

More Alike Than Different? A Comparative Study of Self-Esteem, Body Image, And Attitudes Towards Women in Single-Sex and Co-Educational Institutions

Aishwarya Singh¹, Apeksha Sehgal¹, Garima¹, Sargam Mishra¹,
Yashita Thareja¹ & Puspita Behera²

Abstract: Educational contexts have a profound impact on the psychosocial development of individuals, shaping their perceptions and attitudes towards themselves and their surroundings. The present study aimed to explore differences in self-esteem, body image, and attitudes towards women among female students attending single-sex and co-educational institutions. The study included 149 undergraduate female participants aged between 18 and 24 years enrolled in educational institutions within the Delhi-NCR region. An ex-post facto research design was adopted, and independent samples t-tests were used to test differences across the three variables. The results revealed significant differences in attitudes towards women ($t = 2.09, p = 0.04$), with female students in single-sex institutions demonstrating more liberal attitudes compared to their counterparts in co-educational settings. No statistically significant differences were found on the dimensions of self-esteem ($t = 0.52, p = 0.60$) and body image ($t = 0.02, p = 0.98$). Future research may employ mixed-methods approaches and longitudinal studies to investigate these constructs, taking into account cultural and regional variations.

Keywords: educational context, self-esteem, body image, attitudes toward women, single-sex vs. co-educational institutions

In 2022, the Kerala State Commission for Protection of Child Rights had recommended closing down boys-only and girls-only schools in the state starting from the academic year 2023–24, directing the government to prepare an action plan for implementing a co-education system across all schools. The petition that prompted this order argued that gender justice can be meaningfully ensured in government and aided schools only through the adoption of co-education. The recommendation further emphasized that co-education could play a crucial role in enhancing the mental, emotional, and social well-being of students. This move to phase out single-sex schooling brings forth a pertinent question: Is the promotion of co-education truly an effective approach to achieving gender equality, fostering inclusive social development, and supporting the holistic well-being of students?

While academic performance has long dominated debates on single-sex versus co-educational schooling, increasing attention is being paid to psychosocial outcomes such as self-esteem, interpersonal skills, emotional well-being, and gender identity formation.

Proponents of single-sex education argue that girls benefit from environments free of gender-based stereotypes and social pressures, which can enhance classroom participation, academic risk-taking, and self-confidence, particularly in male-dominated subjects like STEM (Sadker & Zittleman, 2009; Shapka & Keating, 2003). Single-sex settings are also associated with fewer distractions and stronger feelings of safety, fostering greater academic engagement (Eisenkopf et al., 2015). It is also argued that co-educational settings can pose obstacles, particularly for girls, who must navigate gendered expectations, romantic dynamics, and the male gaze during adolescence, all of which can impact self-esteem and emotional well-being (Byrne & Carthy, 2022).

However, critics caution that gender based segregation may reinforce gender binaries and limit opportunities for developing cross-gender social skills (Patterson & Bigler, 2007). For instance, Wong et al. (2018) highlighted that girls from single-sex schools may experience greater anxiety in mixed-gender environments and show lower tendencies to form

¹Undergraduate student, Department of Psychology, Lady Shri Ram College for Women, University of Delhi

²Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Lady Shri Ram College for Women, University of Delhi

Corresponding Author: apekshasehgal1701@gmail.com

friendships with boys. Moreover, it is argued that the cognitive and social benefits of single-sex education are often overstated, and that gender-essentialist assumptions underlying such models deserve further scrutiny (Eliot, 2013).

Building on the policy debate outlined above, researchers have attempted to understand how educational settings, whether single-sex or co-educational, affect students' psychosocial development. However, the evidence remains inconsistent, particularly with regard to self-esteem, body image, and attitudes toward women.

Extant research on self-esteem yields little consensus on whether single-sex or co-educational contexts are more advantageous. Bonds-Raacke and Nicks (2001) detected no school-type differences in female students' global self-esteem, an outcome replicated by Guglielmi (2011), who broadened the construct to appearance, peer, and academic domains and likewise reported null effects. Guglielmi argued that sophomore year, the developmental stage at which most participants were assessed is uniformly impressionable, making girls in both environments equally vulnerable to peers' evaluations. These findings stand in tension with region-specific evidence from India, where Kapoor et al. (2022) observed lower self-esteem among Delhi undergraduates in co-educational colleges, whereas Vidyarthi et al. (2022) recorded higher self-esteem for co-educational girls in Himachal Pradesh schools. Riordan's classic synthesis (1990) complicates matters further by suggesting that distractions in mixed-gender classrooms can depress academic and social outcomes after puberty, yet acknowledges that similar peer-dynamics-driven challenges can surface in single-sex settings. Taken together, the literature suggests that any link between school type and self-worth is highly contingent on developmental stage, local culture, and institutional climate.

