

A Probe into the Psychological Capital of School Teachers in Purulia District

Rupesh Mahato¹, Ananda Nanda Bera², Samirranjan Adhikari³

¹Assistant Professor, Vidyasagar Foundation School of Education and Training, Purulia (W.B.) and Research Scholar, Department of Education, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia

²Assistant Professor in Geography, Sevayatan Sikshan Mahavidyalaya, Jhargram

³Professor, Department of Education, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.120700103>

Received: 08 July 2025; Accepted: 12 July 2025; Published: 05 August 2025

ABSTRACT

Psychological Capital (PsyCap), a higher-order construct encompassing hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism, has emerged as a critical psychological resource that can significantly enhance individual performance and well-being in professional settings. In the education sector, where teachers face multifaceted challenges including workload, resource scarcity, and socio-emotional pressures, PsyCap becomes an essential determinant of their professional efficacy and mental health. This study examines the state of Psychological Capital among school teachers in the Purulia district of West Bengal, India—a socioeconomically backwards region facing persistent developmental and educational challenges. Using a quantitative research design, quantitative data were collected using the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ-24), developed by Luthans et al. (2007). Results indicate high levels of overall psychological capital (PsyCap). Socio-demographic factors such as gender were found to significantly influence PsyCap dimensions. The findings underscore the urgent need for policy interventions, continuous teacher training, and institutional support mechanisms to nurture the psychological strengths of educators in under-resourced regions like Purulia.

Keywords: Psychological Capital, School Teachers, Hope, Efficacy, Resilience, Optimism

INTRODUCTION

In today's educational environment, teachers are called upon to fulfil roles far beyond traditional instruction—acting as mentors, emotional anchors, curriculum designers, and even administrative coordinators. These demands become even more pronounced in regions like Purulia, West Bengal, where schools often operate with limited resources and infrastructural support (Banerjee & Saha, 2021). In such settings, a teacher's internal psychological strengths, rather than external incentives, often determine their effectiveness and well-being.

This study focuses on **Psychological Capital (PsyCap)**—a positive psychological resource comprising **hope, optimism, resilience, and self-efficacy** (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). Unlike traditional forms of capital based on skills or social networks, PsyCap emphasises who the teacher is, rather than what they know (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017). Research has shown that teachers with high PsyCap are more capable of managing classroom challenges, staying motivated, and coping with occupational stress (Avey et al., 2011; Zhang & Chen, 2020).

Purulia's rural, socio-economically challenged context, characterised by overcrowded classrooms and minimal professional development, intensifies the psychological demands on educators (Government of West Bengal, 2020). Yet, little empirical work has investigated how teachers in such areas develop or sustain PsyCap. This gap is particularly urgent in light of ongoing educational reforms in India under the National Education Policy

(NEP) 2020, which reimagines teachers as facilitators of holistic and student-centred learning (**Kundu & Ghosh, 2022**).

Against this backdrop, the current study explores the levels and patterns of PsyCap among teachers in Purulia. It examines how demographic and institutional factors shape psychological resources and aims to inform policy and interventions to strengthen teacher resilience and school effectiveness in underprivileged regions.

Objective of the Study

The primary objective of the study is to explore and analyse the levels and dimensions of Psychological Capital comprising hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism (**Luthans et al., 2007**) among school teachers. The study also aims to identify the effect of gender that may shape the development and application of Psychological Capital in the educational settings of the Purulia district (**Sweetman & Luthans, 2010**).

Specific Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of this study were as follows–

O₁: To assess the present situation of the *Psychological Capital* of the teachers, considering **both male and female teachers** as a whole.

O₂: To assess the present situation of the *Psychological Capital* of the **male teachers**.

O₃: To assess the present situation of the *Psychological Capital* of the **female teachers**.

O₄: To compare the *Psychological Capital* between **male and female** teachers.

Research Questions of the Study

The present study was designed to find out the answer to the following research questions–

Q₁: What is the present situation of the *Psychological Capital* of the teachers, considering **both male and female** as a whole?

Q₂: What is the present situation of the *Psychological Capital* of the **male teachers**?

Q₃: What is the present situation of the *Psychological Capital* of the **female teachers**?

Q₄: Is there any difference between the **male** and **female** teachers concerning their *Psychological Capital*?

Hypothesis of the Study

This study was designed to verify the following research hypotheses –

H₁: The teachers, considering **both male and female** as a whole, have high *Psychological Capital*.

H₂: The **male** teachers have high *Psychological Capital*.

H₃: The **female** teachers have high *Psychological Capital*.

H₄: The **male** and **female** teachers do not differ in their *Psychological Capital*.

