



## INTERACTION EFFECT OF THE POSITIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMME AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS ON THE ACADEMIC RESILIENCE, PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING AND SELF-EFFICACY OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS

\*Dr. Megha D'souza

\* Associate Professor, Smt. Kapila Khandwala College of Education

### Abstract:

Happiness and well-being are primary pursuits of man. Yet happiness is difficult to find as people in today's time live a stressful life. Positive education is an approach to education that development of well-being skills and character development along with academic learning. People who facilitate academic learning are teachers. Teachers of current times play a multifaceted role. As a result she ends up giving much more from her reservoir that she feels exhausted and burned out. Therefore efforts need to be made to build their capacities that they can take charge of their own well-being. This study intends to study the interacting effect of positive education programme and socio-economic status on academic resilience, psychological well-being and self-efficacy of pre-service teachers. The positive education intervention programme of 30 hours was developed for this purpose. The participants included in the study were 46 and 48 preservice teachers in the control and experimental group respectively. The results show that there is a significant interactive effect of positive education programme and SES on psychological well-being of pre-service teachers. However the positive education programme has found to be uniformly effective in enhancing the academic resilience and teacher self-efficacy of pre-service teachers regardless of their SES background.

**Key words:** Positive Education Programme, SES, Academic Resilience, Psychological Well-Being, Teacher Self-Efficacy.

**Copyright © 2022 The Author(s):** This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited

### Introduction:

All human beings all seek happiness, there is good reason why they do so? Happiness does a whole lot of good to us. Happy people in any sector of life do well. In school, happy kids perform better academically; in sports happy people perform better. At work, happy employees are more productive. At home, happy parents make happy children. Most importantly happiness is the primary pursuit of all mankind.

Yet happiness is so difficult to find and achieve. In schools, students are stressed. At work employees are over worked, at home parents are anxious. This could be because man is continuously striving to do more, get more. In this ever busy lifestyle he is struggling to pursue things hoping that they will bring us happiness. Happiness and well-being is not only about feeling good momentarily but it is about functioning well and doing good in life. This is what Eudemonic philosophy explains that well-being and happiness is about living well and doing well. Thus well-being as per eudemonic view point is about cultivation of personal strengths and contribution to the greater good, acting in accordance with one's inner nature and deeply held values (Waterman 1984 as cited in Ryff 1989), the realization of one's true potential (Ryff and Keyes 1995), and the experience of purpose or meaning in life (Ryff 1989). Positive psychology



demonstrates how well-being comes from experiencing meaning in life rather than merely feeling happy.

Application of positive psychology to the field of education brings us to the area of positive education. Positive education is an approach to education that combines character strengths and academic learning. It not only focusses on cognitive development but also development of well- being skills and character strengths. Thus it is defines as education for both traditional skills and happiness. Positive education entails educating students on certain life skills like resilience, character strengths, optimism, and growth mind-set among others.

### **Rationale of the study:**

Teachers shoulder responsibility of shaping future citizens of nation. Teacher in current times plays a multifaceted role- that of academician, facilitator, guide, mentor, counsellor, curriculum developer, event manager, so on. All these tasks places a lot of emphasis on amount of time and effort a teacher has to dedicate to her work. As a result she ends up giving much more from her reservoir that she feels exhausted and burned out. One must remember that teachers are significant human resource of any nation. Therefore efforts need to be made to build their capacities that they can take charge of their own well- being. When we have happy and flourishing teachers, this will definitely make a positive impact in the lives of future citizens who are being moulded by them. The background of teachers in our country differs based on social, economic, regional factors. This study intends to study the interacting effect of positive education programme and socio- economic status on academic resilience, psychological well- being and self- efficacy of pre-service teachers.

### **Statement of the problem**

Interaction Effect of the Positive Education Programme and Socio- Economic Status on the Academic Resilience, Psychological Well- Being and Self- Efficacy of Pre-Service Teachers.

### **Operational Definition of the Terms**

**Positive Education:** Positive education is defined as enabling the learner to acquire knowledge and skills to develop their well-being.

**Psychological Well-being:** Psychological well- being is defined as ability manifested by a person to pursue happiness, cultivate character strengths, develop positive relationships, hold positive attitude towards one's self, realize one's true potential and experience purpose or meaning in life.

**Academic Resilience:** Academic resilience is defined as ability manifested by an individual in two aspects: self- efficacy and Social support and social competence.

- Self- efficacy is the ability to do something or think in a certain way, confidence in academic qualities, disposition to expect positive outcomes and belief in one's ability to influence outcomes in life.
- Social support and social competence consists of care, support and encouragement received from family, friends, teachers and other members of the institution. It is the ability of the person to get along well with others and function constructively in groups.

