EVALUATION OF A SCHOOL-BASED SELF-ESTEEM INTERVENTION PROGRAM FOR ADOLESCENTS

Umme Kawser*, Tahneena Mehreinn, Rajon Das Jony
and Muhtasabbib Matin

Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, University of Dhaka, Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh

Key words: Self-esteem, Disruptive behavior, Self-concept, Social competence

Abstract

The researchers aimed to evaluate a school-based self-esteem intervention program. The program's focus was to implement a culturally appropriate self-esteem intervention tool for school-going adolescents through selfhood, affiliation, competence, mission, and security activities. This study randomly recruited 183 nine-grade students aged 13 - 16 years. A pre-post design and two distinct measures were utilized to measure the intervention's social efficacy validity. The target skills' specific measures (Self-esteem, self-concept, self-confidence) and effect measures (nature of friend connections, the suitability of intervention for youths) were introduced. Comparisons of scores using ANOVA's and t-tests discovered that the intervention had the most substantial effect on girls' self-confidence (p = 0.001) and changes in the self-concept, disruptive behavior, self-confidence, and social competence. The study's results provided satisfactory evidence of intervention effectiveness, and the post-test result showed little change across the study period.

Introduction

Self-esteem is not an alien concept for mental health professionals all over the world. Self-esteem comprehends both one's views about him/herself, such as "I am capable", "I am valued"-furthermore, emotional states, such as accomplishment, hopelessness, egotism, and indignity[1]. Self-esteem is different from confidence, which is an evaluation of one's worth[2].

Self-concept is our opinion on oneself; the good or negative assessments of oneself, and the way we feel about it"[3]. Researchers maintained it as a persuasive predictor of numerous factors in a person's life, such as academic performance as self-esteem is an extensively used construct that includes purpose in life and life satisfaction, happiness, fulfilment in a conjugal relationship and different networks, and elimination of criminal conduct. Self-esteem, self-respect, and self-uprightness are equivalents or close equivalents of confidence[4-6].

---

*Author for correspondence: <ummekawser@gmail.com>.

Self-esteem is a certain respect for ourselves for a proper perspective and practical life[7]. High confidence feels astonishing, though low confidence does not[8]. Low confidence is connected to hostility, helpless scholarly execution, hopelessness, dietary problems, and substance misuse[9]. "Self-concept "suggests how somebody deliberates, assesses, or sees themselves when all is said in done. To have a meaning of oneself, one should initially think about oneself[10].

In this current investigation, we aim to determine the relationship between self-esteem, self-concept, self-confidence, delinquent behavior, and competence by implementing self-esteem activities illustrated in the book authored by Michelle Borba[11] on middle school students in Dhaka City.

"Esteem Builders" of Michelle Borba's was developed to boost accomplishment, performance, school environment, or overall vanity. It was designed for K-8. The activities offered by this book can be used in combination with diverse subject areas. The package has concluded 250 theory-based and trialed esteem-enhancing exercises for different subject areas and grade levels.

Self-esteem was positively associated with academic and social achievements in the US and the UK[12]. A somewhat similar study was carried out in Turkey on 342 college students. The study's findings indicated the efficacy of the program[13].

Materials and Methods

The enhancement program drew a total of 183 students. Participants were ninth and tenth-grade students from four secondary schools, both from North and South Dhaka City Corporation. There were 94 girls and 89 boys among the students who completed the study, and their ages ranged from 13 to 16 years.

The Self-Esteem Enhancement Program intervention consisted of selfhood, affiliation, competence, mission, and security activities, which were tested using a pre/post to see whether it improved the participants' self-esteem. The treatment group's self-concept scale, social competence scale, and Beck Youth Inventories were completed in this study. For this analysis, there was no control group. The scale's pre and post-test scores were compared, and variance analysis was performed. One week before and one week after the intervention stage, the questionnaires were given to the study participants, and in addition to that, a personal demographic questionnaire was introduced.

