

General Well Being among Social Skill Deficient and Non Deficient School Students

^{1,2} Mukesh Devi, ³ MS Chahar

¹ Research Scholar, Department of Education, MD University, Rohtak, Haryana

² Lecturer in Seth Banarshi Dass College of Education, Kurukshetra, Haryana

³ Principal (Retired), Chhotu Ram College of Education, Rohtak, Haryana

Abstract

Social skills have a profound effect on the nature of the interactions with other people and on individuals' psychological well-being. General well being which includes life satisfaction, quality of life and psychological well-being is also affected by social skills of students. The present research study was undertaken to assess the effect of social skills on the general well being of school students. The effect of social skill on general well being for different background factors was studied separately. The sample consists of 320 students from Kurukshetra district of Haryana state. The data obtained was analyzed using mean, S.D's and 't'-test. The results revealed that general wellbeing have significant dependence on social skills of school students. The study has implications for the parents, teachers and policy makers.

Keywords: Social skills, General wellbeing, t- ratio, Mean

1. Introduction

The terminology well-being captures psychological and physical exploration on health in one's life. Wellbeing is widely used to understand happiness, an individual's outlook on life, and life satisfaction. The definition and description of wellbeing is grounded in two distinct paradigms: the first is hedonism, "the view that well-being consists of pleasure or happiness," and the second is eudemonism, grounded in the idea that "well-being consists of fulfilling or realizing one's true nature" (Ryan and Deci 2001, 143). The terms that have been used, interchangeably with the GWB term, included life satisfaction, quality of life and psychological well-being (Karatzias A *et al.*, 2001, 2002 and Huebner ES *et al.*, 2004; [34])^[9, 10, 8]. One of the most commonly accepted definitions across the literature describes Q.O.L. as "a general sense of well-being" [Campbell A. 1976]. Although this definition appears to be rather general, it incorporates the multiple meanings of the term described earlier on.

Previous existing research in adolescents has identified a number of significant factors associated with GWB. These include demographic (e.g., Jirojanakul *et al.*, 2003), personality such as emotional stability, (Vitterso J *et al.*, 2001)^[16]; general confidence (Cheng H *et al.*, 2003)^[7]; self-esteem (Bekhuis TCHM, 1994 and Vingilis E, 1998)^[2, 17], life events and school performance (Cheng H *et al.*, 2003)^[7]. It may be important to emphasize that apart from GWB, personality constructs, like high self-esteem have been shown to act as protective factors against psychopathology in adolescents (McDonald *et al.*, 1996)^[12]. Understanding well-being in adolescents explores more about their school/college experiences. As students move through their educational experience, understanding the factors that shape their well-being contributes to the literature regarding the multitude of ways that school impacts students. Indeed, well-being can be related to self-esteem, cognitive function, personality, and mood, including positive effects such

as happiness, vigour, and morale, and negative effects such as anxiety and depression (Brown 1992)^[5].

Social skills have a profound effect on the nature of the interactions with other people and on individuals' psychological well-being. Moreover these two phenomena are theoretically related as the level of social interactions can affect and be affected by a person's state of mind. (Bellack and Hersen 1979, 512)^[1] Researches have proved that social skills were predicted to be associated with two indicators of psychological well-being which are reduced symptoms of depression and life-satisfaction. Social skills were also associated with a reduction in the experience of stress. Social competence and emotional well-being are considered to be the major issue for the children. Social skills always related with being liked, feeling accepted, and having self-confidence. These social outcomes contribute towards the association with psychological wellbeing. Lack of social skills has an implication in schizophrenia (Patterson, Moscona, and McKibbin 2001)^[13], social anxiety and phobia (Wenzel *et al.*, 2005)^[18], depression (Segrin 2000)^[14], eating disorders (Mallinckrodt, McCreary, and Robertson, 1995)^[11], and loneliness (DiTommaso *et al.* 2003). The present investigation states to cull out the role of social skills in psychological wellbeing and this exploration begin with social skills as a single domain.

2. Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the study were:

1. To compare general wellbeing of social skills deficient and non deficient school students.
2. To compare the general wellbeing of social skill deficient and non deficient school students for various categories as determined by their background factors like gender, locality (Urban/Rural) and school management (Govt./Private).

3. Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no difference between social skill deficient and non deficient school students on general well being.

H₀₂: General Wellbeing of school students is same for both social skill deficient and non deficient students for all categories as determined by their background.

4. Research Method

Descriptive survey method was used

5. Sample

The purposive sampling method was used for the present study. The sample included 320 school students (193 male, 127 female) from eight different schools in kurukshetra district of Haryana state. Out of these eight schools, four were from rural area and other four were from urban areas. The selected students were enrolled in 10th, 11th and 12th grades (age group 15-18 years).

