



ENHANCING WELL- BEING THROUGH POSITIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMME

* *Dr. Megha D'souza,*

* *Associate Professor, Smt. Kapila Khandvala College of Education.*

Abstract:

Good psychological health is an indicator of the overall well-being of a person. In today's times, well-being of people is at stake. Post pandemic there is higher risk of psychological problems due to the stressful environment, poverty, unemployment, debt, diet, bereavement of losing someone close, etc. All this adversely affects well-being of young students. Schools need to intervene to help students cope with such situation and equip them with knowledge and skills that promote well- being. Positive education is an approach to education that brings together well- being skills with academic learning. This study aims to ascertain the magnitude of the effect size of the positive education programme on academic resilience, psychological well- being and self- efficacy of pre-service teachers. The positive education intervention programme of 30 hours was developed for this purpose. The participants included in the study were 46 and 48 preservice teachers in control and experimental group respectively. The findings of the study reveal that the effect size of the treatment, i.e. positive education intervention programme on academic resilience and psychological well- being of pre-service teachers is high in magnitude. Whereas the effect size of the treatment, i.e. positive education intervention programme on teacher self- efficacy of pre-service teachers is moderate in magnitude.

Key Words: Positive education programme, Academic Resilience, Psychological well- being, Teacher self- efficacy.

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial Use Provided the Original Author and Source Are Credited.

Introduction:

The overall well- being of a person is not only about good physical health, but it is also importantly about psychological health. In case of physical health problems, professional help is sought. However, in case of psychological issues, there is a stigma attached to it. This deters people from acknowledging problems related to mental health and further seek any kind of help or support for such problems. But psychological health is as important as physical health. Good psychological health is an indicator of overall well- being of a person.

In today's times, well- being of people is at stake. Stress, anxiety, overwork, burnout, etc. commonly characterizes life of a human being. Students at school often face stress and anxiety about their academics, they face peer pressure, etc. Post pandemic there is higher risk of such psychological problems due to the stressful environment, poverty, unemployment, debt, diet, bereavement of losing someone close, etc. All this adversely affects well- being of young students. Schools need to intervene to help students cope with such situation and equip them with knowledge and skills that promote well- being.

Well- being is not only about feeling good momentarily, but it is about doing well in life and functioning well. As per Eudaemonic philosophy well- being is about living well and doing well. Thus, well- being as per



eudemonic viewpoint is about cultivation of personal strengths and contribution to a greater good, acting in accordance with one's inner nature and deeply held values (Waterman 1984 as cited in Ryff 1989), the realization of one's true potential (Ryff and Keyes 1995), and the experience of purpose or meaning in life (Ryff 1989). The field of positive psychology demonstrates experiencing well-being not just by feeling positive emotions but by experiencing meaning in life.

When principles of positive psychology are applied to the field of education, it brings us to the area of positive education. Positive education is an approach to education that brings together skills of academic and character development. It is about combining well-being skills with academic learning. Thus it is defined as education for both traditional skills and happiness. Positive education entails educating students on certain life skills like resilience, character strengths, optimism, and growth mind-set among others.

Rationale of the Study:

There is bias among people towards physical health, they know to take care of their physical health. But same is not the situation in case of psychological health. Eating healthy food, maintaining oral hygiene, resting, etc are the efforts taken towards maintaining good health in physical aspect. But what about psychological health?

There is lack of knowledge and skills among people to take care of psychological aspect of their personality. Thus there is a need to integrate these skills in the curriculum so that students are equipped with knowledge and skills to upkeep their own well-being. If teachers' capacities are built, then through direct and indirect ways they will contribute towards the development of the well-being skills in students. Positive Education Programme is an approach to education that focusses not only on academic learning, but enhancement of well-being skills. Positive Education Programme was developed to study its outcome on pre-service teachers.

In the present study, an attempt is made to ascertain the magnitude of the effect size of the positive education programme on the following variables:

- Academic Resilience (ARS)
- Psychological Well-being (PWB)
- Teacher self-efficacy (TSES)

Objective of the study:

To compute the effect size of the Positive Education Programme, Socio-Economic Status, Faculty of Graduation and Marks at Graduation on the following variables:

- a) Academic Resilience
- b) Psychological Well-being
- c) Teacher Self-efficacy

Methodology of the Study:

In present research, quasi experimental design of the pre-test post-test, non-equivalent groups type is used.

It can be described as follows: The pre-test-post-test non-equivalent groups design

O1 X O2

O3 C O4



Where, O1 and O3 = Pre-test Scores O2 and O4 = Post- test Scores X: Experimental Group C: Control Group.

Sample of the Study:

In the present study, the sample has been selected consisting of one intact class each of S. Y. B. Ed. students from two different colleges of education situated in the Greater Mumbai. The study adopted a two-stage sampling technique. At the first stage, colleges were selected using a simple random sampling technique (lottery method). At the second stage, students were selected from these two colleges using the cluster sampling technique. The experimental group comprised of 48 student- teachers and the control group consisted of 46 student- teachers.