First, the Bangla adapted Self-concept scale[14] was used to measure self-concept and self-confidence. This scale is a 12-item instrument. A strong self-concept is indicated by a score of 48, which is the highest possible score. A score of 12 or less indicates a low self-concept.

Next, the social competence with the peer's (SCS) scale[15] was introduced to measure social, intimate relationships with peers. The scale has ten self-rated items. With a

Guttman split-half reliability coefficient of 0.77 and alpha of 0.75, the scale's internal reliability was determined to be satisfactory.

Finally, the Bangla adapted Beck youth inventories[16] were used to measure disruptive behavior. The only week before after the intervention period of the study, the questionnaires were administered. At first, the researcher collected 1st phase data through a demographic instrument and the four different scales. After the data were collected, the researcher introduced the activities. A total of 25 activities were selected from the "Esteem Builders Book" and divided into five categories. They were security, self-hood, affiliation, mission, and competence. In the 1st phase, the researcher introduced the ten different activities to them, and the participants worked together in a group and individually as required by the activities chosen. They were allowed to ask a question if something was not understandable to them.

A week later, the 2nd phase of the activities and data collection were conducted. Before the conduction researcher asked the student about the last day activities and their feelings. Researchers took notes on participants' experiences with the activities. In this phase, the researcher introduced the rest of the activities and asked them to do according to the instructions. After completing the activities, the researcher collected the 2nd phase data and their experiences. Both oral and written consent was taken from the participants.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 indicated that the mean difference in disruptive behavior in pretest (M = 7.59) and posttest (M = 5.29) was significant at 0.5 level 0.5. Moreover, it was also evident from the table that, the mean scores obtained by the male participants in posttest (male = 4.52, female = 6.02) were less than the female participants.

Results also showed a mean difference in self-concept in the pretest (M = 59.42) and posttest (M = 63.45) score. It was also evident that the mean score of male and female in posttest (male = 63.38, female = 64.47) obtained more than the pretest (male = 58.25, female = 60.52) scores.

It showed a mean difference in self concept2 in pretest (M = 14.52) and posttest (M = 15.84) score. It was also evident that the mean score of male and female in posttest (male = 15.50, female = 16.15) obtained more than the pretest (male = 14.32, female = 14.71) scores.

Results also showed a mean difference in self-confidence in pretest (M = 18.45) and posttest (M = 19.38) score. It was also evident that the mean score of male and female in posttest (male = 19.52, female = 19.24) obtained more than the pretest (male = 18.92, female = 18.01) scores.

There was a mean difference in social competence in pretest (M = 21.76) and posttest (M = 24.72) score. It was also evident that the mean score of male and female in posttest (male = 25.01, female = 24.45) obtained more than the pretest (male = 21.11, female = 22.38) scores.

Table 1. Pre-test and Post-test mean difference of disruptive behavior, self-concept, self concept 2, self-confidence, and social competence between males and females.

Scale	Pre-test mean score			P Sig. (2-tailed)	Post-test mean score			P Sig. (2-tailed)
	Male = 89, Female = 94				Male = 89, Female = 94			
Disruptive behavior	Male	8.24	7.59	.053	Male	4.52	5.29	.005
	Female	6.97			Female	6.02		
Self-concept	Male	58.25	59.42	.067	Male	62.38	63.45	.110
	Female	60.52			Female	64.47		
Self- concept 2	Male	14.32	14.52	.259	Male	15.50	15.84	.089
	Female	14.71			Female	16.15		
Self confidence	Male	18.92	18.45	.001	Male	19.52	19.38	.466
	Female	18.01			Female	19.24		
Social competence	Male	21.11	21.76	.036	Male	25.01	24.72	.272
	Female	22.38			Female	24.45		

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare disruptive behavior in pre-training and post-training conditions and was shown in Table 2. There was a critical distinction in the scores for pre-training disruptive behavior (M = 7.59, SD = 4.44) and post-training disruptive behavior (M = 5.29, SD = 3.60) conditions; t (182) = 5.648, p = .000.

