Life Skills Education for the 21st Century: Systemic Strengths in Finland and Australia versus India's Implementation Gaps

Abid Husain [1*], Hira Musarrat [2]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Jamia Millia Islamia (JMI), Jamia Nagar, Okhla, New Delhi-110025, India

[2]Hira Musarrat, M.A Applied Psychology, Jamia Millia Islamia (JMI), Jamia Nagar, Okhla, New Delhi-110025, India.

*Corresponding Author: Abid Husain, 1Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Jamia Millia Islamia (JMI), Jamia Nagar, Okhla, New Delhi-110025, India.

Abstract

This paper compares Life Skills Education (LSE) in Finland, Australia, and India, focusing on socio-emotional competencies (SEC), problem-solving abilities (PSA), and career readiness (CR). Drawing on a narrative review of research, policy documents, and international benchmarks (PISA, OECD SSES), it identifies two effective implementation models. Finland embeds life skills across subjects and relies on highly trained teachers with professional autonomy, enabling context-sensitive classroom practice. Australia employs structured, evidence-based social and emotional learning programs, fidelity monitoring, and vocational pathways to scale impact and align schooling with labour-market needs. In contrast, India's National Education Policy 2020 and UNICEF/NCERT frameworks set strong goals but face delivery challenges: limited teacher preparation, weak infrastructure, an exam-focused assessment culture, and unequal access that limit consistent LSE in classrooms. The paper argues that India's problem is implementation rather than policy design and recommends practical reforms: accredited LSE teacher certification, integration of life skills across curricula, low-stakes formative assessments, and targeted infrastructure investment for disadvantaged schools. Grounded in comparative lessons from Finland and Australia, these measures aim to help India scale meaningful LSE and better prepare students for 21st-century economic participation.

Keywords: life skills education (lse); socio-emotional competencies (sec); problem-solving abilities (psa); career readiness (cr)

Introduction

Life Skills Education (LSE) has become central to preparing students for the challenges of the 21st century, equipping them with socio-emotional competencies (SEC), problem-solving abilities (PSA), and career readiness (CR). While global policy frameworks increasingly emphasize these skills, implementation varies sharply across contexts. High-performing education systems such as Finland and Australia demonstrate strong integration of LSE into schooling, while India continues to face significant delivery gaps despite ambitious reforms. Finland's approach is based on transversal competences embedded across all subjects and supported by highly trained teachers who enjoy professional autonomy. Australia, by contrast, relies on structured, evidence-based programs with strong implementation fidelity, accountability, and vocational pathways to align education with labour-market needs. Both models have shown consistent effectiveness in strengthening socio-emotional and cognitive outcomes. In India, however, systemic weaknesses such as limited teacher capacity, infrastructure deficits, exam-focused assessment, and equity gaps have created a wide gulf between the aspirations of the National Education Policy (NEP 2020) and classroom realities. This paper draws on a narrative review of literature, policy documents, and international benchmarks to compare these three contexts. The objectives are to (1) map effective features of the Finnish and Australian models, (2) diagnose India's structural barriers, and (3) propose feasible reforms. Section II defines key concepts, Section III outlines the review protocol, Sections IV–VI present country analyses, and the paper concludes with comparative insights and recommendations.

I. Establishing The Foundation: Concepts, Outcomes, And Global Measurement

A. Defining the Life Skills Continuum: Terminology and Scope

Life Skills Education (LSE) serves as a broad conceptual umbrella, encompassing a variety of crucial non-cognitive and transferable skills necessary for navigating modern life. Globally, these skills are often referred to by diverse synonyms such as "transferable skills," "21st-

century skills," "soft skills," and "socio-emotional skills" (UNICEF, n.d.; UNESCO-UNEVOC, n.d.). The World Health Organization (1993) defines life skills as abilities that enable individuals to adapt and respond effectively to the demands and challenges of everyday life, highlighting their centrality in education and health promotion. Similarly, a recent scoping review emphasizes that life skills are closely linked to multiple domains of well-being, including psychological, cognitive, physical, social, and emotional development (BMC Public Health, 2023). Given this terminological overlap and multidimensional scope, establishing a clear definition of LSE is essential for comparison across national education systems.