The pattern is equally ambiguous for body-image outcomes. Early residence-hall work in the United States (Flicek & Urbas, 2003) and Australian high-school studies (Tiggemann, 2001) reported no

differences in disordered eating or body dissatisfaction by school type. Spencer et al. (2012) extended this inquiry to U.S. colleges and likewise found no disparities among first- and second-year students; however, after prolonged exposure to their respective milieus, seniors at women's colleges endorsed larger personal and perceived societal ideals than their mixed-college peers. Spencer and colleagues (2012) interpreted this shift as evidence that women enter higher education with comparable body ideals and diverge only as cumulative institutional and peer influences accrue - an interpretation reinforced by Dyer and Tiggemann's earlier observation (1996) that thinner ideals sometimes emerge in single-sex cohorts. Such temporal and contextual variation underscores that school type alone cannot explain body-image trajectories; rather, trajectories appear to be shaped by evolving peer cultures, achievement norms, and media pressures.

Attitudes towards women are attitudes based on gender role attitudes, i.e., attitudes toward the role of women in society that different people have (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Attitudinal research offers another mosaic of results. An Istanbul study by Erarslan and Rankin (2013) observed that girls in single-sex high schools espoused more egalitarian views of family roles, although their attitudes toward work and social life did not differ from those of co-educated peers. U.S. and British work on women's colleges has long echoed this partial advantage, attributing it to feminist campus climates and visible female role models, yet similar attitudinal gains have been documented in co-educational institutions that embed robust gender-sensitisation programmes (Hartman, 2010; Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Signorella et al., 1996; Symth, 2010). Thus, while single-sex settings facilitate feminist consciousness by eliminating direct male gaze and competition, their impact is neither uniform across all facets of gender ideology nor immune to replication in well-designed mixed-gender environments.

Collectively, these demonstrate that the psychosocial effects of school gender composition remain far from settled. Divergent findings arise not only from methodological heterogeneity - differences

in age bands, cultural contexts, analytic controls, and measurement tools- but also from moderating influences such as peer dynamics, family background, and institutional ethos. The persistent inconsistency highlights a pressing need for integrative, context-specific research.

Moreover, according to the Social Identity Theory, proposed by Tajfel and Turner (1979), individuals derive a significant part of their self-concept and esteem from the social groups to which they belong. In the context of a single-sex college, students form a strong in-group identity based on their gender, which fosters a sense of belonging and positive social comparison within that group. This strengthened group identity can enhance self-esteem by promoting feelings of empowerment and solidarity among students. Moreover, the absence of the opposite gender in single-sex institutions may reduce gender-based social pressures and stereotypical judgments, potentially resulting in a healthier body image and more progressive attitudes towards women. In contrast, coeducational settings often involve more complex intergroup dynamics and social comparisons across genders, which can influence body image concerns and traditional gender attitudes differently. This would suggest that college type shapes key psychological variables through the processes of group identification and intergroup relations.

At the same time, Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) provides a broader framework, suggesting that development is the result of complex, interacting influences across nested environmental systems. While the educational institution (part of the microsystem) is certainly influential, it does not operate in isolation. Family attitudes, cultural expectations, media representations, and broader societal discourses (the exosystem and macrosystem) also profoundly shape young women's experiences of self and gender. From this perspective, the absence of consistent findings across studies may not indicate a lack of effect but rather reflect the reality that educational context is only one of many interwoven factors influencing psychosocial development.

As the discourse surrounding gender-segregated or co-educational institutions has gained renewed relevance in the Indian context, it becomes increasingly important to examine the available empirical evidence. Yet, there remains a notable paucity of empirical data that critically examines how different educational contexts shape the psychosocial development of female students, particularly concerning constructs as complex and socially embedded as self-esteem, body image, and gender attitudes.