6. Tools Used

Social skills: Matson Evaluation of Social Skills with youngsters (MESSY) is the one of the most frequently researched social skill scale. The initial sample was tested in 1983 with 744 children between 4 and 18 years of age. In the present study adapted Hindi version of MESSY self-rating version was used. Sushma (2000) after the factor analysis dropped 12 items of the original scale (MESSY). Sushma (2000) also reported that Hindi adaptation of MESSY have good reliability and response consistency.

General Wellbeing: PGI General Well Being scale was used for general well being study. The subject is asked to answer 20 items based on his/her feelings in last one month. For scoring, numbers of ticks are counted which constitute the general wellbeing score of that particular individual at that time.

7. Statistical Techniques

Mean (M), standard Deviation (SD) and t-ratio were used to compare the social skills in the school students in relation to their gender and locality.

8. Results

8.1 Descriptive Statistics

In the present study, descriptive statistics applied on the data obtained for both scales is shown in Table 1. As clearly visible from the table, minimum and maximum score of school students on the social scale was 80 and 176 respectively. The mean score on social skill scale was 111 (SD= 16.3). In case of GWB scale, the minimum observed score was 1 and maximum value was obtained as 20. The mean GWB score was 13.14 (SD=5.15).

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of data

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Social Skills	320	80	176	111	16.3
General Well Being	320	1	20	13.14	5.15

8.2. Identification of social skill deficient students

Based on the score of social skill scale, students were divided between two groups; social skill deficient and non deficient. Students whose total social scale score was less than 90 (i.e. Mean – SD), were considered as social skill deficient. The students, whose social skill score was more than 90, were considered as non deficient students.

8.3. Inferential Statistics

Inferential statistics plays important role in hypothesis testing where it is used to determine if a null hypothesis can be rejected or retained. For the present study, general well being is compared for two groups; social skill deficient and non deficient. The mean values, SD and t-ratios are compared in Table 2. Table 3 indicates the mean, SD and t-values of GWB score for social skill deficient and non deficient students for various background factors. The values are shown for all background factors like gender, locality (Urban/Rural) and school management (Govt./Private).

Table 2: Mean, SD and T-ratio for compared groups

Variables	Social Skill Deficient		Non Deficient		t-value	Level of Significance
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
General Well Being	10.26	4.22	14.57	4.98	7.64	P < 0.01

Table 3: Mean, SD and t-ratio of GWB score for compared groups

Background Factors	Sub Category	SS Deficient		Normal		t-ratio	Level of Significance
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Gender	Male	10.04	4.46	14.33	4.99	5.52	P < 0.00
	Female	10.50	3.99	15.01	4.96	5.45	P < 0.00
Locality	Urban	10.44	4.09	14.20	4.89	4.85	P < 0.00
	Rural	10.09	4.37	14.98	5.07	5.92	P < 0.00
School type	Govt.	10.22	4.35	15.18	4.75	6.73	P < 0.00
	Private	10.33	4.10	13.89	5.16	4.12	P < 0.00

9. Analysis

9.1 Testing of hypothesis H₀₁

It can be seen from Table 2 that mean emotional intelligence score of social skill deficient and non deficient students are 10.26 and 14.57 with standard deviations 4.22 and 4.98 respectively. The 't' value between two groups comes out to be 7.64. It is significant at 0.01 level of significance, leading to an

inference that the social skills play very important role in deciding the general well being of school students.

The comparison of mean scores further reveals that mean GWB score of social skill deficient school students is lower than the non deficient school students. It indicates that social skill deficient school students possess lower GWB.

Therefore, the hypothesis (H_{02}) that *'there exists no significant difference between social skills deficient and non deficient school students with respect to their general well being'* is rejected.

9.2. Testing of hypothesis H_{02}

Male students: From Table 3, it is evident that for male students, the t-ratio between the two groups comes out to be 5.52, which is significant at 0.01 level. The comparison of mean GWB score of two groups further reveals that mean GWB score of non deficient male students is higher than the social skill deficient male school students. It indicates that social skill deficient male students score low on GWB scale as compared to non deficient male students.

Female Students: The t-ratio between the two groups comes out to be 5.45 (Table 3), which is significant at 0.01 level. The comparison of mean score of female students among both groups further reveals that social skill deficient female students possess low GWB as compared to non deficient female students.

Urban Students: The mean GWB score of social skill deficient and non deficient students are 10.44 and 14.20 with standard deviations 4.09 and 4.89 respectively (Table 3). The t-ratio between the two groups comes out to be 4.85, which is significant at 0.01 level. The comparison of GWB score of both groups further reveals that mean academic score of social skill deficient urban students is less than the non deficient urban school students.

Rural Students: The t-ratio between the two groups comes out to be 5.92, which is significant at 0.01 level (Table 3). The comparison of mean GWB score further reveals that in rural areas, the social skill deficient students have poor GWB as compared to non deficient students.

