similar.

Table 18: *Mean differences in dimensions of aggression with respect Occupation*

Dimensions	Occupation	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	P-value
Physicalaggression	Working	28	27.85	2.64			
	Non-Working	172	28.22	2.04	-.850	198	.396
Verbalaggression	Working	28	35.17	2.40			
	Non-Working	172	35.48	2.31	-.641	198	.522
Anger	Working	28	18.96	2.53			
	Non-Working	172	19.20	1.83	-.603	198	.547
Hostility	Working	28	33.42	2.15			
	Non-Working	172	33.88	2.28	-.999	198	.319

The findings above table, reveals the mean difference of dimensions of Aggression (physical aggression, Verbal aggression, aggression and hostility) are not significantly differs with the respect to occupation. It is found that the average value of working transgenders is found to be 27.85 (N=28, SD=2.64). Further, the mean of non-working transgenders was found 28.22 (N=172, SD=2.04), t-value= -.850 with df 198. The no significant p-value (P>0.05) revealed that physical aggression is not significantly differs with respect to occupation.It is found that the average value of working transgenders is found to be 35.17 (N=28, SD=2.40). Further, the mean of non-working transgenders was found 35.48 (N=172, SD=2.31), t-value= -.641 with df 198. The no significant p-value

(P>0.05) revealed that verbal aggression is not significantly differs with respect to occupation. It is found that the average value of working transgenders is found to be 18.96 (N=28, SD=2.53). Further, the mean of non-working transgenders was found 19.20 (N=172, SD=1.83), t-value= -.603 with df 198. The no significant p-value (P>0.05) revealed that anger is not significantly differs with respect to occupation. It is found that the average value of working transgenders is found to be 33.42 (N=28, SD=2.15). Further, the mean of non-working transgenders was found 33.88 (N=172, SD=2.28), t-value= -.999 with df 198. The no significant p-value (P>0.05) revealed that hostility is not significantly differs with respect to occupation.

Table 19: *Mean difference of dimensions of Aggression with respect to family background*

	Family background	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	P-value
Aggression	Nuclear	194	115.8	4.90	.823	198	.412
	Joint	6	114.1	8.08			

The above table 19 reveals that the average aggression in transgenders are not significantly differs with respect to family background, it is found that the average value of a nuclear family is 115.8 (N=194, SD=4.90). Further, the mean of the joint

family was found 114.1(N=6, SD=8.08), t-value=-.823 with df 198. The no significant p-value (P>0.05) revealed that aggression is not significantly differed with respect to family background.

Table20: *Mean difference of dimensions of Aggression with respect to family background*

Dimensions	Familybackground	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	P-value
Physicalaggression	Nuclear	194	28.20	2.09	1.177	198	.241
	Joint	6	27.16	3.31			
Verbalaggression	Nuclear	194	35.48	2.27	1.729	198	.085
	Joint	6	33.83	3.31			
Anger	Nuclear	194	19.13	1.93	-1.277	198	.203
	Joint	6	20.16	2.13			
Hostility	Nuclear	194	33.84	2.26	.722	198	.471
	Joint	6	33.16	2.22			

The findings of table 20 reveals the mean difference of dimensions of Aggression (physical aggression, Verbal aggression, aggression and hostility) are not significantly differs with the respect to

family background. It is found that the average value of the nuclear family of transgenders is found to be 28.20 (N=194, SD=2.09). Further, the mean of the joint family of transgenders was found 27.16

(N=6, SD=3.31), t-value= 1.177with df 198. The no significant p-value (P>0.05) revealed that physical aggression is not significantly differs with respect tofamily background.It is found that the average value ofthe nuclear family of transgenders is found to be 35.48 (N=194, SD=2.27). Further, the mean of the joint family of transgenders was found 33.83 (N=6, SD=3.31), t-value= 1.729with df 198. The no significant p-value (P>0.05) revealed that verbal aggression is not significantly differs with respect tofamily background. It is found that the average value ofthe nuclear family of transgenders is found to be 19.13 (N=194, SD=1.93). Further, the mean of the joint family of transgenders was found 20.16 (N=6, SD=2.13), t-value= -1.277with df 198. The no significant p-value (P>0.05) revealed that anger is not significantly differs with respect tofamily background. It is found that the average value ofthe nuclear family of transgenders is found to be 33.84 (N=194, SD=2.26). Further, the mean of the joint family of transgenders was found 33.16(N=6, SD=2.22), t-value= .722with df 198. The no significant p-value (P>0.05) revealed that hostility is not significantly differs with respect tofamily background.

Table 21: *Simple linear regression analysis of Aggression*

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std Error of Estimate
Aggression	Psychological Wellbeing	.085[a]	.007	.002	16.04410
B	111.807				
Std.Error	26.389				
β	.85				
t-value	4.237				
p-value	.000				

In table 21 shows the simple linear regression analysis of Aggression with Psychological wellbeing. The correlation (R) was found to be .085 and R2 was .007 for Psychological wellbeing. It indicates that Aggression contributes 7% of variance to Psychological wellbeing. Hence it can be stated that by controlling the level of Aggression, Psychological wellbeing can be improved.

