Chapter 7
Conclusion
CONCLUSION

The objective of the present study was to see the impact of socioeconomic status and self-efficacy on wellbeing and performance of students studying in 9th and 10th standard in different government high schools of Una district of Himachal Pradesh in (India). A final sample of N = 240 subjects was selected from the preliminary sample of approximately 1200 students those were subdivided into various groups initially on the basis of high (N=120) and low (N = 120) socioeconomic status then on the basis of high (N= 60) and low (N = 60) self-efficacy. Thus, there were four groups in all named as: High socio-economic Status-High Self-efficacious, High Socio-economic Status Low Self-efficacious, Low Socio-economic Status-High Self-efficacious and Low Socio-economic Status-Low Self-efficacious group. The subjects comprises in each groups were N = 60 those were assessed with the help of various measure of wellbeing and performance. Initially necessary permission was sought from the concerned Principal, Headmaster, and class teachers of the concerned school by apprising about the objective and relevance of the study. In later stage, interaction with the students along with purpose of visit was informed to them. In the first instance, all the students (N = 1200) were given socioeconomic status scale and general self-efficacy scales Hindi version to fill in up in order to form groups. In this manner four groups with N = 60 subjects were formed who were tested on various dimension of wellbeing (PGI general wellbeing, State Trait Anxiety inventory and Satisfaction with Life Scale) and performance (Problem Solving Task i.e. anagram solution and academic achievement). The scores were tabulated and analyzed by computing Mean, SD, LSD and find two ways Analysis of Variance.

The result obtained through ANOVA revealed that the main effect of socioeconomic status on the parameter of general well-being was found as F (1,236)
=18.11, p<.001 as statistically significant. Similarly, the main effect of self-efficacy on the aforesaid parameter was found $F(1, 236) = 6.47, p<.01$ as statistically significant. The interaction between socioeconomic status and self-efficacy on measure of wellbeing was found $F(1, 236) = 7.96, p<.005$ as statistically significant.

More appropriately, the mean score of high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group on the parameter of general well-being was found 15.60 whereas mean score of high socioeconomic status and Low self-efficacious one was 13.67. It shows that the high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacy reported better well-being as compared to their counterpart. Similarly, the mean score of Low Self-efficacious group was 13.05 whereas the mean score of low socioeconomic status and Low self-efficacious group was 13.15. It shows that low socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group have better well-being as compare to their counterpart. More appropriately, the average score of high socioeconomic status with Low self-efficacy was found 14.63 and low socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group was 13.86. It again shows that the students with high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacy reported better well-being as compare to their counterpart. The test verified the importance of high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacy on the member of general well-being. As a result hypothesis No. 1, 3 and 5 got accepted.

As per the appraisal of state anxiety among the school students is concerned, the main effect of socioeconomic status on this parameter was found as $F(1,236) = 15.90, p<.001$ as statistically significant. Similarly, the main effect of self-efficacious group on the parameter state anxiety was found $F(1, 236) = 26.09, p<.001$ as statistically significant. More appropriately, the mean score of high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group on the parameter of state anxiety was found 36.04 whereas mean score of high socioeconomic status and Low self-efficacious
group was found as 46.23. It shows that the high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group was found as students have more state anxiety as compared to their counterpart. Similarly, the mean score of Low self-efficacious group was found as 44.78 whereas mean score of low socioeconomic status and Low self-efficacious group was 48.17. It shows that low socioeconomic status and high self-efficacy have more anxiety as compare to their counterpart. More appropriately, the average score of high socioeconomic status with Low self-efficacy was found 41.13 and low socioeconomic status and high self-efficacy was 43.80. It again shows that the students with high income showed better performance as compare to their counterpart. As a result hypothesis No. 1, 3, and 5 got accepted.

Similarly, the main effect of socioeconomic status on the parameter of satisfaction with life was found as $F(1, 236) = 54.05, p < .001$ as statistically significant. Similarly, the main effect of self-efficacious group on the aforesaid parameter was found $F(1, 236) = 54.05, p < .001$ as statistically significant. The interaction between socioeconomic status and self-efficacy on satisfaction with life was also found $F(1, 236) = 3.71, p < .05$ as statistically significant. More appropriately, the mean score of high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group on the parameter of life satisfaction was found 27.53 whereas mean score of high socioeconomic status and Low self-efficacy was found as 23.85. It shows that the high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group reported more anxiety as compared to their counterpart. Similarly, the mean score of Low Self-efficacious group was found as 23.85 whereas mean score of low socioeconomic status and Low self-efficacious group was found as 17.55. It shows that low socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group showed more satisfaction as from life compare to their counterpart. More appropriately, the average score of high socioeconomic status with Low self-
efficacy was found as 25.69 and low socioeconomic status and high self-efficacy was 23.29. It again shows that the students with high socio-economic status and high self-efficacy reported better life satisfaction as compare to their counterpart. As a result hypothesis No. 1, 3 and 5 got accepted.

