Optimizing Health and Happiness - A Study on the Well-Being of SNSEP-OIC Students Through the PACES Framework

Jason Sinlasart Button[1], Wachirawit Sripanich[2], Woramet Chatsriphiboon[3], Juanito A. Como Jr.[4]

[1,2,3,4]Saint Nicholas School, Thailand, 65000

Email address: jasnotty123@gmail.com, wachirawits1234@gmail.com, boom25zth3@outlook.co.th, echo_como@yahoo.com

Abstract— *This research study aimed to investigate the well-being of students at Saint Nicholas School-English Programme OIC (SNSEP-OIC) across Grades 7 to 12 using the PACES (Physical, Affective, Cognitive, Economic, and Social) framework. Employing a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected from 88 respondents, representing 82.24% of the total population, through simple random sampling. Data analysis involved frequency and percentage distribution, mean computation, and the Pearson Correlation Coefficient. The findings revealed that students generally report high levels of agreement in their well-being across all PACES dimensions. Significant correlations were found between grade levels and well-being, with physical well-being consistently significant across all grades. Affective well-being showed the strongest connections in Grades 8, 9, and 12, while social well-being displayed varied associations. The study emphasizes the need for tailored support mechanisms to address students' well-being comprehensively, fostering holistic development throughout their academic journey.*

Keywords— *Student Well-Being, PACES Framework, Descriptive-Correlational Study, Grade Levels, Holistic Development.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The global pandemic has significantly disrupted education, profoundly impacting student well-being. Understanding the multifaceted dynamics of student well-being has emerged as critical, with scholars like Van Petegem et al. (2007) and Anderson and Graham (2016) highlighting the importance of exploring students' emotional landscapes and sense of agency. These factors are pivotal in shaping overall happiness and psychological well-being, revealing the intricate interplay between individual psychology and broader institutional contexts.

Henrich (2020) underscores the role of public support systems in buffering crises' adverse effects on students, while Becchetti and Pisani (2014) emphasize economic determinants such as family income and socioeconomic status in shaping life satisfaction and well-being. Torres, Madera, and Basilio's (2023) research into Southeast Asian learners, including those in Thailand, offers culturally sensitive insights, highlighting the unique cultural and socio-environmental factors influencing student experiences. These studies collectively provide nuanced perspectives on the structural and socioeconomic determinants of well-being in educational contexts.

Addressing student well-being requires a multifaceted approach that validates individual emotions, mobilizes institutional resources, addresses systemic inequalities, and fosters culturally responsive practices. By synthesizing insights from diverse research contexts, educators, policymakers, and stakeholders can develop comprehensive strategies to promote student well-being and resilience amid ongoing challenges posed by the pandemic and other societal stressors.

The global outbreak has undoubtedly imparted changes on the way people live, as well as introducing unprecedented challenges to students' lives and their well-being. Beyond its immediate health implications, the pandemic has significantly impacted students' educational, psychological, and social well-being.

The conceptual framework for this research study is based on the PACES model, a comprehensive approach developed by Nelson, Tarabochia, and Koltz (2015), which identifies five interconnected domains crucial to student well-being: Physical, Affective, Cognitive, Economic, and Social. These domains are not isolated but intricately linked, shaping the overall landscape of student wellness. Together, they form a cohesive framework that offers a holistic perspective on student well-being.

Fig. 1. Interactive domains of the PACES framework of student well-being

Understanding how these domains are interconnected is crucial, as they work together to shape and enhance various aspects of student well-being. The PACES framework, renowned for its effectiveness in improving school counseling

programs, acts as a valuable resource for evaluating and meeting the well-being requirements of students.

This research seeks to delve into the following central research inquiries:

1. What is the demographic of the respondents in terms of grade level?
2. How may the well-being of students be described in terms of physical, affective, cognitive, economic, and social?
3. Is there a correlation between student demographic (grade level) and the well-being of students in terms of physical, affective, cognitive, economic, and social?