**Teacher Sense of Efficacy:** It is the confidence a teacher holds in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).<sup>1</sup>

### **Scope and Delimitations of the Study:**

The present study included pre-service teachers from colleges of education affiliated to university of Mumbai. It did not include pre-service teachers from colleges of education affiliated to other than Mumbai University. The study was



limited to B.Ed. colleges with English as the medium of instruction. It excluded colleges of education not having English as a medium of instruction. The study was limited to pre-service teachers pursuing Bachelor of Education degree. It did not include students from any other course of education such as M. Ed. or D. Ed. It included only S. Y. B. Ed. Students of the academic year 2017- 18 and not the F. Y. B. Ed. Students. In the present study, interaction effect of positive education programme and SES on Academic Resilience, Psychological Well-being and Teacher self- efficacy from English medium colleges of education was studied. Other variables such as engagement, academic achievement, motivation, anxiety, stress, etc. were excluded from the study. The study has adopted quantitative approach and not the qualitative approach.

#### **Aim of the Study:**

To study the interaction effect of positive education programme and socio- economic status on academic resilience, psychological well- being and self- efficacy of pre- service teachers.

#### **Objectives of the Study:**

To ascertain the effect of (i) Positive Education Programme, (ii) Socio- economic status and (iii) their interaction on the following variables:

- a) Academic Resilience
- b) Psychological Well-being
- c) Teacher Self- efficacy

#### **Null Hypotheses of the Study:**

There is no significant effect of (i) Positive Education Programme, (ii) Socio- Economic Status and (iii) their interaction on the following variables:

- a) Academic Resilience
- b) Psychological Well-being
- c) Teacher Self- efficacy

#### **Methodology of the Present Study:**

In the present research, quasi experimental design of the pre-test post-test, non-equivalent groups type is used. It can be described as follows:

The pre-test-post-test non-equivalent groups design

$O_1 X O_2$

$O_3 C O_4$

Where,

$O_1$  and  $O_3$ = Pre-test Scores

$O_2$  and  $O_4$ = Post- test Scores

X: Experimental Group

C: Control Group.

#### **Sample of the Study:**

In the present study, the sample has been selected consisting of one intact class each of S. Y. B. Ed. students from two different colleges of education situated in the Greater Mumbai. The study adopted a two-stage sampling technique. At the first stage, colleges were selected using simple random sampling technique (lottery method). At the second stage,

students were selected from these two colleges using cluster sampling technique. The experimental group comprised of 48 student- teachers and the control group consisted of 46 student- teachers.

### Tool of the Study:

In the present study following tools were used by the researcher to collect the data:

1. Academic Resilience Scale (D'souza and Pandya, 2017)
2. Psychological Well-being Scale (Ryff, 1989)
3. Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen- Moran & Hoy, 2001) 155
4. Socio- Economic Status Inventory (Patel, 1997)

**Intervention Programme:** The positive education intervention programme was conducted in the experimental group. The positive education intervention programme comprised of five modules namely, resilience, positive emotions, positive relationships, character strengths and meaning in life. The duration of the programme was of 30 hours. Each module of the programme was divided into sessions. Every session was further divided into some activities.

### Data Analysis and Interpretation:

Null Hypotheses:

There is no significant effect of (i) Positive Education Programme, (ii) Socio- Economic Status and (iii) their interaction on the following variables:

- a) Academic Resilience
- b) Psychological Well-being
- c) Teacher Self- efficacy

The Socio- Economic Status of the participants of EG and CG was classified as low, middle and high groups.

Techniques of Data Analysis: The present research used statistical techniques of 2\*3 factorial ANCOVA.

#### a. Academic Resilience

Table 1 shows adjusted mean ARS by treatment and SES

**TABLE 1**  
**MEAN ARS BY TREATMENT AND SES**

| Group/ SES | EG     | CG     | Total  |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Low        | 142.39 | 121.80 | 128.06 |
| Middle     | 143.12 | 126.20 | 135.03 |
| High       | 141.26 | 131.11 | 138.01 |
| Total      | 142.35 | 125.52 | 134.12 |

Table 2 shows ANCOVA for mean ARS by treatment and SES.