Constructs of the Study

In psychological and educational research, the term “**construct**” refers to an abstract concept that is specifically chosen or created to explain a given phenomenon. The present study primarily revolves around the central construct of **Psychological Capital (PsyCap)** and its constituent components.

Psychological Capital (PsyCap)

Psychological Capital (PsyCap), as conceptualised by **Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2007)**, reflects a person's inner strength and growth potential, built upon four core psychological resources: hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism—collectively referred to as *HERO*. Unlike traditional forms of capital, PsyCap centres on who individuals are and the strengths they can develop to face challenges meaningfully.

Hope involves not just dreaming big but also planning paths to achieve those dreams and staying motivated along the way (**Snyder et al., 1991**). In schools, hopeful teachers envision success for their students and themselves, and they adapt creatively when plans falter. Self-efficacy, a concept introduced by **Bandura (1997)**, is the belief in one's ability to handle tasks and reach goals. Teachers with high self-efficacy tend to foster active classrooms, engage students effectively, and find deeper satisfaction in their work.

Resilience equips educators to rebound from setbacks—whether due to systemic pressures, personal trials, or classroom disruptions. **Gu and Day (2007)** highlight how resilient teachers not only endure but often grow stronger through adversity. Optimism, as defined by **Seligman (1998)**, enables individuals to interpret challenges with hope and perseverance. Optimistic teachers are more inclined to view setbacks as temporary and remain enthusiastic in their roles, uplifting both themselves and their students.

Contextual Relevance: Purulia District

Purulia, a district in West Bengal characterised by its rural landscape and socio-economic challenges, presents a unique backdrop for the application of PsyCap constructs. Teachers working in this district often encounter **limited resources, multi-grade classrooms, infrastructure constraints**, and socio-cultural barriers. The **resilience and optimism** of these teachers are particularly pertinent constructs, as they directly influence not just teacher well-being but also student outcomes and institutional development.

REVIEW OF ALLIED LITERATURE

The review of allied literature provides a foundational framework to understand the breadth of research related to psychological capital (PsyCap) among school teachers. It explores global and Indian perspectives on psychological capital, its components—hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism (**Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007**)—and how these constructs interplay with teaching effectiveness, job satisfaction, and well-being in educational contexts. This section critically examines studies pertinent to the themes of teacher well-being, psychological capital in the teaching profession, and regional investigations relevant to the socio-cultural context of the Purulia district.

Conceptual Foundations of Psychological Capital

Psychological Capital (PsyCap), as introduced by **Luthans et al. (2007)**, represents a set of inner strengths that help individuals thrive in their professional lives. It includes four key components: **hope**, or the drive and strategy to achieve meaningful goals (**Snyder, 2002**); **self-efficacy**, the belief in one's ability to tackle difficult tasks (**Bandura, 1997**); **resilience**, the capacity to recover from setbacks (**Masten & Reed, 2002**); and **optimism**, the expectation of positive outcomes in both the present and future (**Carver & Scheier, 2002**). Together, these positive psychological resources have been shown to enhance well-being and performance across various fields, including education, where they support teacher motivation and occupational fulfilment.

Psychological Capital and the Teaching Profession

Teachers, especially in socio-economically challenged districts, face a myriad of stressors ranging from heavy workloads, role ambiguity, administrative burdens, and lack of adequate resources. Psychological capital serves as a buffer against these adversities, as it enhances emotional well-being, promotes adaptive coping, and fosters commitment (**Xanthopoulou et al., 2009**).

A study by **Avey, Luthans, and Jensen (2009)** demonstrated that individuals with high PsyCap exhibit lower

stress and better psychological well-being. Similar results were seen in the educational sector, where PsyCap was found to positively correlate with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and reduced burnout (**Bakker & Bal, 2010; Simons & Buitendach, 2013**).

Empirical Studies on Teachers' Psychological Capital

A study by **Hoy, Tarter, and Hoy (2006)** explored how collective teacher efficacy is vital for school improvement and linked it with higher teacher morale and student achievement.

Siu, Bakker, and Jiang (2014) examined Hong Kong teachers and found that high PsyCap significantly predicted job satisfaction and personal accomplishment. In India, found that secondary school teachers with high levels of hope and optimism had better coping strategies and reported greater career satisfaction.

Roche, Haar, and Luthans (2014) argued that psychological capital mediates the relationship between work engagement and well-being, indicating that investment in PsyCap development programs may yield long-term benefits in teacher performance.

