European Journal of Open Education and E-learning Studies
ISSN: 2501-9120
ISSN-L: 2501-9120
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

DOI: 10.46827/ejoe.v6i2.3912 Volume 6 | Issue 2 | 2021

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING LEVELS OF TEACHER CANDIDATES IN THE DISTANCE EDUCATION PROCESS[i]

Ramazan Özkul[1],
Metin Kirbaç[2],
Fatih Kaya[2ii]
[1]Ministry of National Education,
R&D Unit,
Turkey
[2]İnönü University,
Faculty of Education,
Turkey

Abstract:
The expansion of the global communication network with the help of technological developments has undoubtedly shown its greatest impact in the field of education. As a matter of fact, the spread of communication networks between countries and individuals, in the field of education; it has created a global perception of education by accelerating the circulation of information resources, ideas and products. Especially with the covid-19 epidemic, the transition to distance education has accelerated. In this context, it is considered important to investigate the behaviors and psychological states of students and to contribute to their good management of this process. The aim of this study is to examine the psychological well-being levels of teacher candidates in the distance education process. This research, which aims to examine the psychological well-being levels of teacher candidates in the distance education process, is a quantitative method with a causal comparison model. The study population of the research consists of İnönü University Faculty of Education students. The sample of the study consisted of 584 participants determined by the random stratified sampling method from the population. The data of the study were collected with the "Psychological Well-Being Scale". Obtained data, independent groups t-test, one-way ANOVA and descriptive statistics tests were performed. Research findings showed that participants had high levels of psychological well-being.

Keywords: teacher candidates, distance education, psychological well-being, quantitative research

[i] UZAKTAN EĞİTİM SÜRECİNDE ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARININ PSİKOLOJİK İYİ OLUŞ DÜZEYLERİ
[ii] Correspondence: email fatih.kaya@inonu.edu.tr, metin.kirbac@inonu.edu.tr

Özet:
Teknolojik gelişmeler eliyle küresel iletişim ağının genişlemesi, şüphesiz en büyük etkisini eğitim alanında göstermiştir. Nitekim ülkeler ve bireyler arasındaki iletişim ağlarının yaygınlaşması, eğitim alanında; bilgi kaynaklarının, fikirlerin ve ürünlerin dolaşımını hızlandırarak küresel bir eğitim algısı meydana getirmiştir. Özellikle covid-19 salgını ile birlikte uzaktan eğitime geçiş süreci hızlanmıştır. Bu kapsamda öğrencilerin davranışlarını ve psikoloik durumlarını araştırmak ve bu süreci iyi yönetmelerine katkı sağlamak önemli görülmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, öğretmen adaylarının uzaktan eğitim sürecinde psikolojik iyi oluş düzeylerinin incelenmesidir. Öğretmen adaylarının uzaktan eğitim sürecinde psikolojik iyi oluş düzeylerini incelemeyi amaçlayan bu araştırma nicel yöntemli nedensel karşılaştırma modelli bir araştırmadır. Araştırmanın çalışma evrenini İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencileri oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın örneklemi ise evrenden seçkisiz tabakalı örnekleme yöntemi ile belirlenen 584 katılımcı oluşturmuştur. Araştırmanın verileri "Psikolojik İyi Oluş Ölçeği" ile toplanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler, bağımsız gruplar t-testi, tek yönlü ANOVA ve betimsel istatistik testleri yapılmıştır. Araştırma bulguları katılımcıların psikolojik iyi oluş düzeylerinin yüksek olduğunu göstermiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: öğretmen adayları, uzaktan eğitim, psikolojik iyi oluş, nicel araştırma

1. Introduction

The first quarter of the century we live in today has witnessed and continues to be the scene of many historical events in which the world has developed and changed rapidly. This rapid change has not only manifested itself in technological developments and the face of the world, but also caused great differences in the attitudes and behaviors of the individual. These differences, on the one hand, put the inter-individual relations into a global structure, on the other hand, they caused the relations to become more complex, making it difficult to understand the causes of human behavior. The increasing complexity of human behavior has shifted the direction of academic studies towards "*understanding and exploring human behavior*", especially in recent years. In this context, one of the main themes of our study is the concept of "*psychological well-being*", which is a human-oriented situation (Kaya, Özkul & Kırbaç, 2021: 131).