In the context of this study, the PACES framework is employed to identify and understand the well-being of the student-respondents. These strategies will address the unique needs and challenges faced by students, ultimately fostering their overall welfare and development. This research seeks to contribute valuable insights to educators and counselors, facilitating a comprehensive understanding of student well-being and promoting effective strategies for their sustained support and growth.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design and Population

The researchers conducted a descriptive-correlational study to investigate the dimensions of health and happiness among students at Saint Nicholas School-English Programme – Oxford International Curriculum (SNS EP-OIC), located at 228 Wisutkasat Road, Muang District, Phitsanulok, Thailand. Using the PACES framework (Physical, Affective, Cognitive, Economic, and Social well-being), the study aimed to provide a comprehensive assessment of student welfare. A total of 88 students, representing approximately 82.24% of the entire student population from Grades 7 to 12, were selected through a simple random sampling technique, ensuring equitable representation across different grade levels. This approach enhances the study's reliability and generalizability, offering valuable insights into how these aspects of well-being operate within an international educational context and suggesting implications for targeted interventions and policy development to promote student health and happiness.

B. Research Instruments and Data Gathering Tools

To facilitate a comprehensive assessment, a survey questionnaire, translated into Thai and administered via Google Forms, facilitated comprehensive data collection among respondents, ensuring accessibility and understanding.

Focused on assessing students' perceptions of well-being using the PACES (Physical, Affective, Cognitive, Economic, and Social) framework, the survey employed a 5-point Likert scale:

TABLE 1. 5-Point Likert Rating Scale.

Weight/Scale	Mean Range	Verbal Interpretation
1	1.00 – 1.79	Strongly Disagree
2	1.80 – 2.59	Disagree
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Agree
4	3.40 – 4.19	Agree
5	4.20 – 5.00	Strongly Agree

In this study, negative survey statements were carefully crafted to assess nuanced perceptions among respondents. These statements require attention to ensure respondents interpret them correctly. For instance, respondents were instructed to consider statements like " *I do not have time for relaxation.*" with care, understanding that agreeing with such statements indicates a lack of confidence. Clear instructions were provided at the onset of the survey to guide respondents on how to interpret and respond to negatively worded items, aiming to minimize ambiguity and enhance the accuracy of data collection. This scale facilitated a nuanced assessment of student perspectives.

Responses were meticulously recorded and analyzed to identify variations in self-confidence levels and English language acquisition among students. The questionnaire, comprising 55 questions, was tailored to capture students' well-being perceptions within the PACES framework, following a rigorous translation process to ensure clarity and relevance.

The data gathering instrument was adapted from Torres et al.'s (2023) study titled "HOW ARE YOU? EXPLORING THE WELL-BEING OF NDCFC STUDENTS TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A HOLISTIC SELF-CARE PROGRAM," aiming to gain insights into health and happiness optimization among students at Saint Nicholas School English Programme - Oxford International Curriculum (SNSEP-OIC). This approach provided a nuanced understanding of student well-being aspects, informing targeted interventions and support strategies.

C. Statistics

In conducting this research, several statistical tools were utilized to analyze the gathered data comprehensively. First, frequency and percentage distribution were used to interpret the demographic characteristics of the respondents, which provided an overview of the composition of the research sample. The 5-Point Likert rating scale, ranging from (5) Strongly Agree to (1) Strongly Disagree, was utilized to gauge students' perceptions regarding their well-being across multiple dimensions aligned with the PACES (Physical, Affective, Cognitive, Economic, and Social) framework.

Mean calculations were employed to determine the average scores and ascertain the range of responses among the respondents. This statistical measure helped in understanding the central tendencies of students' perceptions on their well-being.

Additionally, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r) was applied to explore the linear relationship between different variables, specifically examining the correlation between student demographics based on grade level and their well-being as measured through the PACES framework. This statistical analysis provided insights into how demographic factors may influence students' overall well-being across various dimensions.

Overall, the application of these statistical tools enabled a rigorous examination of the data, offering valuable insights into the relationships and patterns within the study, thereby contributing to a deeper understanding of student well-being in educational settings.

III. RESULTS

A. Demographic Profile of the Respondents in terms of Grade Level

TABLE 2. Demographic Profile of the Respondents in terms of Grade Level.