PsyCap Interventions and Educational Outcomes

Positive psychological interventions aimed at building PsyCap have shown promising results. **Luthans, Avey, and Patera (2008)** documented that a brief online intervention significantly improved psychological capital. In an educational context, **Dweck's (2006)** growth mindset framework shares conceptual parallels with PsyCap, especially in fostering optimism and resilience among educators and students.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a structured quantitative approach to understand the present situation of psychological capital among the teachers in the Purulia district. Using a descriptive survey method and standardised tools, it gathers reliable data from a diverse group of teachers through stratified random sampling and analyses it using correlation and regression, while strictly upholding ethical standards like consent and confidentiality.

Nature of the Study

The present study was separated into three parts: (i) **Descriptive Part**, (ii) **Gender-wise Comparative Part**. The research design of each part of the present study is presented below.

Descriptive Survey Research

Descriptive research helps us better understand how society works by clearly outlining patterns and behaviours. Though simple in form, it provides the groundwork for deeper analysis and is essential in fields like population studies, economics, and crime.

Survey Method

A survey is a non-experimental research method used to gather information that can't be directly observed. Common in education and social sciences, it helps researchers understand people's thoughts, behaviours, and experiences by collecting self-reported data.

In this part, descriptive and survey research were done in the case of collecting data on the variable **"Psychological Capital"** as the independent variable.

Gender Wise Comparison

In this part of the research, a **Gender-wise Comparative Analysis** was done. Here, gender was the **independent variable**, and its two levels (i.e., male and female) were considered. **"Psychological Capital"** was considered the **dependent variable**.

Sampling and Representative Sample

Sampling plays a vital role in research by enabling a small group to represent a larger population meaningfully (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In the context of Purulia's diverse teaching community, a carefully chosen sample helps reflect the range of teachers' backgrounds and lived experiences shaped by home, school, and society (Taherdoost, 2016). To ensure that all key segments—like gender, age, and socio-economic status—were fairly represented, the study used stratified random sampling, a method known for reducing bias and enhancing the credibility of results (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). Ethical considerations such as informed consent and confidentiality were strictly maintained in line with APA guidelines (APA, 2020).

Source of Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from secondary and higher secondary schools in Purulia district, West Bengal, India. The sampling frame consisted of government schools, government-aided schools, and government-sponsored schools in the district. These institutions provided a representative pool of participants for the research, focusing on Job Satisfaction, Personality Factors, Psychological Capital, and Work-Life Balance among school teachers.

Sampling Technique

In the present study, the *Stratified Random Sampling Technique* was employed to ensure a representative sample. This method involves dividing the population into smaller, homogeneous subgroups called strata, based on shared attributes or characteristics. Each stratum's size determines the proportion of the sample drawn from it. Random samples are then selected from each stratum and combined to form a single, representative sample that accurately reflects the population's diversity.

Sample Size

Finally, 413 male subjects and 126 female subjects have participated in the study.

Table 4.5.3: Gender-Wise Distribution of Sample

Gender		Total
Male	Female	
413	126	539

Research Instruments

Research instruments are essential for gathering reliable data in psychological and educational studies. This study employs standardised tools to measure personality factors, psychological capital, work-life balance, and job satisfaction among teachers in Purulia District. These instruments ensure validity and reliability in assessing key constructs (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The following research tool was used in the present study for data collection. The tool was selected by applying yardsticks of relevance, appropriateness, reliability, validity, and suitability. A brief description of the tool is given below.

Psychological Capital Questionnaire – PCQ-24

Here's a detailed discussion on the **Psychological Capital Questionnaire – PCQ-24**, formatted in **APA Style**, for the study. This questionnaire is a widely used psychometric instrument designed to measure **Psychological Capital (PsyCap)**, a positive psychological state comprising self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). Developed by Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman (2007), this

questionnaire assesses the four dimensions of PsyCap, each contributing to an individual's motivation, well-being, and job performance in organisational settings.

Development and Structure of PCQ-24

The **PCQ-24** consists of **24 items**, with six items dedicated to each of the four PsyCap components:

Self-Efficacy – Reflects an individual's belief in their capability to successfully execute tasks and overcome challenges. This is based on **Bandura's (1997)** self-efficacy theory.

Optimism – Captures the individual's positive expectations about future events, aligning with the dispositional optimism model (**Scheier & Carver, 1985**).

Hope – Represents goal-directed energy and pathways thinking, rooted in **Snyder's (2002) Hope Theory**.

Resilience – Assesses the ability to recover from setbacks, drawing from resilience theories (**Masten & Reed, 2002**).

Scoring Procedure

Responses are made on a 6-point scale, and the response categories are assigned weights from 1 to 6. The scoring scheme used was to give a score of 6 to each response marked under 'strongly agree', a score of 5 to each response marked under 'agree', a score of 4 to each response marked under 'partially agree', a score of 3 to each response marked under 'partially disagree', a score of 2 to each response marked under 'disagree' and a score of 1 to each response marked under 'strongly disagree'. This was done for positive statements. The summation of scores earned by a teacher on all statements was taken as his psychological capital score.