**TABLE 2**  
**ANCOVA FOR MEAN ARS BY TREATMENT AND SES**

| Sources of variation | SS       | Df | MS      | F     | P      |
|----------------------|----------|----|---------|-------|--------|
| Treatment            | 6059.41  | 1  | 6059.41 | 32.46 | <0.001 |
| SES                  | 1174.22  | 2  | 587.11  | 3.15  | 0.0478 |
| Interaction effect   | -746.77  | 2  | -373.39 | -2    | <0.001 |
| Error                | 16239.68 | 87 | 186.66  |       |        |

- i. Treatment effect: It is seen from table 2 that the F- ratio is 32.46 which is significant (P <0.001). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected with reference to the treatment effect for ARS.

- ii. SES: The F ratio for SES effect is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted with respect to the effect of SES on ARS.
- iii. Interaction effect: The F- ratio is -2 which is significant ( $P < 0.001$ ). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected with reference to the interaction effect for ARS.
- iv. Since the interaction effect for ARS by treatment and SES is significant, the t-test is applied for further analysis as shown in table 3. The t-test has been used to determine which group of SES differ significantly.
- v. The following table gives the numerical data and level of significance for computing mean differences in ARS of pre-service teachers by treatment and SES.

**TABLE 3**  
**NUMERICAL DATA AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR**  
**MEAN DIFFERENCES IN ARS BY TREATMENT AND SES**

| No. | Group              | N  | df | Mean   | SD    | t-ratio | I.o.s |
|-----|--------------------|----|----|--------|-------|---------|-------|
| 1   | EG- Low SES        | 7  | 21 | 142.39 | 13.66 | 3.32    | 0.01  |
|     | CG- Low SES        | 16 |    | 121.80 | 13.66 |         |       |
| 2   | EG- Middle SES     | 24 | 44 | 143.12 | 13.66 | 4.20    | 0.01  |
|     | CG- Middle SES     | 22 |    | 126.20 | 13.66 |         |       |
| 3   | EG- High SES       | 17 | 23 | 141.26 | 13.66 | 1.73    | NS    |
|     | CG- High SES       | 8  |    | 131.11 | 13.66 |         |       |
| 4   | Low SES (total)    | 23 | 67 | 128.06 | 13.66 | 1.995   | NS    |
|     | Middle SES (total) | 46 |    | 135.03 | 13.66 |         |       |
| 5   | Low SES (total)    | 23 | 46 | 128.06 | 13.66 | 2.53    | 0.05  |
|     | High SES (total)   | 25 |    | 138.01 | 13.66 |         |       |
| 6   | Middle SES (total) | 46 | 69 | 135.03 | 13.66 | 0.88    | NS    |
|     | High SES (total)   | 25 |    | 138.01 | 13.66 |         |       |

#### Interpretation and conclusion:

- a. The mean ARS of pre- service teachers from the experimental group is significantly greater than that of the pre-service teachers in the control group. This indicates that the positive education programme was effective in enhancing the academic resilience of the pre- service teachers.
- b. There is no significant difference in the mean ARS of pre- service teachers from the low, middle and high SES groups. It means that the positive education programme is effective to students of all the groups irrespective of their SES background.
- c. The mean ARS of pre-service teachers from low and middle SES background of EG is significantly higher than the pre-service teachers from low and middle SES background respectively of the CG. However there is no significant difference in the mean ARS of the pre-service teachers from the high SES background of the EG and CG.
- d. There is significant difference in the mean ARS of the pre-service teachers from the low and high SES background. The mean ARS of pre-service teachers from the high SES background is higher than that of the pre-service teachers from the low SES background. However there is no significant difference found in the mean ARS of the pre-service teachers from the low and middle and from the middle and high SES background.

#### b. Psychological Well- Being

Table 4 shows adjusted mean PWBS by treatment and SES

TABLE 4

MEAN PWBS BY TREATMENT AND SES

| Group/ SES | EG     | CG     | Total  |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Low        | 206.53 | 173.01 | 183.21 |
| Middle     | 207.14 | 175.19 | 191.86 |
| High       | 200.94 | 197.46 | 199.83 |
| Total      | 204.85 | 178.31 | 191.86 |

Table 5 shows ANCOVA for mean PWBS by treatment and SES.

TABLE 5

ANCOVA FOR MEAN PWBS BY TREATMENT AND SES

| Sources of variation | SS       | Df | MS       | F     | P      |
|----------------------|----------|----|----------|-------|--------|
| Treatment            | 16057.66 | 1  | 16057.66 | 43.46 | <0.001 |
| SES                  | 3054     | 2  | 1527     | 4.13  | 0.0193 |
| Interaction effect   | 665.07   | 2  | 332.53   | 0.9   | 0.4103 |
| Error                | 32142.47 | 87 | 369.45   |       |        |

i. Treatment effect: It is seen from table 5 that the F ratio for treatment effect is 43.46 which is significant ( $P < 0.001$ ). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected with reference to the effect of PEP on PWBS.

ii. SES: The F- ratio for SES effect is 4.13 which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the null is rejected with respect to the effect of SES on PWBS. The mean PWBS of the pre-service teachers from middle SES group is highest as compared to those from low and high SES groups.

iii. Interaction effect: The F- ratio for interaction effect is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted with respect to the interaction effect for PWBS.