Ryff (1995) defined the concept of well-being as 'the struggle to realize the true potential of the individual rather than merely attaining happiness', it is seen that the concept of well-being is discussed from two different perspectives in the literature. The first of these is hedonism (hedonism), subjective well-being, and the other (eudaimonism) creates psychological well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Subjective well-being (hedonism) is based on happiness in well-being, while psychological well-being (eudaimonism) is based on the individual's functionality, self-actualization level and self-understanding (Cenkseven & Akbaş, 2007; Deci & Ryan, 2008). Subjective well-being consists of two components, cognitive and emotional evaluation of an individual's life. In addition,

subjective well-being (hedonism) as emotional components; consists of positive and negative emotions, and life satisfaction as cognitive components (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985; Diener & Diener, 1995). In general, psychological well-being; It is a multifaceted concept that includes emotions and terms such as the individual's psychological state, life satisfaction, ability to establish and maintain positive relationships, sense of autonomy, self-acceptance, personal development, life purpose and self-esteem (Matteucci & Soncini, 2021; Stewart-Brown & Janmohamed, 2008). The concept of psychological well-being, which is formed by the combination of a high level of positive perspective towards life and life satisfaction (Horwood & Anglim, 2019), is a state of emotion that brings together the ways of coping with the difficulties in life by using different abilities of the individual and brings him personal satisfaction.

Psychological well-being has been described as managing the existential challenges (such as maintaining meaningful goals, personal development, and establishing quality relationships with others) that an individual faces in his life (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002; Telef, 2013). Ryff (1989), who introduced the "*well-being*" model for the first time, called "*multidimensional psychological well-being*", defined the concept as a multidimensional structure consisting of life attitudes rather than a simple combination of positive and negative emotions and life satisfaction. As a matter of fact, Ryff (1989) stated that there are no theoretical approaches to explain well-being that reflects psychological functioning, and created a multi-component model called "*multidimensional psychological well-being*", on which personality and development theorists base their theoretical knowledge on positive psychological health (Zümbül, 2019). This model developed by Ryff (1989); self-acceptance, self-development, life purpose, positive communication with values, environmental dominance and autonomy. When evaluated in this context, psychological well-being has a very important place in personality and development theories, both theoretically and practically (Özen & Gülaçtı, 2012). Although subjective well-being (hedonism) and psychological well-being (eudaimonism) involve different aspects of positive psychological health, they are related concepts. As a matter of fact, many researchers consider subjective and psychological well-being together as a multidimensional phenomenon (Ryan & Deci, 2001). In this context, it is thought that it would be more beneficial to consider two approaches together in order to examine positive psychological health in a multifaceted and whole (Cenkseven & Akbaş, 2007).

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that studies on well-being mostly focus on subjective well-being (Diener, 1984; Doğan, 2012; Eryılmaz, 2009; Eryılmaz & Öğülmüş, 2010; Kabasakal & Uz Baş, 2013; Ryan & Deci, 2001). On the subject of psychological well-being, there are a number of domestic and international studies conducted in the literature (Beydoğan-Tangör & Curun, 2016; Cenkseven & Akbaş, 2007; Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002; Özen & Gülaçtı, 2012; Ryff & Singer, 1996; Telef, 2013). This study focuses on psychological well-being, which is one of the two different perspectives of the concept of well-being.

In addition to the responsibility of educational institutions to meet the learning needs of the society, it is to follow the living conditions that are updated and developed every day and to raise individuals who are suitable for these conditions. Education systems should produce knowledge suitable for changing conditions. This situation necessitated the individual to learn faster and to benefit from a more enriched environment. For this reason, distance education in which information technologies are used effectively in learning processes has become inevitable. Distance education, which we are not familiar with in our learning life, is a system that provides learning comfort to individuals who are educated synchronously or asynchronously through technological tools and the internet without the necessity of time and place (Özkul et al., 2020). In this context, it is important to investigate the psychological well-being of students in the distance education process.

The aim of this study is to examine the psychological well-being of the students of the Faculty of Education during the distance education process. In this context, answers to the following questions will be sought:

Psychological well-being levels of students;

a) What level is it?
b) Does it differ significantly according to the gender variable?
c) Does it differ significantly according to the class variable?
d) Does it differ significantly according to the field variable?
e) Does it differ significantly according to the method of participating in distance education?
f) Does it differ significantly according to the variable of the number of people continuing distance education at home?
g) Does it differ significantly according to the Internet access type variable?
h) Does it differ significantly according to the study room variable?
i) Does it differ significantly according to the settlement variable?
j) Does it differ significantly according to the variable of preferring distance education or face-to-face education?

