

POSITIVE EDUCATION: EXPLORING STUDENTS' WELL-BEING FRAMEWORK IN INDONESIA

Yoga Setyo Wibowo *, Farida Agus Setiawati, Siti Rahmi Qodriah, Yulia Ayriza
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
*e-mail: yogasetyo.2018@student.uny.ac.id

Abstract: Positive education is a general term to describe an intervention and an empirically validated program that draws on positive psychology to promote students' well-being. To date, there is no well-being measurement developed specifically for use in the Indonesian context. This article explores positive education, its relation to students' well-being, and its relationship to the concept of the Positive Emotions, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishment (PERMA model) in the Indonesian context. The sample used was 434 students in Yogyakarta Province. The data were analyzed using exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis. The research instrument was adapted from the Positive Affect and Negative Affect Scale for Children (PANAS-C), the EPOCH (Engagement, Perseverance, Optimism, Connectedness, and Happiness), Measure of Adolescent Well-being, and Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ). The results showed that (1) the well-being of students in Indonesia is structured into eight dimensions: pleasure, passion, excitement, engagement, relationship, presence, search, and accomplishment, and (2) confirmatory factor analysis shows that the eight dimensions show a better fit model than the PERMA model. Therefore, it is concluded that the well-being of high school students in Indonesia does not follow the "PERMA" model.

Keywords: Positive education, well-being, students

PENDIDIKAN POSITIF: EKSPLORASI KERANGKA KESEJAHTERAAN SISWA DI INDONESIA

Abstrak: Pendidikan positif adalah istilah umum yang digunakan untuk menggambarkan intervensi dan program yang divalidasi secara empiris dari psikologi positif yang berdampak pada kesejahteraan siswa. Namun, hingga saat ini tidak ada ukuran yang dikembangkan secara spesifik dengan konteks Indonesia. Artikel ini mengeksplorasi pendidikan positif, hubungannya dengan kesejahteraan siswa, dan hubungannya dengan konsep model PERMA (Positive Emotions, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishment) dalam konteks Indonesia. Sampel yang digunakan adalah 434 siswa di Provinsi Yogyakarta. Teknik analisis data menggunakan analisis faktor eksploratori dan analisis faktor konfirmatori. Instrumen penelitian diadaptasi dari *positive affect and negative affect scale-children scale (PANAS-C)*, *EPOCH (Engagement, Perseverance, Optimism, Connectedness, and Happiness)*, *Measure of Adolescent well-being* dan *Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ)*. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa (1) siswa kesejahteraan di Indonesia terstruktur dari delapan dimensi: kesenangan, gairah, kegembiraan, keterlibatan, hubungan, kehadiran, pencarian, dan prestasi. (2) Analisis faktor konfirmatori menunjukkan bahwa delapan dimensi menunjukkan model kesesuaian yang lebih baik daripada model PERMA. Oleh karena itu, dapat disimpulkan bahwa kesejahteraan siswa sekolah menengah di Indonesia tidak mengikuti model PERMA.

Kata Kunci: Pendidikan positif, kesejahteraan, siswa

INTRODUCTION

Positive education is a general term used to describe interventions and programs that are empirically validated in positive psychology that has an impact on student well-being (Seligman & Adler, 2018; White & Murray, 2015) Although it is a new term in the world of education, positive education derives from the Aristotle's view that the purpose of human life is to prosper (Trask-Kerr et al., 2019) In addition, White and Murray

(2015) also explained that positive education is also an empirical implementation of Seligman's theory namely the PERMA Model. The question that arises from this is why positive education is important to be implemented in schools, especially in Indonesia?

Some experts have previously argued that positive education is a pertinent issue in the development of children in schools (Boniwell, 2015; White & Murray, 2015). This is due to the fact that challenges in the education sector are

getting more complex such as students' low academic achievement, poor levels of students' engagement, and high levels of students' anxiety. For example, Cheung et al. (2020) cross-sectional survey study shows that anxiety and stress trends among international students are increasing. In addition, Dassanayake et al. (2017) reported that at least 5% of students under their study experienced mental disorders at school. Furthermore, Data from the National Center of Educational Statistics (2015) show that children aged 12 to 18 frequently experienced bullying at school particularly those in grades six (27.8%) and seven (26.4%) (DeVoe & Murphy, 2011). On the other hand, the results of the PISA assessment show that 30% of students in the world did not engage with the activities carried out at school. Then, how can positive education work?