Grade Level	No. of Students	Percent (%)
Grade 7	20	20.88
Grade 8	16	18.68
Grade 9	22	25.27
Grade 10	7	8.79
Grade 11	9	12.09
Grade 12	14	14.29
Total	**88**	**100**

Table 2 illustrates the distribution of respondents according to their grade levels at Saint Nicholas School-English Programme - OIC. The study included a total of 88 students, with varying representation across different grades. Grade 9 accounted for the largest proportion of respondents, comprising 25.00% (n = 22) of the total sample. This was followed by Grade 7, which constituted 22.73% (n = 20) of the respondents, and Grade 8 with 18.18% (n = 16). Meanwhile, Grades 10, 11, and 12 comprised 7.95% (n = 7), 10.23% (n = 9), and 15.91% (n = 14) of the sample, respectively. The distribution reflects a predominance of Grade 9 students among the respondents.

B. The Well-Being of Students Described through PACES (Physical, Affective, Cognitive, Economic, Social) Framework

TABLE 3. The Well-Being of Students Described through PACES (Physical, Affective, Cognitive, Economic, Social) Framework.

PACES Framework	Overall Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Physical	2.38	Disagree
Affective	3.48	Agree
Cognitive	3.41	Agree
Economic	3.50	Agree
Social	3.65	Agree

Table 3 presents a comprehensive overview of students' well-being across the PACES (Physical, Affective, Cognitive, Economic, Social) framework. Physically, students indicated a mean score of 2.38, suggesting a general disagreement with statements related to physical pain and relaxation time, while also recognizing issues with nutrition and physical activity. This indicates a nuanced perception of their physical health, where they may not experience significant pain but acknowledge room for improvement in lifestyle habits.

In terms of affective well-being, the overall mean score was 3.48, reflecting a positive outlook. Students expressed agreement in areas such as joy of learning, feeling connected to their school community, emotional stability, and a sense of purpose and direction in life. This suggests that students derive satisfaction and fulfillment from their academic and social experiences, contributing positively to their overall emotional health.

Cognitive well-being scored an overall mean of 3.41, indicating students' positive attitudes towards their educational engagement and academic achievements. They perceive their educational activities as purposeful and demonstrate confidence in their academic abilities, suggesting a strong cognitive foundation and active participation in learning processes.

Economically, students reported an overall mean score of 3.50, indicating agreement with statements regarding their family's financial stability, access to necessary resources for education, and freedom from financial worries. This reflects a sense of security and support in their economic circumstances, which contributes to their overall well-being and academic performance.

Socially, students demonstrated an overall mean score of 3.65, indicating strong agreement with aspects of social health, effective communication through social media platforms, and supportive relationships with family, teachers, and friends. Students feel understood, accepted, and supported within their social networks, highlighting the importance of positive social interactions in their overall well-being.

C. Correlation Analysis of Student Demographic (Grade Level) and Well-Being through PACES (Physical, Affective, Cognitive, Economic, Social) Framework

TABLE 4.1. The Correlation Analysis between Grade Level and Physical Well-Being.

Grade Level	Overall Mean	p-value	r	Results
7	2.25	0.0000273	0.7957	Significant
8	2.26	0.001145	0.7363	Significant
9	2.30	0.0001337	0.7253	Significant
10	2.40	0.00001042	0.9922	Significant
11	2.64	0.002298	0.8699	Significant
12	2.59	0.0001214	0.8493	Significant

Table 4.1 illustrates a detailed correlation analysis between grade levels and physical well-being, revealing consistent and significant positive correlations across Grades 7 to 12. Grade 7 shows a strong positive correlation (r = 0.796, p = 0.0000273), indicating a notable link between Grade 7 students and their physical well-being. Similarly, Grade 8 (r = 0.736, p = 0.001145) and Grade 9 (r = 0.725, p = 0.0001337) also exhibit significant positive correlations, suggesting meaningful connections with physical well-being throughout early secondary school years. Grade 10 demonstrates an even stronger positive correlation (r = 0.992, p = 0.00001042), implying a robust relationship with physical well-being as students progress further. Additionally, Grade 11 (r = 0.870, p = 0.002298) and Grade 12 (r = 0.849, p = 0.0001214) both display significant positive correlations, indicating substantial associations with physical well-being in the later years of secondary school. These findings collectively highlight that as students advance from Grade 7 to Grade 12, there is a consistent and significant relationship between their grade level and their perceived physical well-being, underscoring the importance of age-related factors in understanding and promoting students' physical health across their academic journey.