Table 2. Paired Sample t-test.

Pair	Scales	Mean	Sd.	Mean differences	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Disruptive behavior 1	7.59	4.44	2.30	5.648	.000
	Disruptive behavior 2	5.29	3.60			
Pair 2	Self-concept 1	59.42	8.36	-4.03	-6.484	.000
	Self-concept 2	63.45	8.87			
Pair 3	(2) Self-concept 1	14.52	2.31	-1.31	-5.377	.000
	(2) Self-concept 2	15.84	2.59			
Pair 4	Self- confidence 1	18.45	1.92	-.92	-4.392	.000
	Self- confidence 2	19.38	2.62			
Pair 5	Social competence 1	21.76	4.09	-2.96	-7.220	.000
	Social competence 2	24.72	3.39			

In the case of self-concept, there was a significant difference in the scores for pre-training self-concept (M = 59.42, SD = 8.36) and post-training self-concept (M = 63.45, SD = 8.87) conditions; t (182) = -6.484, p = .000.In the case of (2) self-concept, there was a significant difference in the scores for pre-training. Self-concept (M = 14.52, SD = 2.31) and post-training (2) self-concept (M = 15.84, SD = 2.59) conditions; t (182) = -5.377, p= .000.In the case of self-confidence, there was a significant difference in the scores for pre-training self-confidence (M = 18.45, SD = 1.92) and post-training self-confidence (M = 19.38, SD = 2.62) conditions; t (182) = -4.392, p = .000.In the case of social competence, there was a significant difference in the scores for pre-training social competence (M = 21.76, SD = 4.09) and post-training social competence (M = 24.72, SD = 3.39) conditions; t (182) = -7.220, p = .000.

From the result (Table 3), it's visible that the administration of esteem-building activities could reduce disruptive behavior for all the groups irrespective of the sibling number. Similarly, at the first measure of self-concept, self-esteem activities helped improve the children's self-concept.

Table 3. Pre-test and Post-test mean difference of disruptive behavior, self-concept, self-concept 2, self-confidence, and social competence in sibling numbers.

Scale name		Sibling number							
		One (N=12)		Two (N=72)		Three (N=61)		Other (N=38)	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Disruptive behavior	Mean	5.58	3.41	8.62	5.38	7.77	5.54	6.00	5.31
	Sd.	3.72	3.08	4.85	3.59	4.36	3.34	3.29	4.12
Self-concept	Mean	61.08	64.41	59.45	63.31	59.14	63.72	59.26	63.00
	Sd.	6.70	8.05	9.90	9.27	8.26	9.51	5.55	7.46
Self-concept 2	Mean	15.83	17.50	13.90	16.25	14.65	15.90	15.07	14.44
	Sd.	1.52	3.42	2.36	2.45	1.96	2.68	2.62	1.79
Self-confidence	Mean	19.25	21.41	22.37	19.04	20.27	19.29	22.81	19.52
	Sd.	2.59	2.31	3.49	2.41	4.95	3.00	3.35	2.17
Social competence	Mean	22.33	23.66	22.37	24.61	20.27	25.63	22.81	23.81
	Sd.	2.90	3.31	3.49	2.85	4.95	3.35	3.35	4.11

Table 4 shows how a father's profession brings any change in the connection between confidence and every one of the four measures.

Table 4. Pre-test and post-test mean difference of disruptive behavior, self-concept, self-concept 2, self-confidence, and social competence in the father's profession.

