Psychology Research on Education and Social Sciences, 3(3), 85-94, Sept. 2022
e-ISSN: 2717-7602
dergipark.org.tr/press

youngwisepub.com
gencbilgeyayincilik.com ©2022

Research Article

Social capital and its influence on the teachers psychological well being during the pandemic COVID-19

Nur Eva[1], Siti Khorriyatul Khotimah[2], Sri Andayani[3]

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

Article Info

Received: 06 August 2022
Accepted: 23 September 2022
Available online: 30 Sept 2022

Keywords:
Psychological well-being
Social capital
Teacher

Abstract

The teachers' psychological well-being is very important to note because it affects their performance. Various factors affect the teachers' psychological well-being, including one of them is the teachers' social capital. This study aims to determine the effect of social capital on teachers' psychological well-being. The research topic is based on the problem of finding problems where increasing social capital needs to be done not only to improve psychological well-being even in all aspects of human life, especially to get out of the crisis due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This study involved a subject of 250 teachers. This study uses quantitative research techniques with correlational descriptive methods. Data collection in this study used two kinds of instruments: the personal social capital 16 scale and the psychological well-being scale. Based on the results of the study, it was found that: (1) social capital has a significant influence on psychological well-being, and the direction of the relationship is positive, meaning that when the value of social capital on teachers (as subjects) increases, their psychological well-being also increases, (2) aspects of social capital in the form of bonding and bridging lead to different roles in the relationship that affect each aspect of psychological well-being, (3) each aspect of social capital in the form of bonding and bridging does not always have the same effect on each aspect of social capital. The implications of this research are teachers' social capital needs to improve teachers' psychological well-being.

To cite this article

Eva, N., Khotimah, S.K., & Andayani, S. (2022). Social capital and its influence on the teachers psychological well being during the pandemic COVID-19. *Psychology Research on Education and Social Sciences, 3*(3), 85-94.

Introduction

During the pandemic, teachers are required to develop competencies related to mastery of literacy and science and technology (König, Jäger-Biela, & Glutsch, 2020), class management skills (Moorhouse, 2020), and communication (Kim, Oxley & Asbury, 2022) and social competencies (Sudrajat, 2020). Ligan et al., (2015) and Ozamiz-Etxebarria et al., (2021)found that teacher psychological well being are also related to their school work quality life. Research conducted by Azhar (2019) resulted in data that psychological well-being contributes to teacher competence by 23.0%. Hence, teachers with a high level of psychological well-being also have high competence. Research shows that the psychological well-being of early childhood teachers influences the climate of parenting and learning in the classroom in parenting and early education, and child development (Jeon, 2017). This research also reveals that teachers' self-efficacy

[1] Assoc. Prof., Psychology Department, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. E-mail: nur.eva.fppsi@um.ac.id ORCID: 0000-0003-3584-5049

[2] Assoc. Prof., Psychology Department, Faculty of Health and Psychology, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel, Surabaya, Indonesia. E-mail:: khotim_psi@uinsby.ac.id Phone (+62) 817-593-246 ORCID 0000-0003-4416-7550

[3] Assis. Prof., Psychology Department, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. E-mail: sriandayani91@gmail.com ORCID: 0000-0002-0502-2503

levels and work environment generally relate to their psychological well-being above and beyond their personal and professional background (Jeon, 2017). It strenghtened by Cansoy et al., (2020) and Xiyun et al., (2022) that was found the strong relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and psychological wellbeing, and self-efficacy as predictor of their psychological well-being.

In addition, the community's demand for teacher competence in conducting online learning is increasing. The Indonesian Child Protection Commission (KPAI) stated that online learning at home was ineffective because many students had the wrong concept of online learning by giving them many tasks. (Setiawan, 2020). The results of research evidence this statement by Makbul et al. (2021); it is known that students have problems in understanding the learning material because there is no further explanation from the teacher, with a percentage of 47.3% then 22.1% of students experiencing quota constraints, 7.6% do not have cellphones, 17.6% are too busy. Many tasks and 5.5% no textbooks at home. This can lead to a lack of public trust in teacher learning. If there is no trust, there will be no social network. Whereas social networks (networks), norms and values (norm and value), and trust (trust) are sources of social capital.