Table 4.2 provides a detailed analysis of the correlation between grade levels and affective well-being, revealing varying results across Grades 7 to 12. Grade 7 shows a non-significant small positive correlation (r = 0.222, p = 0.3472), indicating no significant relationship between Grade 7 students and their affective well-being.

TABLE 4.2. The Correlation Analysis between Grade Level and Affective Well-Being.

Grade Level	Overall Mean	p-value	r	Results
7	3.56	0.3472	0.2218	Not Significant
8	3.67	0.002301	0.7047	Significant
9	3.88	0.008704	0.5451	Significant
10	2.63	0.4819	0.3216	Not Significant
11	2.73	0.1540	0.3216	Not Significant
12	3.46	0.007842	0.6769	Significant

In contrast, Grade 8 exhibits a significant large positive correlation (r = 0.705, p = 0.002301), suggesting a notable link between Grade 8 students and positive affective well-being. Similarly, Grade 9 demonstrates a significant moderate positive correlation (r = 0.545, p = 0.008704), implying a meaningful connection between Grade 9 students and their affective well-being. Conversely, Grade 10 displays a non-significant moderate correlation (r = 0.322, p = 0.4819), indicating no significant relationship. Grade 11 also shows a non-significant moderate positive correlation (r = 0.322, p = 0.1540), suggesting no meaningful link with affective well-being. Notably, Grade 12 demonstrates a significant large positive correlation (r = 0.677, p = 0.007842), indicating a strong connection between Grade 12 students and their affective well-being. These findings underscore that significant correlations are observed in Grades 8, 9, and 12, with Grade 8 and 12 students exhibiting the strongest relationships with their affective well-being, highlighting important distinctions in affective development across different stages of secondary education.

TABLE 4.3. The Correlation Analysis between Grade Level and Cognitive Well-Being.

Grade Level	Overall Mean	p-value	r	Results
7	3.66	6.371e-9	0.9236	Significant
8	3.38	0.000001639	0.9033	Significant
9	3.97	0.0001556	0.7205	Significant
10	2.70	0.58	0.2557	Not Significant
11	2.69	0.000002042	0.9831	Significant
12	3.04	0.001355	0.7674	Significant

Table 3.3 presents the correlation analysis between students' grade levels and their cognitive well-being, revealing diverse relationships across different grades. Grades 7, 8, and 9 show significant positive correlations (r = 0.9236, 0.9033, and 0.7205 respectively, all p < 0.001), indicating robust associations with cognitive well-being. This suggests that students in these grades exhibit notable cognitive engagement and satisfaction. Conversely, Grade 10 displays a non-significant relationship (r = 0.2557, p = 0.58), suggesting a lack of significant impact on cognitive well-being at this grade level. However, Grade 11 and Grade 12 demonstrate strong significant correlations (r = 0.9831 and 0.7674 respectively, both p < 0.001), indicating pronounced connections with cognitive well-being. These findings underscore the varying impacts of grade levels on students' cognitive well-being, with Grades 7, 8, and 9 showing substantial effects while Grades 10, 11, and 12 depict differing levels of significance. Overall,

significant correlations are observed in Grades 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12, with the strongest relationships found in Grades 11 and 12.

TABLE 4.4. The Correlation Analysis between Grade Level and Cognitive Well-Being.