While a handful of studies have examined the relationship between college type and psychological outcomes, findings across contexts and time periods remain inconclusive. Moreover, the bulk of extant literature has either prioritized academic performance or approached psychosocial constructs in isolation, neglecting the relational, institutional, and cultural dimensions through which they are often shaped. Constructs like body image and self-esteem are not static intrapsychic traits but are continually negotiated through peer interaction, exposure to gendered norms, institutional messaging, and broader socio-digital influences (Grogan, 2016; Tiggemann & Slater, 2014). Similarly, attitudes toward women, though often treated as cognitive or ideological stances, are intimately tied to lived experiences of gendered power relations, opportunities for voice and leadership, and the visibility of female role models (Eagly & Wood, 2012; Ridgeway, 2011). Given that both single-sex and co-educational institutions purport to empower women in differing ways, there is a compelling need to empirically investigate which aspects of psychosocial development are most affected by the structural and cultural affordances of these settings.

This study aims to address this empirical gap by conducting a comparative analysis of self-esteem, body image, and attitudes toward women among female undergraduate students enrolled in single-sex and co-educational colleges in the Delhi-NCR region. By focusing on a culturally and demographically diverse sample, the study seeks to move beyond universalizing claims and instead offer a contextually grounded understanding of how institutional environments interact with developmental processes. In doing so, it

also responds to a broader need for Indian scholarship that interrogates the psychological dimensions of gender socialization in educational spaces. The findings are expected to contribute not only to academic literature but also to ongoing policy conversations about gender equity, institutional reform, and the creation of psychologically supportive learning environments for women in higher education.

Method

The present study investigates the impact of different educational environments, single-sex and co-educational institutions, on self-esteem, body image, and attitudes toward women among female college students. Adopting an ex-post facto research design, the study focuses on naturally occurring distinctions within these educational settings.

Objectives

The research has the following objectives.

- i. To compare the levels of self-esteem among female students in single-sex and co-educational institutions.
- ii. To compare the levels of perceptions of body image among female students in single-sex and co-educational institutions.
- iii. To compare the attitudes towards women among female students in single-sex and co-educational institutions

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated.

- H1.** There will be a significant difference in the levels of self-esteem among female students in single-sex and co-educational institutions.
- H2.** There will be a significant difference in the levels of perceptions of body image among female students in single-sex and co-educational institutions
- H3.** There will be a significant difference in the attitudes

towards women among female students in single-sex and co-educational institutions.

Sample

Utilizing a between-subjects design, 149 college students were divided into two groups: participants from single-sex colleges catering to women ($n = 87$) and those from co-educational colleges ($n = 62$). The inclusion criteria ensured that all participants were assigned female sex at birth, were undergraduate students aged 18-24 years, and were studying in Delhi-NCR. Non-undergraduate students, such as postgraduate or non-student individuals, were excluded from the study. Participants were recruited primarily through convenience sampling, with communication facilitated via WhatsApp. Comprehensive information regarding the study's purpose, procedures, risks, and benefits was provided to ensure informed consent. Data were collected using an online form, which was available to participants from November 25, 2023, to April 17, 2024. Independent sample t-tests were conducted using SPSS 16.0 to compare the data obtained from single-sex and co-educational college participants.

Measures

The Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (RSES)

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES), developed by Rosenberg (1965), is a widely used 10-item self-report measure designed to assess self-esteem. Participants respond to each statement using a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Sample statements include "On the whole, I am satisfied with myself" and "I take a positive attitude toward myself." The responses are scored from 1 to 4, with higher scores reflecting higher self-esteem. Items 2, 5, 6, 8, and 9 are reverse-scored. The scale's total score is computed by summing all item scores. With simple instructions and straightforward administration, the RSES has proven to be a reliable and valid tool, showing an internal consistency of 0.87 (Baldwin & Courneya, 1997).

Body Self-Image Questionnaire – Short Form (BSIQ-SF)

The Body Self-Image Questionnaire - Short Form (BSIQ-SF), developed by Rowe (2005), is a 27-item measure of body image across 9 subscales. Participants respond on a 5-point scale with 'a' (Not at all true of myself), 'b' (Slightly true of myself), 'c' (About halfway true of myself), 'd' (Mostly true of myself), and 'e' (Completely true of myself). These responses are scored on a 1-5-point scale, with a=1 and e=5. Reverse scoring is applied only to item 1. The BSIQ should not be used to derive a summed "total body image" score. Instead, each subscale score is to be treated individually, with scores ranging from a minimum of 3 to a maximum of 15. The 9-factor structure of the BSIQ demonstrated a good fit across different samples, as indicated by the following model fit statistics: $\chi^2(df=576) = 2210.19$, CFI = .93, NNFI = .92, and RMSEA = .04.