2. Method

2.1 Research Model

This research, which aims to examine the psychological well-being levels of education faculty students in the distance education process, is a research with a quantitative method and a causal comparison model. "*Research with causal comparison model is research that aims to determine the causes and consequences of differences between human groups without any intervention on conditions and participants*" (Büyüköztürk et al., 2015: 15-16).

2.2. Study Group

The study population of the research consists of Inonu University Faculty of Education students. Within the scope of the research, stratified random sampling, one of the random sampling methods, was taken as the basis. The stratum is based on gender, and it is seen that the percentage distribution in the population is 36.79% for males and 63.21% for females, and the values in the sample are close to the gender distribution in the universe. In addition, several methods were applied together in the stage of deciding on the sample size. Sample sizes determined according to different confidence levels and deviation amounts in the literature were examined (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2015; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). As a result of the examinations, it was determined that the sample size should be 370, based on the confidence interval of ".95" and the amount of deviation for an average population size of 10,000 people (Büyüköztürk et al., 2015). The "power analysis" method, which is another sample size calculation method, was also used within the scope of the research. Although "power analysis" varies according to the type of analysis, it is used as one of the sample size calculation methods based on the .80 power level and the average effect size (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). Within the scope of this study, group t-test and one-way ANOVA test were used independent of causal comparison tests. In this context, as a result of the power analysis using the G*Power package program, it was seen that reaching a minimum sample number of 108 people would be sufficient for the analysis to be made.

Table 1: Information about the sample group is given in Descriptive Statistics Regarding the Sampling

Variables		**Frequency (f)**	**Percent (%)**
Gender	Female	379	64.9
	Male	205	35.1
Class	1st Class	97	16.6
	2nd Class	358	61.3
	3rd Class	81	13.9
	4th Class	48	8.2
Area	Numeric	62	10.6
	Verbal	190	32.5
	Equal Weight	171	29.3
	Special Ability	99	17.0
	Foreign Language	44	7.5
How to Participate in Distance Education	Computer	307	52.6
	Phone/Tablet	277	47.4
Number of Persons Participating in Distance Education	1	180	30.8
	2	168	28.8
	3	151	25.9
	4 or more	85	14.6
Internet Access Type	Fixed (Home) Internet	428	72.8
	Mobile Internet	159	27.2

Study Room	Available	366	62.7
	None	218	37.3
Settlement Center	Central District	395	67.6
	District	109	18.7
	Village	80	13.7
Preferring Face-to-face Education or Distance Education	Face-to-face Education	102	17.5
	Distance Education	482	82.5

In Table 1, the personal characteristics of the education faculty students participating in the research are given. Accordingly, while 64.9% of the sample consists of female students, 35.1% consists of male students. In terms of the class variable, it is seen that the largest group of the sample is the students in the 2nd grade with 61.3%, while the smallest group is the students in the 4th grade with 8.2%. In terms of the field variable, it was stated that the largest group was the students studying in the field with verbal input with 32.5%, and the smallest group was the students studying in the field with foreign language input with 7.5%. 52.6% of the sample stated that they attended distance education via computer and 47.4% by phone. Considering the variable of the number of people participating in distance education at home, it is seen that the largest group is 30.8% with 1 person, and the smallest group with 14.6% is the group with 4 or more people. In terms of internet access type variable, 72.8% of the participants stated that they participated in distance education via fixed (home) internet and 27.2% via mobile internet. 62.7% of the education faculty students participating in the study stated that they have a study room, 37.3% stated that they do not have a study room. 67.6% of the participants live in the center or the central district, 18.7% in the district and 13.7% in the village. Finally, 17.5% of the sample prefers face-to-face education and 82.5% prefer distance education.

2.3 Data Collection Tools

The first part of the measurement tool used in the study consists of the demographic information of the participants, developed by the researchers. In the second part, the "Psychological Well-Being Scale" developed by Diener et al. (2010) and adapted into Turkish by Telef (2013) was used.

2.3.1 Demographic Information Questionnaire

The demographic information questionnaire, in which the participants' information such as "gender, class, area, the means by which they participated in distance education, the number of people who participated in distance education at home, the type of internet access, study room, residence, preferring distance education or face-to-face education" were collected by the researchers.