Here, the mean score of the scale was normalised, and the normalisation procedure was as follows:

Normalised mean = Mean of the item responses in a dimension of the scale/Total number of items in the dimension of the scale.

Then, the normalised mean fell within the range extending from 1 to 6, with 3.5 as the mid-point (moderately satisfied).

The range of normalised mean scores of the "**Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire**" may be interpreted as –

1.00 to 2.24	:	Very Low
2.25 to 3.49	:	Low
3.50 to 4.74	:	High
4.75 to 6.00	:	Very high

Psychometric Properties

The **PCQ-24** demonstrates **strong psychometric properties**, making it a reliable and valid measure for assessing PsyCap:

Reliability– **Luthans et al. (2007)** reported Cronbach's alpha values ranging from **0.72 to 0.89** across different samples, indicating strong internal consistency.

Validity– Studies have shown **construct validity**, with the PCQ-24 correlating significantly with job satisfaction, employee engagement, and performance (**Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011**).

Cross-Cultural Applicability– The PCQ-24 has been validated across multiple cultural and professional contexts, including educational, corporate, and healthcare settings (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009).

Presentation of Results

Quantitative research in the descriptive survey method was adopted to explore the “**Psychological Capital**” of the School Teachers of the Purulia district of West Bengal.

Results are presented in two separate subsections:

a) Descriptive and b) Comparative

Descriptive Presentation

The results are presented herewith.

Psychological Capital

Here, the results of descriptive analysis of the “**Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire**” Scores of the teachers of Purulia district are presented herewith in tabular form.

Psychological Capital of the Teachers Considering Both Genders as a Whole

Here, the purpose of the presentation is to test the following hypothesis –

Hypothesis- H₁: The teachers, considering both male and female as a whole, have high Psychological Capital.

Table 5.1.1.1: Descriptive Statistics of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire Score of The Teachers, Considering Both Male and Female as A Whole

Psychological Capital	N	Range	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
Efficacy	539	2.83	3.00	5.83	4.98	0.54	Very High
Hope	539	2.33	3.50	5.83	4.91	0.44	Very High
Resilience	539	2.67	3.00	5.67	4.40	0.52	High
Optimism	539	2.33	3.17	5.50	4.66	0.41	High
PsyCap in Totality	539	2.08	3.46	5.54	4.74	0.34	Very High

Table 5.1.1.1 presents the descriptive statistics of the “**Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire**” Score obtained by the teachers (considering both males and females as a whole) in the present study. In the case of **Efficacy**, the “minimum” score was 3.00 and the “maximum” score was 5.83, yielding a range of 2.83. The “mean” and “standard deviation” for this distribution were 4.98 and 0.54, respectively. Moving to **Hope**, the scores ranged from a “minimum” of 3.50 to a “maximum” of 5.83, with a range of 2.33. The “mean” and “standard deviation” were 4.91 and 0.44, respectively. In the case of **Resilience**, the range ranged from a “minimum” of 3.00 to a “maximum” of 5.67, resulting in a range of 2.67, with a “mean” of 4.40 and a “standard deviation” of 0.52. In the case of **Optimism**, scores ranged from a “minimum” of 3.17 to a “maximum” of 5.50, giving a range of 2.33, with a “mean” of 4.66 and a “standard deviation” of 0.41. Finally, **PsyCap in Totality** ranged from a “minimum” of 3.46 to a “maximum” of 5.54, yielding a range of 2.08, with a “mean” of 4.74 and a “standard deviation” of 0.34.

Psychological Capital of the Male Teachers

Here, the purpose of the presentation is to test the following hypothesis –

Hypothesis- H₂: The male teachers have high Psychological Capital.

Table 5.1.1.2: Descriptive Statistics of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire Score of The Male Teachers

Psychological Capital	N	Range	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
Efficacy	413	2.00	3.83	5.83	5.07	0.43	Very High
Hope	413	2.00	3.83	5.83	4.99	0.39	Very High
Resilience	413	2.67	3.00	5.67	4.37	0.53	High
Optimism	413	2.17	3.17	5.33	4.67	0.41	High
PsyCap in Totality	413	1.75	3.79	5.54	4.77	0.31	Very High

