PsyCap in a Relation to Happiness, Life satisfaction and Self- Esteem in Male and Female Management Students

Saima Ayyub

Clinical psychologist cum Assistant Professor

Dept of clinical psychology AIBAS Amity University Lucknow campus

ABSTRACT

 PsyCap or Psychological capital, more precisely known as positive psychological capital is one of the important concepts in the newly developed psychology known as positive psychology. One can refer Positive Psychological capital or Psychological capital simply as PsyCap and therefore throughout this thesis it will be referred to as PsyCap. The major concern for this study is to understand the relationship if any between PsyCap and Happiness, Satisfaction or Psychological well-being.

KEY WORDS:- Psychological Capital, Happiness, Life satisfaction and Psychological well being.

INTRODUCTION

PsyCap is an individual's psychological state of development is characterized by:

A -Having confidence (Self- efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging task.

B- Making a positive attribution (optimism)

C- About succeeding new to and redirecting path to goal (hope) in order to succeed.

D- When beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond resiliency to attain success.

How important is it for our students to be happy and satisfaction with their life? Does their self esteem have an impact on student success or on their relationships with professors and peers? The tentative and indirect answer is offered by positive psychology, a new movement that studies optimal human functioning (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), and which demonstrates that happiness promotes success across various arenas of human functioning (Myers, 1992). For example, happy and satisfied people are more active, efficient, and

productive at their academics, jobs and earn better income (Argyle, 2001). They are optimistic and more positive toward other people (Seligman, 2002). They enjoy better physical and mental health, and cope with stress better than unhappy people (Vaillant, 2000). Based on Fredrickson's build-and-broaden theory (2002) and research by Isen (2003) positive affect correlates with processes that contribute to college success—cognition and motivation.

A -Psychological Capital Theory – The 4 Constructs

Psychological Capital consists of four positive psychological constructs identified as hope, optimism, efficacy, and resilience (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009;Avey et. al, 2011; Luthans, Avey, Avolio, & Peterson, 2010). Avey, Reichard, Luthans and Mhatre (2011) go further in their meta-analysis to add that when these four constructs are combined there exists a second-order core construct that is the shared variance between the four constructs (p. 128). This is significant to this report in that the literature review and study will view these constructs not only as independent variables but also as constructs that are inter-related. This assists in gaining a better understanding of team dynamics and performance.

The following brief explanation of the four constructs, identified as hope, optimism, efficacy and resilience, is described below.

Hope. Luthans, Norman, Avolio, and Avery (in press) view hope as consisting of the will-power or motivation to succeed, the way-power or pathway to succeed, and the reality of accomplishing set goals .

Efficacy. Efficacy is the belief and confidence that people have in their ability to accomplish something (Luthans, 2002; Luthans, Norman, Avolio, & Avery, in press). Albert Bandura emphasizes that **self**-efficacy is the most pervasive and important of the psychological constructs of positivity (Luthans, 2002, Self-efficacy, as defined by BusinessDictionary.com (2013), is a person's belief about his or her ability and capacity to accomplish a job.

Resilience. Resilience is defined as the ability to bounce back from adversity (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004).

Optimism. Optimism is what sparks internal awareness of success and acknowledgement of possible future positive outcomes (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004).

METHODOLIGY

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY –

It has been reported that PsyCap and its components may be related to directly or indirectly with Happiness, Self-esteem and Life satisfaction. However, students are limited in this area Therefore the present study is directed to fulfil following aims and objectives.

1. To study the level of Happiness in students with High Psyap and Low PsyCap as well as Male and Females. Further more to examine the joint effect of PsyCap and gender on the measure of Happiness.

2. To understand the level of Positive and Negative Affect in students with High Psyap and Low PsyCap as well as Male and Females. To evaluate the joint effect of PsyCap and gender on the measures of both (Positive and Negative Affect).

3. To explore the level of Self- Esteem in students with High Psyap and Low PsyCap as well as Male and Females. Furthermore to examine the joint effect of PsyCap and gender on the measure of Happiness.

HYPOTHISES OF THE STUDY-

To fulfil the above objective following hypothesis were formulated:-

1-

 (A)   There will be a significant deference on Happiness in Students with High
     Psy-Cap and Low Psy-Cap.