Since the F- ratio for SES effect is significant, the t-test is applied for further analysis as shown in table 6. The t-test has been used to determine which group of SES differ significantly on PWBS.

The following table gives the numerical data and level of significance for computing mean differences in PWBS of pre-service teachers on the basis of SES.

TABLE 6

 NUMERICAL DATA AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR  
 MEAN DIFFERENCES IN PWBS BY SES

| No. | Group               | N  | df | Mean   | SD    | t-ratio | I.o.s |
|-----|---------------------|----|----|--------|-------|---------|-------|
| 1   | Low- SES (total)    | 23 | 67 | 183.21 | 19.22 | 1.70    | NS    |
|     | Middle- SES (total) | 46 |    | 191.86 | 19.22 |         |       |
| 2   | Middle- SES (total) | 46 | 69 | 191.86 | 19.22 | 1.61    | NS    |
|     | High- SES (total)   | 25 |    | 199.83 | 19.22 |         |       |
| 3   | Low- SES (total)    | 23 | 46 | 183.21 | 19.22 | 2.89    | 0.01  |
|     | High- SES (total)   | 25 |    | 199.83 | 19.22 |         |       |
| 4   | EG- Low SES         | 7  | 21 | 206.53 | 19.22 | 3.71    | 0.01  |
|     | CG- Low SES         | 16 |    | 173.01 | 19.22 |         |       |
| 5   | EG- Middle SES      | 24 | 44 | 207.14 | 19.22 | 5.43    | 0.01  |
|     | CG- Middle SES      | 22 |    | 175.19 | 19.22 |         |       |
| 6   | EG- High SES        | 17 | 23 | 200.94 | 19.22 | 0.41    | NS    |
| 7   | CG- High SES        | 8  |    | 197.46 | 19.22 |         |       |

**Conclusion:**

- a. The mean PWBS of pre- service teachers from the experimental group is significantly greater than that of the pre-service teachers in the control group. This indicates that the positive education programme was effective in enhancing the psychological well- being of the pre- service teachers.
  - b. There is significant difference in the mean PWBS of pre- service teachers from the low, middle and high SES groups. The mean PWBS of pre- service teachers from the high SES group are the highest as compared to those from middle and low SES groups.
  - c. There is no significant difference in the mean PWBS of pre- service teachers from the low and middle as well as middle and high SES groups. However there is significant difference in the mean PWBS of pre- service teachers from the high and low SES background. The mean PWBS of pre-service teachers from the high SES background are significantly greater than those from low SES background.
  - d. There is significant difference in the mean PWBS of pre- service teachers from the low and middle SES background of EG and CG. The mean PWBS of pre-service teachers from low and middle SES background of EG is significantly higher than the pre-service teachers from low and middle SES background respectively of the CG. However there is no significant difference in the mean PWBS of pre- service teachers from the high SES background of EG and CG.
- c. Teacher Self- Efficacy**

Table 7 shows adjusted mean TSES by treatment and SES

**TABLE 7**  
**MEAN TSES BY TREATMENT AND SES**

| Group/ SES    | EG     | CG     | Total  |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|
| <b>Low</b>    | 189.83 | 165.73 | 173.06 |
| <b>Middle</b> | 193.19 | 172.14 | 183.13 |
| <b>High</b>   | 182.94 | 184.48 | 183.43 |
| <b>Total</b>  | 189.07 | 172.06 | 180.74 |

Table 8 shows ANCOVA for mean TSES by treatment and SES.

**TABLE 8**  
**ANCOVA FOR MEAN TSES BY TREATMENT AND SES**

| Sources of variation | SS       | df | MS      | F     | P      |
|----------------------|----------|----|---------|-------|--------|
| Treatment            | 6295.69  | 1  | 6295.69 | 14.38 | 0.0003 |
| SES                  | 1771.64  | 2  | 885.82  | 2.02  | 0.1388 |
| Interaction effect   | 1126.61  | 2  | 563.3   | 1.29  | 0.2805 |
| Error                | 38097.86 | 87 | 437.91  |       |        |

- i. Treatment effect: The above table shows that the F- ratio is 14.38 for treatment effect is significant (P= 0.0003). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected with reference to the effect of treatment on TSES.
  - ii. SES: The F- ratio for SES effect is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted with respect to the effect of SES on TSES.
  - iii. Interaction effect: The preceding table shows that the F- ratio is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted with reference to the interaction effect for TSES.

