

Evaluating Happiness Levels Among B.Ed. Trainees in Almora District, Uttarakhand: A Comparative Study

1. **Gauhar Fatima**, Assistant Professor, Department of Education (Government Post Graduate College Purola, Uttarkashi)
2. **Dr. Sangeeta Pawar**, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education (Soban Singh Jeena University Almora)
3. **Dinesh Patel**, Research Scholar, Faculty of Education (Soban Singh University Jeena University Almora)

Abstract

Throughout history, humanity has sought happiness through various methods. In the educational sector, understanding the happiness of B.Ed. trainees is vital for enhancing teaching effectiveness and student outcomes. This study evaluates the happiness levels of B.Ed. trainees from government and self-financed institutions, focusing on career, subjective, social, spiritual, and emotional dimensions. Using a descriptive survey with 100 trainees from Soban Singh Jeena University and Government Postgraduate College, Ranikhet, happiness was measured using a scale by Rastogi and Moorjani (2020). Data analysis included mean, standard deviation, and t-tests. Results showed no significant differences in happiness based on demographics or academic factors, but significant differences were found between government and self-financed institutions. Additionally, career and subjective well-being differed by gender, while social, spiritual, and emotional dimensions showed no significant differences. The study recommends incorporating happiness-focused curricula in teacher training to improve emotional and psychological well-being and educational outcomes.

Keywords: Level of Happiness, B.Ed. Trainees, Demographics, Academic Factors

Introduction

Throughout history, humanity has pursued happiness, exploring many avenues and methods to achieve a state of contentment and well-being. This quest, however, is influenced by the dynamic interplay of societal, cultural, and technological changes. As societies evolve, so do our understanding and definition of happiness. The concept of what constitutes happiness varies among different thinkers and eras. For example, Epicurus posited that pleasure is the core of happiness, emphasizing the importance of feeling good (O'Keefe, 2010).

Conversely, Aristotle discusses the concept of eudaimonia (happiness or flourishing) and how it is achieved through virtuous activity following reason. Here is a specific reference:

"For one swallow does not make a summer, nor does one day; and so too one day, or a short time,

does not make a man blessed and happy. Happiness, then, is something final and self-sufficient, and is the end of action." (Nicomachean Ethics, Book I, Chapter 7)

These divergent views highlight that happiness does not stem from a single source but rather from a complex mix of factors. The subjective nature of happiness complicates its definition and measurement. According to Kringelbach and Berridge (2010), various elements, including personal relationships, work fulfilment, physical and mental health, a sense of purpose, and the capacity to handle life's challenges, significantly influence happiness. Furthermore, happiness plays a critical role in mental health, encompassing positive emotions like joy, peace, and a robust sense of involvement in life (McMahon, 2004). Research by Naghibakht et al. (2015), Sheykhi (2011), and Chow (2005) identifies several primary factors that impact happiness, including gender, income, marital status, education level, job satisfaction, and health promotion. In the words of the founder of Positive Psychology, Seligman (2011), "*Happiness alone is not enough. Positive emotion alienated from the other pillars of well-being can make life pleasant but not meaningful. To have a flourishing life, you must have engagement, good relationships, meaning, and accomplishment.*"

The influence of these factors varies among individuals, reflecting the complex interplay that contributes to overall well-being. This variability underscores the multidimensional nature of happiness and its significance across different contexts of human life. Although there may be diverse opinions regarding the factors contributing to happiness, there is a universal consensus that happiness is essential for a fulfilling life. The happiness of young individuals, particularly those engaged in vocational education to pursue specific careers, holds significant importance as it offers insights into their potential success and fulfilment in their chosen paths. Evaluating the happiness levels of these individuals provides valuable indicators of their overall well-being, satisfaction, and alignment with their vocational aspirations. In particular, aspiring teachers or student-teachers are noteworthy, as they are striving towards a profession that equips individuals for other vocations, so their 'happiness' or, in the words of Fredrickson, 'human flourishing' has substantial merit (Valenzuela, 2022).

Consequently, these individuals' emotional and psychological well-being, often referred to in academic circles as 'happiness', assumes a critical role. For student-teachers, happiness thus implies their own emotional and psychological health and capacity to impact their future students positively. Teachers' well-being directly influences their effectiveness and enthusiasm in the classroom, which in turn affects the academic achievement of their students (Tabbodi et al., 2015).