2.3.2 Psychological Well-Being Scale

The Psychological Well-Being Scale was developed by Diener et al. (2010) to measure socio-psychological well-being as a complement to existing well-being measures. The

Turkish adaptation of the scale was done by Telef (2013). The Psychological Well-Being Scale consists of eight items. These items cover feelings of efficacy and important aspects of human function, which include having a meaningful and purposeful life. A high score indicates that the individual has many psychological resources and strengths. As a result of the validity study conducted with 529 university students, it was determined that the scale consisted of a single factor and the total explained variance was 53%. It was observed that the factor loadings of the scale items varied between .61 and .77. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be .87. Although the scale does not provide separate measures related to aspects of psychological well-being, it is stated that it provides an overview of positive functions that are believed to be important in different areas (Telef, 2013). Within the scope of this research, the internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha) coefficient was determined as .84.

2.4 Analysis of Data

The normality distribution of the data obtained in the study was examined and it was seen that there was no wrong or incompletely filled scale. Analyzes were made on 584 scales. The obtained data were subjected to independent groups t-test, one-way ANOVA and descriptive statistics tests. The analyzes of the data collected within the scope of the research were made using the SPSS 24.0 package program.

3. Findings

3.1 Findings and interpretation of psychological well-being

The first sub-title of the second sub-problem of the study is “What is the psychological well-being of the students?” expressed as. The descriptive statistics results obtained for this purpose are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Psychological Well-Being Level of Students

Dimensions	N	$\bar{X}$	Sd	Level
Psychological Well-Being	584	3.45	.727	Mostly Agree

Looking at Table 2, it is seen that the average score of the participants is 3.45, and this score is at the level of "Mostly Agree" on the scale.

3.2 Findings and comments on the gender variable

The second subtitle of the second sub-problem of the study is "Do students' psychological well-being levels differ significantly according to the gender variable?" expressed as. For this purpose, T Test was conducted on Independent Groups. The results are in Table 3.

Table 3: T-Test Results Regarding Whether Students' Psychological Well-Being Levels Differ Significantly According to Gender Variable

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Sd	df	t	p	Cohen's d
Psychological Well-Being	Female	379	28.21	5.47	582	3.358	.001	.29
	Male	205	26.53	6.26				

Looking at the values in Table 3; psychological well-being levels of students differ statistically significantly according to the gender variable (t=3.358, p<.05). Looking at the average scores, it is seen that the mean scores of girls ($\bar{X}$=28.21) are higher than the mean scores of boys ($\bar{X}$=26.53). When looking at the effect size (d = .29), it can be said that this difference is small.

3.3 Findings and interpretation regarding the class variable

The third subtitle of the second sub-problem of the study was "Do students' psychological well-being levels differ significantly according to the class variable?" expressed as. For this purpose, One-Way ANOVA Test was conducted. Results are included in Table 4.

Table 4: One-Way ANOVA Test Results Regarding Whether Students' Psychological Well-Being Levels Differ Significantly According to Grade Variable

	Class	N	$\bar{X}$	Sd	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Squares Avg.	F	p
Psychological Well-Being	1	97	27.75	5.08	Intergroup	35.6	3	11.89	.350	.789
	2	358	27.74	5.81	Within groups	19690.4	580	33.95		
	3	81	27.11	6.53	Total	19726.1	583			
	4	48	27.23	6.07						
Total		584	27.61	5.81						

Looking at the values in Table 4; psychological well-being levels of students did not differ statistically significantly according to the class variable (F=0.350 and p<.05).

3.4 Findings and interpretation regarding the field variable

The fourth subheading of the second sub-problem of the study is "Do the psychological well-being levels of the students differ significantly according to the field variable?" expressed as. For this purpose, One-Way ANOVA Test was conducted. The results are in Table 5.

Looking at the values in Table 5; psychological well-being levels of the students did not differ statistically according to the field variable (F=0.606 and p<.05).

Table 5: One-Way ANOVA Test Results Regarding Whether Students' Psychological Well-Being Levels Differ Significantly According to the Field Variable

	Area	N	x̄	Sd	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Squares Avg.	F	p
Psychological Well-Being	Digital	80	28.25	5.17	Intergroup	82.2	4	20.56	.606	.658
	Verbal	190	27.78	6.12	Within groups	19643.8	579	33.92		
	Equal Weight	171	27.11	5.75	Total	19726.1	583			
	Special ability	99	27.55	6.35						
	Foreign language	44	27.79	4.39						

3.5 Findings and comments on the variable of participating in distance education with which tool

The fifth sub-title of the second sub-problem of the study is "Do the psychological well-being levels of the students differ significantly according to the method of participating in distance education?" expressed as. For this purpose, Independent Groups T-Test was conducted. The results are in Table 6.