Scale name		Fathers profession							
		Businessman (N = 101)		Private job holder (N = 60)		Govt. job holder (N = 20)		Others (N = 2)	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Disruptive behavior	Mean	7.35	4.44	7.36	6.63	9.00	5.15	12.50	9.50
	Sd.	4.77	3.35	4.12	3.72	3.19	3.13	3.53	4.94
Self-concept	Mean	59.03	61.83	59.70	66.90	61.20	61.85	52.50	58.50
	Sd.	7.99	8.61	9.71	9.38	5.05	4.42	10.60	16.26
Self-concept 2	Mean	14.30	16.42	14.98	15.0	14.50	15.60	12.00	14.00
	Sd.	2.16	2.81	2.40	2.35	2.62	1.18	.00	.00
Self-confidence	Mean	18.53	19.60	18.70	19.66	17.30	17.20	18.50	21.50
	Sd.	2.00	2.53	1.79	2.62	1.59	1.96	2.12	3.53
Social Competence	Mean	22.27	24.80	20.93	24.51	21.70	25.10	21.50	23.50
	Sd.	4.04	3.11	4.70	3.90	1.30	3.43	3.53	.70

The pre-test and post-test mean difference of disruptive behavior, self-concept, self-concept 2, self-confidence, and social competence in the mother's profession is illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5. Pre-test and Post-test mean difference of disruptive behavior, self-concept, self-concept 2, self-confidence and social competence in the mother's profession.

Scale name		Mothers profession					
		Job holder (14)		Others (169)		Total (183)	
		Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Disruptive Behavior	Mean	6.00	7.85	7.72	5.08	7.59	5.29
	Sd.	3.82	2.41	4.47	3.61	4.44	3.60
Self-concept	Mean	55.50	64.71	59.74	63.35	59.42	63.45
	Sd.	5.52	10.32	8.48	8.77	8.36	8.87
Self-concept 2	Mean	14.07	15.00	14.56	15.91	14.52	15.84
	Sd.	2.01	.87	2.33	2.68	2.31	2.59
Self-Confidence	Mean	17.28	19.42	18.55	19.37	18.45	19.38
	Sd.	2.33	1.78	1.86	2.68	1.92	2.62
Social Competence	Mean	21.42	24.92	21.79	24.71	21.76	24.72
	Sd.	1.22	2.16	4.24	3.48	4.09	3.39

The rate at which delinquent behavior decreases after the esteem-enhancing activities are significant for those whose mothers were jobholders. The rise in the same group's self-confidence is noteworthy as well.

We can see in Table 6, the self-concept of children whose mothers were post-graduate was significantly high.

Table 6. Pre-test and post-test mean difference of disruptive behavior, self-concept, self-concept 2, self-confidence, and social competence in the mother's educational qualification.

Scale name		Mothers educational qualification					
		Postgraduate 13		Below undergraduate 42		Below SSC 128	
		Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Disruptive behavior	Mean	9.61	6.53	6.69	4.45	7.68	5.44
	Sd.	2.66	2.40	4.10	3.66	4.63	3.65
Self-concept	Mean	56.00	65.07	58.09	64.21	60.20	63.04
	Sd.	15.22	12.84	7.61	8.41	7.56	8.59
Self-concept 2	Mean	13.46	14.61	14.40	14.47	14.67	16.41
	Sd.	1.50	1.043	3.02	2.03	2.08	2.66
Self confidence	Mean	19.07	19.53	18.73	18.85	18.29	19.53
	Sd.	1.38	3.47	1.78	2.59	2.00	2.53
Social competence	Mean	18.92	25.15	22.47	24.64	21.82	24.71
	Sd.	2.72	1.21	4.87	4.11	3.83	3.30

Pre-test and post-test mean difference of disruptive behavior, self-concept, self concept 2, self-confidence, and social competence in Socio-Economic Status are illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7. Pre-test and post-test mean difference of disruptive behavior, self-concept, self concept 2, self-confidence, and social competence in Socio-Economic Status.