The narrative review focuses on three interrelated, measurable outcomes.

1. Socio-Emotional Competencies (SEC): SEC involves the processes through which children and adults manage emotions, pursue positive goals, show empathy, cultivate healthy relationships, and make responsible decisions. The widely used CASEL (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning) framework defines five core competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making (CASEL, 2020).

2. Problem-Solving Abilities (PSA) / Critical Thinking: PSA involves critical thinking and the capacity to handle increasingly complex problems encountered in life and are recognized as a key life skill linked to cognitive and social well-being (BMC Public Health, 2023).

3. Career Readiness (CR) goes beyond vocational training to include cognitive, interpersonal, and professional skills. For instance, frameworks such as those from the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) define CR through competencies like critical thinking, professionalism, and teamwork (NACE, 2024).

B. International Benchmarks For Skill Assessment

Cross-national analysis requires reliable, comparable data that measures educational outcomes rather than just policy inputs. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) provides two vital tools for this purpose.

1. The Role of OECD Data (PISA and SSES): The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) rigorously evaluates 15-year-old students' performance in mathematics, science, and reading, offering a robust proxy for cognitive skills and problem-solving abilities (OECD, 2019). The results of PISA allow policymakers to compare learning outcomes internationally and identify where education systems are succeeding or lagging (OECD, 2023a). For example, high-performing systems such as Australia consistently maintain strong outcomes in PISA assessments (OECD, 2023b). Alongside this, the OECD's *Survey on Social and Emotional Skills* (SSES) represents the world's largest initiative to gather comparable data on socio-emotional competencies, including creativity, empathy, motivation, responsibility, and collaboration among 10- and 15-year-olds (OECD, 2023c).

2. Significance of Cross-National Data: Utilizing international benchmarks such as PISA and SSES moves discussion beyond policy aspirations to objective measures of educational effectiveness. A consensus among education experts suggests that balancing cognitive, social, and emotional skills is essential to meet the demands of the 21st century (OECD, 2023a). By comparing India's outcomes with those of OECD leaders like Finland and Australia, it becomes possible to diagnose systemic gaps and identify implementation levers that are missing in the Indian context. This highlights how gaps in Life Skills Education (LSE) represent not only a pedagogical

issue but also a profound economic challenge, as deficits in socio-emotional and critical thinking skills constrain future workforce mobility and productivity (OECD, 2023a; OECD, 2023b).

C. Critical Review Of Validated Assessment Tools For Sec, Psa, And Cr In Adolescence

Assessing the qualitative nature of life skills presents a critical challenge worldwide, particularly in systems dominated by high-stakes testing (OECD, 2023a). The inability to objectively quantify these outcomes often results in their de-prioritization within the curriculum, which further exacerbates structural barriers to Life Skills Education (LSE) implementation (OECD, 2023b).

1. Assessment Challenges

Life skills are inherently subjective and qualitative, complicating the development of effective measurement tools (OECD, 2023a). In systems focused heavily on summative assessments and rote learning, skills that are difficult to evaluate objectively such as socio-emotional competencies (SEC) and complex problem-solving abilities (PSA) are often neglected in favor of testable academic content. This creates a fundamental structural barrier to integrating LSE effectively (OECD, 2023b).

2. Tools for Socio-Emotional Competencies (SEC)

International studies have developed validated psychometric instruments to evaluate adolescents' social and emotional development. For social competence, tools such as the *Social Skills Rating System (SSRS)* and the *Adolescent Multidimensional Social Competence Questionnaire (AMSCQ)* are widely used, capturing dimensions such as cooperation, empathy, assertion, and self-control (Miller et al., 2015). Emotional competence is often measured using instruments derived from emotional intelligence models, including the *Trait Meta-Mood Scale (TMMS)* and the *Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20)* (Salovey et al., 1995; Bagby et al., 1994).