Table 6: Independent Group T Test Results Regarding Whether Students' Psychological Well-Being Levels Significantly Differentiated According to the Vehicle Participation in Distance Education Variable

	Vehicle	N	x̄	Sd	df	t	p	Cohen's d
Psychological Well-Being	Computer	307	28.69	4.90	582	4.815	.000	.40
	Phone	277	26.41	6.48				

Looking at the values in Table 6; It is seen that the psychological well-being levels of the students differ statistically according to the means by which they participate in distance education ($t=4.815$, $p<.05$). When the average scores are examined, it is seen that the average scores of those who participate in distance education by computer ($\bar{X}=28.69$) are higher than the average scores of those who participate by phone ($\bar{X}=26.41$). Considering the effect size ($d=.40$), it can be said that this difference is close to the medium level.

3.6 Findings and comments on the variable of the number of people continuing distance education at home

The sixth sub-title of the second sub-problem of the study is "Do the psychological well-being levels of the students differ significantly according to the variable of the number of people participating in distance education at home?" expressed as. For this purpose, One-Way ANOVA Test was conducted. The results are in Table 7.

Table 7: One-Way ANOVA Test Results Regarding Whether Students' Psychological Well-Being Levels Differ Significantly According to the Variable of the Number of Persons Participating in Distance Education at Home

	Persons	N	x̄	Sd	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Squares Avg.	F	p
Psychological Well-Being	1	180	27.74	5.59	Intergroup	260.8	3	86.94	2.591	.052
	2	168	27.16	5.88	Within groups	19465.2	580	33.56		
	3	151	28.55	5.25	Total	19726.1	583			
	4 or more	85	26.58	6.84						
Total		584	27.61	5.81						

Looking at the values in Table 7; it is seen that the psychological well-being levels of the students do not differ statistically according to the variable of the number of people participating in distance education at home (F=2.591 and p<.05).

3.7 Findings and interpretation of the internet access type variable

The seventh subheading of the second sub-problem of the study is "Do the psychological well-being levels of the students differ significantly according to the type of internet access variable?" expressed as. For this purpose, Independent Groups T-Test was conducted. The results are in Table 8.

Table 8: Independent Group T-Test Results on Whether Students' Psychological Well-Being Levels Differ Significantly According to the Variable of Internet Access Type

	Internet Type	N	x̄	Sd	df	t	p	Cohen's d
Psychological Well-Being	Fixed (home)	425	28.50	5.18	582	6.234	.000	.58
	Mobile	159	25.23	6.69				

Looking at the values in Table 8; psychological well-being levels of students differ statistically according to the variable of internet access type (t=6.234, p<.05). Considering the average scores, it is seen that the average scores of those who participate in distance education with fixed (home) internet (X̄=28.50) are higher than the average scores of those who participate with mobile internet (X̄=25.23). Considering the effect size (d=.58), it can be said that this difference is moderate.

3.8 Findings and comments on the study room variable

The eighth sub-title of the second sub-problem of the study is "Do the psychological well-being levels of the students differ significantly according to the study room variable?" expressed as. For this purpose, Independent Groups T-Test was conducted. The results are in Table 9.

Table 9: Independent Group T-Test Results Regarding Whether Students' Psychological Well-Being Levels Differ Significantly According to the Study Room Variable

	Study room	N	X̄	Sd	df	t	p	Cohen's d
Psychological Well-Being	Yes	366	28.41	5.31	582	4.351	.000	.36
	No	218	26.28	6.37				

Looking at the values in Table 9; students' psychological well-being levels differ statistically significantly according to the study room variable (t=4.351, p<.05). Considering the average scores, it is seen that the average scores of those who have their own study room (X̄=28.41) are higher than the average scores of those who do not (X̄=26.28). When looking at the effect size (d = .36), it can be said that this difference is closer to a small level.

3.9. Findings and comments on the settlement variable

The ninth sub-title of the second sub-problem of the study is "Do the psychological well-being levels of the students differ significantly according to the residence variable?" expressed as. For this purpose, One-Way ANOVA Test was conducted. The results are in Table 10.