Social capital is defined as the number of resources individuals acquire based on a durable network of interpersonal relationships (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). When the sources of psychological capital are lacking, the relationship between individuals does not work well or even does not last long. At the same time, social capital is needed in every aspect of human life. Various studies show that psychological well-being is strongly influenced by social support, which is one source of social capital. In addition, social capital is needed to increase economic and human development through cooperation with various parties. The collaboration will create accelerated growth in all fields. Therefore, raising social capital needs to be done not only to improve psychological well-being but also in all aspects of human life, especially to get out of the crisis due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Increasing social capital should be carried out by all levels of society, both individuals, government agencies/institutions, as well as the community and schools. Schools as a source of knowledge are expected to be able to help optimize human development from the COVID-19 crisis. An essential factor in this development effort is the teacher. Teachers have a role in assisting the students in developing optimally. Besides that, good communication between teachers and parents can build sustainable collaboration between the school and the community. Teachers need social capital to involve various parties in human development efforts during the crisis.

Increasing social capital can be done in several ways, namely open communication (open communication channels), collaboration between fields (cross-functional work teams), and work-life balance programs (Luthan, 2004). Open communication, a partnership between areas, and work-life balance programs can be done through psychoeducation and training. Through these three things, it is hoped that the source of social capital for teachers is fulfilled and increased so that later it will have an impact on the development of a more resilient and prosperous society.

Problem of Study

The purpose of this research is to examine the influence of social capital to psychological well-being of teacher according to different demographic variables during the Covid 19 pandemic. The main problem of the research is how the social capital influence the psychological well-being levels of teacher during the Covid 19 pandemic?

Method

Research Model

This study uses a regression analysis research design that examines how much influence the social capital variable has on the psychological well-being variable.

Participant

The population in this study were teachers in Indonesia. The sample of this study used 250 subjects with the characteristics of elementary school teachers or equivalent to high school or equivalent. Sampling was done by non-probability sampling with accidental sampling technique.

The subjects of this study amounted to 250 teachers of the male gender, 55 people or 21.9% of the total data and 195 female teachers or 77.7% of the entire data. The educational background of teachers is 199 undergraduate students, with an average length of teaching period of 16.13 months. Data collection in this study used two kinds of instruments, namely the personal social capital 16 scale and the psychological well-being scale.

Table 1. Demographic data

Gender	f	%
Male	55	21.9
Female	195	77.7
Total	250	100

Data Collection Tools

The data of this research used the used try out test. The variables studied were social capital as the dependent variable and psychological well-being as the independent variable. The instruments used are Personal Social Capital 16 Scale (Wang et al., 2013) and Psychological Well-being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

Personal Social Capital 16 Scale (PCS-16)

Personal Social Capital 16 Scale (Wang, et al., 2013) was adapted before we used. This scale consist 16 item based on 2 dimension which are arranged to measure social capital, i.e., bonding and bridging dimension. The reliability coefficient of PSC-16 IS 0.920.

Psychological Well-being Scale

Psychological Well-being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995) was adapted on Indonesian. This scale consist 18 item based on 6 dimension which are arranged to measure psychological capital, i.e., autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, positive relationships, personal growth, and self-acceptance.

Data Analysis

The data obtained were analyzed using is regression analysis. Before performing regression analysis, the data will go through normality and homogeneity tests. Based on the results of the normality test for the distribution of data, it was found that the significant value was 0.000, with a significant level of $p < 0.0001$, so it can be said that the data had a normal distribution. Based on the results of the homogeneity test, it was found that the significance value of the social capital variable was 0.142 and the psychological welfare variable was 0.370. With a significant level of $p > 0.05$, it can be said that the two variables (social capital and psychological well-being) have homogeneous data.