(B) There will be significant deference in males and females on Happiness.

(C) There will be significant interactive effect of PsyCap and gender on
    Happiness.

2-

 (A)   There will be a significant deference on Positive and Negative Affect in
       Students with High PsyCap and Low PsyCap.

 (B) There will be significant deference in males and females on Positive and
    Negative Affect.

 (C) There will be significant interactive effect of PsyCap and gender on
    Positive and Negative Affect.

 (A) There will be a significant deference on Self- Esteem in Students with High

PsyCap and Low PsyCap.

(B) There will be significant deference in males and females on

Self- Esteem

(C) There will be significant interactive effect of PsyCap and gender on

Self- Esteem.

RESEARCH DESIGH

The major proposed research design is 2x2 factorial design, where two independent varied at two levels. These variables include gender and (viz. Boys & Girls)and Positive Psychological capital known as PsyCap (viz. High on PsyCap & Low on PsyCap). These two (Gender and Psy-cap) are varied at two levels: Boys & Girls and High & Low PsyCap. The criterion of High and Low PsyCap was based on median value of overall scores on Positive Psychological Capital Questionnaire. It was decided to have a sample of 15 subjects of the four cells. This 2x2 factorial design is shown graphically as under:

Psychological Capital

Gender	High PsyCAP	Low PsyCap	TOTAL
MALE	N=15	N=15	30
FEMALE	N=15	N=15	30
	30	30	60

Tools used:

1.Psychological capital questionnaire. (Fred Luthans, Bruce J. Avolio, & James B. Avey*)*

2. Happiness inventory (Christopher Peterson 2005)

3. positive and negative affect (Brandburn , 1969)

4. Self-Esteem scale (Rosenberg 1965)

SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

In the present study the sample consisted of 60 college going students. The age varies 17 to 25 years. All sixty college going students (Male=30 and Female=30) were drawn using the technique of random sampling from those students who attended management course in Amity University Jaipur campus .The sample of 60 management students was further divided into four groups on the basis of mean value of PsyCab and gender

PROCEDURE –

First of all tools to be used for the research purpose were decided and then the management students of Amity was approached. From the office list of merit students was collected. From the list students best matched the need of the study were selected for the conduction of the research. Once the participants were selected, the time and place suitable for participants were decided to fill up the questionnaires. Once the participants were ready, the following instructions were given to them, "This is a survey about your life satisfaction and happiness and there is no right and wrong .please read the instructions given carefully before answering. Please do not leave any question unanswered, as that will render the entire tool useless. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for academic purpose only.

Then the participants were given adequate time to complete their questionnaire asked if they had any doubts regarding the survey.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

SPSS 16 was used to analyse the data. The data was analysed on the basis of:
1. **Descriptive Statistics** –it consisted of the computation of means and standard deviation.
2. **ANOVA**-was done to determine the effect of gender Happiness, Life satisfaction and Self-Esteem, effect of PsyCap on Happiness, Positive & Negative Affect and Self Esteem and combination effect of them on happiness, life satisfaction and Self esteem.

RESULTS

TABLE 1.1- Means and SDs for Happiness and for Four Groups (N=60)

Gender	High PsyCap	Low PsyCap	TOTAL
Male	35.27 (8.73)	29.94 (5.85)	31.90 (7.37)
Female	33.30 (9.36)	26.25 (8.72)	28.60 (9.40)
	34.33 (8.87)	28.05 (7.60)	30.25 (8.54)

TABLE 1.2   Summary of ANOVA for Happiness

SOURCE OF VARIENCE	SUM OF SQUARE	Df	MEAN SQAURE	F	P
Between subject A	109.53	1	109.53	1.70	NS
Between PsyCAP B	521.73	1	521.73	8.08	P<0.001
INTRACTION A*B	10.13	1	10.13	.157	NS

NS=non -significant

Means and SDs on Happiness for the four groups are given in Table 1.1. It may be seen that male and female management students have scored more or less same (means 31.90 Vs 28.60). This mean difference is insignificant in (Table 1.2 F=1.70,ns). However subjects with High PsyCap have scored significantly more than subjects with Low   PsyCap (34.33vs 28.05;

F=8.08; P =<0 .001). It can also be seen that interaction of gender and PsyCab is insignificant (F=<1.00,ns). It means that Gender and PsyCap do not jointly influence the measure of Happiness.