Table 22 *Simple linear regression analysis of Resilience*

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	R	R^2	AdjustedR^2	Std Error of Estimate
Resilience	PsychologicalWellbeing	.055[a]	.003	-.002	16.07867
B	155.449				
Std.Error	15.668				
β	-.055				
t-value	-.767				
p-value	.444				

In the above table shows the simple linear regression analysis of Resilience with Psychological wellbeing. The correlation (R) was found to be .055 and R2 was .003for Psychological wellbeing. It indicates that resilience contributes 3% of variance to Psychological wellbeing. Hence it can be stated that by increasing the level of resilience, Psychological wellbeing can be improved.

Correlation Analysis

Table 23: *Correlation between Resilience, Aggression and Psychological wellbeing*			
	Resilience	**Aggression**	**Psychological wellbeing**
Resilience	1	-.051	-.055
Aggression		1	.085
Psychologicalwellbeing			1

The above table shows that the resilience is negatively correlated with aggression (r=.-051) and with psychological wellbeing (r=-.055). It is also infers that aggression is positively correlated with psychological well-being (r=.085).

4. DISCUSSION:

The purpose of the study was to assessthe level ofresilience, psychological well-being and aggression among transgenders. To achieve the objectives of the present study data were collected from 200 respondents through the purposive sampling technique. The obtained data was statistically analysed to test the hypothesis of the study. Based on the statistical methods utilized, the finding of the present study reveals thatthe overall aggression among transgenders 100% of respondents are having a high level of aggression. In physical aggression, 98.5% of the respondents are highly physically aggressive, followed by 1.5% of the respondents havinga low level of physical aggression. All the respondents have low verbal aggression. In anger, 83.5% of the respondents have a high level of anger and very less respondents have a 16% low level of anger. In the dimension of hostility, all the respondents have a high level of hostility 100%.It is evident that the majority of transgenders are highly aggressive. It is because society is not accepting them and they don't get any respect from their family, friends and society which leads to physical aggression and hostility. And also they face a lot of problems in wok setting too. They feel isolated and alone due to discrimination from society. These findings also goes hand in hand with research finding by Varuneeand Javier(2010). Transgenders are aggressive because they are lonely in their life. One of the studies suggests that loneliness is associated with aggressive tendencies (Wijnadh, Eric, Paul & Joseph 2019).

Further, the resilience level of respond does not differ with respect to age, occupation and family background. The results revealed that psychological wellbeing doesn'tdiffers with age, occupation and family background.

Based on the findings, it is evident that aggression plays a vital role in the age group between 20-29, 30-39 years). Some research found that the transgenders were more yield to those aggressive activities that direct towards injury or violence rather than create social or psychological damage. They further highlight that in aggression sex differences are mainly perceived consequences in aggression which are studied as social aspects as well as the role of genders (Eagly and Steffen 1986). The dimensions of aggression (Physicalaggression, Verbalaggression, hostility) plays an important role with age. Research has reported that transgenders are frequently exposed to violence, harassment in everyday life. Physical aggression and verbal aggression derive from various perpetrators (strangers, partners, family members). Further transgender people suffer from assaults, rape and harassment at an early age, and these experiences persist throughout their life (Tooru, Brite and Mariko 2011). These issues make them very aggressive and hostile towards society and their family.

Resilience was found to be inversely related to aggression and psychological wellbeing among transgenders. It was found that there is an increased need for psychological well-being for transgenders who have low resilience and it was found that due to higher level of aggression resilience tend to be low.Transgenders who have low resilienceusually tend to be more stressed and depressed. In their lives. The factors may include who is not resilient, lack of social skills, relationship difficulties, isolation, experiencing discrimination and being exposed to violence etc. These things increase the amount of stress in an individual's life and it means that it's weakening the system. It reduces the ability to cope with difficult situations. As we know that transgenders face a lot of issues, special in India. If society rejects them in some way or criticises them, they react more strongly and are hurt more deeply. Due to this, they are more aggressive towards everyone. Individuals with resilience and psychological well-being tend to take things more personally. It is important to consider resilience-building interventions. Establishing connections and encouraging more frequent contact with society could be considered a key focus area when addressing resilience (Emily, Anthony, William, Marian, Paul and Murray 2015)

Aggression plays a vital role in psychological wellbeing when it involves transgenders. Hence it can state that controlling the aggression level can improve psychological wellbeing. The findings indicated that, other sources like, the family of origin may have the most influence in protecting psychological wellbeing (Emily, Anthony, William, Marian, Paul and Murray 2015). A need to encourage family members to be open and show some source of support can decrease their aggression and maintain their psychological wellbeing. Lack of social relationships may have impacted transgender groups, a sense of loneliness and lack of support from society represents

a risk factor for their psychological wellbeing (van der Miesen et al., 2020). Resilience can also help to improve psychological well-being. To survive in today's world resilience is important to move forward and tackle all the situations this will intern help in developing psychological well-being.