Attitude Towards Women Scale (AWS)

The AWS or the Attitude Towards Women Scale is a 25-item scale developed by Spence, Helmrich & Stapp in 1973. It is a shorter version of the original, 55-item Attitude Towards Women Scale. The participant responds to each statement with (A) agree strongly, (B) agree mildly, (C) disagree mildly, or (D) disagree strongly. The responses are scored from 1 to 3, with A= 0, and D = 3. However, items 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 18, 21, 24, and 25 are reverse-scored. The total scale score is calculated as the sum of all item scores. A high score is indicative of a profeminist, egalitarian attitude, while a low score is indicative of a traditional, conservative attitude. For the 25-item scale, Cronbach's alpha and Spearman Brown reliabilities were .89 and .86, respectively (Daugherty & Dambrot, 1986).

Results**Table 1**

Differences between Females Studying in Single Sex vs. Coeducational Institutions in Self Esteem, Attitudes towards Women and Body Image

Variable	Single Sex (<i>n</i> = 87)		Coeducational (<i>n</i> = 62)		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Self Esteem (RSES)	26.44	4.64	26.05	4.26	0.52	0.60
Attitudes towards Women (AWS)	65.78	7.36	62.74	10.44	2.09	0.04
Body Image (BSIQ)	77.11	13.05	77.06	13.28	0.02	0.98

As shown in Table 1, the t-test results reveal a statistically significant difference in Attitudes towards Women between females studying in single-sex and coeducational institutions ($t = 2.09$, $p = 0.04$). Females in single-sex educational institutions scored higher on Attitudes towards Women ($M = 65.78$, $SD = 7.36$) as compared to their counterparts in Coeducational institutions ($M = 62.74$, $SD = 10.44$), indicating that the former hold more favourable, egalitarian, and profeminist attitudes. Females in single-sex institutions, therefore, showcase attitudes supportive of increasing equality, expanding human choice, eliminating gender stratification, ending sexual violence, and promoting sexual freedom, while females in coeducational institutions may hold relatively more traditional and conservative beliefs. However, the t-test results indicate no statistically significant difference between females studying in single-sex and coeducational institutions on the constructs of Self-Esteem ($t = 0.52$, $p = 0.60$) as well as Body Image ($t = 0.02$, $p = 0.98$).

Discussion

Self-esteem is defined as a positive or negative attitude toward him/herself; it can also be described as an individual's sense of self-worth (Rosenberg, 1965). The present study's findings did not reveal a statistically significant difference in self-esteem scores between female students in single-sex and co-educational institutions; thus, the hypothesis was rejected. Several studies corroborate the non-significant differences in self-esteem observed in this research. For instance, the differences between women studying in co-educational and single-sex institutions in Pakistan were explored, and it was concluded that while female students in single-sex institutions experienced more stress, their life satisfaction and self-esteem were comparable to those in co-educational settings (Afridi & Maqsood, 2017). Similarly, research investigating self-esteem and locus of control among students from single-sex and co-educational schools found no significant differences, further aligning with our findings (Bonds-Raacke & Nicks, 2001).

High self-esteem scores among secondary school female and male students in Pakistan were also reported in another study, which attributed this to participants' tendency to provide socially desirable responses (Farid & Akhtar, 2013). In a similar context in India, this tendency toward social desirability might explain the lack of significant differences in self-esteem scores in our study.

In their study, Delfabbro et al. (2011) found that negative views of appearance among adolescents were linked to lower self-esteem, reduced life satisfaction, and greater distress, while protective factors such as extraversion, strong social networks, and supportive family environments maintained self-esteem despite poor body image perceptions. These findings suggest that self-esteem is shaped by various factors beyond the school environment, including family dynamics, peer relationships, and personality traits. The implications of these results resonate with our study, highlighting the need to consider external factors when interpreting self-esteem outcomes. Familial support and access to external resources, like social media and

extracurricular activities, may influence self-esteem more than the type of college attended.

Significant progress in women's empowerment and gender equality has been made in recent years, particularly in India, as evidenced by increased female education, fewer early marriages, and more women in leadership positions (Somani, 2022), empowering young women and possibly contributing to similar self-esteem levels across educational settings. Both single-sex and co-educational colleges may offer similar resources such as counseling and mentorship, creating supportive environments that foster self-esteem (Sax et al., 2009).