Results

The regression analysis results showed an F score of 77.589 with a significance level of 0.000. The rule used is $p < 0.01$; based on this rule, it indicates a very significant positive effect between social capital on the psychological well-being of teachers. The results of the regression analysis can be seen in table 2. Through table 2, it is known that the R square value of 0.238 means that the results of the regression indicate that social capital has an effect of 23.8% of the variation in contribution ($R2 = .238$, $F(1,249) = 77,589$, $p< .001$).

Table 2. Results of Social Capital Regression Analysis on PWB

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Changes	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
0.487	0.238	0.235	8.012	0.238	77.589	1	249	0.000

Table 3 shows that the value of $B = 0.344$, $t(249) = 27.9$, and the significance of $p < .001$ means that social capital significantly predicts PWB. The regression equation $Y = 58.269 + 0.344x$ was obtained based on the regression analysis results. This equation explains that the value of 58.269 states that if the social capital variable (X) does not change, the

PWB (Y) value is 58.269. The value of the coefficient of social capital is 0.344, indicating a positive direction, meaning that social capital has a direct relationship with psychological well-being. When the value of the coefficient of social capital increases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will increase by 0.344. Likewise, when the value of the coefficient of social capital decreases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will decrease by 0.344.

Table 3. Social Capital Coefficients on PWB

Model	**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**	**Collinierity Statistics**	
	B	*Std.Error*				*Tolerance*	*VIF*
(Constant)	58.269	2.089		27.898	0.000		
Total Social Capital	0.344	0.039	0.487	8.808	0.000	1.000	1.000

Table 4 shows that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) enormously contribute to the psychological welfare of 30.5%. .001). The coefficient value of Bonding (X1) is -0.090, indicating that bonding negatively affects psychological well-being. When the value of the bonding coefficient increases by 1 unit, the buy of psychological well-being will decrease by 0.090; conversely, when the value of the bonding coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will increase by 0.090. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.644, indicating a positive direction, meaning that bridging has a direct relationship with psychological well-being. When the value of the bridging coefficient increases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will increase by 0.644. Likewise, when the value of the bridging coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will decrease by 0.644.

Table 4. Multiple regression results of Bonding and Bridging towards PWB

Model	**F**	**df1**	**df2**	**R Square**	**Sig.**	**B**	
						Bonding	**Bridging**
Bonding and Bridging towards PWB	54,302	2	248	0,305	0,000	-0,090	0,644
Bonding and Bridging towards SA	0,754	2	248	0,006	0,472	0,032	-0,001
Bonding and Bridging towards Positive Relationship	11,305	2	248	0,084	0,000	0,005	0,086
Bonding dan Bridging terhadap Purpose of Life	18,788	2	248	0,132	0,000	0,135	0,033
Bonding and Bridging towards Environtment Mastery	8,599	2	248	0,065	0,000	-0,022	0,088
Bonding and Bridging towards Personal Growth	31,770	2	248	0,204	0,000	0,019	0,151
Bonding and Bridging towards Autonomy	43,144	2	248	0,258	0,000	-0,259	0,288

The results of the multiple regressions of the two aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) on each element of PWB are shown in table 4. These results indicate that the two aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) have an 0% effect on self-acceptance ($R2 = 0.006$, $F(2, 248) = 0.75$, $p = 0.47$), which means that it is insignificant so that the two aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) do not affect self-acceptance. The coefficient value of Bonding (X1) is -0.032, indicating that bonding has a negative relationship with self-acceptance. When the value of the bonding coefficient increases by 1 unit, the importance of self-acceptance will decrease by 0.032; conversely, when the value of the bonding coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will increase by 0.032. The coefficient

value of bridging (X2) is 0.024, indicating a positive direction between bridging and self-acceptance. When the bridging coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the self-acceptance value will increase by 0.024. Likewise, when the bridging coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the self-acceptance value will decrease by 0.644.