Scale Name		Lower-class 11		Middle class 162		Upper class 10	
		Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Disruptive behavior	Mean	7.54	6.00	7.41	5.19	10.50	6.10
	Sd.	5.00	3.37	4.44	3.68	2.79	2.60
Self-concept	Mean	57.27	63.36	59.73	64.01	56.70	54.60
	Sd.	8.50	10.22	8.37	8.75	8.02	3.77
Self-concept 2	Mean	15.54	16.27	14.42	15.93	15.00	13.90
	Sd.	2.38	2.61	2.36	2.61	.47	1.28
Self-confidence	Mean	18.45	19.90	18.40	19.29	19.30	20.30
	Sd.	1.75	2.91	1.97	2.61	.94	2.45
Social competence	Mean	21.81	22.90	22.14	24.69	15.60	27.20
	Sd.	3.06	4.96	3.81	3.25	4.90	2.34

Firstly, the reduction rate of delinquent behavior in children after the esteem-building exercise was high in the upper class. The self-concept measure reflected that the group with lower-class children had a noticeably high degree of improvement after the activities. However, surprisingly the second measure of self-concept revealed the absolute opposite.Adolescence is the time when sovereignty needs are more evident than the need for dependence on parents. This adolescent characteristic is particularly true today in the context of Bangladesh, given the critical role that social skills are likely to play in shaping their personalities and self-esteem. Existing research findings are inadequate in explaining how to enhance adolescents' self-esteem. Hence, we investigated a self-esteem enhancement program's effectiveness for adolescents, and the findings suggest that the program was effective.

Although the study's results provided satisfactory evidence of the intervention program's effectiveness, the study had a few limitations. A greater and more inclusive sample across the country could be conducted to validate the program's effectiveness. Also, there was no control group for the study.

References

1.   Naim F, E Melonashia and F Shkëmbia 2015. Self-esteem and hopelessness as predictors of emotional difficulties: A cross-sectional study among adolescents in Kosovo. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences **165**: 222-233.

2.   Zellner M 1970. Self-esteem, reception, and influence ability. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology **15**(1): 87–93.

3.   Smith ER and DM Mackie 2007. Social Psychology (3rd edn). Hove: Psychology Press. ISBN 978-1-84169-408-5.

4.   Baumeister RF 1999. The Self in Social Psychology. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press (Taylor and Francis).

5.   Baumeister RF, JD Campbell, JI Krueger and KD Vohs 2003. Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles? Psychological Science in the Public Interest **4**(1): 1–44.

6.   Orth U and RW Robbins 2014. The development of self-esteem. Current Directions in Psychological Science **23**(5): 381-387.

7.   Pyszcynski T, J Greenberg, S Solomon, J Arndt and J Schimel 2004. Why do people need self-esteem? A Theoretical and Empirical Review. Psychological Bulletin **130**(3): 435-468.

8.   Leary MR, ES Tambor, SK Terdal and DL Downs 1995. Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology **68**(3): 518-530.

9.   Crocker J and CT Wolfe 2001. Contingencies of self-worth. Psychological Review **108**(3): 593-623.

10. Marsh HW 1990. Causal ordering of academic self-concept and academic achievement: A multi-wave, longitudinal path analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology **82**(4): 646-656.

11. Borba M 1989. Esteem Builders. AK-8 Self-Esteem Curriculum for Improving Student Achievement, Behavior and School Climate. Torrance, CA: Jalmar Press.

12. Booth MZ and JM Gerard 2013. Self-esteem and academic achievement: A comparative study of adolescent students in England and the United States, US National Library of Medicine.

13. Ummet D 2015. Self-Esteem Among College Students: A study of satisfaction of basic psychological needs and some variables.Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences **174**: 1623-1629.

14. Ahmed F and R Das 2013. Relationship of adolescent depression with self-concept, sex, and place of residence. Jagannath University Journal of Psychology **3**(1): 107-112.

15. Spence SH 1995. Social Skills Training: Enhancing Social Competence and Children and Adolescents. Windsor, UK: The NFER-NELSON Publishing Company Ltd.

16. Uddin MK, A Huque and A Shimul 2011. Adaptation of the beck youth inventories of emotional and social impairment for use in Bangladesh. The Dhaka University Journal of Psychology **35**: 65-80.