TABLE 2.1- Means and SDs for Positive affect and for four Groups (N=60)

Gender	High PsyCap	Low PsyCap	TOTAL
Male	5.45 (1.50)	5.52 (1.21)	5.50 (1.30)
Female	4.80 (1.39)	5.25 (1.21)	5.10 (1.32)
	5.14 (1.45)	5.38 (1.24)	5.30 (1.31)

Table 2.2 Summary of ANOVA for Positive Affect.

SOURCE OF VARIENCE	SUM OF SQUARE	Df	MEAN SQAURE	F	P
Between subject A	2.95	1	2.95	1.67	NS
Between psyCAP B	.92	1	.92	.52	NS
INTRACTION A*B	.49	1	.49	.27	NS

1. NS=non significant

Means and SDs for Positive Affect for the four groups are given in Table 2.1. It may be seen that male and female management students have scored more or less same (means 5.50 Vs5.10). This mean difference is insignificant in (Table 2.2 F=<1.00 ns). The Table 2.2 also shows that means on for High PsyCap and Low PsyCap students are again

insignificant Table 2.1&2.2; 5.14 Vs5.38, F=<1.00ns) Interaction of gender and PsyCap also turns out to be insignificant (F=<1.00,ns).

TABLE 3.1 Means and SDs for Negative affect and for Four Groups (N=60)

Gender	High PsyCap	Low PsyCap	TOTAL
Male	4.45 (1.12)	5.15 (1.64)	4.90(1.49)
Female	5.00 (1.15)	5.65 (1.75)	5.43(1.59)
	4.71 (1.14)	5.41 (1.69)	5.16 (1.55)

Between PsyCap B	6.24	1	6.24	2.65	1. **TABLE 3.2 Summary of ANOVA for (Negative Affect)**					
					SOURCE OF VARIENCE	SUM OF SQUARE	Df	MEAN SQAURE	F	P
					Between subject A	3.66	1	3.66	1.55	NS
					NS					
INTRACTION A*B	.01	1	.01	.004	NS					

1. Means and SDs on Negative Affect for the four groups are given in Table 3.1. It shows that both male and female management students have scored more or less same (means 4.90 Vs 5.43). This mean difference being insignificant (F= <1.00ns).

2. Similar trend was also found with respect to the Negative Affect. No significant differences were found between the mean difference on Negative Affect of gender (Male Vs Female 4.90 Vs5.43, F=1.55, ns).as well on High Low Psychological Capital (4.71 Vs5.41,f=2.65,ns).Interaction effect was also insignificant=<1.00,ns).

TABLE 4.1 Means and SDs For Self –Esteem and for Four groups (N=60)

Gender	High PsyCap	Low PsyCap	TOTAL
Male	16.81 (2.82)	14.94 (4.24)	15.63 (3.84)
Female	17.10 (2.43)	15.00 (2.59)	15.70 (2.69)
	16.95 (2.57)	14.97 (3.45)	15.66 3.29)

TABLE 4.2   Summary of ANOVA for Self-Esteem.

SOURCE OF VARIENCE	SUM OF SQUARE	Df	MEAN SQAURE	F	p
Between Gender A	.38	1	.38	0.36	NS
Between PsyCap B	53.71	1	53.75	5.13	NS
INTRACTION A*B	.17	1	.17	.017	NS

Table 4.1 present mean Self –Esteem scores of the four groups. Here again, Male and Female students have scored more or less same mean scores on the measure of Self- Esteem and therefore mean differences are insignificant Table 4.2(15.63 Vs 15.70, F=1.00ns).

Similarity students with High and Low PsyCap also scored more or less similar mean self-esteem scores (16.95 Vs 14.97) this mean difference is again insignificant (F=<1.00,ns).Interaction of gender and PsyCap is also insignificant (F<1.00,ns).