Although not all experts agree that positive education can solve educational problems (see: Kristjánsson, 2012; Reveley, 2015; Kern et al., 2015) and (White & Murray, 2015) show that it helps to address such issues. For example, (Levy, 2018) explains that the PEACE (Positive Education about Aging and Contact Experiences) Model can be applied to reduce ageism. The results of the study prove that students who have poor relationship with their parents and teachers experience better attitude changes. In addition, the results of previous studies show that schools that include positive education as a curriculum, such as Geelong Grammar School and St. Peter's College (Seligman et al., 2009) show better results compared to when they did not apply positive education.

Seligman (2011) stated that the implementation of positive education must consider the character and values of the school because each school may have its unique strengths and culture. Thus, it can be concluded that the first stage of implementing positive education is to measure the well-being of students and the academic community and develop them according to the context and culture of the school (Brunzell et al., 2016). In line with this, (White & Murray, 2015) argues that the implementation of positive education in schools must have a plan and be part of the school curriculum, at least in the next five years, which will help to set clear goals, objectives, and strategies. Therefore, the availability of measurement instruments for objective evaluation is important.

In 2011, Seligman (2011) introduced the PERMA model (Positive Emotions, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplish-

ment), where well-being is defined in five dimensions, namely positive emotions, involvement, positive relationships, meaning, and accomplishment. Seligman (2011) believes that the best way to achieve well-being is by combining two perspectives called hedonic and eudemonic. Therefore, Kern et al. (2016) explained that with the existence of significant positive educational benefits, schools need to consider how to best build and support student well-being.

Previous research evidence shows that students who have high levels of well-being have better benefits compared to those who do not. For example, the results of the literature review conducted by Seligman et al. (2009) show that positive education can increase student resilience, positive emotions, and involvement in schools. Brunzell et al. (2016) found that students who have a strong character, such as having high levels of resilience tend to have better school performance and attainment. This means that students who have high levels of well-being will be able to actively engage in the lessons and have meaningful learning experiences, which are important in succeeding the implementation of improvement programs in schools (Riedel et al., 2020).

There is evidence that well-being plays a crucial role in the development of adolescents, especially in schools. Lately, well-being instruments have been integrated into the framework of positive education but there are at least two problems found. First, research results show that scales such as EPOCH (Kern et al., 2016) PERMA-Profiler (Kern et al., 2015) are not robust on cultural effects. Second, the results of previous studies only focused on developed countries such as Germany, Italy, China, and Australia. The development of positive education in developing countries like Indonesia has been underexplored.

The results of the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) in 2018 show that Indonesia's reading scores ranked 72 out of 77 countries, math scores ranked 72 out of 78 countries, and science scores ranked 70 out of 78 countries, indicating that there are problems in the education system in Indonesia (Wibowo et al., 2020). Although the ministry of education and culture has done various ways to improve student achievements such as changes and revisions of the curriculum to adjust it to the market demand, research results show that Indonesia's achievements over the past ten years have not increased (Pratiwi, 2019). Indonesia, over the

past 20 years, has always occupied place among the five countries with the lowest achievement in PISA.

Responding to the results, the Indonesian government through the ministry of education and culture introduced a new program called *Merdeka Belajar* (Freedom to Learn), one of the programs aimed at creating a happy learning atmosphere in schools for students and teachers. (Kusumaryono, 2020) explained that the program was designed based on comprehensive studies tailored to the needs of the market. This education program includes four policy points, one of which is to erase the final exam system, and replace it with a new system, namely the Minimum Competency Assessment and Character Survey, following the assessment benchmarks contained in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), but still maintaining local wisdom (Kusumaryono, 2020).

Essentially, this new program and positive education have two things in common. First, the two programs have the same perspective on education. According to White and Murray (2015) positive education conceives that the flow of positive psychology is important to be applied in schools for increasing the levels of well-being among students and teachers. At the same time, *Merdeka Belajar* program also conceives that an evaluation of the atmosphere of the school, classes, and how to create a happier school to support the achievement of student outcomes was emphasized. Second, these two programs also emphasize an objective evaluation of the character of students, the well-being of school members included in the school curriculum. This has also been a concern of PISA since 2000 until now. Based on these similarities, we believe that it is important to develop well-being measures that are appropriate to the Indonesian context. Bearing this in mind, in the future, educational evaluations and student development are not limited to achievement, but also to psychological contexts such as the atmosphere of the school and the psychological well-being of students and teachers.

