SOCIAL CAPITAL AND TEACHING ABILITY AMONG STUDENT TEACHERS

Mrs. T. Niresha[1] and Dr. S. Malathi[2]

[1]Research scholar and [2]Research Supervisor, N.K.T.National College of Education for Women, Affiliated to TamilNadu Teachers Education University, Chennai

[1]nireshaedu@gmail.com and [2]malathinkt@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In this study, we explore the significance difference between the demographic characteristics with social capital and teaching ability among student teachers. This study explores the relationship between social capital and teaching ability of student teachers. The literature review discuss the aspects of social capital and teaching ability to elucidate understanding of how teachers in schools influence student's relationship and ability to cope along in the society. The factors like cognitive capital, structural capital, relational capital, teaching skills, teaching goal and classroom management indicate positive relationship between social capital and teaching ability. The researcher herself developed the tool with the help of the investigator and committee members to fine-tune the statements. The results shows that, there is significant relationship between social capital and teaching ability among student teachers, also there is significant relationship among the demographic characteristics. Thus, this study provides evidence and importance of social capital and teaching ability within educational institutions and school. Higher level of social capital and teaching ability results in positive outcomes among student teachers which helps in academic achievement of students.

Key words: Social capital, teaching ability, student teachers, Classroom management, teaching skill, teaching goal, cognitive capital, structural capital, relational capital

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of social capital has found its place in many different fields of social science. A growing number of sociologists, political scientists, and economists are using the concept of social capital to help them address various questions related to their respective professions. Recently, social scientists from many different countries have shown that social networks can affect productivity. The basic principles of social capital are that "relationships matter" and "social networks are valuable assets." When people participate, they form community and commitment to each other. People benefit greatly when they have a sense of belonging and hands-on experience with social media. Societies with higher levels of social capital are more likely to benefit from reduced crime rates, better health, higher levels of education, and faster economic development.

One of the most important theoretical products of sociology is social capital (Field, 2001). Hanifan's comments on rural school community centers were the first to introduce the concept of social capital. Hanifan is especially concerned with cultivating goodwill, friendship, compassion, and social interaction among people who "form a social unit." Regarding social theory, Pierre Bourdieu (1986) and then James S. Coleman (1989), in their reflections on the social context of education, introduced this concept into academic debates. However, it was Robert D. The work of Putnam (1993; 2000) has made social capital an important topic of research and political debate.

Social capital encourages the acquisition of human capital, which in turn promotes the formation of social capital. So anyone interested in one side of this equation should be interested in both. This section examines the impact of social capital on educational outcomes. Social capital is not only a necessary input to education but also a beneficial by-product and the best indicator of high social capital is simply the number of years of formal education. Education is a fundamental element of social cohesion, national identity and democratic development. In school, the foundations of conscious and active citizenship are often laid. Education creates social capital in three main ways: First, children practice social capital skills such as participation and reciprocity; second, schools provide a platform for community engagement; and third, students learn how to properly participate in society

International Journal of Applied Engineering & Technology

through civic education. Several aspects of the educational process are important in creating social capital and teaching ability.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Hypothesis

The general hypothesis of our study is to find the difference between social capital and teaching ability among student teachers with general difference with type of family and educational qualification of student teachers respectively. To compare the difference among student teachers within the respective groups to their age groups and religion.

2.2 Sample

The samples were selected from various Colleges of Education in Chennai District is around 1009 student teachers.

2.3 Procedure and Materials

The researcher developed the tool for assessing social capital and teaching ability for student teachers to measure their cognitive capital, relational capital, structural capital, skills, goals, attitude and classroom management. Analysis is done by using SPSS package. Social capital questionnaire consists of 84 statements and teaching ability questionnaire consists of 63 statements with 5 response options: "Strongly Agree", "Agree", "Undecided", "Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree" respectively. The relevant score varies from 1 to 5 depending on the significance of the manifestation.