Discussion

As regards to influence of happiness on psychological capital in management students, it was found that students with high Psycab have better than low happiness. The former group significantly obtained higher scores on happiness than later group. Thus we can safely infer that happiness is best predictor of psychological capital in male and female management students.

The finding of the present study the role of happiness in psychological capital on management students consonants with earlier research Happiness at work: maximizing your psychological capital for success (Pryce, 2010) conclude that happiness really means in a work context and it matters to the individual and organization in both human and financial term.

The finding of the study also in line with other study. Happiness to inspire productivity and performance maximising psychological capital for success (webinar,2013) the output from the result is that happiness improve performance and achieve potential.

Other study (Satories et al.2010) also conclude that daily work well-being was significantly associated with daily positive mood and daily life satisfaction.

In the present study the other two variables life satisfaction and self esteem was insignificant on psychological capital in management students .it is may be because of small sample, the sample was restricted with management students only and may be there is differences between cultural and socio- economical status.

According to Majumder (2006) there is lack of association between and self esteem and self efficacy on gender.

In a earlier research Khatun et al. (1998) it was found evidence that higher socio economical status had a direct and positive impact on self esteem and life satisfaction.

It was also found in other study Kessier (1982) inverse relationship between socioeconomic status and life satisfaction in which increase level of socioeconomic status increase life satisfaction.

Summary and Conclusion

FINDING OF THE STUDY

The following major finding emerged from the result of ANOVA

1-

> ➤ There is a significant deference on Happiness in Students with High PsyCap and Low PsyCap.
> ➤ There is not any significant deference in Male and Female on Happiness.
> ➤ There is not any significant interactive effect of PsyCap and gender on Happiness.

2-

> ➤ There is not any significant deference on Positive and Negative Affect in Students with High PsyCap and Low PsyCap.
> ➤ There is not any significant deference in Male and Female on Positive and Negative Affect.
> ➤ There is not any significant interactive effect of PsyCap and gender on Positive and Negative Affect.

3-

> ➤ There is not any significant deference on Self- Esteem in Students with High PsyCap and Low PsyCap.
> ➤ There is not any significant deference in Male and Female on
> Self- Esteem
> ➤ There not any significant interactive effect of PsyCap and gender on Self- Esteem.

LIMITATION.

➢ The study was restricted to the management students only that to only from one college.

➢ Although gender effect seems to play no important role may be due to homogeneous small sized.

➢ There was shortage of research review available to initiate as well as to support the study from Indian scenario.

SUGGESTIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

➢ A comprehensive study need to be conducted on a larger sample.

➢ A study including various demographic areas can also be conducted.

➢ Qualitative and in depth study also needs to be done employing case history and interview method.

➢ Study may include intervention programme to develop components of PsyCap.

IMPLICATIONS

➢ This study is part of Positive Psychology focusing Life Satisfaction, Happiness and Psychological Well Being in student by developing positive attitudes, virtues and qualities such as optimism, hope, self-efficacy and resilience.

REFERENCES

1-Luthans F, Youssef C M, & Avolio B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

2-Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., & Peterson, S. J. (2010). The development and resulting performance impact of positive psychological capital. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 21*, 41–67.

3-Stajkovic, A., & Luthans, F. (1998a). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*, 240–261.

4-Ferguson, K. M. (2006). Social capital and children's psychological well-being: A critical synthesis of the international social capital literature. *International Journal of Social Welfare*.

5-Bandura, A. (2000). Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organisational effectiveness. In E. Locke (Ed.). *Handbook of principles of organisational behavior* (pp. 120-136). Oxford,United Kingdom: Blackwell.

6-Argyle, M. (2001). *The psychology of happiness* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Inc.Abbas M and Raja U (2008), Impact of psychological Capital on Innovative Performance and Job Stress, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*,29.

7-Griffith N, Jakari N, "The influence of pre-training positive Psychological Capital development on training motivation" (January 1, 2010). *ETD collection for University of Nebraska - Lincoln.*

8-Luthans, Fred; Avolio, Bruce J; Avey, James B; and Norman, Steven M (2007). Positive Psychological Capital : measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Leadership institute faculty publications*, 11.

9-Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resiliency. *Journal of Management*, 33, 774–800.