

Personal well-being among school and university teachers in Arunachal Pradesh during COVID-19 pandemic

Sweta Kaman^{1*}, Rani Jha²

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the personal well-being among school and university teachers in Arunachal Pradesh during the phase of the COVID-19 Pandemic concerning gender, teaching level and age range. The Personal well-being Score (PWS) prepared by Tim Benson, Joe Sladen, Andrew Liles and Henry W W Potts (2019) which is a short version of ONS4 is being used as a tool in our study. The survey sample consists of 68 teachers out of which 21 are school teachers (12 females and 9 males) and 47 are university teachers (25 females and 22 males). The data was collected from various schools and universities of Arunachal Pradesh. The scoring and analysis of the data is as per the PWS. Hypothesis testing is calculated using 'F-Test'. The result showed that (1) There is no significant difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among female and male teachers (2) There is no remarkable difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among university and school teachers and (3) There is a compelling difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among age groups 30-50 and 19-29 and the teachers of the age group 30-50 are having much better personal well-being than the teachers of the 19-29 age groups during the period of COVID-19 pandemic phase.

Keywords: COVID-19, Personal Well-Being Score, Arunachal Pradesh, School Teachers, University Teachers

With the rise in the number of cases due to COVID-19 around the world, the education policies have seen a major change in its structure compared to the previous norms. Regular on-campus classes have been replaced with online computer-based classrooms. This move in the pattern of learning has greatly affected the teaching community both from the students as well as the teacher community. A large number of studies have been reported recently focusing on the effect and influence of online classes on the students. However, fewer detailed studies had been reported from the teacher's perspective of online classes. More specifically in the state of Arunachal Pradesh in North-East part of India.

¹Research Scholar, Department of Science of Intelligence, Indian Institute of Technology Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India

²Associate Professor, Director of Science & Technology, Arunachal University of Studies, Namsai, Arunachal Pradesh, India

*Responding Author

Received: August 31, 2020; Revision Received: September 22, 2020; Accepted: September 27, 2020

Personal well-being among school and university teachers in Arunachal Pradesh during COVID-19 pandemic

The present study is thus an effort to highlight the mindset of the teachers both positive and negative due to the influence of COVID-19 pandemic from a teacher's perspective. The study was a survey based analysis wherein a questionnaire was passed and data was collected from a group of teachers ranging from senior secondary to university level.

Personal well being is a subjective terminology, wherein a person's (herein and after referred to a teacher) emotional status is analyzed based on his or her current exposure to the conditions. This is a self analysis method with evaluations being done based on the answers an individual gives to specific questions that defines the current state of mind. The factors that broadly describe the personal well being of a person are: - a feeling of life satisfaction (generally a work-related factor), sense of purpose and meaning in life (also referred to as eudaimonic well-being factor) and the level of happiness and/or the anxiety measurement (also known as the Hedonistic well-being factor). These factors majorly affect the extent to which a teacher is able to perform in the classroom. After all a happy teacher delivers well in his or her classroom and is able to connect better with the students. The personal well-being factors have also been looked into based on gender and age groups of the teachers.

The onset of the personal well-being score being an important aspect in social life affecting performance has been kicked off by the study done by the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission (2009). The idea was to connect an individual's economic growth (a well paid job) pattern based on his or her social behaviour. A more subjective study has been undertaken by the UK Office of National Statistics (ONS) in the year 2011, wherein, personal well-being questionnaires (ONS4) were set for a more clearer picture of an individual's state of mind. These questions were thus formed under the National statistical Analysis and have been duly approved for use by the Government Statistical Service Harmonised Principle.

The personal well-being score (PWS) thus consists of four questions based on an individual's life-satisfaction goals, eudemonic well-being, level of happiness and the level of anxiety based on the current state of mind according to the social and the economic balance. A similar study has been done to prepare a set of questions to evaluate the personal well-being score of an individual by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

It is a well-known fact that an individual's behaviour, the extent to which he or she can take pressure or adhere to changes may affect his or her health along with the daily performance in personal as well as the professional life. A care model was thus developed by the North-East Hampshire and Farnham (NEHF) under the NHS Vanguard project in the year 2015, to study the relation between an individual's personal state of mind (happy or sad) with his or her actual health conditions to the confidence in life and workplace performance. All these studies suggest a balanced family life being the core to a happy and satisfied life. With the uncertainty of the current time due to COVID-19, the anxiety level has risen both in teachers as well as the students. It is thus equally important that an effort is being made to understand the level and factors affecting emotional balance of the teaching community along with how to keep it under check.