Table 10: One-Way ANOVA Test Results on Whether Students' Psychological Well-Being Levels Differ Significantly According to Residence Variable

	Residential area	N	X̄	Sd	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Squares Avg.	F	p	Difference (Sidak)	Eta square (η2)
Psychological Well-Being	Center/ central district	395	28.20	5.36	Intergroup	488.5	2	244.2	7.377	.001	1-3	.025
	District	109	26.87	6.50	Within groups	19237.5	581	33.1				
	Village	80	25.71	6.51	Total	19726.1	583					
Total		584	27.61	5.81								

Looking at the values in Table 10; It is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between the psychological well-being levels of the students and the place of residence variable (F=7.377 and p<.05). Considering the average scores, it is seen that the level of psychological well-being is highest in those living in the center/central district with X̄=28.20 points, and the lowest in those living in villages with X̄=25.71 points. According to the Sidak test conducted to find the source of the difference, the difference emerged between the group whose settlement is the center/central district and the group with the village, and in favor of those living in the center/central district. It is seen that the effect size calculated as a result of the test (η2 =.025) is small.

3.10 Findings and comments on the variable of preferring distance education or face-to-face education

The tenth sub-title of the second sub-problem of the research is "Do students' psychological well-being differ significantly according to the variable of preferring

distance education or face-to-face education?" expressed as. For this purpose, Independent Groups T-Test was conducted. Results are included in Table 11.

Table 11: Independent Group T-Test Results on Whether Students' Psychological Well-Being Levels Differ Significantly According to the Variable of Preferring Distance Education or Face-to-face Education

	Prefer	N	$\bar{X}$	Sd	df	t	p	Cohen's d
Psychological Well-Being	Face to face education	102	27.37	5.89	582	-2.202	.028	.24
	Distance Education	482	28.76	5.32				

Looking at the values in Table 11; students' psychological well-being levels differ statistically significantly according to the variable of preferring distance education or face-to-face education ($t=-2.202$, $p<.05$). Considering the average scores, it is seen that the average scores of those who prefer distance education ($\bar{X}=28.76$) are higher than the average scores of those who prefer face-to-face education ($\bar{X}=27.37$). When looking at the effect size ($d = .24$), it can be said that this difference is small.

4. Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

It is seen that the psychological well-being levels of the participants are at the level of "Mostly Agree". The concept of psychological well-being, which is formed by the combination of a high level of positive perspective on life and life satisfaction (Horwood & Anglim, 2019), is the emotional state that brings together the ways of coping with the difficulties in the individual's life by using different abilities. When evaluated from this point of view, it can be said that the well-being levels of teacher candidates who successfully use many coping strategies in the distance education process, especially in order to fight the pandemic and continue their education in this process, are effective.

According to the results of the research, it was determined that the psychological well-being levels of the teacher candidates differed statistically according to the gender variable and this difference was in favor of the girls. Although the research findings conducted by Metin (2014) and Bayraktar (2007) show parallelism with the studies of Tekin and Kapancı (2010), Voltan-Acar et al. (2008), does not show similarity with the research findings carried out by researchers such as.

It is seen that the psychological well-being levels of teacher candidates differ statistically according to the method of participating in distance education. The average scores of those who participated in distance education by computer are higher than the average scores of those who participated in the distance education by telephone. Considering that this difference is significant when the participants express their views on distance education, it can be stated that the use of computers in the education process is more useful for teacher candidates in terms of being active in online platforms and while doing research about their lessons.

Distance education can be taught independently of time and place, the lessons can be watched many times, the training needs can be met within certain restrictions, it provides protection against the transmission of the disease, the awareness of the importance of technology in education is increased, technological skills development and it provides ease of learning in the environment (Özdogan and Berkant, 2020) can also be stated to affect the psychological well-being of teacher candidates positively. In the family environment, it can be said that factors such as healthy nutrition, adequate sleep, giving importance to personal hygiene, and taking time for the participants play an important role in this process.

The high level of psychological well-being of university students in distance education can be considered as a positive gain for our education system. The reasons for this situation can be supported by qualitative research and more detailed results can be obtained. Based on these results, it can contribute to academicians and university administrators in their studies in order to increase the psychological well-being of students in the face-to-face education process.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

About the Author(s)

Dr. Ramazan Özkul works as a Mathematics teacher at the Ministry of National Education. He completed his PhD in Educational Administration in Inonu University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences in 2021.