3. STATISTICAL ANALYSES

Hypothesis I: **There is no significant difference between Nuclear family and Joint family student teachers with respect to their Social Capital and Teaching Ability.**

Table 3.1 t-test for significant difference between nuclear family ad joint family with respect to factors of social capital and teaching ability of student teachers

Dimensions of Social capital and teaching ability	Type of Family				t Value	P Value
	Nuclear family		Joint family			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Cognitive Capital	66.64	21.85	63.67	21.54	2.174	0.030*
Structural Capital	85.65	27.15	82.57	27.80	1.781	0.075
Relational Capital	100.40	35.01	95.92	35.87	2.006	0.045*
Overall Social Capital	**252.70**	**71.02**	**242.17**	**69.08**	**2.387**	0.017*
Classroom Management	66.29	20.75	61.79	21.65	3.369	0.001**
Teaching Skill	69.64	23.58	66.45	23.06	2.169	0.030*
Teaching Goal	67.74	21.10	66.01	21.32	1.302	0.193
Overall Teaching Ability	**203.67**	**53.41**	**194.25**	**54.45**	**2.774**	**0.006****

Note: 1. **denotes significant at 1% level

2. denotes significant at 5% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to factors of classroom management, and overall teaching ability. Hence there is significance difference between nuclear family and joint family student teachers with regard to factors of classroom management, and overall teaching ability. Based on mean score, the nuclear family student teachers have better psychological perspectives than joint family student teachers in these dimensions because nuclear family student teachers have better learning environment and they are socially, personally, emotionally attached to their parents at home.

Copyrights @ Roman Science Publications Ins.   **Vol. 5 No.4, December, 2023**
International Journal of Applied Engineering & Technology

346

International Journal of Applied Engineering & Technology

Since the P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level, with regard to cognitive capital, relational capital, overall social capital and teaching skill. Hence there is significance difference between nuclear family and joint family student teachers with regard to cognitive capital relational capital and teaching skill. Based on mean score, nuclear family student teachers is better in psychological perspectives, because nuclear family student teachers have more facilities and amenities at their home. Parents took personal care in their education, health and skills.

There is no significance difference between nuclear family student teachers and joint family student teachers with regard to factors of structural capital and teaching goal, since the P value is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level with regard to factors of structural capital and teaching goal. Student teachers either in nuclear family or in joint family should develop their skills in using technology, communication and subject knowledge.

Hypothesis II: **There is no significant difference between undergraduate and post graduate student teachers with respect to their social capital and teaching ability.**

Table 3.2 t-test for significant difference between undergraduate and post graduate student teachers with respect to their social capital and teaching ability

Dimensions of Social capital and teaching ability	Educational Qualification				t Value	P Value
	UG		PG			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Cognitive Capital	64.27	21.88	66.04	21.56	1.296	0.195
Structural Capital	82.61	27.55	85.62	27.42	1.742	0.082
Relational Capital	94.45	35.03	101.89	35.61	3.346	0.001**
Overall Social Capital	**241.32**	**69.62**	**253.55**	**70.33**	**2.775**	**0.006****
Classroom Management	61.59	20.94	66.50	21.43	3.679	<0.001**
Teaching Skill	66.88	23.41	69.21	23.28	1.584	0.114
Teaching Goal	65.77	21.71	67.99	20.67	1.662	0.097
Overall Teaching Ability	**194.24**	**54.49**	**203.69**	**53.37**	**2.783**	**0.005****

Note: 1. **denotes significant at 1% level

2. denotes significant at 5% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to factors of relational capital, overall social capital, classroom management and overall teaching ability. Hence there is significance difference between undergraduate and postgraduate student teachers with regard to factors of relational capital, overall social capital, classroom management and overall teaching ability. Based on mean score, the postgraduate student teachers have better psychological perspectives than undergraduate student teachers in these dimensions because postgraduate student teachers have better exposure to learning environment and they have enriched knowledge in education and society.

There is no significance difference between undergraduate student teachers and postgraduate student teachers with regard to factors of cognitive capital, structural capital, teaching skill and teaching goal, since the P value is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level with regard to factors of cognitive capital, structural capital, teaching skill and teaching goal. Student teachers have to develop their interpersonal trust and usage of technology.