Although well-being measurement has been widely developed in the framework of the positive education in a country, there is still the potential for an element of cultural bias in dimensions that are more culturally influenced, such as achievement, emotions, and social relationships with others. According to Seligman (2011),

positive education should be also adjusted to the cultural context of the school. Based on a brief description of the condition, three contributions to the literature have been made in this study. First, there were in-depth explorations focusing on student well-being in the Indonesian context, following previous research which shows that cross-cultural research on well-being is important because well-being has the potential to be biased towards culture. Second, this study tested the suitability of the model and the comparison of the well-being model of the PERMA model with the well-being found in Indonesian culture. This was to answer whether PERMA's robust model in Indonesia was contextualized and whether well-being, based on exploration results, was in line with student well-being in Indonesia. Third, this research is expected to be used in the future as a theoretical foundation for implementing positive education, especially for *Merdeka Belajar* program in Indonesia.

METHODS

Participants

There were 434 participants in this study (male = 201; average age = 16 with SD = 2.12) who were students from three high schools in Yogyakarta Province. The distribution of participants' age in this study was as follows: 13 years (n = 1, 0.23%); 14 years (n = 1, 0.23%); 15 years (n = 63, 14.52%); 16 years (n = 202, 46.54%); 17 years (n = 136, 31.34%); 18 years (n = 29, 6.68%), and 19 years (n = 2, 0.46%). Slovin's formula was used to determine the population. All participants received an informed consent. In this study, multistage random sampling was chosen to determine samples that could represent the population. Ayriza et al. (2019) explained that multistage random sampling is used to collect random and stratified samples according to specific units.

Measure

The first measurement included the demographic data that was used to determine the characteristics of the study sample. Demographic questions included age, sex coded with dummy variable 1 = female; 0 = male, school coded 1 = school a; 2 = school b; and 3 = school 3. To measure well-being, we followed previous research that well-being has a multidimensional construct consisting of positive emotions; engagement, positive and meaningful relation, and accomplishment. Data on the well-being of high school students were obtained by using an

adaptation scale: 1) Positive affect and negative affect scale – for children (PANAS-C), but we limited it to the dimensions of positive emotions and one part of negative emotions namely stress. Because the results of previous studies show that there is an increase in student stress levels at school, as shown in the data obtained through EPOCH (Engagement, Perseverance, Optimism, Connectedness, and Happiness) and Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ). All instruments were translated in Indonesian language and content validity was conducted by a linguist (see appendix).

Data Analysis

The analysis process was carried out in three stages. In the first stage, we explored factor analysis using SPSS version 22. Indicators used in the EFA were: 1) to determine the feasibility of the sample using KMO and the Bartlett test of sphericity and 2) to calculate the number and load dimensions using Total Variance Explained. This study saw the similarity of common variants using varimax orthogonal factor rotation (Hair Jr. et al., 2014). In the second stage, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis using Lisrel 8.80. If the results of the exploratory factor analysis produced different dimensions of the PERMA model, then we conducted a comparison test of the model produced from exploratory with the PERMA model. Next, to test the suitability of the model, we used χ^2 , χ^2 / df , RMR, RMSEA, TLI, and CFI (Brown, 2015; Hair et al., 2014).

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis

The EFA results show that KMO = 0.926 with the Bartlett Test of Sphericity of 9776,382 ($p < 0.01$), meaning that the results were good. Furthermore, the anti-image results also show that the entire anti-image correlation matrix was greater than 0.05 which was between 0.522 - 0.954, so it could be concluded that each item could explain the measured manifest. In addition, based on the results of the rotation factor, eight dimensions were found that made up the well-being of students in Indonesia: pleasure, arousal, excitement, engagement, positive relations, presence, search, and accomplishment (Table 1). Pleasure, arousal, and excitement were dimensions that were formed by positive emotions, while presence and search were formed by the dimension of meaning.

Based on the Table 1, it was also known that the search dimension was the largest dimension that could explain student well-being (29.54%), followed by positive relationships (7.3%), pleasure (4.95%), presence (4.46%), arousal (3.57%), accomplishment (3.57%), excitement (2.82%) and engagement (2.77%). Here, we explained these dimensions in more detail, arranged according to the frequency at which the items cluster together to form the dimensions mentioned.