Lastly, while the RSES is a widely used and validated tool providing a global assessment of self-esteem, it focuses on general self-worth rather than specific dimensions, such as academic, social, or physical self-esteem. Some critics argue that the RSES may not capture desirable self-esteem components and suggest exploring new concepts and non-conscious measurement tools for more comprehensive assessment (Yamasaki, 2019).

The present study revealed a statistically significant difference in Attitudes Toward Women (AWS) between female students enrolled in single-sex and co-educational institutions, with students in single-sex colleges reporting a slightly higher mean score. Attitudes towards women are based on gender role attitudes, i.e., attitudes toward the role of women in society that different people have. The finding of higher AWS scores in single-sex institutions may indicate that these environments offer conditions conducive to fostering progressive gender attitudes, and that the educational context influences perceptions and attitudes towards women, with females in single-sex institutions showing greater positive attitudes compared to those in co-educational institutions.

Prior literature highlights that single-sex educational institutions foster empowerment, agency, and more progressive gender attitudes among female students. By dismantling traditional gender stereotypes, especially in male-dominated fields such as ICT, and

encouraging active participation in subjects like science and mathematics, these environments enhance students' confidence in women's capabilities (Chennabathni & Rejskind, 1998; Miliszewska & Sztendur, 2009). The emotionally and politically safe spaces they offer allow for open expression, mutual support, and the development of egalitarian worldviews (Cumings, 2015). Students in these settings often report higher aspirations, stronger belief in their potential, and greater identification with feminist ideologies (Bijlani & Utereja, 2016; Carroll, 2002). Additionally, increased access to female role models and institutional support further reinforces respect for women's contributions both personally and professionally ((Erarslan & Rankin, 2013; Miller-Bernal, 1993)

However, while the findings of the study indicated a significant difference, the effect size was small ($d = 0.34$), suggesting that while differences exist at a statistical level, their practical significance may be limited. This small magnitude of the difference in AWS scores in our study warrants caution. If single-sex institutions indeed had a broad and robust impact on shaping gender attitudes, this effect might also be expected to manifest in related domains such as self-esteem and body image in the present study. This suggests that while the type of educational institution, single-sex or co-educational, may exert some influence on gender-related attitudes, its impact is neither uniform nor absolute.

Drawing on Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory (1979), an individual's development is shaped by multiple interrelated systems. Within this framework, school/college type constitutes only one layer of influence. Factors such as family environment, cultural background, peer dynamics, and media exposure may play a far more substantial role in shaping students' attitudes, beliefs, and self-perceptions (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). The type of academic institution, though relevant, may represent only one of many influencing factors within the broader ecological context. For instance, Delfabbro et al. (2011) and Grabe et al. (2008) highlight how strong family support and media significantly affect self-esteem and body

image - domains in which the present study found no significant difference based on college type.

Personality development studies suggest that while single-sex education may enhance certain supportive characteristics, the broader cultural and educational influences seem to moderate any differences in attitudes toward women (Conway, 1996; Malik, 2013). Moreover, as colleges, regardless of gender composition, become increasingly supportive and hospitable toward women, this shapes liberal and positive attitudes towards women's roles and rights (Hoffnung, 2011).

Additionally, the sample for the present study was recruited from Delhi NCR. In the Indian context, particularly that of female students from Delhi University colleges, research indicates that students are increasingly rejecting traditional and restrictive views about gender roles. Their attitudes toward women are becoming more liberal, and the gender gap in attitudes is narrowing, irrespective of the co-educational or single-sex environment. Overall, in Delhi University and similar Indian educational contexts, the differences in AWS between female students in co-educational and single-sex settings are minimal, likely because both groups are influenced by evolving societal norms that encourage more egalitarian views about gender roles (Sachdev, 1998).

Moreover, a selection effect may be influencing the findings. Students who choose or are encouraged to attend single-sex colleges may already come from progressive, feminist-leaning families or communities. These students may possess more egalitarian attitudes independent of the school context, as noted by Erarslan & Rankin (2013). Thus, the observed differences in attitudes toward women could be reflective of pre-existing beliefs rather than the causal effect of the educational setting.

Overall, the relatively small magnitude of the difference observed in this study highlights the need to move beyond binary comparisons of college types. Rather than viewing single-sex and co-educational environments as monolithic, it is important to examine the specific elements within each setting, such as

curriculum design, teacher-student interactions, peer culture, mentorship structures, and exposure to female role models, that may more directly contribute to shaping gender-related attitudes.