The main effect of socioeconomic status on the parameter of problem solving task was found as $F(1, 236) = 12.73$, $p < .001$ as statistically significant. Similarly, the main effect of self-efficacy on the aforesaid parameter was found $F(1, 236) = 4.89$, $p < .05$ as statistically significant. The interaction between socioeconomic status and self-efficacy on the problem solving task was found as $F(1, 236) = 4.04$, $p < .05$ as statistically significant. More appropriately, the mean score of high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group on the parameter of problem solving task was found 9.25 whereas mean score of high socioeconomic status and Low self-efficacy was 9.18. It shows that the high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group have performed better as compared to their counterpart. Similarly, the mean score of Low self-efficacious group was found 8.73 whereas mean score of low socioeconomic status and Low self-efficacious group was 7.33. It shows that low socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group have better performance as compare to their counterpart. The average score of high socioeconomic status Low self-efficacious group was found 9.21 and low socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious was 8.61. It again shows that the students with high income showed better problem solving abilities as compare to their counterpart. The test verified the importance of high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacy on problem solving task. It shows that the socioeconomic status and self-efficacy are quite influential factor that exert its influence on the performance of the students, studying in different high school. Therfore, the hypothesis No. 2, 4 and 6 got accepted.
Further, the main effect of socioeconomic status on the parameter of performance was found as $F(1, 236) = 19.26, p < .001$ as statistically significant. Similarly, the main effect of self-efficacy on the aforesaid parameter was found $F(1, 236) = 59.47, p < .001$ as statistically significant. The interaction between socioeconomic status and self-efficacy on performance was found $F(1, 236) = 20.17, p < .001$ as statistically significant. More appropriately, the mean score of high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group on the parameter of performance was found 70.95 whereas mean score of high socioeconomic status and Low self-efficacious group was found as 66.22. It again shows that the high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacy have performed better as compared to their counterpart. Similarly, the mean score of Low socio-economic status and high self-efficacy was 71.10 whereas mean score of low socioeconomic status and Low self-efficacious group was 53.17. It shows that low socioeconomic status and high self-efficacious group showed better performance as compare to their counterpart. The average score of high socioeconomic status with Low self-efficacy was found 68.58 and low socioeconomic status and high self-efficacy was 65.38. It again shows that the students with high income and high self-efficacy showed better performance as compare to their counterpart. Therefore, the hypothesis No. 2, 4 and 6 got accepted. From the piece of research, it is concluded that the students belonging to high socioeconomic status and high self-efficacy were found better in the diamensions of well-being and performance as compare to their counterpart. For improving the well-being of the students in general and especially the students belonging to socially deprived section of the society including the students with low degree of self-efficacy beliefs following suggestions have been given in the next section.
Suggestions for promoting wellbeing and performance of the school students

- For increasing wellbeing and performance of the students, soft skill ability, technical skills and application skills through classroom teaching are required.
- Reservation during admission to the different courses such as Medical, Non-Medical and Commerce stream be implemented strictly in case of socially disadvantaged students.
- Free uniform, two time meal and free books including concession in fees be given to poor students.
- Psychologist be deployed in every school so as to reduce psychological vulnerabilities of the students and to promote self-efficacy beliefs through psychological intervention.
- Favorable policies for the welfare of students that require relaxation in fee structure and other parameters is need.
- The professional courses information be imparted to the students by the concerned teachers and future prospectus in the field be awarded to them.
- Scholarship and fellowship facilities are strongly required during studies to the meritorious and deprived students.
- Regular counselor be deputed in school so as to impart counselling and Yoga.
- There is a need to enhance Self-awareness through medias, symposium, lecture, workshop, seminar, audio-visual mode.
Limitations of the Study

1. The study need to be replicated on large Sample.

2. Gender wise analysis is required in future.

3. Similar study may be conducted on students belonging to some other district and areas of the countries.

4. Future research may include counselling session and workshop for the students.

5. Qualitative or indepth information are also required in future from the students and their families.