In the present study, effort has been made to keep the questionnaire simple, easy to understand by all concerned age groups under study, are easy to analyze by the individual and therefore takes less time to answer them. The data thus collected was thoroughly

Personal well-being among school and university teachers in Arunachal Pradesh during COVID-19 pandemic

analyzed to maintain simplicity and comparisons were made at each step in order to make this a widely applicable pattern of study now and in near future.

Objective

The objectives are:

1. To understand the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on the personal well-being of school as well as university teachers in Arunachal Pradesh.
2. To understand the difference between personal well-being among school and university teachers on the basis of gender, teaching level and age groups.

METHODOLOGY

Hypothesis

1. There is no substantial difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among female and male teachers.
2. There is no remarkable difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among university and school teachers.
3. There is no compelling difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among age groups 30-50 and 19-29.

Participants

The survey sample was collected using a web-based questionnaire that consisted of sixty-eight teachers of Arunachal Pradesh out of which 21 are school teachers (12 females and 9 males) and 47 are university teachers (25 females and 22 males). There were two age groups (1) 19-29 and (2) 30-50. A total of 68 teachers were equally distributed between the different types of teaching levels, gender and age groups.

Tools

The Personal well-being Score (PWS) prepared by Tim Benson, Joe Sladen, Andrew Liles and Henry W W Potts (2019) which is a short version of ONS4 is being used as a tool in our study. The PWS consists of four PWS items namely (1) I am satisfied with my life (2) What I do in my life is worthwhile (3) I was happy yesterday and (4) I was NOT anxious yesterday. Each PWS item is being scored as follows: Disagree=0, Neutral=1, Agree=2 and Strongly Agree=3 which makes this a 13-point scale from 0 (4×Disagree) to 12 (4×Strongly agree). According to PWS a high PWS is better than a low PWS, i.e higher scores will indicate better mental well-being. The mean summary score and mean item scores are transformed to a 0–100 scale. For the internal consistency Cronbach's α is calculated which is expected to be in between 0.7 and 0.9.

Procedure

Many teachers who are teaching in Arunachal Pradesh both at university as well as school level were contacted and sent a Google Form containing the four items Personal Well-Being Score along with some basic demographic information like age, gender, etc in order to understand their mental state during the phase of COVID-19 Pandemic. The dataset was collected between the dates 18th and 26th July 2020, which was scored according to the scoring instructions mentioned in the PWS. Cronbach's α was generated in order to find out the internal consistency of the items and 'F'-Test was calculated for the hypothesis testing on the basis of which final conclusions were interpreted.

Personal well-being among school and university teachers in Arunachal Pradesh during COVID-19 pandemic

Variable

Independent Variables

- **Gender:** Female and Male
- **Level of Teaching:** University and School
- **Age Groups:** 19-29 and 30-50

Dependent Variable: Personal well-being score.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Frequency counts (%), Item Scores (0-100 scale) and Summary Score (0-100 scale) for each Personal Well-Being Score item

	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (2)	Neutral (1)	Disagree (0)
I am satisfied with my life	41 (62.29%)	1 (1.47%)	7 (10.29%)	19 (27.94%)
What I do in my life is worthwhile	18 (26.47%)	23 (33.82%)	18 (26.47%)	9 (13.23%)
I was happy yesterday	42 (61.76%)	0 (0%)	17 (25%)	9 (13.23%)
I was NOT anxious yesterday	11 (16.17%)	11 (16.17%)	24 (35.29%)	22 (32.35%)
Mean Item Score (0-100 scale)	31	52.3	63.3	33
Mean Summary Score (0-100 scale)	44.83			

The above table no.1 shows the frequency distribution for each PWS item, mean item score and mean summary score on 0–100 scales. After measuring the number of responses, we found out that during the phase of COVID-19 Pandemic, 62.29% of the survey population strongly agrees that they are satisfied with their lives, 32.35% were anxious and stressed out, 33.82% agrees that whatever they do in their lives is worthwhile and 61.76% states that they are happy. The Mean Item Score is calculated using the formula: $(\text{mean item score}) \times 100 / 3$; and the Mean Summary Score is calculated using the formula: $(\text{mean summary score}) \times 100 / 12$.