The study's findings did not reveal a statistically significant difference in body image scores (BSIQ) between female students in single-sex and co-educational institutions. These results suggest that body image concerns are not significantly influenced by the type of educational context.

For instance, Spencer et al. (2012) found no significant differences in body concern or physical appearance social comparison based on college type or year of study. Likewise, Hannan et al. (1996) reported that while boys in co-educational settings exhibited lower self-reported body image, no such differences were observed among girls. Further, Willoughby and Carroll (2009) noted no significant differences in body image or related traits, such as impulsivity and extroversion, among students residing in co-educational versus gender-specific housing. Davey et al. (2011) too found no meaningful differences between single-sex and co-educational students in their current and ideal body image ratings.

The relationship between body image dissatisfaction and self-esteem is well-documented. Higher body image dissatisfaction is associated with lower self-esteem (Vasudeva, 2013). The absence of significant differences in RSES among participants across single-sex and co-educational institutions may partially explain the non-significant differences in BSIQ scores observed in this study.

Moreover, societal standards and media portrayals strongly shape body image, affecting both groups equally through social media, advertisements, and cultural norms. Media consumption correlates with body dissatisfaction, particularly among women (Grabe et al., 2008). Higher education environments may play a smaller role in shaping body image as students develop greater awareness of these issues, which could act as a protective factor.

Further, research suggests a relationship between educational attainment and body image dissatisfaction. Body dissatisfaction tends to increase in women with lower education over their life course (Rosenqvist et al., 2024). This implies that a statistically significant difference might emerge if a comparison between groups with varying education levels were conducted. The current study sample comprised women pursuing undergraduate degrees, where no significant differences in body image were observed between single-sex and co-educational institutions.

Limitations

Firstly, the instruments used such as RSES, AWS, and BISQ-SF, were developed in Western contexts, potentially impacting their cultural relevance and applicability to the study's participants. Two of these are older than 10 years, which may compromise their relevance to contemporary contexts. Additionally, relying predominantly on quantitative measures like surveys might limit the depth of insights into participants' opinions towards women and feminism; qualitative methods like interviews could provide a more comprehensive understanding. The study's relatively small sample size, further restricted by being limited to Delhi NCR, may raise concerns about generalizability. Moreover, sensitive topics like self-esteem, body image, and feminist identity carry the risk of eliciting socially desirable responses. The reliance on self-report measures also introduces inherent biases like social desirability bias, memory errors, and inaccurate self-perception.

Future Directions

Though in the present study, attempts have been made to study participants' Self-esteem, Body Image, and Attitude towards Women through quantitative measures such as the survey, the use of mixed methods may provide further insights. This can also mitigate biases and capture diverse cultural perspectives. There is also an urgent need for more pervasive and large-scale studies in the Indian context, and the use of recently developed and culturally relevant scales will be apt for such further research. Employing multidimensional

scales in future research could provide a more nuanced understanding of these potential differences. Additionally, conducting longitudinal studies could offer a deeper understanding of how self-esteem, body image, and attitude towards women evolve over time, and how they relate to individuals' life trajectories. Future research can be aimed at investigating the intersection of educational experiences with religious values and mental health implications, and accordingly, the formulation of policy recommendations for supportive environments needs to be carried out.

Conclusion

The shift from single-sex to co-education has sparked debate on its effectiveness. This study revealed that students from single-sex college had more liberal Attitudes toward Women, though Self-esteem and Body image showed no significant differences. These findings highlight the role of all-girls educational environments in fostering egalitarian gender attitudes, while Self-esteem and Body image may be influenced by individual traits and family dynamics beyond college type. Further research using mixed-method and longitudinal approaches is essential to explore these constructs, considering cultural and regional contexts. Such studies can guide educational policies to support holistic psychosocial development in diverse learning environments.