Table 5.1.1.2 presents the descriptive statistics of the “**Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire**” Score obtained by the male teachers in the present study. In the case of **Efficacy**, the “minimum” score was 3.83 and the “maximum” score was 5.83, yielding a range of 2.00. The “mean” and “standard deviation” for this distribution were 5.07 and 0.43, respectively. Moving to **Hope**, the scores ranged from a “minimum” of 3.83 to a “maximum” of 5.83, with a range of 2.00. The “mean and “standard deviation” were 4.99 and 0.39, respectively. In case of **Resilience**, it ranged from a “minimum” of 3.00 to a “maximum” of 5.67, resulting in a range of 2.67, with a “mean” of 4.37 and a “standard deviation” of 0.53. In case of **Optimism**, showed scores from a “minimum” of 3.17 to a “maximum” of 5.33, giving a range of 2.17, with a “mean” of 4.67 and a “standard deviation” of 0.41. Finally, **PsyCap in Totality** ranged from a “minimum” of 3.79 to a “maximum” of 5.54, yielding a range of 1.75, with a “mean” of 4.77 and a “standard deviation” of 0.31.

Psychological Capital of the Female Teachers

Here, the purpose of the presentation is to test the following hypothesis –

Hypothesis- H₃: The female teachers have high Psychological Capital.

Table 5.1.1.3: Descriptive Statistics of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire Score of The Female Teachers

Psychological Capital	N	Range	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
Efficacy	126	2.50	3.00	5.50	4.67	0.72	High
Hope	126	2.17	3.50	5.67	4.67	0.51	High
Resilience	126	2.00	3.17	5.17	4.51	0.48	High
Optimism	126	1.83	3.67	5.50	4.66	0.42	High
PsyCap in Totality	126	1.71	3.46	5.17	4.63	0.40	High

Table 5.1.1.3 presents the descriptive statistics of the “**Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire**” Score obtained by the female teachers in the present study. In the case of **Efficacy**, the “minimum” score was 3.00

and the “maximum” score was 5.50, yielding a range of 2.50. The “mean” and “standard deviation” for this distribution were 4.67 and 0.72, respectively. Moving to **Hope**, the scores ranged from a “minimum” of 3.50 to a “maximum” of 5.67, with a range of 2.17. The mean and standard deviation were 4.67 and 0.51, respectively. In the case of **Resilience**, it ranged from a “minimum” of 3.17 to a “maximum” of 5.17, resulting in a range of 2.00, with a “mean” of 4.51 and a “standard deviation” of 0.48. In the case of **Optimism**, scores ranged from a “minimum” of 3.67 to a “maximum” of 5.50, giving a range of 1.83, with a “mean” of 4.66 and a “standard deviation” of 0.42. Finally, **PsyCap in Totality** ranged from a “minimum” of 3.46 to a “maximum” of 5.17, yielding a range of 1.71, with a “mean” of 4.63 and a “standard deviation” of 0.40.

Comparative Analysis

To compare the two groups, an independent sample t-test was done. The results of the comparative analysis are presented in tabular form.

Psychological Capital

The results of the comparative analysis in Psychological Capital are presented in tabular form to test the following null hypothesis:

Hypothesis H₄: The male and female teachers do not differ in their Psychological Capital.

Table 5.2.1(a): Group Statistics of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire Score of The Male and Female Teachers

Psychological Capital	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remarks
Hope	Male	413	5.07	0.43	Very High
	Female	126	4.67	0.72	High
Efficacy	Male	413	4.99	0.39	Very High
	Female	126	4.67	0.51	High
Resilience	Male	413	4.37	0.53	High
	Female	126	4.51	0.48	High
Optimism	Male	413	4.67	0.41	High
	Female	126	4.66	0.42	High
PsyCap in Totality	Male	413	4.77	0.31	Very High
	Female	126	4.63	0.40	High

Table 5.2.1 (a) shows group statistics of different dimensions of **Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire** scores of the male and female teachers. In terms of Psychological Capital derived from **Hope**, males had a mean score of 5.07 and females 4.67, with standard deviations of 0.43 and 0.72, respectively. For satisfaction derived from **Efficacy**, males had a mean score of 4.99 and females 4.67, with standard deviations of 0.39 and 0.51, respectively. Regarding Psychological Capital derived from **Resilience**, males had a mean score of 4.37 and females 4.51, with standard deviations of 0.53 and 0.48, respectively. In Psychological Capital derived from **Optimism**, males scored a mean of 4.67 and females 4.66, with standard deviations of 0.41 and 0.42, respectively. Finally, in terms of **Psychological Capital (PsyCap) in Totality**, males had a mean score of 4.77 and females 4.63, with standard deviations of 0.31 and 0.40, respectively.