Search. The dimension one was named search because this dimension was formed from items such as M2 “*Saya mencari sesuatu yang membuat hidup saya terasa bermakna*” (I’m searching for something that makes my life feel meaningful), M3 “*Saya aktif mencari untuk menemukan tujuan hidup saya*” (I am actively searching for my purpose in life), M7 “*Saya aktif mencari sesuatu yang membuat hidup saya lebih bermakna*” (I am actively searching for something that makes my life more meaningful), M8 “*Saya mencari tujuan atau misi hidup saya*” (I am searching for the purpose or mission of my life) and M10 “*Saya mencari makna dalam hidup saya*” (I’m searching for meaning in my life). Based on these findings, we concluded that the search for meaning was the motivation to make sense of life that must be fulfilled by itself because meaningfulness was in nature not a condition that is inherited from birth. In this research, it was known that the search for meaning is the main dimension in well-being because it accounts for 29.54% of the well-being levels of students in Indonesia.

Positive relation. The second dimension was given the name positive relations because this dimension was formed from positive relations items such as R6 “*Ada orang dikehidupan saya yang sangat mempedulikan saya*” (There are people in my life who really care about me), R7 “*Ketika saya memiliki masalah, ada seseorang yang ada untuk saya*” (When I have a problem, there is someone there for me) dan R8 “*Saya merasa dicintai*” (I feel loved). Based on these findings, we defined positive relations as a feeling of being socially integrated, cared for, supported by others, and in a loving relationship with others. In this study, positive relations were able to explain the well-being of 7.3% of the total variance.

Pleasure. The third dimension was named pleasure because this dimension was formed from the items of the positive emotion such as the P1 “*Cheerful*” item, P2 “*Happy*”, P4 “*Happy*”,

and P8 "Happy". Following Russell's (1980) opinion, emotions such as cheerfulness, and happiness were emotions that were formed from high pleasure and low arousal. This means that these items were interpreted by adolescents as emotions of pleasure but little encouragement to be expressed. In this study, the pleasure was able to explain the well-being of 4.95% of the total variance.

Presence. The name of presence came from the items of the meaning dimension such as the item R9 "*Saya merasa bahwa hidup saya memiliki tujuan*"(I feel that my life has a purpose), M1 "*Saya mengerti arti hidup saya*" (I understand the meaning of my life), M4 "*Hidup*

saya memiliki tujuan yang jelas" (My life has a clear purpose), M5 "*Saya bisa merasakan apa yang membuat hidup saya bermakna*" (I can feel what makes my life meaningful) dan M6 "*Saya telah menemukan tujuan hidup yang memuaskan*" (I have found a fulfilling life purpose). Based on these items, we concluded that presence was a feeling of having a purposeful direction in which meaning has been inherent literally since birth. This was different from the search for meaning, which emphasized the search for meaning in life to become a complete human being. In this study, presence accounts for 4.46% of the total variance.

Table 1. Exploratory of the Well-being Factor

Item	Pleasure	Arousal	Excitement	Engagement	Relationship	Presence	Search	Accomplish
P1	.726							
P2	.815							
P4	.783							
P8	.763							
P14	.451							
P5		0.421						
P6		0.779						
P7		0.629						
P11		0.738						
P12		0.587						
P13		0.342						
P3			0.662					
P9			0.497					
P10			0.727					
E2				0.635				
E3				0.515				
E4				0.625				
E5				0.555				
R1					0.455			
R2					0.547			
R3					0.388			
R4					0.586			
R5					0.706			
R6					0.738			
R7					0.755			
R8					0.639			
R9						0.711		
M1						0.677		
M4						0.657		
M5						0.4		
M6						0.532		
M9						0.673		
M2							0.712	
M3							0.741	
M7							0.765	
M8							0.787	
M10							0.772	
A1								0.716
A2								0.719
A3								0.671
A4								0.717

Item	Pleasure	Arousal	Excitement	Engagement	Relationship	Presence	Search	Accomplish
A5								0.505
A6								0.5
% of variance	4.957	3.57	2.824	2.771	7.307	4.466	29.541	3.57
Total % of	4.957	8.527	11.351	14.122	21.429	25.895	55.436	59.006

Arousal. Arousal name in the fourth dimension came from items of the positive emotion dimension such as items P6 "No Fear", P11 "Dare" and P12 "Strong". Based on these items we concluded that arousal was an evaluation of strong positive emotions such as being brave and strong about living conditions. Significant differences with pleasure were different experimental rates. In arousal emotions, individuals were more expressive than in pleasure. In this study, arousal accounts for 3.57% of the total variance.