Grade Level	Overall Mean	p-value	r	Results
7	3.77	5.784e-7	0.8711	Significant
8	3.38	0.0007528	0.7534	Significant
9	4.25	0.00000117	0.8374	Significant
10	2.49	0.7657	0.1393	Not Significant
11	2.20	0.0142	0.7746	Significant
12	3.23	0.00002618	0.8848	Significant

Table 4.4 illustrates the correlation analysis between students' grade levels and their economic well-being, revealing varied patterns across different grades. Grades 7, 8, and 9 exhibit significant positive correlations (r = 0.8711, 0.7534, and 0.8374 respectively, all p < 0.001), indicating strong links between these grades and economic well-being. This suggests that students in Grades 7, 8, and 9 perceive their economic situation positively, reflecting confidence in financial stability and access to resources. Conversely, Grade 10 displays a non-significant relationship (r = 0.1393, p = 0.766), suggesting no significant impact on economic well-being at this grade level. Grade 11 shows a moderate positive correlation (r = 0.7746, p = 0.014), indicating a modest link with economic well-being. In contrast, Grade 12 demonstrates a strong positive correlation (r = 0.8848, p = 0.000), highlighting a notable connection with economic well-being among senior students. These findings underscore the distinct relationships between grade levels and economic well-being, emphasizing significant effects in Grades 7, 8, and 9, while Grades 10, 11, and 12 present differing levels of significance. Overall, significant correlations are observed in Grades 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12, with the strongest relationships seen in Grades 7, 9, and 12.

TABLE 4.5. The Correlation Analysis between Grade Level and Social Well-Being.

Grade Level	Overall Mean	p-value	r	Results
7	3.85	0.1399	0.3421	Not Significant
8	3.95	0.04215	0.5130	Significant
9	4.35	0.00001205	0.7904	Significant
10	2.34	0.3276	0.4364	Not Significant
11	2.56	0.2915	0.3960	Not Significant
12	3.20	0.8536	0.05436	Not Significant

Table 4.2 presents the correlation analysis between students' grade levels and their social well-being, revealing diverse relationships across different grades. Grade 7 shows a non-significant moderate positive correlation (r = 0.342, p = 0.1399), indicating no significant relationship between Grade 7 students and their social well-being. Conversely, Grade 8 exhibits a significant moderate positive correlation (r = 0.513, p = 0.04215), suggesting a notable link between grade 8 students and their social well-being. Grade 9 demonstrates a significant large positive correlation (r = 0.790, p = 0.00001205), implying a meaningful connection between Grade 9 students and their social well-being. In contrast,

Grades 10, 11, and 12 display non-significant correlations, suggesting no significant relationships with social well-being at these grade levels. These findings indicate that while Grades 8 and 9 exhibit stronger relationships with social well-being, Grades 7, 10, 11, and 12 do not show significant associations. Overall, significant correlations are observed in Grades 8 and 9, highlighting varying impacts of grade levels on students' social well-being in secondary education.

IV. DISCUSSIONS

Table 2 provides an overview of the distribution of respondents according to their grade levels at Saint Nicholas School-English Programme - OIC. Out of the total 88 students surveyed, Grade 9 had the highest representation, comprising 25.00% (n = 22) of the sample. The distribution indicates a predominance of younger students, particularly those in Grade 9, which may influence the overall findings related to student well-being and perceptions. This skew in distribution aligns with research by Anderson and Graham (2016), who noted that younger students often participate more actively in school surveys and initiatives. Understanding this distribution is crucial for interpreting the data accurately, as the higher representation of certain grades might highlight specific developmental or educational challenges prevalent among those age groups (Van Petegem et al., 2007; Soutter et al., 2014). This distribution can also help tailor targeted interventions and support mechanisms to address the unique needs of students at different stages of their educational journey, reinforcing the need for age-specific strategies in promoting student well-being (Bladek, 2021; van Den Bogerd et al., 2020).

Table 3 provides a comprehensive analysis of students' well-being across physical, affective, cognitive, economic, and social domains, revealing diverse perceptions. The data shows general disagreement with physical issues, indicating a positive view of physical health among students. Affective well-being is notably high in Grades 8, 9, and 12, highlighting the importance of emotional support and engagement as underscored by studies like Anderson & Graham (2016). Cognitive well-being also receives positive feedback, particularly in Grades 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12, suggesting students feel confident in their academic abilities. This underscores the significance of addressing both cognitive and socio-emotional factors for comprehensive student welfare, as emphasized by Carroll et al. (2021).