The results of the regression show that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging have an effect of 8.4% of the variation in the contribution to the positive relationship ($R2 = 0.084$, $F(2, 248) = 11.305$, $p < 0.001$) significantly so that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) has a positive effect on the positive aspects of the relationship. The coefficient value of Bonding (X1) is -0.005, indicating that bonding has a negative connection with a positive relationship. When the bonding coefficient value increases by 1 unit, then the value of a positive relationship will decrease by 0.005. Conversely, when the value of the bonding coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the value of a positive relationship will increase by 0.005. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.086, indicating a positive direction, meaning bridging significantly has a unidirectional relationship with the positive aspect of the relationship. When the bridging coefficient value is n increases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will increase by 0.086. Likewise, when the value of the bridging coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the psychological welfare value will decrease by 0.086.

The results of the regression showed that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) had an effect of 13.2% on the variation of contribution to purpose in life ($R2 = 0.132$, $F(2, 248) = 18.788$, $p < 0.001$) significantly. The coefficient value of bonding (X1) is 0.135, indicating a positive direction, meaning that bonding has a unidirectional relationship with purpose in life. When the value of the bonding coefficient increases by 1 unit, the value of purpose in life will increase by 0.135. Likewise, when the value of the bonding coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the value of the intention of life will decrease by 0.135. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.033, indicating a positive direction, meaning that bridging has a unidirectional relationship with purpose in life. When the bridging coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the goal in life value will increase by 0.033. Likewise, when the bridging coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the purpose in life value will decrease by 0.033.

The results of the regression show that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) have an effect of 6.5% of the variation in contribution to environment mastery ($R2 = 0.065$, $F(2, 248) = 8.599$, $p < 0.001$) significantly. The coefficient value of Bonding (X1) is -0.022, indicating that bonding negatively impacts environment mastery. When the bonding coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the environmental mastery value will decrease by 0.022. Conversely, when the bonding coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the environmental mastery value will increase by 0.022. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.088, indicating a positive direction, meaning that bridging has a unidirectional relationship with environment mastery. When the bridging coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the environmental value will increase by 0.088. Likewise, when the bridging coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the environmental mastery value will decrease by 0.088.

The results of the regression showed that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) had an effect of 20.4% on personal growth ($R2 = 0.204$, $F(2, 248) = 31.770$, $p < 0.001$) significantly. The coefficient value of bonding (X1) is 0.019, indicating a positive direction, meaning that bonding has a unidirectional relationship with personal growth. When the value of the bonding coefficient increases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will increase by 0.019. Likewise, when the bonding coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the value of personal growth will decrease by 0.019. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.151, indicating a positive direction, meaning that bridging significantly has a unidirectional relationship with personal growth. When the value of the bridging coefficient increases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will increase by 0.151. Likewise, when the value of the bridging coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the value of personal growth will decrease by 0.151.

The results of the regression showed that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) were 25.8% towards autonomy ($R2 = 0.258$, $F(2, 248) = 43.144$, $p < 0.001$) significantly. The coefficient value of Bonding (X1) is -0.259, indicating that bonding has a negative relationship with autonomy. When the bonding coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the autonomy value will decrease by 0.259. Conversely, when the bonding coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the autonomy value will increase by 0.259. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.288, indicating a positive direction,

meaning that bridging has a unidirectional relationship with autonomy. When the bridging coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the autonomy value will increase by 0.288. Likewise, when the bridging coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the autonomy value will decrease by 0.288.

The results of the multiple regressions of the two aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) on each element of PWB are shown in table 4. These results indicate that the two aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) have an 0% effect on self-acceptance (R2 = 0.006, F(2, 248) = 0.75, p = 0.47), which means that it is insignificant so that the two aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) do not affect self-acceptance. The coefficient value of Bonding (X1) is -0.032, indicating that bonding has a negative relationship with self-acceptance. When the value of the bonding coefficient increases by 1 unit, the importance of self-acceptance will decrease by 0.032; conversely, when the value of the bonding coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will increase by 0.032. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.024, indicating a positive direction between bridging and self-acceptance. When the bridging coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the self-acceptance value will increase by 0.024. Likewise, when the bridging coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the self-acceptance value will decrease by 0.644.