References

- Afridi, S., & Maqsood, S. (2017). Perceived stress, life satisfaction and self-esteem among women studying in co-education and uni-gender institutions. *Pakistan Journal of Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 18(1), 25–33.
- Baldwin, M. K., & Courneya, K. S. (1997). Exercise and self-esteem in breast cancer survivors: An application of the exercise and self-esteem model. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 19(4), 347–358.
- Bijlani, D., & Utreja, D. (2016). *Comparative analysis of feminism-related ideologies among students in single-sex and coeducational institutions*. RED'SHINE Publication.
- Bonds-Raacke, J. M., & Nicks, S. D. (2001). The relationship between single-sex and co-educational environments on socioemotional development. *Modern Psychological Studies*, 8(1), Article 2.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Byrne, D., & Carthy, A. (2022). An argument against sex segregation in post-primary schools: Examining wellbeing perspectives. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 13(3), 487–498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2020.1861072>
- Carroll, A. (2002). At-risk and not at-risk adolescent girls in single-sex and mixed-sex school settings: An examination of their goals and reputations. *Westminster Studies in Education*, 25(2), 147–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0140672020250205>
- Chennabathni, R., & Rejskind, G. (1998). Gender issues in collaborative learning. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 17(4), 44–46.
- Conway, K. E. (1996). *Differential effects of single-sex versus coed education on the mathematical reasoning ability, verbal reasoning ability, and self-concept of high*

- school girls* [Doctoral dissertation, Florida International University]. FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations. <https://doi.org/10.25148/etd.FI14061500>
- Cumings, M. K. (2015). The importance of safe space and student voice in schools that serve minoritized learners. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, 30(1), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.21307/jelpp-2015-004>
- Daugherty, C. G., & Dambrot, F. H. (1986). Reliability of the Attitudes toward Women Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 46(2), 449–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316448604600221>
- Davey, Z., Jones, M. K., & Harris, L. M. (2011). A comparison of eating disorder symptomatology, role concerns, figure preference and social comparison between women who have attended single sex and coeducational schools. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 65(9-10), 751–759. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-9942-3>
- Delfabbro, P. H., Winefield, A. H., Anderson, S., Hammarström, A., & Winefield, H. (2011). Body image and psychological well-being in adolescents: The relationship between gender and school type. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 172(1), 67–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.2010.517812>
- Dyer, G., & Tiggemann, M. (1996). The effect of school environment on body concerns in adolescent women. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 34(1-2), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01544800>
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2012). Social role theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 458–476). SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249222.n49>
- Eisenkopf, G., Hessami, Z., Fischbacher, U., & Ursprung, H. W. (2015). Academic performance and single-sex schooling: Evidence from a natural experiment in Switzerland. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 115, 123–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2014.08.004>
- Eliot, L. (2013). Single-sex education and the brain. *Sex Roles*, 69(7–8), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0037-y>
- Erarslan, A. B., & Rankin, B. (2013). Gender role attitudes of female students in single-sex and coeducational high schools in Istanbul. *Sex Roles*, 69(7–8), 455–468. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-013-0277-0>
- Farid, M. F., & Akhtar, M. (2013). Self-esteem of secondary school students in Pakistan. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 14(10), 1325–1330.
- Flicek, K., & Urbas, B. (2003). Coed versus single-sex residence halls: Correlates of disordered eating behavior. *UW-L Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 6, 1–6.
- Grabe, S., Ward, L. M., & Hyde, J. S. (2008). The role of the media in body image concerns among women: A meta-analysis of experimental and correlational studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(3), 460–476. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.3.460>
- Grogan, S. (2016). *Body image: Understanding body dissatisfaction in men, women and children* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315681528>
- Guglielmi, A. (2011). *Girls' self-esteem rates in single sex & coed high schools* [Undergraduate thesis, Trinity College]. Trinity College Digital Repository. <https://jstor.org/stable/community.34030610>
- Hannan, D., Smyth, E., McCullagh, J., O'Leary, R., & McMahon, D. (1996). *Coeducation and gender equality: Exam performance, stress and personal development*. Oak Tree Press.
- Hartman, K. (2010). *The advantages of single-sex vs. coeducational environments for high school girls*