Accomplishment. We followed Kern et al. (2015) who explained that accomplishment was defined as a feeling of being able to go about everyday life including making progress towards set goals and having a sense of achievement. That was because this dimension was formed from all items in *accomplishment* such as A1 "Saya menyelesaikan apapun yang saya mulai" (I finish whatever I start), A2 "Saya berusaha untuk menyelesaikan pekerjaan yang telah saya rencanakan sebelumnya" (I'm trying to finish the work I had planned in advance), A3 "Saya seorang pekerja keras" (I'm a hard worker), A4 "Saya mampu menyelesaikan semua tugas sekolah sampai selesai" (I am able to complete all school assignments), A5 "Hampir setiap hari saya merasakan pencapaian dari apa yang saya lakukan" (Almost every day, I have a sense of accomplishment from what I have done) dan A6 "Selama dua minggu terakhir, saya senang menyelesaikan tugas yang sulit dilakukan" (For the past two weeks, I have enjoyed completing difficult tasks). In this study, accomplishment accounts for 3.57% of the total variance.

Excitement. Excitement was a combination of P3 "energetic" items, P9 "excited" and P10 "active". Russell (1980) explained that such emotions form equal levels of pleasure and arousal. In these emotions, adolescents have pleasure and would also show that pleasure with the same magnitude, so that emotions tend to be expressed. However, the difference with arousal was in the level of the impulse to express. In the excitement dimension which had the same drive and balances it would show a more stable and not excessive expression

compared to arousal. In this study, excitement contributes to 2.82% of the total variance.

Engagement. Appleton et al. (2006) explained that student involvement in school could be seen through students' attitudes towards ownership of school, student involvement in learning and behavior in school. The analysis shows that the engagement dimension accounts for 2.7% of the total variance. Engagement dimensions were formed from all engagement items such as E2 "Saya menyukai apa yang sedang saya lakukan" (I like what I'm doing), E3 "Saya terlibat dalam kegiatan yang dilakukan" (I am involved in the activities being carried out), E4 "Ketika saya melihat pemandangan yang indah, saya sangat menikmatinya" (When I see a beautiful sight, I really enjoy it) dan E5 "Saya merasa tertarik dengan kegiatan yang dilakukan" (I feel interested in the activities being carried out).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Based on the CFA results, it was known that model 2 ($\chi^2 = 2017.83$, $\chi^2 / df = 2,425$, RMR = 0.047, RMSEA = 0.061, TLI = 0.96 and CFI = 0.97) had a better model compatibility compared to model 1 ($\chi^2 = 4100.53$, $\chi^2 / df = 2.134$, RMR = 0.034, RMSEA = 0.089, TLI = 0.91 and CFI = 0.93). However, the measurement model evaluation results show that model 2 had a loading factor between 0.34 - 0.88, while model 1 had a loading factor between 0.1 - 0.79. Based on this, it was necessary to modify the student well-being model. Model modification was only done on model 2. We removed some items (for example: P5 cross-loads with pleasure; R1 cross-loads with dimensions of excitement, engagement, search and accomplishment; and R2 cross-loads with excitement and engagement).

Well being Model	χ^2	χ^2/df	RM	RMSE	TL	CF
		f	R	A	I	I
Model 1	4100.53	2.13	0.03	0.089	0.9	0.9
Model 2	2017.8	2.42	0.04	0.061	0.9	0.9
Model 3	930.77	2.13	0.03	0.058	0.9	0.9

Based on the GOF CFA test results after modification, it was known that model 3 had a better fit model ($\chi^2 = 930.77$, $\chi^2 / df = 2.134$, RMR = 0.034, RMSEA = 0.058, TLI = 0.97 and CFI = 0.98) compared to the model 2 ($\chi^2 = 2017.83$, $\chi^2 / df = 2,425$, RMR = 0.047, RMSEA = 0.061, TLI = 0.96 and CFI = 0.97) and 1 ($\chi^2 = 4100.53$, $\chi^2 / df = 2.134$, RMR = 0.034, RMSEA = 0.096, CFI = 0.97) and 1 ($\chi^2 = 4100.53$, $\chi^2 / df = 2.134$, RMR = 0.034, RMSEA = 0.089, TLI = 0.91 and CFI = 0.93). In addition, all loading factors range between 0.53 - 0.88, so it could be concluded that the loading factor was a model 3. The loading factor exceeded the desired standard of 0.50 (Hair, 2014) indicating that the convergent validity was acceptable. In addition, using the value of the loading factor, the results of the analysis also show that the composite reliability of the eight dimensions of student well-being ranged from 0.81 - 0.94, where the pleasure dimension had $\alpha = 0.94$; arousal $\alpha = 0.83$; Excitement $\alpha = 0.85$; Engagement $\alpha = 0.81$; Relation Positive $\alpha = 0.81$; Presence $\alpha = 0.87$; Search $\alpha = 0.92$; accomplishment $\alpha = 0.86$, showing that the eight dimensions of well-being had good reliability (Brown, 2015; Hair, 2014; Raykov et al., 2010) On the other hand, the correlation between latent variables show acceptable discriminant validity, ranging from 0.22 to 0.7 (Brown, 2015; Hair Jr. et al., 2014).