The results of the regression show that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging have an effect of 8.4% of the variation in the contribution to the positive relationship (R2 = 0.084, F(2, 248) = 11.305, p < 0.001) significantly so that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) has a positive effect on the positive aspects of the relationship. The coefficient value of Bonding (X1) is -0.005, indicating that bonding has a negative connection with a positive relationship. When the bonding coefficient value increases by 1 unit, then the value of a positive relationship will decrease by 0.005. Conversely, when the value of the bonding coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the value of a positive relationship will increase by 0.005. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.086, indicating a positive direction, meaning bridging significantly has a unidirectional relationship with the positive aspect of the relationship. When the bridging coefficient value is n increases by 1 unit, the value of psychological well-being will increase by 0.086. Likewise, when the value of the bridging coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the psychological welfare value will decrease by 0.086.

The results of the regression showed that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) had an effect of 13.2% on the variation of contribution to purpose in life (R2 = 0.132, F(2, 248) = 18.788, p < 0.001) significantly. The coefficient value of bonding (X1) is 0.135, indicating a positive direction, meaning that bonding has a unidirectional relationship with purpose in life. When the value of the bonding coefficient increases by 1 unit, the value of purpose in life will increase by 0.135. Likewise, when the value of the bonding coefficient decreases by 1 unit, the value of the intention of life will decrease by 0.135. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.033, indicating a positive direction, meaning that bridging has a unidirectional relationship with purpose in life. When the bridging coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the goal in life value will increase by 0.033. Likewise, when the bridging coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the purpose in life value will decrease by 0.033.

The results of the regression show that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) have an effect of 6.5% of the variation in contribution to environment mastery (R2 = 0.065, F(2, 248) = 8.599, p < 0.001) significantly. The coefficient value of Bonding (X1) is -0.022, indicating that bonding negatively impacts environment mastery. When the bonding coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the environmental mastery value will decrease by 0.022. Conversely, when the bonding coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the environmental mastery value will increase by 0.022. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.088, indicating a positive direction, meaning that bridging has a unidirectional relationship with environment mastery. When the bridging coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the environmental value will increase by 0.088. Likewise, when the bridging coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the environmental mastery value will decrease by 0.088.

Discussion

The study's results prove that there is a significant effect of social capital on psychological well-being, especially in the subject of this study, namely the teacher. In line with this study, in their research on social capital and social welfare in

Japanese immigrants, Gong et al. (2021) stated that social capital affects psychological well-being in a positive and significant way (Gong et al., 2021). Social capital positively influences psychological well-being, meaning that when a person has increased social capital, his psychological well-being will also increase. Conversely, their psychological well-being will also decrease when their social capital decreases. In another study on the effect of social capital on health and well-being, it was stated that in the world of education, social capital could have an influence on the physical and psychological aspects of students, especially in the field of health and psychological well-being (Yamaguchi, 2013). In general, the relationship between the two shows a structural difference which means that a person takes a role in social relations with people around him and cognitive differences in social capital, which means that there is mutual trust that provides mutual benefits through norms, behaviour, and values adopted in a society (Gilbert, 2003). et al., 2013).

The findings from the calculation of each aspect of each variable indicate that the bonding and bridging aspects have a significant influence on psychological well-being, which means that social capital, in general affects the psychological well-being of teachers (Veronese et al., 2018). The bonding aspect does not have a significant effect on psychological well-being. In contrast, the bridging element influences psychological well-being with a positive relationship direction, meaning that when a person has increased social capital in the bridging aspect, his psychological well-being will increase and vice versa; when his social capital decreases, his welfare will increase. Psychologically will also decline in line with research conducted by Nieminen et al. (2010) that the bonding aspect is statistically insignificant in relationship to psychological well-being with the cause of the limited bonding aspect only when experiencing stress. Meanwhile, the bridging aspect positively influences psychological well-being with social participation and influences the group.

In the aspect of psychological well-being in the form of self-acceptance, the two aspects of social capital, namely bonding and bridging, have no significant effect. That is, the two aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) do not have any influence on the element of self-acceptance. Constant, Sproull & Kiesler's (1996) research suggests that the relationship between aspects of self-acceptance in psychological well-being does not have a significant relationship; according to him, this needs further study. Significant and have a positive relationship. However, for the social capital aspect variable in the form of bonding, the results obtained are negative and insignificant. In contrast, the social capital aspect variable in the form of bridging has a positive and significant relationship. That is, the aspect of social capital in the form of bridging has a considerable influence on the positive relationship. When a person has increased bridging, the positive association will also increase. Pang (2018) mentions that diverse and intense interactions in everyday life can improve a person's psychological well-being.