Review Of Related Studies

Studies have shown that various factors influence teacher trainees' happiness, including academic stress, social support, self-efficacy, and personal life satisfaction. For instance, a study by Kauts and Sharma (2009) found that B.Ed. trainees with higher levels of self-efficacy and lower levels of academic stress reported greater happiness and life satisfaction. Similarly, Huebner et al. (2000) highlighted the importance of peer and mentor social support in enhancing teacher trainees' happiness. A study by Singh and Singh (2019) on

the happiness levels of college students in Uttarakhand indicated that factors such as cultural practices, natural environment, and community support significantly contribute to overall happiness. Eldeleklioğlu et al. (2010) assert that the teacher trainees' psychological well-being did not vary significantly according to gender, income, parents' education levels, residence and success. However, significant differences were found between the family relationships and the father's education level variables. Anand and Singh (2023) found out that male and female trainees with higher happiness levels achieved higher academically, while those with lower happiness levels had lower academic achievement. Female trainees had higher happiness and academic achievement compared to male trainees. Hamre and Pianta (2006) concluded that personal relationships, family support, and social interactions within the training institution are also crucial for overall well-being. Furthermore, the quality of infrastructure, availability of resources, and administrative support in teacher training institutions play a vital role in shaping trainees' happiness (Wubbels et al., 2006).

Need and Significance of the Study

Research has shown that happy teachers are more effective in the classroom, enhancing student outcomes (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005), and assessing the level of happiness among B.Ed. trainees allow educators and policymakers to develop strategies that cultivate a positive learning environment, fostering teacher happiness and student success. The teaching profession is often associated with high-stress levels and burnout (Kyriacou, 2001). This study aims to identify early stress indicators and implement preventive measures to support future teachers' mental health and well-being throughout their careers. Fisher (2011) examined stress factors among secondary teachers and suggested crucial measures at the training level to mitigate these issues.

Teacher training programs shape future educators' attitudes, beliefs, and practices. Investigating the happiness of B.Ed. trainees provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of current training methodologies and inform the development of more holistic approaches that prioritize academic and emotional preparation for the teaching profession. Day and Qing (2009) highlight the importance of emotional well-being and its impact on teaching effectiveness. Despite growing interest in positive psychology and well-being, more research should be done explicitly focusing on the happiness of B.Ed. trainees. This study seeks to fill this gap by generating empirical evidence on the subjective well-being of future educators, thereby enriching existing knowledge on teacher education and professional development.

Objectives of the Study

- To compare the level of happiness among B.Ed. trainees based on different demographic (gender and nature of residence) and academic factors (academic streams and administrative type of B.Ed. Institutions)
- To compare the various dimensions of the level of happiness among B.Ed. trainees based on different demographics and academic factors.

Hypotheses of the Study

1. There is no significant difference in the level of happiness among sub-groups of B.Ed. trainees identified based on gender.
2. There is no significant difference in the level of happiness among sub-groups of B.Ed. trainees are identified based on the nature of the residence.
3. There is no significant difference in the level of happiness among sub-groups of B.Ed. Trainees identified based on different academic streams.
4. There is no significant difference in the level of happiness among sub-groups of B.Ed. trainees identified based on the administrative type of B.Ed. Institutions.

(A test of this hypothesis was proposed to be undertaken between the above-mentioned demographic and academic factors, viz. gender, nature of residence, academic streams and administrative type of institutions B.Ed. trainees in terms of different dimensions of happiness)

Delimitation

The present study delimits to the pupil teachers of B.Ed. Level studying in the Almora district of Uttarakhand.

Population and Sample

The population for the study comprises of 200 B.Ed. trainees pursuing B.Ed. degree programme from Soban Singh Jeena University Campus Almora and Government Postgraduate College, Ranikhet Uttarakhand, fifty pupil teachers from each institute were selected using a random sampling technique to constitute a hundred B.Ed. trainees.

Methodology

In the present study, a descriptive survey methodology was utilized, carefully aligned with the stated objectives of the study.

Applied Tools

Researchers have applied the Happiness Scale developed by Rastogi and Moorjani (2020) for the present study.

Statistical Techniques

The statistical techniques viz. mean, standard deviation, and t-test had been employed to compare the level of happiness among B.Ed. trainees based on different demographic and academic factors.

Analysis and Interpretation

Hypothesis 1.0: There is no significant difference in the level of happiness among sub-groups of B.Ed. trainees identified based on gender.

Table 1.0 Happiness Levels of B.Ed. Trainees by Gender

S.No.	Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	Degree of Freedom	't' Value	Result
1	Male	267.18	22.75	98	1.63	Insignificant
2	Female	259.59	20.43			

From the observation of Table 1.0, it is evident that among the B.Ed. level male and female teacher trainees, the mean scores on happiness are 267.18 and 259.59, respectively. Upon comparing the averages of both groups, a t-value of 1.63 was obtained, which was not significant at the 0.05 level. The absence of significant differences in happiness levels based on gender suggests that B.Ed. programs are potentially fostering an environment that promotes equality and inclusivity.