Table 5.2.1 (b): Results of Independent Samples T-Test of Gender Wise Comparison of Means of Different Dimensions of Psychological Capital (PsyCap) Questionnaire Scores of the Male and Female Teachers

Psychological Capital		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Hope	Equal variances assumed	47.08	0.00	7.84	537.00	0.00
	Equal variances not assumed.			6.05	153.18	0.00
Efficacy	Equal variances assumed	18.86	0.00	7.43	537.00	0.00
	Equal variances not assumed.			6.46	172.04	0.00
Resilience	Equal variances assumed	1.27	0.26	-2.64	537.00	0.01
	Equal variances not assumed.			-2.76	222.98	0.01
Optimism	Equal variances assumed	0.16	0.69	0.22	537.00	0.82
	Equal variances not assumed.			0.22	200.56	0.83
PsyCap in Totality	Equal variances assumed	9.61	0.00	4.38	537.00	0.00
	Equal variances not assumed.			3.84	173.58	0.00

From table 5.2.1(b), it is transparent that the two groups (male and female) differed (statistically) significantly in the dimensions of Hope, Efficacy, and Resilience, and also in PsyCap in Totality of Teachers Psychological Capital. On average, the male teachers expressed their (statistically) significantly higher psychological capital in the dimensions of Hope and Efficacy and also in PsyCap (in Totality) than female teachers, but in the dimension of Resilience, female teachers expressed their (statistically) significantly higher psychological capital than male teachers.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The **Discussions and Conclusions** chapter synthesises findings on personality factors, psychological capital, and work-life balance in shaping teachers' job satisfaction in the Purulia district. Insights align with prior research (Luthans et al., 2007; Judge et al., 2002), highlighting significant psychological influences.

In this chapter, discussions and conclusions are presented in two sub-sections – (a) **Discussions**, and (b) **Conclusions**.

Discussions

The present study was designed to probe into the present scenario of the “*Psychological Capital*” of the teachers of the Purulia district. In this section, discussions of the results are placed. In the previous section, the results of the study were presented in two separate sections: (a) **Descriptive Presentation**, and (b) **Comparative Analysis**. The discussions are also made in two segments, and afterwards, conclusions will be drawn.

Discussion on the Results of Descriptive Presentation

The discussion begins with the descriptive presentations of the results to test the following hypotheses.

H₁: The teachers, considering both male and female as a whole, have high **Psychological Capital**.

H₂: The male teachers have high **Psychological Capital**.

H₃: The female teachers have high **Psychological Capital**.

(a) Psychological Capital of the School Teachers of both Male and Female as a Whole

From the results of Table 5.1.1.1, it was observed that the School Teachers, considering both male and female as a whole, were scored very high in Efficacy, Hope, and PsyCap in Totality, and high in Resilience and Optimism.

Therefore, the hypothesis **H₁** was accepted.

(b) Psychological Capital of the Male School Teachers

From the results of Table 5.1.1.2, it was observed that the male School Teachers were scored very high in Efficacy, Hope, and PsyCap in total, and high in Resilience and Optimism.

Therefore, the hypothesis **H₂** was accepted.

(c) Psychological Capital of the Female School Teachers

From Table 5.1.1.3, it was observed that the female school teachers were scored high in all the dimensions of Psychological Capital and PsyCap in Totality.

Therefore, the hypothesis **H₃** was accepted.

Discussion on the High Psychological Capital of the School Teachers

Psychological Capital (PsyCap) is a key concept in positive psychology, reflecting an individual's inner strengths, like self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience (**Luthans, Youssef-Morgan, & Avolio, 2007**). For school teachers, especially in challenging and demanding environments, high PsyCap contributes to better job performance, stronger commitment, and greater job satisfaction (**Avey et al., 2011**). It plays a vital role in supporting teachers' well-being and professional effectiveness amid the pressures of their work.

Components of High Psychological Capital

Components of Psychological Capital are presented herewith.

Psychological Capital (PsyCap) traits like self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience play a vital role in enhancing teachers' professional effectiveness and emotional well-being. Self-efficacy reflects a teacher's confidence in managing classrooms and applying innovative strategies (**Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001**), while optimism helps them stay motivated and view setbacks as temporary (**Seligman, 1998; Carver & Scheier, 2002**). Hope enables teachers to stay goal-focused and find new ways to succeed despite obstacles (**Snyder, 2002; Lopez et al., 2009**). Resilience allows them to bounce back from stress and remain committed to their roles despite challenges like heavy workloads or difficult student behaviour (**Masten, 2001; Gu & Day, 2013**). Together, these traits help build a positive, student-centred learning environment.