In the aspect of psychological well-being in the form of life goals, both aspects of social capital, namely bonding and bridging, have a significant influence and positive relationship. However, only bonding significantly affects life goals, while bridging does not show effective results. When a person (teacher) has an increased bond, his life goals will also increase. Ellison et al. (2014) explain that a person can be motivated, which affects one's goals and expectations in life, bonding to the people around one can observe and see someone as inspiration in finding or determining life goals.

In the aspect of psychological well-being in the form of the environment, both parts of social capital, namely bonding and bridging, have a significant influence and negative relationship. In the social capital aspect variable in the form of bonding, the results obtained are negative and significant. In contrast, the social capital aspect variable in the form of bridging has a positive but insignificant relationship. When a person has an increased bonding, then aspects of psychosocial well-being in the environment will decrease.

In the aspect of psychological well-being in the form of personal growth, both parts of social capital, namely bonding and bridging, have a significant influence and positive relationship. The aspect of social capital in the form of bonding does not have a significant effect. A person's personal growth (especially in this study is the teacher) is influenced by bridging, where when bridging increases, the personal growth of a person will also increase. According to Yamaguci (2013), social capital provides person access to interpersonal and community development relationships that help a person to develop emotionally and socially through norms, networks, and social trust that provide mutual benefits. In the aspect of psychological well-being in the form of autonomy, only the bridging element has a significant influence.

The relationship between bridging and autonomy is positive, which means that when a teacher has increased bridging, the autonomy aspect of his psychological well-being will also increase. A person's autonomy in making their own choices independently in everyday life in personal and interpersonal relationships around them determines social capital that positively affects the level of psychological well-being (Yamaguci, 2013).

The research results above align with the research by Gong et al. (2021). In this study, it was found that, in general, social capital has a positive and significant effect on psychological well-being, with details of bonding and bridging aspects, each having a different effect on psychological well-being. In some cases, only bonding can affect psychological well-being by directly increasing psychological well-being. Meanwhile, in other cases, bridging can also improve psychological well-being in the presence of other factors (Gong et al., 2021). Another study by Neiminen (2010) about the relationship between social capital, health, and psychological well-being, found that aspects of bonding and bridging can be in the form of mutual trust, reciprocity, social networks, and participation in social life have a positive influence on health and psychological well-being. The results of the regression showed that both aspects of social capital (bonding and bridging) were 25.8% towards autonomy ($R2 = 0.258$, $F(2, 248) = 43.144$, $p < 0.001$) significantly. The coefficient value of Bonding (X1) is -0.259, indicating that bonding has a negative relationship with autonomy. When the bonding coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the autonomy value will decrease by 0.259.

Conversely, when the bonding coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the autonomy value will increase by 0.259. The coefficient value of bridging (X2) is 0.288, indicating a positive direction, meaning that bridging has a unidirectional relationship with autonomy. When the bridging coefficient value increases by 1 unit, the autonomy value will increase by 0.288. Likewise, when the bridging coefficient value decreases by 1 unit, the autonomy value will decrease by 0.288

Conclusion

The results of the analysis of this study indicate that: (1) There is a significant effect of social capital on the psychological well-being of teachers, (2) Aspects of social capital in the form of bonding and bridging have different effects on each aspect of psychological well-being with details as follows: following; bridging has an influence with a positive relationship direction on psychological well-being, both bonding and bridging do not have an influence on aspects of psychological well-being in the form of self-acceptance, bridging has a significant influence and the direction of a positive relationship on aspects of psychological well-being in the form of a positive relationship, bonding has a significant influence with direction positive relationship to aspects of psychological well-being in the form of life goals, bonding has a significant influence with the direction of a negative relationship to aspects of psychological well-being in the form of the environment, bridging has a significant influence and the direction of positive relationships to aspects of psychological well-being in the form of personal growth, bridging has a significant influence and direction positive relationship to aspects of psychological well-being in the form of autonomy.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Applicants