A comparison of the level of happiness between male and female B.Ed. trainees in terms of career well-being, subjective well-being, social well-being, spiritual well-being, and emotional well-being are presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Gender Differences in Dimensions of Happiness Among B.Ed. Trainees

Dimensions of Happiness	Gender	N	Mean	SD	df	't' Value	Result
Career Well-being	Male	25	1.32	0.55	98	2.630**	Significant (at 0.01 level)
	Female	75	1.77	0.79			
Subjective Well-being	Male	25	1.84	0.94	98	1.972*	Significant (at 0.05 level)
	Female	75	2.26	0.93			
Social well-being	Male	25	2.20	0.76	98	1.470	Insignificant
	Female	75	2.45	0.74			
Spiritual Well-being	Male	25	2.56	0.86	98	0.824	Insignificant
	Female	75	2.69	0.63			
Emotional Well-being	Male	25	2.20	0.57	98	1.880	Insignificant
	Female	75	2.49	0.70			

The results from Table 1.1 indicate that among B.Ed. trainees, career and subjective well-being scores are moderately higher for female B.Ed. trainees with mean scores of 1.32 and 1.84, respectively, compared to male B.Ed. trainees with mean scores of 1.77 and 1.84. The obtained 't' values for both dimensions are 2.630 and 1.972, respectively, significant at the 0.01 and 0.05 levels, showing a significant difference between male and female B.Ed. trainees in terms of career well-being and subjective well-being.

In contrast, no statistically significant differences were observed in dimensions of social well-being, spiritual well-being, and emotional well-being. This suggests that across these dimensions, the levels of happiness among B.Ed. trainees remain consistent or uniform.

Hypothesis 2.0: There is no significant difference in the level of happiness among sub-groups of B.Ed. Trainees are identified based on their nature of residence.

Table 2.0: Comparison of Happiness Levels of B.Ed. Trainees by Nature of Residence

S.No.	Nature of Residence	Mean	Standard Deviation	Degree of Freedom	't' Value	Result
1	Rural	260.35	22.23	98	0.54	Insignificant
2	Urban	262.73	20.78			

After the observation of Table 2.0, it is evident that the mean values of happiness among rural and urban B.Ed. trainees are 260.35 and 262.73, respectively. The obtained t-value is 0.54, which is insignificant at a 0.05 level. The similar levels of happiness among rural and urban B.Ed. trainees could stem from their exposure to standardized curriculum and training programs due to the quality of the teaching-learning experience.

A comparison of the level of happiness between rural and urban trainees in terms of career well-being, subjective well-being, social well-being, spiritual well-being, and emotional well-being is reflected in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Comparison of Happiness Dimensions in Rural and Urban B.Ed. Trainees

Dimensions of Happiness	Nature of Residence	N	Mean	Sd	df	't'	Result
Career Well-being	Rural	41	1.80	.90	98	1.584	Insignificant
	Urban	59	1.55	.65			
Subjective Well-being	Rural	41	2.34	.91	98	1.604	Insignificant
	Urban	59	2.03	.96			
Social Well-being	Rural	41	2.41	.83	98	0.272	Insignificant
	Urban	59	2.37	.69			
Spiritual Well-being	Rural	41	2.73	.70	98	0.853	Insignificant
	Urban	59	2.61	.69			
Emotional Well-being	Rural	41	2.48	.74	98	0.825	Insignificant
	Urban	59	2.37	.64			

An analysis of scores obtained by rural and urban B.Ed. trainees on different dimensions of happiness (career, subjective, social, spiritual, emotional), as reflected in table 2.1, revealed no statistically significant differences in the independent t-tests carried out between rural and urban B.Ed. trainees. All p-values exceeded the conventional threshold for statistical significance (typically $p < 0.05$), leading to a conclusion that supports the null hypothesis. The results suggest that there is no significant difference in the different dimensions of happiness among B.Ed. trainees based on their rural or urban backgrounds.

Hypothesis 3.0: There is no significant difference in the level of happiness among sub-groups of B.Ed. trainees identified based on different academic streams.