Economic well-being is perceived positively, especially in Grades 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12, reflecting students' sense of financial stability. Social well-being shows significant correlations in Grades 8 and 9, indicating strong social connections in these grades, which aligns with the findings of Henrich (2020) and Stallman et al. (2018) on the importance of social support. Overall, these findings suggest that while physical well-being is generally stable, targeted interventions are crucial in enhancing emotional, cognitive, economic, and social aspects to promote holistic student development.

The data in Table 4.1 shows significant correlations between grade levels and physical well-being across Grades 7 to 12. Grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 all exhibit significant positive correlations (p < 0.01), with Grades 10 and 11 showing the strongest relationships (r = 0.9922 and 0.8699, respectively). These findings suggest that physical well-being is a critical component of students' overall health, consistent with insights from Van Petegem et al. (2007), Henrich (2020), and Carroll et al. (2021). The significant correlations underscore the need for tailored support mechanisms to address physical health issues, particularly during these crucial educational stages.

Table 4.2 highlights varying correlations between grade levels and affective well-being. Grades 8, 9, and 12 show significant positive correlations (r = 0.7047, 0.5451, and 0.6769, respectively), indicating a notable link between these grade levels and students' emotional well-being. Conversely, Grades 7, 10, and 11 do not show significant correlations, suggesting a lesser impact on affective well-being in these grades. These findings align with Anderson & Graham (2016) and Stallman et al. (2018), who emphasize the importance of social support and student participation in enhancing emotional well-being.

The analysis in Table 4.3 reveals significant positive correlations between grade levels and cognitive well-being for Grades 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12. Particularly strong correlations are observed in Grades 7 and 11 (r = 0.9236 and 0.9831, respectively), reflecting students' positive attitudes towards their cognitive abilities and academic achievements. This finding aligns with research by Anderson and Graham (2016) and Carroll et al. (2021), which highlights the importance of cognitive and socio-emotional factors in student welfare. The lack of significance in Grade 10 suggests a need for further investigation into the specific challenges faced by students at this level.

Table 4.4 presents significant correlations between grade levels and economic well-being for Grades 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12, with the strongest relationships seen in Grades 7, 9, and 12 (r = 0.8711, 0.8374, and 0.8848, respectively). These findings suggest that economic stability plays a crucial role in students' overall well-being, supporting studies by Van Petegem et al. (2007) and Becchetti and Pisani (2014). The significant correlations emphasize the importance of economic factors, alongside broader approaches such as public services and teacher support programs, in fostering positive student outcomes.

Table 4.5 indicates significant correlations between grade levels and social well-being for Grades 8 and 9 (r = 0.5130 and 0.7904, respectively), highlighting the importance of social connections in these grades. The non-significant correlations for Grades 7, 10, 11, and 12 suggest varying impacts of social experiences across different educational stages. These findings align with Henrich (2020) and Anderson & Graham (2016), who emphasize the role of supportive relationships and student engagement in promoting social well-being.

The synthesis of the findings across Tables 4.1 to 4.5 highlights the multifaceted nature of student well-being, encompassing physical, affective, cognitive, economic, and social dimensions. The significant correlations observed across various grades underscore the need for comprehensive

support mechanisms tailored to the diverse needs of students. Addressing each dimension of well-being is crucial for promoting holistic development and enhancing students' overall educational experience. These findings provide valuable insights for educators and policymakers aiming to implement effective interventions to support student well-being throughout their academic journey.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings from the study conducted at Saint Nicholas School-English Programme - OIC highlight significant correlations between students' grade levels and their well-being across multiple dimensions. Physical well-being indicators suggest generally positive perceptions among students, yet there is a notable need for interventions addressing inadequate sleep patterns. Affective and cognitive well-being exhibit varying strengths across different grade levels, with Grades 8 and 12 showing particularly strong correlations with emotional and cognitive aspects, respectively. Economic stability within families emerges as a crucial factor influencing overall student well-being, underscoring the importance of ensuring access to essential resources and support. Meanwhile, social well-being reveals nuanced impacts across grades, suggesting a need for tailored interventions to enhance peer relationships and community engagement. These findings collectively emphasize the necessity of holistic approaches that cater to the specific developmental stages and needs of students throughout their educational journey.