Government School Students: The t-ratio between the two groups comes out to be 6.73, which is significant at 0.05 levels (Table 3). The comparison of mean GWB of government school students reveals that in government run schools, social skill deficient students have low GWB as compared to non deficient students.

Private School Students: In case of students from private management schools, the t-ratio between the two groups comes out to be 4.12, which is significant at 0.01 level (Table 3). The comparison of GWB score of students belonging to rural areas further reveals that GWB of social skill deficient students is low as compared to the non deficient students.

Based on above results, hypothesis (H_{02}) that *'there exists no significant difference between social skills deficient and non deficient school students irrespective of their background'* is rejected.

10. Discussion

The study by Bijstra and Jackson, (1998) ^[3] also highlights the impact of Social skills on enhancing general wellbeing. The result of this study also finds a similarity with the study conducted by Segrin *et al.* (2007) ^[15], where their results supported the hypothesized relationship between social skills and a greater well-being.

11. Conclusion

The effect of social skills was studied on the general well being of school students. The social skills were found to play very important role in deciding the general well being of the students. Social skill deficient school students were found to possess lower GWB as compared to non deficient school students. It was also observed that for all categories of students determined by the background factors, the social skill deficient students have lower general well being as compared to non deficient students. Based on these results it may be further concluded that there is a strong need to provide social skills to all categories of students irrespective of their background factors. Further research is needed with a positive note that an intervention of social skills training can be utilized for the enhancing the general wellbeing of school students.

References

1. Alan Bellack S, Michel Hersen. Research and Practice in Social Skills Training Springer, 1979.
2. Bekhuis TCHM. The self-esteem of adolescents in American public high schools: A multilevel analysis of individual differences. Personal Indiv Differ 1994; 16:579-588.
3. Bijstra Jan O, Sandy Jackson. Social Skills Training with Early Adolescents: Effects on Social Skills, Well-being, Self-esteem and Coping. European Journal of Psychology of Education. 1998; 13(4):569-83.
4. Bowman NA. The development of psychological well-being among first-year college students. Journal of College Student Development 2010; 51(2):180-200. Doi:10.1353/csd.0.0118.
5. Brown, Antony, Barlow Psychometric properties of the Penn state worry questionnaire in a clinical anxiety disorders sample Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1992; 30(1):33-37
6. Campbell A. Subjective measures of well-being. Am Psychol 1976; 31:117-124.
7. Cheng H, Furnham A. Personality, self-esteem, and demographic predictions of happiness and depression. Personal Indiv Differ 2003; 34:921-942.
8. Huebner ES, Valois RF, Suido SM, Smith LC, McKnight CG, Seligson JL *et al.* Perceived quality of life: A neglected component of adolescent health assessment and intervention. J Adolescent Health. 2004; 34:270-278.
9. Karatzias A, Power KG, Swanson V. Quality of school life: Development and preliminary standardisation of an instrument based on performance indicators in Scottish secondary schools. School Effect School Improve 2001a; 12:265-284.
10. Karatzias A, Power KG, Flemming J, Lennan F, Swanson V. The role of demographic, personality variables and school stress on predicting school satisfaction/dissatisfaction: Re view of the literature and research findings. Edu Psychol 2002a; 22:33-50.
11. Mallinckrodt Brent, McCreary Beverly A. Robertson, Anne K., Co-occurrence of eating disorders and incest: The role of attachment, family environment, and social competencies. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1995; 42(2):178-186.
12. McDonald G, O'Hara K. ten elements of mental health, its promotion and demotion. In: Somerville S, Iillsley T,

- Kennedy J, Smillie S, Robbie, D (eds), Tayside Mental Health Promotion paper, 1996, 2003.
13. Patterson TL, Moscona S, McKibbin CL, Davidson K, Jeste DV. Social skills performance assessment among older patients with schizophrenia *Schizophr Res*. Mar 2001; 30-48(2-3):351-60.
 14. Segrin, Flora. Poor social skills are a vulnerability factor in the development of psychosocial problems *Human Communication Research*, 2000; 26(3):489-514.
 15. Segrin C, Taylor M. Positive interpersonal relationships mediate the association between social skills and psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences* 2007; 43:637-646.
 16. Vitterso J. Personality traits and subjective well-being: Emotional stability, not extraversion, is probably the important predictor. *Personal Indiv Differ* 2001; 31:903-914.
 17. Vingilis E, Wade TJ, Adlaf E. What factors predict student self rated physical health? *J Adolescence*. 1998; 21:83-97.
 18. Wenzel L, DeAlba I, Habbal R, Kluhsman BC, Fairclough D, Krebs LU *et al*. Quality of life in long-term cervical cancer survivors *Gynecol Oncol* 2005; 97(2):310-7.