Table 2 : Internal Consistency of the Personal Well-Being Score items

Variables	Mean Score	Variance	Standard Deviation
I am satisfied with my life	1.93	1.86	1.37
What I do in my life is worthwhile	1.78	0.97	0.99
I was happy yesterday	2.10	1.39	1.19
I was NOT anxious yesterday	1.18	1.15	1.08
Sum of Variances of each Item Scores	5.36		
Variance of Individual Summary Scores	13.10		
Cronbach's α	0.79		

Personal well-being among school and university teachers in Arunachal Pradesh during COVID-19 pandemic

The above table no.2 depicts the internal consistency of the data samples showing the mean score, variance, standard deviation, sum of the variances of each item scores, variance of individual summary scores as well as the Cronbach's α . The Cronbach's α is expected to be between 0.7 and 0.9, that would support the use of the whole summary score as well as the internal consistency. We got the value of Cronbach's $\alpha=0.79$ as shown in table no.2 which shows that this is eligible for further statistical analysis and hypothesis testing and sustains a good internal consistency and reliability of the PWS items.

Table 3 : F-Test between the Personal Well-Being Score of Female and Male Teachers

	Gender		'F' Value	Significance Level (α)
	Female	Male		
Mean Score	7.03	6.94		
Variance	13.58	13.40		
Observations	37(54.4%)	31(45.5%)	1.01	0.05
F Critical Right-Tail	1.81			

The above table no.3 shows the mean scores and variances of personal well-being score among female and male teachers. The mean score of female and male teachers are 7.03 and 6.94 respectively, which indicates that both the female and male teachers are having similar state of personal well-being. The table also shows the F critical right-tail value which is "1.81" and calculated F-value is "1.01" for the significance level at 0.05. This clearly shows that 1.01 is less than 1.81 which states that the F-value comes under the acceptance region. Thus from the result we can state that our hypothesis no.1, "There is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among female and male teachers" is accepted.

Table 4: F-Test between the Personal Well-Being Score of University and School Teachers

	Teaching Level		'F' Value	Significance Level (α)
	University	School		
Mean Score	7.17	7.10		
Variance	14.41	9.69		
Observations	47 (69.11%)	21 (30.88%)	1.49	0.05
F Critical Right-Tail	1.98			

The above table no.4 shows the mean scores and variances of personal well-being score among university and school teachers. The mean score of university and school teachers are 7.17 and 7.10 respectively, which indicates that both the university and school teachers are having similar state of personal well-being. The table also shows the "F critical right-tail value" of "1.98" and calculated F-value of "1.49" for the significance level at 0.05. This

Personal well-being among school and university teachers in Arunachal Pradesh during COVID-19 pandemic

clearly shows that 1.56 is less than 1.98 which states that the F-value comes under the acceptance region. Thus, from the result we can state that our hypothesis no.2, “There is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among university and school teachers” is accepted.

Table 5: F-Test between the Personal Well-Being Score of Age Range 19-29 and Age Range 30-50

	Age Range		'F' Value	Significance Level (α)
	30-50	19-29		
Mean Score	34.92	25.40		
Variance	28.24	4.34		
Observations	25 (36.76%)	43 (63.23%)	6.51	0.05
F Critical Right-Tail	1.78			

The above table no.5 shows the mean scores and variances of personal well-being score among two age groups- 30-50 and 19-29. The mean score of age groups 30-50 and 19-29 are 34.92 and 25.40 respectively, which indicates that the teachers of the age group 30-50 are having much better personal well-being than the teachers of the 19-29 age groups. And also, the table no.6 shows the “F critical right-tail value” of “1.78” and calculated F-value of “6.51” for the significance level at 0.05. This clearly shows that 6.51 is higher than 1.78 which states that the F-value comes under the rejection region. Thus, from the result we can state that our hypothesis no.3, “There is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among age groups 30-50 and 19-29” is rejected.

CONCLUSION

1. There is no significant difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among female and male teachers and both are having similar state of personal well-being during the period of COVID-19 pandemic phase.
2. There is no remarkable difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among university and school teachers and again both are having similar state of personal well-being during the period of COVID-19 pandemic phase.
3. There is a compelling difference between the mean score of the personal well-being score among age groups 30-50 and 19-29 and the teachers of the age group 30-50 are having much better personal well-being than the teachers of the 19-29 age groups during the period of COVID-19 pandemic phase.