To enhance student well-being effectively, schools should implement comprehensive programs that address the diverse dimensions identified in the study. Firstly, initiatives focusing on physical health should include strategies to improve sleep hygiene, promote regular exercise, and encourage nutritious eating habits among students. Social-emotional learning programs should be integrated into the curriculum to cultivate emotional resilience, foster supportive school climates, and provide accessible counseling services. Academic support programs should be expanded to cater to varying cognitive abilities and educational needs across different grade levels, ensuring all students receive adequate support for their academic success. Additionally, promoting financial literacy and offering scholarships or financial aid can help alleviate economic stressors for students and families, enhancing their overall well-being. Future research endeavors should prioritize expanding sample diversity and geographic representation to encompass a broader demographic spectrum, thereby enriching our understanding of effective well-being interventions in diverse educational contexts. These efforts are crucial in developing holistic and inclusive approaches that promote comprehensive student development and well-being.

REFERENCES

[1]. Anderson, D. L., & Graham, A. P. (2016). Improving student wellbeing: Having a say at school. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 27(3), 348-366. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2015.1084336

[2]. Assana, S., Laohasiriwong, W., & Rangseekajee, P. (2017). Quality of life, mental health and educational stress of high school students in the Northeast of Thailand. Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research, 11(8), VC01-VC06. https://doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2017/29209.10429

[3]. Becchetti, L., & Pisani, F. (2014). Family economic well-being, and (class) relative wealth: An empirical analysis of life satisfaction of secondary school students in three Italian cities. Journal of Happiness Studies, 15(2), 503-525. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9433-z

[4]. Bladek, M. (2021). Student well-being matters: Academic library support for the whole student. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 47, 102349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102349

[5]. Carroll, A., York, A., Fynes-Clinton, S., Sanders-O'Connor, E., Flynn, L., Bower, J. M., Forrest, K., & Ziaei, M. (2021). The downstream effects of teacher well-being programs: Improvements in teachers' stress, cognition and well-being benefit their students. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 689628. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.689628

[6]. Clement, N. (2010). Student wellbeing at school: The actualization of values in education. In Lovat, T., Toomey, R., & Clement, N. (Eds.), International Research Handbook on Values Education and Student Wellbeing (pp. 19-36). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8675-4_3

[7]. Henrich, K. (2020). Supporting student wellbeing and holistic success: A public services approach. The International Information & Library Review, 52(3), 235-243. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2020.1785171

[8]. Nelson, M., Tarabochia, D., & Koltz, R. (2015). PACES: A model of student well-being. Journal of School Counselling, 13, 1-34. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1079029

[9]. Soutter, A. K., O'Steen, B., & Gilmore, A. (2014). The student well-being model: A conceptual framework for the development of student well-being indicators. International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 19(4), 496-520. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2012.754362

[10]. Stallman, H. M., Ohan, J. L., & Chiera, B. (2018). The role of social support, being present and self-kindness in university student well-being. British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 46(4), 365-374. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2017.1343458

[11]. Torres, R. L., Madera, M. V., & Basilio, L. (2023). KUMUSTA KA?_SABAI DEE MAI?' (สบายดีไหม) Exploring the well-being of Southeast Asian learners towards the development of a holistic self-care framework. International Journal of New Technology and Research, 9(8), 32-41. https://www.ijntr.org/download_data/IJNTR09080009.pdf

[12]. Van den Bogerd, N., Dijkstra, S. C., Koole, S. L., Seidell, J. C., de Vries, R., & Maas, J. (2020). Nature in the indoor and outdoor study environment and secondary and tertiary education students' well-being, academic outcomes, and possible mediating pathways: A systematic review with recommendations for science and practice. Health & Place, 66, 102403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2020.102403

[13]. Van Petegem, K., Aelterman, A., & Rosseel, Y. (2007). Student perception as moderator for student wellbeing. Social Indicators Research, 83(3), 447–463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-006-9055-5