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to explore positive education, its relation to student well-being, and its relationship to the concept of the PERMA model in the Indonesian context. The results of the study are expected to provide operational applications for the development of positive education in schools (Halliday et al., 2019). This research was divided into two stages. The first stage was an exploratory study aimed at explaining whether well-being in students was manifested according to the theoretical model described by Seligman. Furthermore, in the second stage, confirmatory analysis was used to confirm whether the theory of demand for the (Seligman, 2012) model was robust in the Indonesian population.

The results of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) show that well-being is manifested in a multidimensional context. These results are in line with previous studies by Giangrasso (2021); Lai et al. (2018); Pezirkianidis et al. (2021) and Wammerl et al. (2019) Interestingly, in this study, we found that in Indonesia the dimensions of student well-being

were formed from eight dimensions: search (29.54%), positive relationships (7.3%), pleasure (4.95%), presence (4.46%), arousal (3.57%), accomplishment (3.57%), excitement (2.82%) and engagement (2.77%). The eight dimensions that were formed had a total variance explaining the contribution of 59.24%. Then the question was why this happened and what distinguished it from the previous concept. In this section, we explained one by one why this happened.

If we focused on the process of forming the dimensions of pleasure, presence, and arousal, we found that the three dimensions were formed through the items of positive emotions. More than 40 years ago, Russell, (1980) has provided a description that emotions cannot stand alone independently of others (e.g., positive emotions and negative emotions). But the emotional dimension was an interrelated dimension in a very systematic way. Russell, (1980) explained that there are eight emotional concepts that are divided into a circle and are interrelated namely: pleasure (0 °), excitement (45 °), arousal (90 °), distress (135 °), displeasure (180 °), depression (225 °), sleepiness (270 °), and relaxation (315 °). For example, there is a question about the differences between happiness and satisfaction. Following the difference is in the expression, happiness is an emotion formed from pleasure and a lot of arousals, conversely, satisfaction is formed from pleasure and a lot of sleepiness. This difference results in different expressions of these two positive emotions. Then the next discussion, did this also occur in the meaning dimension?

In general, the meaning of life is interpreted from two different perspectives. The first perspective defines meaning as the coherence of life in life. For example, the meaning of life is felt when one has lived in accordance with the goals set (Ryff, 2013). Meanwhile, the second perspective defines it as the search for meaning in life. This perspective arises because not all universal meanings fit into everyone's life (Frank, 1959). Every person is forced to create meaning in his own life either through the pursuit of important goals or the development of a coherent narrative of life. In short from that explanation, in Indonesia, students demarcate life goals into two different dimensions, namely presence and search.

Furthermore, the confirmatory factor analysis results show that the eight-dimensional contract ($\chi^2 = 930.77$, $\chi^2 / df = 2.134$, RMR = 0.034, RMSEA = 0.058, TLI = 0.97 and CFI = 0.98) are better than the five dimensional ($\chi^2 =$

4100.53, $\chi^2 / \chi^2 / df = 2.134$, RMR = 0.034, RMSEA = 0.089, TLI = 0.91 and CFI = 0.93). These differences may occur due to the influence of culture. For example, previous research from Khaw and Kern (2015) found that the Malaysian sample had lower values on all dimensions of well-being compared to the American sample. Starting from that assumption, we found that the positive aspects of emotion from three robust dimensions in Indonesia. It is in line with previous research which found that positive emotions cannot be generalized into one because positive emotions such as being happy and satisfied have a slightly different core in expressing them (Russell, 1980).