Tools of the Study: In the present study the following tools were used by the researcher to collect data:

1. Academic Resilience Scale (D'souza and Pandya, 2017)
2. Psychological Well-being Scale (Ryff, 1989)
3. Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen- Moran & Hoy, 2001)
4. Socio- Economic Status Inventory (Patel, 1997)

Intervention Programme:

The positive education intervention programme was conducted in the experimental group. The positive education intervention programme comprised of five modules namely, resilience, positive emotions, positive relationships, character strengths and meaning in life. The duration of the programme was of 30 hours. Each module of the programme was divided into sessions. Every session was further divided into some activities.

Data Analysis and interpretation:

The data analysis deals with computation of the effect size of the Positive Education Programme, Socio-Economic Status (SES), Faculty of Graduation (FOG) and Marks at Graduation (MAG) on the following variables:

- Academic Resilience (ARS)
- Psychological Well- being (PWB)
- Teacher self- efficacy (TSES)

In order to calculate the effect size of the positive education programme on the dependent variables Wolf's formula was applied. This helped in finding the effectiveness of the treatment on the dependent variables viz, academic resilience, psychological well-being and teacher self- efficacy.

Wolf's formula is as follows: $D = \frac{M_E - M_C}{SD_C}$

Where, M_E = Mean of the experimental group

M_C = Mean of the control group

SD_C = Standard deviation of the control group

The criteria for judging the effect size as given by Wolf is as follows:

Value	Effect size
>0.2,	No Effect
0.2- 0.4	Low Effect
0.4- 0.8	Moderate Effect
<0.8	High Effect



Table 1 shows the effect size of the positive education programme on the dependent variables.

TABLE 1
EFFECT SIZE OF THE POSITIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMME ON THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent/ Moderator variables Dependent Variables	Treatment	SES	FOG	MAG
ARS	1.21	1.23	1.18	1.21
PWBS	1.30	1.38	1.28	1.33
TSES	0.79	0.81	0.77	0.79

The effect size of the treatment, i.e. positive education intervention programme on Pre- service teachers' academic resilience was found to be 1.21 which is high in magnitude. Thus, it can be concluded that the positive education intervention programme has a high effect on academic resilience of pre-service teachers. The effect of SES, FOG and MAG on academic resilience of pre-service teachers is 1.23, 1.18 and 1.21 respectively which is high in magnitude.

The effect size of the positive education intervention programme on psychological well- being of pre- service teachers was found to be 1.30 which is high in magnitude. Thus it can be concluded that the positive education intervention programme has a high effect on psychological well- being of pre-service teachers. The effect of SES, FOG and MAG on psychological well-being of pre service teachers is 1.38, 1.28 and 1.33 respectively which is high in magnitude.

The effect size of the positive education intervention programme on teacher self- efficacy of pre- service teachers was found to be 0.79 which is moderate in magnitude. It is worth noting that the effect size of TSES is just 0.01 less than the score required for high effect. Thus it can be concluded that the positive education intervention programme has a moderate effect on teacher self- efficacy of pre-service teachers. The effect of SES on teacher self- efficacy of pre service teachers is 0.81 which is high in magnitude. The effect of FOG and MAG on teacher self- efficacy of pre service teachers is 0.77 and 0.79 respectively which is moderate in magnitude.

The Conclusion:

The effect size of the treatment, i.e. positive education intervention programme, SES, FOG and MAG on academic resilience and psychological well- being of pre-service teachers is high in magnitude. Whereas the effect size of the treatment, i.e. positive education intervention programme, FOG and MAG on teacher self- efficacy of pre-service teachers is moderate in magnitude. However, the effect size of SES on teacher self- efficacy of pre-service teachers is high in magnitude.

References:

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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719>
Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological





well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 57, No. 6, pp. 1069-1081.

D'souza, M and Pandya, S. (2018). *Positive Education Intervention Programme Outcome on the Psychological Well- being of Pre-service Teachers*. Online International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 187- 195.

D'souza, M. (2021). *Positive Education Intervention Programme Outcome on The Teacher Self- Efficacy of Pre- Service Teachers*. Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies, Vol 9/67, pp. 15987-15994.

Kern, S. E. (2013). *Inferential statistics, power estimates, and study design formalities continue to suppress biomedical innovation*. Retrieved from <https://keydifferences.com/difference-between-descriptive-and-inferential-statistics.html>

Surbhi, S. (2016, May 9). Difference between descriptive and inferential analysis. Retrieved from <https://keydifferences.com/difference-between-descriptive-and-inferential-statistics.html>

Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (1986). *Research in Education* (5th ed). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt Ltd. P.9

Garret, H.E. (1958). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*. New York: Longman, Green and Co. p.461

Guilford, J.P. and Fruchter, B. (1978). *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education*. Auckland: The McGraw Hill Intl. Co.p.242

ANCOVA (Analysis of co variance) retrieved from <https://www.lehigh.edu/~wh02/ancova.html>

Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (2006). *Research in Education* (10th ed). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt Ltd. p. 429.

Cite This Article:

***Dr. Megha D'souza, (2023). Enhancing well- being through Positive Education Programme, *Educreator Research Journal*, Volume–X, Issue– III, May – June 2023, 144-148.**