Impact of High Psychological Capital on School Teachers

Psychological Capital (PsyCap) significantly influences teachers' professional well-being and effectiveness. Teachers with high PsyCap—marked by hope, resilience, optimism, and self-efficacy—report greater job satisfaction, reduced stress, and stronger engagement in their roles (**Luthans et al., 2007; Avey et al., 2011**). This positive mindset not only helps them manage job-related challenges but also creates a motivating classroom atmosphere that boosts student outcomes (**Hoy et al., 2006; Reyes et al., 2012**). Promoting PsyCap

through professional development and supportive organisational practices can build a more resilient, satisfied, and high-performing teaching workforce.

Discussion on the Results of Gender Wise Comparative Analysis

Now, let us start the discussion on the results of the gender wise comparative analysis.

To prove the hypothesis-H₄ (i.e., the male and female teachers do not differ in their Psychological Capital), the following discussions were conducted.

From table-5.2.1(a) and table-5.2.1(b), it was observed that the two groups (male and female) differed (statistically) significantly in the dimensions of Hope, Efficacy, and Resilience, and also in PsyCap in Totality of Teachers Psychological Capital. On average, the male teachers expressed their (statistically) significantly higher psychological capital in the dimensions of Hope and Efficacy and also in PsyCap (in Totality) than female teachers, but in the dimension of Resilience, female teachers expressed their (statistically) significantly higher psychological capital than male teachers.

Hence, the hypothesis **H₄** has been rejected.

Gender-Wise Comparison of Psychological Capital of the School Teachers

Psychological capital (PsyCap) is a crucial personal resource in workplace settings, comprising **self-efficacy, hope, resilience, and optimism** (Luthans, Youssef-Morgan, & Avolio, 2007). In the domain of education, school teachers' PsyCap significantly influences their motivation, job performance, and well-being (Cenkseven-Önder & Sari, 2009). Given the differential socio-cultural expectations and psychological dispositions of male and female teachers, it is pertinent to explore **gender differences in PsyCap**.

Gender Differences in Psychological Capital

Research shows that Psychological Capital (PsyCap) differs across genders, shaped by social roles, stress levels, and coping styles (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). Male teachers are often seen as more confident in discipline and structure, while female teachers tend to excel in emotional resilience and relationship-building (Görgens-Ekermans & Herbert, 2013).

In terms of **self-efficacy**, men typically show strength in classroom control (Klassen & Chiu, 2010), whereas women are more effective in fostering emotional support (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2020). **Hope** is often stronger in female teachers, who invest emotionally in student growth (Day & Gu, 2014), while males take a more structured, results-driven approach (Luthans et al., 2015). **Resilience** appears more prominent in women due to emotional expressiveness and social bonds (Gu & Day, 2007), while men rely more on solitary coping (Tugade & Fredrickson, 2004). In **optimism**, men generally score higher due to socially reinforced confidence (Peterson & Chang, 2003), though women's optimism may be tempered by workplace anxiety (Hoy et al., 1991).

Empirical Findings on Gender-Wise Comparison of PsyCap Among Teachers

Empirical studies indicate mixed gender differences in Psychological Capital (PsyCap) among teachers. Some findings suggest female teachers exhibit higher emotional resilience and optimism, while males often show greater self-efficacy (Luthans et al., 2007; Avey et al., 2011). Contextual factors, however, mediate these variations (Siangchokyoo et al., 2020).

Conclusion

The present study reveals that high levels of Psychological Capital (PsyCap)—comprising hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism—serve as vital psychological resources enabling teachers to thrive amidst the multifaceted challenges of contemporary educational settings. The findings indicate that teachers exhibiting elevated PsyCap not only maintain better emotional and professional well-being but also demonstrate greater

job satisfaction, instructional effectiveness, and adaptive capacity in response to systemic pressures and student needs (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007).

Specifically in the context of the Purulia district, where teachers often navigate infrastructural limitations and socio-economic constraints, high PsyCap emerges as a significant buffer against burnout and job-related stress. Resilient teachers in such settings are better equipped to recover from setbacks, sustain positive attitudes, and continue goal-directed behaviours (Avey et al., 2011). Moreover, hope and optimism among educators contribute to the cultivation of supportive classroom climates, improved student engagement, and the fostering of inclusive learning environments (Snyder, 2002).

Importantly, the study affirms that Psychological Capital is not a fixed trait but a *state-like* quality, which can be nurtured through intentional interventions such as professional development, peer collaboration, and reflective practices (Luthans et al., 2006). As such, school leadership and educational policymakers should consider structured PsyCap development programs as a core strategy in teacher capacity-building efforts, especially in underserved districts like Purulia.

In sum, investing in the enhancement of PsyCap among teachers holds transformative potential—not only for individual educators' well-being and professional fulfilment but also for the broader goals of educational equity, quality, and resilience in the Indian schooling context.