REFERENCES

- Benson, T., Sladen, J., Liles, A. and Potts, H.W., (2019) “Personal Wellbeing Score (PWS)—a short version of ONS4: development and validation in social prescribing” *BMJ open quality*, Vol. 8 (2), p.e000394.
- Pfefferbaum, B., and Carol S.N., (2020) "Mental health and the Covid-19 pandemic." *New England Journal of Medicine*.
- Streiner, D. L., Norman, G. R., and Cairney, J. (2015). “Health measurement scales: a practical guide to their development and use.” *Oxford University Press, USA*.

Personal well-being among school and university teachers in Arunachal Pradesh during COVID-19 pandemic

- Stephens, A., Deaton, A., Stone, A. A., (2015) “Subjective well-being, health, and ageing” *Lancet*, Vol. 385, DOI: 10.1136/bmj-2018-000394; Page: 640–8.
- National Research Council. Subjective well-being: measuring happiness, suffering and other dimensions of experience. The National Academies Press, 2014.
- Stiglitz, J., Sen, A., Fitoussi, J.-P., (2009) *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*, www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr.
- Dolan, P., Metcalfe, R., (2012) “Measuring subjective wellbeing: recommendations on measures for use by national governments” *J Soc Policy*, Vol. 41; Pages: 409–427.
- Tinkler, L., (2015) “The Office for National Statistics experience of collecting and measuring subjective well-being” *Statistics in Transition new series*, Vol. 16; Pages: 373–396.
- Allin, P., Hand, D., J., (2017) “New statistics for old? —measuring the wellbeing of the UK” *J R Stat Soc Ser A Stat Soc*, Vol. 180; Pages: 3–43.
- ONS. (2017) “GSS Harmonised principle—Harmonised concepts and questions for social data sources—personal well-being. v2.0 Government Statistical Service” <https://gss.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Personal-Wellbeing-June-17-Pending-informing-SPSC.pdf> [Accessed 26 Feb 2019]
- ONS. (2016) Personal well-being in the UK QMI Newport: Office for National Statistics.
- OECD. (2013) OECD guidelines on measuring subjective well-being. OECD publishing.
- Happy healthy at home project web site (2017) <http://www.happyhealthyathome.org>. [Accessed 17 Dec 2017].
- Benson, T., Sizmur, S., Whatling, J., et al. (2010) “Evaluation of a new short generic measure of health status: howRu” *Inform Prim Care*, Vol. 18; Pages: 89–101.
- Benson, T., Potts, H., W., W., (2014) “A short generic patient experience questionnaire: howRwe development and validation”, *BMC Health Serv Res*, Vol. 14; DOI: 10.1186/s12913-014-0499-z; 499-509.
- Benson, T., Potts, H., W., Bowman, C., (2016) “Development and validation of a short health confidence score” *Value in Health*, Vol. 19; DOI: 10.1016/j.jval.2016.03.1742; Page: A94.
- Stewart-Brown, S., Tennant, A., Tennant, R., et al. (2009) “Internal construct validity of the Warwick-Edinburgh mental well-being scale (WEMWBS): a Rasch analysis using data from the Scottish health education population survey” *Health Qual Life Outcomes*, Vol. 7.
- Fitzpatrick, R., Fletcher, A., Gore, S., et al. (1992) “Quality of life measures in health care. I: applications and issues in assessment” *BMJ*, Vol. 305; Pages: 1074–1077.
- Mokkink, L., B., Terwee, C., B., Patrick, D., L., et al. (2010) “The COSMIN checklist for assessing the methodological quality of studies on measurement properties of health status measurement instruments: an international Delphi study”, *Qual Life Res*, Vol. 19; Pages: 539–49.

Acknowledgements

The authors appreciate all the teachers of Arunachal Pradesh who participated in the study and helped us in facilitating with the data samples.

Conflict of Interest

The author declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Kaman S. & Jha R. (2020). Personal well-being among school and university teachers in Arunachal Pradesh during COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 8(3), 1775-1781. DIP:18.01.182/20200803, DOI:10.25215/0803.182