Based on the findings of this study and the *Merdeka Belajar* program that will be carried forward, we suggest that schools in Indonesia can use a multidimensional scale from this study. Besides, developed based on the concept of student well-being in Indonesia, construct validity and composite reliability have shown good results. More dimensions provide greater benefits for the application of positive education or independent learning programs in Indonesia (Kern et al., 2015). Based on the results of PISA 2018, it is shown that 30% of students have a low level of engagement (e.g., at school). In addition, PISA research shows that 15% of students in Indonesia do not have a clear sense of the meaning of life (OECD, 2020). Base on this result, schools can also use this scale to confirm whether there are students in the school who do not have a clear sense of it, so the school can arrange the right program to overcome these problems.

Riedel et al. (2020) explained that redesigning lessons and learning contexts to make schools more interesting can help improve well-being. Based on the research of (Wibowo et al., 2020) it was found that engagement, positive emotion, and peer support had a positive effect on student achievement in Indonesia. It was further strengthened by the argument on the importance of implementing positive education in schools. We hope once positive education has been successfully implemented in Indonesia in 2022, Indonesia will be able to get out of the poor achievements of the past 20 years.

Some restrictions must be recognized. First, although this study shows that there were eight dimensions that makeup student well-being, these results have not been proven to be used in schools that have different cultures from the sample in Indonesia. Indonesia is an archipelagic

country and there are 652 languages and 1,340 tribes. Future cross-sectional research is needed to prove that this scale can be used throughout Indonesia. Second, future research should examine the effect of the eight dimensions of student well-being on student achievement or objective achievement. Finally, in this study, we stand on scales that have proven robust in Europe. Future research is also expected to develop its own instruments based on the findings of the dimensions in this study so that the application of positive education can be more in line with the concept developed by Seligman (2011). Finally, based on this research, we hope to provide an operational definition and well-being instrument for the application of positive education in Indonesia, or so-called *Merdeka Belajar*. We hope the Indonesian education system can improve so that student achievement can be better.

CONCLUSION

School is where most children and adolescents spend time studying. As such, schools play an important role in building and maintaining positive cultural values and promoting well-being for young people. By measuring well-being based on Indonesian culture, it is expected to increase the potential to be more successful in promoting student well-being. The findings in this study open up opportunities to increase the success of positive education programs in Indonesia, especially the *Merdeka Belajar* program. On the other hand, this study found that the well-being of Indonesian students has eight dimensions that are different from the previous well-being concept. These findings further prove the importance of exploring the well-being framework in each country to implement positive education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Ministry of Research and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia for funding this research as well as Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta and several schools that have supported this research.

REFERENCES

- Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(5), 427–445.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.04.002>