Copyrights @ Roman Science Publications Ins.   **Vol. 5 No.4, December, 2023**
International Journal of Applied Engineering & Technology

347

International Journal of Applied Engineering & Technology

Hypothesis III: **There is no significant difference among age group in years with respect to social capital and teaching ability of student teachers.**

3.3 ANOVA for significant difference among age group in years with respect to social capital and teaching ability of student teachers

Dimensions of Social capital and teaching ability	Age Group in years			F Value	P Value
	21-25	26-30	Above 30		
Cognitive Capital	65.60^a (20.24)	65.70^a (22.30)	63.35^a (21.65)	1.009	0.365
Structural Capital	83.09^a (26.03)	85.63^a (27.82)	81.26^a (27.95)	2.239	0.107
Relational Capital	95.68^{ab} (33.90)	100.74^b (35.86)	94.02^a (35.66)	3.583	0.028*
Overall Social Capital	**244.37^{ab} (65.14)**	**252.06^b (71.99)**	**238.63^a (69.60)**	**3.243**	**0.039***
Classroom Management	63.54^{ab} (20.45)	65.39^b (21.60)	61.10^a (21.17)	3.386	0.034*
Teaching Skill	67.26^a (22.60)	69.10^a (23.66)	66.12^a (23.25)	1.472	0.230
Teaching Goal	65.36^a (19.87)	68.32^a (21.30)	64.67^a (22.03)	3.116	0.045*
Overall Teaching Ability	**196.15^{ab} (50.43)**	**202.81^b (54.40)**	**191.89^a (56.09)**	**3.692**	**0.025***

Note: 1. The Value within bracket refers to SD

2. ** denotes significant at 1% level.

3. * denotes significant at 5% level.

4. Different alphabet among age group in years denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

Since the P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to relational capital, overall social capital, classroom management, teaching goal and overall teaching ability. Hence there is significant difference among age groups in years with regard to relational capital, overall social capital, classroom management, teaching goal and overall teaching ability. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), 26-30 age group significantly differed with above 30 age group in years at 5% level, but there is no significant difference between 21-25 age group and 25-30 age group and also above 30 age group in years in overall social capital and overall teaching ability.

There is no significance difference among cognitive capital, structural capital and teaching skill, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level with regard to factors of cognitive capital, structural capital and teaching skill.

Hypothesis IV: **There is no significant difference among religion with respect to social capital and teaching ability of student teachers.**

3.4 ANOVA for significant difference among religion with respect to social capital and teaching ability of student teachers.

International Journal of Applied Engineering & Technology

Dimensions of Social capital and teaching ability	Religion			F Value	P Value
	Hindu	**Christian**	**Muslim**		
Cognitive Capital	69.20[b] (21.27)	64.58[a] (21.35)	61.43[a] (22.28)	9.078	<0.001**
Structural Capital	88.47[b] (27.97)	83.58[a] (26.98)	79.93[a] (27.32)	6.726	0.001**
Relational Capital	101.90[b] (35.65)	98.85[b] (35.13)	92.39[a] (35.42)	5.057	0.007**
Overall Social Capital	**259.57[c] (70.60)**	**247.01[b] (68.62)**	**233.74[a] (70.39)**	**9.289**	**<0.001****
Classroom Management	66.10[b] (21.39)	64.35[b] (20.75)	60.98[a] (22.00)	3.998	0.019*
Teaching Skill	68.80[b] (23.58)	69.65[b] (22.85)	64.11[a] (23.69)	4.820	0.008**
Teaching Goal	67.81[b] (20.93)	68.51[b] (20.80)	62.69[a] (21.86)	6.581	0.001**
Overall Teaching Ability	**202.70[b] (53.39)**	**202.51[b] (52.24)**	**187.79[a] (57.05)**	**7.095**	**0.001****

Note: 1. The Value within bracket refers to SD

2. ** denotes significant at 1% level.

3. * denotes significant at 5% level.

4. Different alphabet among age group in years denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

Since P value is less than 0.01, null hypothesis is rejected at 1%level with regard to the factors of cognitive capital, structural capital, relational capital, overall social capital, teaching skill, teaching goal, overall teaching ability. Hence there is significance difference among religion of student teachers with regard to the dimensions of cognitive capital, structural capital, relational capital, overall social capital, teaching skill, teaching goal, overall teaching ability. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), Hindu is significantly differed with Christian and Muslim and also Christian is significantly differed with Hindu and Muslim at 5% level overall social capital. Hindu and Christian is significantly differed with Muslim at 5% level, but there is no significant difference between Hindu and Christian in overall teaching ability.

Since P value is less than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected at 5%level with regard to classroom management. Hence there is significant difference among religion of student teachers with regard to classroom management.