REFERENCES

1. **American Psychological Association. (2020).** Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). American Psychological Association.
2. **Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2009).** Psychological capital: A positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. *Human Resource Management*, 48(5), 677–693. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20294>
3. **Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011).** Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviours, and performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(2), 127–152. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20070>
4. **Bakker, A. B., & Bal, P. M. (2010).** Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 83(1), 189–206. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X402596>
5. **Bandura, A. (1997).** Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.
6. **Banerjee, S., & Saha, A. (2021).** Teacher challenges in rural India: Case studies from West Bengal. *Journal of Educational Change*, 22(4), 621–638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-021-09424-4>
7. **Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2002).** Optimism. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 231–243). Oxford University Press.
8. **Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018).** Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
9. **Dweck, C. S. (2006).** Mindset: The new psychology of success. Random House.
10. **Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016).** Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
11. **Görgens-Ekermans, G., & Herbert, M. (2013).** Emotional intelligence as a moderator in the stress–burnout relationship: A questionnaire study on nurses. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 22(15-16), 2311–2320.
12. **Government of West Bengal. (2020).** District Human Development Report: Purulia. Department of Planning and Statistics. <https://wbpspm.gov.in/publications>
13. **Gu, Q., & Day, C. (2007).** Teachers' resilience: A necessary condition for effectiveness. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(8), 1302–1316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.06.006>
14. **Gu, Q., & Day, C. (2013).** Challenges to teacher resilience: Conditions count. *British Educational Research Journal*, 39(1), 22–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.623152>
15. **Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991).** Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organisational climate. SAGE Publications.

16. **Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2006).** Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 425–446. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043003425>
17. **Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010).** Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741–756. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019237>
18. **Kundu, A., & Ghosh, S. (2022).** Reforming teacher roles in the context of NEP 2020: Psychological demands and supports. *Indian Journal of Educational Research*, 11(1), 45–59.
19. **Luthans, F., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2017).** Psychological capital and beyond. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199316479.001.0001>
20. **Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., & Patera, J. L. (2008).** Experimental analysis of a web-based training intervention to develop positive psychological capital. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(2), 209–221. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.32712618>
21. **Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2015).** Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 541–572. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x>
22. **Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2006).** Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge. Oxford University Press.
23. **Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007).** Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge. Oxford University Press.
24. **Masten, A. S. (2001).** Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227>
25. **Masten, A. S., & Reed, M. G. J. (2002).** Resilience in development. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 74–88). Oxford University Press.
26. **Peterson, C., & Chang, E. C. (2003).** Optimism and culture. In E. C. Chang (Ed.), *Optimism & pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice* (pp. 39–56). American Psychological Association.
27. **Reyes, M. R., Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., White, M., & Salovey, P. (2012).** Classroom emotional climate, student engagement, and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(3), 700–712. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027268>
28. **Roche, M., Haar, J. M., & Luthans, F. (2014).** The role of mindfulness and psychological capital on the well-being of leaders. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19(4), 476–489. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037183>
29. **Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985).** Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalised outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology*, 4(3), 219–247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.4.3.219>
30. **Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2020).** Motivation and social-emotional learning: Integrating theory, research, and practice. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 65, 101927.
31. **Seligman, M. E. P. (1998).** Learned optimism: How to change your mind and your life. Pocket Books.
32. **Siangchokyo, N., Siengthai, S., & Kim, S. (2020).** Psychological capital and organisational commitment: The mediating role of work engagement in the Thai hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 88, 102534.
33. **Simons, J. C., & Buitendach, J. H. (2013).** Psychological capital, work engagement and organisational commitment amongst call centre employees in South Africa. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39(2), 01–12. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v39i2.1071>
34. **Siu, O. L., Bakker, A. B., & Jiang, X. (2014).** Psychological capital among university students: Relationships with study engagement and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(4), 979–994. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9459-2>
35. **Snyder, C. R. (2002).** Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(4), 249–275. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1304_01
36. **Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., ... & Harney, P. (1991).** The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(4), 570–585. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.4.570>

37. **Sweetman, D., & Luthans, F. (2010).** The power of positive psychology: Psychological Capital and work engagement. In A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 54–68). Psychology Press.
38. **Taherdoost, H. (2016).** Sampling methods in research methodology: How to choose a sampling technique for research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(2), 18–27.
39. **Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001).** Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783–805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)
40. **Tugade, M. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2004).** Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back from negative emotional experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(2), 320–333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.86.2.320>
41. **Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007).** The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2), 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121>
42. **Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009).** Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 82(1), 183–200. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X285633>
43. **Zhang, Y., & Chen, M. (2020).** Psychological capital and teacher well-being: A cross-sectional study in Chinese primary schools. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 546166. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.546166>