Dr. Metin Kırbaç completed his PhD in Educational Administration in Inonu University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences in 2019. He is a faculty member in the Department of Measurement and Evaluation at the same university.

Res. Asst. Fatih Kaya works at İnönü University Faculty of Education, Department of Social Studies Education, I am doing my doctorate in values education.

References

Bayraktar, G. (2007). *Güreşçilerin psikolojik ihtiyaçları ile atılganlık düzeylerinin bireysel başarılarına etkisi*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Beydoğan-Tangör, B., & Curun, F. (2016). Psikolojik iyi oluşun yordayıcıları olarak bireysel farklılıklar: Özgünlük, benlik saygısı ve sürekli kaygı. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(4), 1-13.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2015). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Pegem Yayınları.

Cenkseven, F. ve Akbaş, T. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinde öznel ve psikolojik iyi olmanın yordayıcılarının incelenmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 3 (27), 43-65.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). Observation. *Research Methods İn Education*, *6*, 396-412.

Diener, E., Diener, M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(4), 653- 663.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. E. , Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.

Doğan, T. (2012). Beş faktör kişilik özellikleri ve öznel iyi oluş. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 14(1), 56-64.

Eryılmaz, A. (2009). Ergen öznel iyi oluş ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(4), 975-989.

Eryılmaz, A., & Öğülmüş, S. (2010). Ergenlikte öznel iyi oluş ve beş faktörlü kişilik modeli. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(3), 189-203.

Faul, F., Erdfeler, E., Lang, A. G. & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*(2), 175-191.

Horwood, S., & Anglim, J. (2019). Problematic smartphone usage and subjective and psychological well-being. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 97, 44-50.

Kabasakal, Z. ve Uz Baş, A. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarında yaşam doyumunun yordayıcısı olarak problem çözme becerileri. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2 (1), 27-35.

Kaya, F., Özkul, R., & Kirbaç, M. (2021). İnvestıgatıon of educatıon faculty students'vıews on dıstance educatıon: the example of Inonu Unıversıty, Turkey. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *8*(7). 131-147.

Keyes, C. L. M., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002) Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 1007–1022.

Matteucci, M. C., & Soncini, A. (2021). Self-efficacy and psychological well-being in a sample of Italian university students with and without Specific Learning Disorder. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 110, 1-11. Doi: 10.1016/j.ridd.2021.103858

Metin, M. (2014). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin güvengenlik düzeyleri ve bağlanma stilleri, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Haliç Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Özdoğan, A. Ç., & Berkant, H. G. (2020). Covid-19 pandemi dönemindeki uzaktan eğitime ilişkin paydaş görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Milli Eğitim, 49(1),* 13-43.

Özen, Y., & Gülaçtı, F., (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının sosyal beceri ve psikolojik iyi oluş düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *UHBAB*, 1(1), 83-101.

Özkul, R., Kırnık D., Dönük, O., Altunhan, Y., & Altunkaynak, Y. (2020). Uzaktan eğitim uygulamalarına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri: Ölçek çalışması. *Turkish Studies*, *15*(8), 3655-3667. https://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.46557

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52 (1), 141-166.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069.

Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4(4), 99-104.

Ryff, C. D., Singer, B. (1996). Psychological wellbeing: Meaning, measurement, and implications for psychotherapy research. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 65, 14-23.

Stewart-Brown, S., & Janmohamed, K. (2008). *Warwick-Edinburgh mental well-being scale*. User guide. Version, 1. http://www.ocagingservicescollaborative.org/wpcontent/uploads/2014/07/WEMWBS-User-Guide-Version-1-June-2008.pdf.

Telef, B. B. (2013). Psikolojik iyi oluş ölçeği: Türkçeye uyarlama, geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(28-3), 374-384.

Tekin, S., & Kapancı, İ. (2010). Sosyal bilgiler eğitimi öğrencilerinin sosyo-ekonomik durumlarının atılganlık durumlarına etkisi. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi S.B.E. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 8(1*), 51-66.

Voltan-Acar, N., Arıcıoğlu, A., Gültekin, F., & Gençtanırım, D. (2008). Üniversite öğrencilerinin güvengenlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 35(35*), 342-350.

Zümbül, S. (2019). Öğretmen adaylarının psikolojik iyi oluş düzeylerinde bilinçli farkındalık ve affetmenin yordayıcı rolleri. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 20(1), 20-36. doi:10.12984/egeefd.481963.