After the research, the following suggestions can be made for people working in the field of psychology;

- It may be recommended to approach the psychological diagnosis and therapy processes by taking into account the different effects of different groups after the pandemic and after the pandemic.
- Considering the impact levels of students at different education levels in the transition to normal life after the pandemic, seminars, training and therapies that provide guidance and treatment can be applied.
- Being aware of the psychological wellbeing states that indicate that single and lonely people are affected by the pandemic, it can be recommended to offer psychological help.
- Therapies that include measures to increase awareness of post-pandemic psychological well-being states and to have more psychological resilience in similar situations that may occur after the pandemic can be offered to people who have a psychological disorder and have previously received psychiatric support.

Recommendations for Further Research

After the research, the following suggestions can be presented to the researchers;

- Our research was conducted in a similar city in Indonesia, and it can be investigated whether there is a differentiation in different socio-economic level provinces.
- The research is quantitative in nature and focused on social capital and psychological well-being. However, a detailed research on the sub-dimensions of social dapital and psychological well-being can be defeated both qualitatively and quantitatively. For quantitative studies, it can be recommended to do at least over 500 people for different variables.
- The concepts of social capital and psychological well-being, which are the most relevant psychological structures during the Covid 19 pandemic period, were examined. The sub-dimensions of these concepts can be examined in depth with qualitative research.
- Studies can be conducted on social capital and psychological well-being levels and the effect of the pandemic in these periods when the pandemic process begins to end and after the pandemic.
- Considering that the pandemic is caused by many factors such as unemployment, loneliness, the thought of not being able to marry, interruption or the end of one's career, in addition to its direct and direct impact on health, it is possible to research the anxiety and stress-increasing situations that will replace the pandemic after the pandemic with these variables.

Limitations of Study

The limitation of the problem in this research is seeing influence social capital to psychological well-being based general level, not looking at each dimension.

Acknowledgment

This study funded in 2021 by Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Malang.

Biodata Author

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Nur Eva**, S.Psi, M.Psi., Psikolog is the Chief of Departement Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. Her main research is about educational psychology, psychological well-being, and gifted research. Affiliation: Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. E-mail: nur.eva.fppsi@um.ac.id Phone (+62) 812-5244-4471 ORCID: 0000-0003-3584- 5049

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Siti Khorriyatul Khotimah**, S.Psi, M.Psi., Psikolog is from Departement Psychology, Faculty of health and psychology, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel, Surabaya, Indonesia. Her main research is about educational psychology and social psychology research. Affiliation: Faculty of health and psychology, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel, Surabaya, Indonesia. E-mail:: khotim_psi@uinsby.ac.id Phone (+62) 817-593-246 ORCID 0000-0003-4416-7550

Sri Andayani, S.Psi., M.Psi is master in Educational Psychology Professional Program, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia. She is working as personal assistance of Chief of Psychology Department, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. Her interesting research include psychological capital, psychological contract, and parenting for special needs. Affiliation: Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia. E-mail: sriandayani91@gmail.com Phone: (+62)85755144428 ORCID: 0000-0002-0502-2503

References

Azhar, P.C. (2019). Hubungan kesejahteraan psikologis dengan kompetensi guru di yayasan haji maksum abidin shaleh stabat. *Jurnal Sintaksis*, *1*(1). https://jurnal.stkipalmaksum.ac.id/index.php/Sintaksis/article/view/9/6

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L.J.D. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge : Polity Press.

Cansoy, Ramazan., Turkoglu, Muhammet Emin., Parlar, Hanifi., 2020, A Predictor of Teachers' Psychological Well-Being: Teacher Self-Efficacy, *International Online Journal of Educational Science, 12*(4), 41-55

Constant, D., Sproull, L., & Kiesler, S. (1996). The kindness of strangers: The usefulness of electronic weak ties for technical advice. Organization Science, 7, 119–135.