5. CONCLUSION:

On the findings of the present study it is concluded that resilience is negatively related to aggression and psychological wellbeing. Further, the study concludes that psychological well-being is effective and helps reducethe level of Aggression of transgenders. However psychological wellbeing can improve by increasing thelevel of resilience.Many other aspects need to be interpreted in the psychological field among transgender so that it gives further findings which might be the focus and further give rise to the matter of concern thus these studies might give a major contribution to the field of study and research.

Limitation:

- Limitations of this study include a particular groupfor the sample that may challenge the generalization of the result.
- The sample has been restricted solely to certain groups and so, the obtained results are generalized entirely to those groups that hold similar and demographic characteristics.
- Lack of rapport between researcher and participants might have affected the participant's interest to respond.

Implications:

- Further advancements to the research can be implemented by taking into consideration the limitations of the study.
- The present study can be used by counsellors and therapists to have an insight into transgenders who come with aggression and psychological issues.
- The result of the present study provides a foundation for other researchto determine to what extent Aggression contributes to an individual's psychological wellbeingand

resilience.

Research conflict: Authors have no conflict of interest.

6. REFERENCES

1. Akhtar, M., & Bilour, N. (2019). State of mental health among transgender individuals in Pakistan: Psychological resilience and self-esteem. *Community Mental Health Journal,* 56(4), 626–634. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-019-00522-5

2. Chakrapani, V. & Dhall, P. (2011); Family Acceptance Among self-identified men who have sex with men (MSM) and Transgender people in India, *Family Planning Association of India (FPAI): Mumbai*

3. Chatterjee, S. (2018). Problems Faced by Transgender Community in India: Some Recommendations, *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 6(1),.

4. Chettiar, A. (2015). Problems Faced by Hijras (Male to Female Transgenders) in Mumbai with Reference to Their Health and Harassment by the Police; *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 5(9), 752-759. https://doi.org/10.7763/IJSSH.2015.V5.551

5. From The Times Of India; "Police harass transgenders most, says study"; Apr 17, 2016, http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/chennai/Police-harass-transgenders-most-says-study/article show/51869919.cms

6. Glynn, T. R., Gamarel, K. E., Kahler, C. W., Iwamoto, M., Operario, D., &Nemoto, T. (2016). The role of gender affirmation in psychological well-being among transgender women. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 3*(3), 336–344. https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000171

7. Grossman, A. H., D'augelli, A. R., & Frank, J. A. (2011). Aspects of psychological resilience among transgender youth. Journal of LGBT Youth, 8(2), 103–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2011.541347

8. Maddux, J. E. (2009). Self-efficacy: The Power of Believing You Can. *The Oxford Handbook ofPositive Psychology*, 334–344. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195187243.013.0031

9. Mukherjee, S. (2015). The Curious Case of Shanthi: The Issue of Transgender in Indian Sports. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 6*(3).

10. Nevatia, S., Raj, Mahajan, S., & Shah, C. (2012). Bound by norms and out of bounds: Experiences of PAGFB (persons assigned gender female at birth) within the formal education system: Lesbians and bisexuals in action (labia). *Contemporary Education Dialogue, 9*(2), 173–196. https://doi.org/10.1177/097318491200900203

11. Polat, A., Yuksel, S., Discigil, A. G., &Meteris, H. (2005). Family attitudes toward transgendered people in Turkey: Experience from a secular Islamic country. *The International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine, 35*(4), 383–393. https://doi.org/10.2190/bhly-k1ml-jdcb-h04w

12. Pratiwi, C. J., Waluyo, A., Yona, S., &Susanti, H. (2019). Difficulties in Performing Prayers as a Muslim Transgender Individual. *Journal of*

International Dental and Medical Research, *12*(1), 310–317.

13. Puckett, J.A, DuBois, L.Z, McNeill, J.N & Hanson, C. (2019). The Association between Social Dominance Orientation, Critical Consciousness, and Gender Minority Stigma. *National Library of Medicine*, 67(8), 1081-1096. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2019.1603493.

14. Reyes, M. E. S., Davis, R. D., Yapcengco, F. L., Bordeos, C. M. M., Gesmundo, S. C., & Torres, J. K. M. (2020). Perceived Parental Acceptance, Transgender Congruence, and Psychological Well-Being of Filipino Transgender Individual. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 22(1), 135–152.

15. Roberts, A. L., Rosario, M., Slopen, N., Calzo, J. P., & Austin, S. B. (2013). Childhood gender nonconformity, bullying victimization, and depressive symptoms across adolescence and early adulthood: An 11-year Longitudinal Study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child &*

Adolescent Psychiatry, *52*(2), 143–152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2012.11.006

16. Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*(6), 1069–1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

17. Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(4), 719–727. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719

18. Singh, A. A., &McKleroy, V. S. (2011). "just getting out of bed is a revolutionary act": The resilience of transgender people of color who have survived traumatic life events. *Traumatology*, *17*(2), 34–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534765610369261

19. Virupaksha, H. G., &Muralidhar, D. (2018). Resilience among Transgender Persons: Indian Perspective. *Indian Journal of Social Psychiatry* , *34*(2), 111–115.