Table 3.0: Comparison of Happiness Levels of B.Ed. Trainees by Academic Stream

S.No.	Academic Stream	Mean	Standard Deviation	Degree of Freedom	't' Value	Result
1	Science	264.55	20.86	98	1.17	Insignificant
2	Arts	259.52	21.57			

After observing Table 3.0, it is evident that the mean values of happiness scores among Science and Arts stream B.Ed. trainees are 264.55 and 259.52, respectively. The obtained t-value is 1.17, which is not significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, no significant difference was found in the happiness among B.Ed. trainees.

Table 3.1 compares happiness levels between the science and arts stream of B.Ed. trainees based on the different dimensions of happiness.

Table 3.1: Comparison of Happiness Dimensions Across Science and Arts Streams in B.Ed. Trainees

Dimensions of Happiness	Stream	N	Mean	SD	df	't' Value	Result
Career Well-being	Science	46	1.67	0.73	98	0.166	Insignificant
	Art	54	1.64	0.80			
Subjective Well-being	Science	46	2.13	0.97	98	0.286	Insignificant
	Art	54	2.18	0.92			
Social well-being	Science	46	2.36	0.71	98	0.250	Insignificant
	Art	54	2.40	0.76			
Spiritual Well-being	Science	46	2.69	0.75	98	0.469	Insignificant
	Art	54	2.62	0.65			
Emotional Well-being	Science	46	2.34	0.73	98	.0973	Insignificant

Upon analyzing the various dimensions of happiness—career, subjective, social, spiritual, and emotional—among B.Ed. trainees from science and arts streams in Table 3.1, the derived t-values do not indicate any statistically significant differences. The respective t-values of 0.166, 0.286, 0.250, 0.469, and 0.0973 for career, subjective, social, spiritual and emotional well-being provide substantial support for the null hypothesis. These findings collectively suggest that there exist no significant disparities in the levels of happiness across the different dimensions among B.Ed. trainees based on their academic stream. This evidence underscores the conclusion that the academic stream, whether science or arts, does not significantly influence the various aspects of happiness among B.Ed. trainees.

Hypothesis 4.0: There is no significant difference in the level of happiness among sub-groups of B.Ed. trainees identified based on the administrative type of B.Ed. Institutions.

Table 4.0: Comparison of Happiness Levels of B.Ed. Trainees by Type of Institution

S.No.	Administrative type of Institution	Mean	Standard Deviation	Degree of Freedom	't' Value	Result
1	Government	265.92	21.01	98	1.96*	Significant (at 0.05 level)
2	Govt. Self-financed	257.66	21.98			

After observing table 4.0, it is evident that the mean values of happiness scores among B.Ed. trainees of Government and Government Self-Financed B.Ed. Colleges are 265.92 and 257.66, respectively. The obtained t-value is 1.96, which is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, a significant difference was found in the happiness level among B.Ed. trainees based on their type of Institution. The higher mean value of 265.92 on the happiness scores obtained by the trainees pursuing B.Ed. programme government institution compared to the mean value of 257.66 obtained by the trainees affiliated with government self-financed institutions, which may be attributed to the better quality of teaching-learning experience received by the trainees in the former administrative set-up.

Table 4.1 depicts the comparison of the level of happiness across the sub-groups of B.Ed. trainees belonging to the government and government self-financed B.Ed. Institutions based on the different dimensions of happiness.

Table 4.1: Comparison of Happiness Levels in Government and Self-Financed Institutions

Dimensions of Happiness	Institution	N	Mean	SD	df	't' value	Result
Career Well-being	Government	50	1.54	0.76	98	1.573	Insignificant
	Govt. Self Financed	50	1.78	0.76			
Subjective Well-being	Government	50	1.98	0.97	98	1.919	Insignificant
	Govt. Self Financed	50	2.34	0.89			
Social Well-being	Government	50	2.36	0.77	98	0.398	Insignificant
	Govt. Self Financed	50	2.42	0.73			
Spiritual Well-being	Government	50	2.60	0.67	98	0.857	Insignificant
	Govt. Self Financed	50	2.72	0.72			
Emotional Well-being	Government	50	2.38	0.72	98	0.583	Insignificant
	Govt. Self Financed	50	2.46	0.64			

Upon the observation of Table 4.1, it is evident that across all five dimensions of well-being measured—career, subjective, social, spiritual, and emotional—the results consistently show no significant differences between government and government self-financed B.Ed. Institutions.