**Conclusion:**

i. The mean TSES of pre- service teachers from the experimental group are significantly greater than that of the pre-service teachers from the control group. It states the positive education programme is effective in developing the teacher self-efficacy of the pre-service teachers from the experimental group.

- ii. There is no significant difference in the mean TSES of pre- service teachers from the low, middle and high SES groups. It means that the positive education programme is effective for all the students irrespective of the SES background.

**Conclusion:** There is no significant effect of SES on academic resilience and teacher self- efficacy. However SES has a significant effect on psychological well- being of pre- service teachers. The pre-service teachers from the high SES group have reported highest level of psychological well- being as compared to the pre-service teachers from the middle and low SES groups.

**Discussion:**

There is a significant interactive effect of positive education programme and SES on psychological well-being of pre-service teachers. The psychological well- being of pre-service teachers from the high SES group is highest followed by the pre-service teachers from the middle and low income group. This difference could be attributed to the following reasons:

- Psychological well- being is about lives going well. It is about functioning effectively and feeling good. A person's socio economic background which encompasses income, educational background, financial security, possession of various assets and availability of resources amongst other things can play a big role in contributing to one's well-being.
- One of the key factors determining a person's socio- economic status is the financial background of that person. Favourable learning environment at home and support from parents are contributing factors to good nutrition and decent lifestyle. Therefore the pre- service teachers from high SES group have reported the highest level of psychological well-being.
- On the other hand, pre- service teachers from low SES background have reported the lowest level of psychological well- being. This could be because people belonging to low SES background have various challenges in life. They have to fight various odds and also supplement family income by earning while learning. The hectic schedule and rigour of the B. Ed course along with the odds of life would be contributing in low levels of psychological well-being in pre-service teachers from low SES background.
- However the effect of positive education programme has shown positive effects on the post test scores of the experimental group. This result gives us some hope that having learnt the well- being skills in the positive education programme, the pre-service teachers from low SES background will be able to develop their level of their Psychological Well- being.
- However the positive education programme has found to be uniformly effective in enhancing the academic resilience and teacher self- efficacy of pre-service teachers regardless of their SES background. Even though there is no significant impact of SES on the academic resilience of the pre-service teachers. There is significant interactive effect of positive education intervention programme and SES on the academic resilience of pre-service teachers. On further analysis it was found that the academic resilience of the pre-service teachers from the low and middle SES background of the experimental group is higher than the academic resilience of the pre-service teachers from the low





and middle SES background of the control group respectively. This difference in the scores in favour of experimental group can be attributed to the positive education intervention programme.

But there was no significant difference in the academic resilience of the pre-service teachers from the high SES background of the experimental and control group. The pre-service teachers belonging to the high SES background would have the advantage of conducive environment to learning, supportive family, financially secured family status, peer support and the societal status enjoyed by them. All these reasons would be contributing to the academic resilience of the pre-service teachers from the high SES background of the experimental as well as control group. Thus there was no significant interactive effect of the positive education intervention programme and SES on the academic resilience of pre-service teachers from the high SES background.

**References:**

- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*. 68, 202-248
- Kern, S. E. (2013). *Inferential statistics, power estimates, and study design formalities continue to suppress biomedical innovation*. Retrieved from <https://keydifferences.com/difference-between-descriptive-and-inferential-statistics.html>
- Surbhi, S. (2016, May 9). Difference between descriptive and inferential analysis. Retrieved from <https://keydifferences.com/difference-between-descriptive-and-inferential-statistics.html>
- Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (1986). *Research in Education* (5<sup>th</sup> ed). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt Ltd. P.9
- Garret, H.E. (1958). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*. New York: Longman, Green and Co. p.461
- Guilford, J.P. and Fruchter, B. (1978). *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education*. Auckland: The McGraw Hill Intl. Co.p.242
- ANCOVA (Analysis of co variance) retrieved from <https://www.lehigh.edu/~wh02/ancova.html>
- Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (2006). *Research in Education* (10<sup>th</sup> ed). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt Ltd. p. 429.

**Cite This Article:**

\* *D'souza, M. (2022)* Interaction Effect of the Positive Education Programme and Socio- Economic Status on the Academic Resilience, Psychological Well- Being and Self- Efficacy of Pre-Service Teachers , *Electronic International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, Volume No. XI, Issue-VI, 289-297.