- Ayriza, Y., Setiawati, F. A., Nurhayati, S. R., Gumelar, S. R., & Sholeha, E. P. D. R. (2019). Does sleep quality serve as a mediator between well-being and academic achievement? *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 38(1), 63–74.
<https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v38i1.22181>
- Boniwell. (2015). *Positive education series editor*. Evidence-Based Approaches in Positive Education.
- Brown, T. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. Guilford publications.
- Brunzell, T., Stokes, H., & Waters, L. (2016). Trauma-Informed Positive Education: Using Positive Psychology to Strengthen Vulnerable Students. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 20(1), 63–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-015-0070-x>
- Cheung, D. K., Tam, D. K. Y., Tsang, M. H., Zhang, D. L. W., & Lit, D. S. W. (2020). Depression, anxiety and stress in different subgroups of first-year university students from 4-year cohort data. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 274(March), 305–314.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.05.041>
- Dassanayake, W., Springett, J., & Shewring, T. (2017). The impact on anxiety and depression of a whole school approach to health promotion: evidence from a Canadian comprehensive school health (CSH) initiative. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion*, 10(4), 221–234.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1754730X.2017.1333913>
- DeVoe, J., & Murphy, C. (2011). Student Reports of Bullying and Cyber-Bullying: Results from the 2007 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey. Web Tables. NCES 2011-316. *National Center for Education Statistics*, May, 1–52.
- Frank, V. E. (1959). *Man 's Search for Meaning*.
- Giangrasso, B. (2021). Psychometric properties of the PERMA-Profiler as hedonic and eudaimonic well-being measure in an Italian context. *Current Psychology*, 40(3), 1175–1184.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-0040-3>
- Hair. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis*. Prentice hall. Upper Saddle River.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/013813263>
- Hair Jr., J. F., Black, W. C., Barry J. Babin, & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Pearson new international edition: Multivariate data analysis*. Pearson.
- Halliday, A. J., Kern, M. L., Garrett, D. K., & Turnbull, D. A. (2019). The student voice in well-being: a case study of participatory action research in positive education. *Educational Action Research*, 27(2), 173–196.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2018.1436079>
- Kern, M. L., Benson, L., Steinberg, E. A., & Steinberg, L. (2016). Supplemental Material for The EPOCH Measure of Adolescent Well-Being. *Psychological Assessment*, 28(5), 586–597.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000201.supp>
- Kern, M. L., Waters, L. E., Adler, A., & White, M. A. (2015). A multidimensional approach to measuring well-being in students: Application of the PERMA framework. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 10(3), 262–271.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.936962>
- Khaw, D., & Kern, M. L. (2015). A cross-cultural comparison of the PERMA model of well-being. *Undergraduate Journal of Psychology at Berkeley*, 1, 1–22.
- Kristjánsson, K. (2012). Positive Psychology and Positive Education: Old Wine in New Bottles? *Educational Psychologist*, 47(2), 86–105.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.610678>
- Kusumaryono. (2020). *Merdeka Belajar*.
- Lai, M. K., Leung, C., Kwok, S. Y. C., Hui, A. N. N., Lo, H. H. M., Leung, J. T. Y., & Tam, C. H. L. (2018). A multidimensional PERMA-H positive education model, general satisfaction of school life, and character strengths use in Hong Kong senior primary school students: Confirmatory factor analysis and path analysis using the APASO-II. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(JUN), 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01090>
- Levy, S. R. (2018). Toward Reducing Ageism: PEACE (Positive Education about Aging and Contact Experiences) Model. *Gerontologist*, 58(2), 226–232.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnw116>

- Pezirkianidis, C., Stalikas, A., Lakioti, A., & Yotsidi, V. (2021). Validating a multidimensional measure of wellbeing in Greece: Translation, factor structure, and measurement invariance of the PERMA Profiler. *Current Psychology*, *40*(6), 3030–3047. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00236-7>
- Pratiwi, I. (2019). PISA Effect On Curriculum In Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan*, *4*(1), 51.
- Raykov, T., Dimitrov, D. M., & Asparouhov, T. (2010). Evaluation of scale reliability with binary measures using latent variable modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *17*(2), 265–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511003659417>
- Reveley, J. (2015). Foucauldian Critique of Positive Education and Related Self-technologies: Some problems and new directions. *Open Review of Educational Research*, *2*(1), 78–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2014.996768>
- Riedel, R., Vialle, W., Pearson, P., & Oades, L. G. (2020). Quality Learning and Positive Education Practice: the Student Experience of Learning in a School-Wide Approach to Positive Education. *International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology*, *5*(1–2), 53–75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41042-020-00029-5>
- Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*(6), 1161–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0077714>
- Ryff, C. D. (2013). Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, *83*(1), 10–28. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000353263>
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2012). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Simon & Schuster.
- Seligman, M. E. P., Ernst, R. M., Gillham, J., Reivich, K., & Linkins, M. (2009). Positive education: Positive psychology and classroom interventions. *Oxford Review of Education*, *35*(3), 293–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980902934563>
- Seligman, & Adler. (2018). *Chapter 4. Positive education*. Global Happiness Policy Report.
- Trask-Kerr, K., Quay, J., & Slep. (2019). A Deweyan positive education: psychology with philosophy. *Oxford Review of Education*, *45*(6), 786–801. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2019.1625761>
- Wammerl, M., Jaunig, J., Mairunteregger, T., & Streit, P. (2019). The German Version of the PERMA-Profiler: Evidence for Construct and Convergent Validity of the PERMA Theory of Well-Being in German Speaking Countries. *Journal of Well-Being Assessment*, *3*(2–3), 75–96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41543-019-00021-0>
- White, M. A., & Murray, A. S. (2015). *Building a positive institution. Evidence-Based Approaches in Positive Education*. Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9667-0>
- Wibowo, Y. S., Setiawati, F. A., Qodriah, S. R., Nizenyumukiza, E., & Ayriza, Y. (2020). Do School Climate and Subjective Well-Being Affect Student Achievement in Indonesia?: A Linear Regression Analysis. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, *10*(2), 183–191. <https://doi.org/10.23960/jpp.v10.i2.202004>