Conclusion

Among B.Ed. trainees, no significant differences were obtained in the level of happiness based on gender. Additionally, no significant differences were observed in the level of happiness based on the nature of residence and academic stream among B.Ed. trainees. However, significant differences were

found in the level of happiness based on the administrative type of Institution among B.Ed. trainees in line with parallel studies (Bjørnskov et al., 2010; Ounprasertsuk, 2022; Blessinger, 2012). Moreover, significant differences were observed in career and subjective well-being dimensions among male and female B.Ed. trainees. Disparities in the career and subjective well-being among male trainees may stem from varying societal expectations, resulting in disparate happiness levels. Conversely, no significant differences were identified in other dimensions such as social, spiritual, and emotional well-being.

Educational Implications

Based on the findings presented above, it can be inferred that:

- Integration of happiness within the educational curriculum has the potential to enrich teacher training programs.
- Educators should implement systematic surveys to identify potential determinants of happiness among teacher trainees.
- It is imperative for educators and administrators to carefully consider factors influencing the career prospects and subjective well-being of trainees, particularly focusing on male participants, to mitigate any potential disparities and foster overall happiness and success.

References:

- Anand, V., & Singh, S. P. (2023). Happiness and academic achievement of D.El.Ed. Trainees. *International Journal for Research in Education (IJRE)*, 12(09), 1–5.
- Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book I, Chapter 7.
- Bjørnskov, C., Dreher, A., & Fischer, J. A. V. (2010). Formal institutions and subjective well-being: Revisiting the cross-country evidence. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 26(4), 419-430
- Blessinger, P. (2012). What role should education play in creating happiness?.
- Chow, H. P. (2005). Life satisfaction among university students in a Canadian prairie city: A multivariate analysis. *Social indicators research*, 70, 139–150.
- Day, C., & Qing, G. (2009). Teacher emotions: Wellbeing and effectiveness. In L. J. Saha & A. G. Dworkin (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching* (pp. 253-264). Springer.
- Direkvand Moghadam, A., Kaikhavani, S., & Sayehmiri, K. (2013). The worldwide prevalence of premenstrual syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis study. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research*, 7(6), 645-650.
- Eldeleklioğlu, Jale & Yılmaz, Aynur & Gültekin, Filiz. (2010). Investigation of teacher trainees' psychological well-being in terms of time management. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2. 342-348. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.022.
- Fisher, M. H. (2011). Factors influencing stress, burnout, and retention of secondary teachers. *Current Issues in Education*, 14(1).
- Huebner, E. S., Gilman, R., & Laughlin, J. E. (2000). A Multimethod Investigation of the Multidimensionality of Children's Well-Being Reports: Discriminant Validity of Life Satisfaction and Self-Esteem. *Social Indicators Research*, 51(2), 223–244.
- Kauts, A., & Sharma, N. (2009). Effect of yoga on academic performance in relation to stress. *International Journal of Yoga*, 2(1), 39-43.
- Kringelbach, M. L., & Berridge, K. C. (2010). The Neuroscience of Happiness and Pleasure. *Social Research (New York)*, 77, 659 – 678.
- Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 53(1), 27–35.
- Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(6), 803-855.
- McMahon, D. M. (2004). From the happiness of virtue to the virtue of happiness: 400 BC-AD1780. *Daedalus*, 133(2), 5-17.

- Naghibakht, N., Mirmahdi, S. R., & Abdollahi, L. (2015). Identifying and ranking the effective factors on happiness among students of elementary level in Ilam city. *Journal UMP Social Sciences and Technology Management*, 3(3), 247-50.
- O'Keefe, T. (2010). *Epicureanism*. Acumen Publishing.
- Ounprasertsuk, J., Ruksachat, J., Rojanabenjakun, P., Benjanirat, T., Jaroengarmsamer, P., Tiya-phom, N., & Sillabutra, J. (2022). The environment of educational institutes and learning happiness of students: A cross-sectional survey Rajabhat University, Thailand. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(2), 2911–2920.
- Rastogi, M., & Moorjani (2020): Happiness Scale. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Seligman, Martin E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A Visionary New Understanding of Happiness and Well-being*. Free Press.
- Sheykhi, M. T. (2011). Happiness among the Youth in Tehran, Iran, A sociological perspective. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 2(1), 39-46.
- Tabbodi, M., Rahgozar, H., & Makki Abadi, M. M. (2015). The relationship between happiness and academic achievements. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings*, 4(1 (s)), pp-241.
- Valenzuela, P. (2022). Fredrickson on Flourishing through Positive Emotions and Aristotle's Eudaimonia. *Conatus-Journal of Philosophy*, 7(2), 37-61.
- Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., den Brok, P., & van Tartwijk, J. (2006). An interpersonal perspective on classroom management in secondary classrooms in the Netherlands. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Classroom Management: Research, Practice, and Contemporary Issues* (pp. 1161-1191).



IJRTI