Ellison, N. B., Wohn, D. Y., & Greenhow, C. M. (2014). Adolescents' visions of their future careers, educational plans, and life pathways. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *31*(4), 516–534. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407514523546

Gilbert, K. L., Quinn, S. C., Goodman, R. M., Butler, J., & Wallace, J. (2013). A meta-analysis of social capital and health: A case for needed research. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *18*(11), 1385–1399.

Gong, S., Xu, P., Wang, S. (2021). Social Capital and Psychological Well-Being of Chinese Immigrants in Japan. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 18*, 1-12.

Iligan, A., Ozu-Okyu, C., Ata, A,m & Akram, M. (2015), The relationship between teachers' psychological well being and their quality of school work life. *The journal of Happiness & Well-Being, 3*(2), 159-181.

Jeon, L., Cynthia K. Buettner, C.K., Grant, A.A (2018) Early Childhood Teachers' Psychological Well-Being: Exploring Potential Predictors of Depression, Stress, and Emotional Exhaustion, *Early Education and Development*, *29*(1), 53-69, DOI: 10.1080/10409289.2017.1341806

Kim, L.E., Oxley, L & Asbury, K. (2022). What makes a great teacher during a pandemic?. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 48*(1), 129-131. DOI: 10.1080/02607476.2021.1988826

König, J., Jäger-Biela, J.D. & Glutsch, N. (2020) Adapting to online teaching during COVID-19 school closure: teacher education and teacher competence effects among early career teachers in Germany, *European Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(4), 608-622. DOI: 10.1080/02619768.2020.1809650

Luthans, F., Luthans, K.W., Luthans, B.C. (2004). Positive Psychological Capital : Beyond Human and Social Capital. *Business Horizons,* 47(1), 45-50.

Makbul, C., Mulkismawati., Erlinda, M. (2021). Bahagiakah siswa belajar di masa pandemi?. *Psikobuletin: Buletin Ilmiah Psikologi, 2*(2). http://ejournal.uin-suska.ac.id/index.php/Psikobuletin/article/download/12326/6338

Moorhouse, B.L. (2020) Adaptations to a face-to-face initial teacher education course 'forced' online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 46(*4), 609-611, DOI: 10.1080/02607476.2020.1755205

Nieminen, T., Martelin, T., Koskinen, S., Aro, H., Alanen, E., & Hyyppä, M. T. (2010). Social capital as a determinant of self-rated health and psychological well-being. *International Journal of Public Health*, *55*(6), 531–542. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-010-0138-3

Ozamiz-Etxebarria, N., Santxo, N. B., Mondragon, N.I., & Santamaría, M.D. (2021). The psychological state of teachers during the covid-19 crisis: the challenge of returning to face-to-face teaching. *Frontier in Psychology, 11*, 1-10. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.620718

Pang, H. (2018). Exploring the beneficial effects of social networking site use on Chinese students' perceptions of social capital and psychological well-being in Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *67*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.08.002

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. Journal *of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(4), 719–727.

Setiawan, R. (2020). Membangun Efektifitas Pembelajaran Sosiologi di Tengah Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Ilmiah Penelitian Pendidikan dan Sosiologi, Edusocius, 4*(1), 1-13. https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/ED/article/view/25073/15152

Sudrajat, J. (2020). Kompetensi guru di masa pandemi covid-19. *Journal Riset Ekonomi dan Bisnis, 13*(1), 100-110. http://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jreb

Veronese, G., Pepe, A., Dagdukee, J., & Yaghi, S. (2018). Social capital, affect balance and personal well-being among teachers in Israel and Palestine. *Teachers and Teaching*, *24*(8), 951–964. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1508431

Xiyun, S., Fathi, J., Shirbagi, N., & Mohammaddokht, F. (2022). A structural model of teacher self-efficacy, emotion regulation, and psychological wellbeing among english teachers. *Frontier in Psychology*, *13*, 1-11, DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.904151

Yamaguchi, A. (2013). Influences of Social Capital on Health and Well Being from Qualitative Approach. *Global Journal of Health Science; 5(5),* 153-161. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105311435983