- [Bachelor's thesis, Providence College]. Providence College Digital Commons. https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/socialwork_students/63/
- Hoffnung, M. (2011). Career and family outcomes for women graduates of single-sex versus coed colleges. *Sex Roles*, 65(9–10), 680–692. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9914-z>
- Kapoor, A., Upadhyay, M. K., & Saini, N. K. (2022). Relationship of eating behavior and self-esteem with body image perception and other factors among female college students of University of Delhi. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, 11, Article 80. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_855_21
- Malik, R. A. (2013). Differential effects of single sex versus coed education on the personality development of primary school students. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, 33(1).
- Miliszewska, I., & Sztendur, E. (2009). Girls from low socio-economic backgrounds: Factors influencing their interest in ICT study and career. In *15th Americas Conference on Information Systems 2009 (AMCIS 2009)*. AMCIS.
- Miller-Bernal, L. (1993). Single-sex versus coeducational environments: A comparison of women students' experiences at four colleges. *American Journal of Education*, 102, 23–54.
- Patterson, M. M., & Bigler, R. S. (2007). Preschool children's attention to environmental messages about groups: Social categorization and the origins of intergroup bias. *Child Development*, 77(4), 847–860. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00906.x>
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*. Oxford University Press.
- Riordan, C. (1990). *Girls and boys in school: Together or separate?* Teachers College Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton University Press.
- Rosenqvist, E., Konttinen, H., Berg, N., & Kiviruusu, O. (2024). Development of body dissatisfaction in women and men at different educational levels during the life course. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 31, 718–729. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-023-10127-7><https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-023-10213-x>
- Rowe, D. A. (2005). Factorial validity and cross-validation of the body self-image questionnaire (short form) in young adults. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 37(Supplement), S148–S149. <https://doi.org/10.1249/00005768-200505001-00803>
- Sachdev, P. (1998). Sex on campus: A preliminary study of knowledge, attitudes and behaviour of university students in Delhi, India. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 30(1), 95–105. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021932098000959>
- Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls?* Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Sadker, D., & Zittleman, K. (2009). *Still failing at fairness: How gender bias cheats girls and boys in school and what we can do about it*. Scribner.
- Sax, L., Arms, E., Woodruff, M., Riggers, T., & Eagan K. (2009). *Women graduates of single-sex and coeducational high schools: Differences in their characteristics and the transition to college*. UCLA Graduate School of Education & Information Studies. https://www.heri.ucla.edu/PDFs/Sax_FINAL%20REPORT_Sing_1F02B4.pdf
- Shapka, J., & Keating, D. (2003). Effects of a girls-only curriculum during adolescence: Performance, persistence, and engagement in mathematics and science. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(4), 929–960. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312040004929>

- Signorella, M. L., Frieze, I. H., & Hershey, S. W. (1996). Single-sex versus mixed-sex classes and gender schemata in children and adolescents. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20(4), 599–607. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1996.tb00325.x>
- Smyth, E. (2010). Single-sex education: What does research tell us? *Revue française de pédagogie*, 171, 47–55.
- Somani, P. (2022). Strengthening women empowerment and gender equality in India. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 5(1), 271–275. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v5-i1-35>
- Spence, J. T. and Helmreich, K. L. (1972). The Attitude toward Women Scale: An objective instrument measure attitude toward the right and role of women in contemporary society. *JSAS Catalogue of Selected Document in Psychology*, 2, 66–67.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 2(4), 219–220. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03329252>
- Spencer, B., Barrett, C., Storti, G., & Cole, M. G. (2012). "Only girls who want fat legs take the elevator": Body image in single-sex and mixed-sex colleges. *Sex Roles*, 69(7–8), 469–479. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-012-0189-4>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.
- Tiggemann, M. (2001). The impact of adolescent girls' life concerns and leisure activities on body dissatisfaction, disordered eating, and self-esteem. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, 162(2), 133–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221320109597955>
- Tiggemann, M., & Slater, A. (2014). NetGirls: The Internet, Facebook, and body image concern in adolescent girls. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 47(6), 630–643. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22254>
- Vasudeva, B. (2013). Body image dissatisfaction in the youth of India: And the effects on self-esteem. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(3), 608–614. <https://doi.org/10.25215/0903.058>
- Vidarthi, A., Devi, A., & Thakur, A. (2022). A comparative study on self-esteem among adolescent girls studying in single sex and co-education schools of Distt Kullu H. P. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 11(1), 1501–1505. <https://doi.org/10.21275/SR22125113853>
- Willoughby, B. J., & Carroll, J. S. (2009). The impact of living in co-ed resident halls on risk-taking among college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 58(3), 241–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480903295359>
- Wong, W. I., Shi, S. Y., & Chen, Z. (2018). Students from single-sex schools are more gender-salient and more anxious in mixed-gender situations: Results from high school and college samples. *PLoS ONE*, 13(12), Article e0208707. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208707>
- Yamasaki, K. (2019). Why do researchers and educators still use the Rosenberg scale? Alternative new concepts and measurement tools for self-esteem. *Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Science*, 7(1), 74–83.