4. RESULT
Thus the result shows, there is significance difference between nuclear family and joint family student teachers with regard to factors of Classroom management and overall teaching ability (P<0.001). Since the results shows there is significance difference nuclear family and joint family student teachers with regard the factors of

Copyrights @ Roman Science Publications Ins.   Vol. 5 No.4, December, 2023
International Journal of Applied Engineering & Technology

349

International Journal of Applied Engineering & Technology

cognitive capital, relational capital, overall social capital and teaching skill (P<0.005). Since the result shows there is no significance difference between nuclear family and joint family student teachers with regard to factors of structural capital and teaching goal (P>0.005). The mean scores on social capital and teaching ability were higher in the group of nuclear family student teachers. Furthermore, there is significance difference between undergraduate and post graduate student teachers with regard to factors of relational capital, overall social capital, classroom management and overall teaching ability (P<0.001). Also, there is no significance difference between undergraduate and post graduate student teachers with regard to factors of cognitive capital, structural capital, teaching skill and teaching goal (P>0.005).

Meanwhile, there is significant difference among age groups in years with regard to the dimensions of relational capital, overall social capital, classroom management, teaching goal and overall teaching ability. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), 26-30 age group significantly differed with above 30 age group in years. There is no significant difference among cognitive capital, structural capital and teaching skill.

Similarly, there is significance difference among cognitive capital, structural capital, relational capital, overall social capital, teaching skill, teaching goal and overall teaching ability of student teachers. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), Hindu is significantly differed with Christian and Muslim and also Christian is significantly differed with Hindu and Muslim in overall social capital and teaching ability. There is significant difference among classroom management of student teachers at (P<0.005).

5. DISCUSSION

In this study, the relationship between type of family and educational qualification of student teachers respectively. The present research revealed that there is significant relationship with type of family, among the dimensions of cognitive capital, relational capital, overall social capital, classroom management, teaching skill and overall teaching ability. Based on the mean score nuclear family student teachers are better than joint family student teachers. Thus, nuclear family parents are providing more attention to the students in their daily activities and provide more exposure to the society to gain knowledge, attitude and skills.

Based on the mean score post graduate student teachers are better in cognitive capital, relational capital, structural capital, overall social capital, classroom management, teaching skill, teaching goal and overall teaching ability than undergraduate student teachers. Thus, more importance should be given to undergraduate student teachers in training them in classroom teaching, sharing knowledge, hands on training in teaching.

Furthermore, with regard to age group there is significant difference among student teachers with respect to relational, overall social capital, classroom management, teaching goal and overall teaching ability. Based on DMRT test there is significant difference between two groups of student teachers with respect to their age group. Meanwhile, with regard to religion there is significant difference among student teachers with respect to cognitive capital, structural capital, relational capital, overall social capital, classroom management, teaching skill, teaching goal, and overall teaching ability with respect to their religion. Based on DMRT test there is significant difference within three groups of student teachers with respect to their religion.

6. CONCLUSION

Social capital creates through our associations, through doing things for one another, and through the believes we make in one another. It helps in "bonding" divided social life; the "bridging" of communities to areas and contacts past their quick environment; and the "linking" of individuals to official structures and offices that they may require for help with instructive or work prospects. It is basic to recognize between these numerous sorts of social capital and to recognize that social capital may both open and near entryways. Schools are key educate for creating civic communities and great attitudes. The show too speaks to social capital's energetic and context-specific character. People's engagement in education, in many forms, has been regarded as a source of social capital, which has a significant impact on educational performance (Aldridge et al., 2002). Thus, social capital and teaching ability has been considered as one of the developing links between students and teachers in the field of education. Researchers believes that the teaching skills and attitude can affects the quality and quantity of

International Journal of Applied Engineering & Technology

social capital in education. A focus on social capital and teaching ability allows for a closer examination of each individuals and groups for making linkages, bridges and bonding among student teachers within organizations, institutions, schools and learning community.

7. REFERENCES

➢ Aldridge S, Halpern D, Fitzpatrick S (2002). Social capital: A Discussion paper, *London: Performance and Innovation Unit*.

➢ Baron, S., J. Field, et al. (2001). "Social capital: critical perspectives." *Oxford, Oxford University Press.*

➢ Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In. J. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* (New York, Greenwood), 241-258.

➢ Coleman, J. (1989). "Social capital in the creation of human capital." *American Journal of Sociology,* 94(Supplement): S95-S120.

➢ Putnam, R. (2000). "Bowling alone: *The Collapse and Revival of American Community*", New York.