3. Tools for Problem-Solving and Cognitive Skills (PSA)

Problem-solving assessment is context-dependent, and several tools have been adapted for specific age groups. For younger populations, the RAPS-K has been designed to assess verbal problem-solving skills with age-appropriate language and cognitive demands (Groeben & Scheele, 2000). At the tertiary level, the OECD has developed the Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO) to evaluate critical thinking and problem-solving among university students (OECD, 2013). For secondary school students, however, PISA data continues to serve as the most widely accepted proxy for cross-national comparison of high-level cognitive and problem-solving skills (OECD, 2023a).

4. Tools for Career Readiness (CR)

Career readiness frameworks aim to align educational outcomes with employer expectations. The OECD's Career Readiness project utilizes longitudinal cohort studies, including PISA data on guidance and career-related activities, to identify how teenage career exploration contributes to better employment outcomes in adulthood (OECD, 2021). Additionally, the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) provides a validated framework of competencies including critical thinking, teamwork, and professionalism that define career readiness and help bridge the gap between education and labor market needs (NACE, 2024).

II. Methods

This study used a narrative review approach guided by the PICO framework to structure the research question and PRISMA principles to ensure transparency in study selection

A. Research Question Decomposition using the PICO Framework

The PICO framework dissects the complex research question into four manageable components, providing conceptual clarity and specificity. The detailed application is summarized below:

Element	Description	Search Terms/Concepts (Integrated)
P (Population)	Primary and Secondary School Students (Ages 6–18) in Compulsory Education	"student*" OR "adolescent*" OR "school child*" OR "primary education" OR "secondary education"
I (Intervention)	Life Skills Education (LSE) Programs / Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)	"life skills" OR "socio-emotional learning" OR "SEL" OR "21st century skills" OR "transferable skills"
C (Comparison)	Cross-National (Finland/Australia vs. India) or Intervention vs. Control	"India" OR "Indian school" OR "NCERT" OR "CBSE" AND "Finland" OR "Australia" OR "OECD"
O (Outcomes)	Improvement in Socio-Emotional Competencies (SEC), Problem-Solving Abilities (PSA), and Career Readiness (CR)	"socio-emotional competence" OR "problem-solving" OR "critical thinking" OR "career readiness" OR "employability"

Table 1: PICO Framework for LSE Comparative Effectiveness Review

B. Search Strategy

A robust search strategy involves combining the PICO elements using Boolean operators (AND, OR) to ensure both comprehensiveness and relevance.

1. Databases: The search must span academic databases such as PubMed, Scopus, ERIC as well as specialized sources including the OECD library, WHO, UNICEF, World Bank, and national educational research repositories.

2. Search Term Structure: The strategy will utilize three blocks combined by AND operators: (1) Population/Setting terms AND (2) Intervention/Synonym terms AND (3) Outcome terms.

   Furthermore, a fourth block combining specific country contexts ("India" AND "Finland" OR "Australia") will be used for comparative studies.

   ○ *Conceptual Search String Example:* (("life skills" OR "SEL" OR "21st century skills") AND

   ("problem-solving" OR "career readiness" OR "socio-emotional competence") AND

   ("effectiveness" OR "evaluation") AND ("India" OR "Finland" OR "Australia"))

3. Grey Literature Search (India Specific): A critical component of this review is the targeted

   search for grey literature in India, defined as non-peer-reviewed but authoritative documents.[4] This includes CBSE teacher manuals, NCERT journals, NGO reports, and policy documents from specific states (e.g., Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Maharashtra). This specialized search is necessary to capture the reality of LSE implementation, addressing the crucial gap between national policy and local practice, which is often detailed in localized dissertations and institutional reports.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria Inclusion Criteria

Eligible studies focused on children and adolescents aged 6–18 years within compulsory

education. Priority was given to empirical designs, including randomized controlled trials (RCTs), quasi-experimental studies with comparison groups, and controlled observational studies. High-quality comparative descriptive analyses and evaluative grey literature were also considered. Interventions had to involve structured life skills education (LSE) or social and emotional learning (SEL) curricula, whether integrated into broader teaching (e.g., Finland's transversal competences) or delivered as stand-alone programs. To reflect contemporary curriculum reforms, only studies published in English from 2005 onwards were included.

Exclusion Criteria

Studies were excluded if they lacked empirical evaluation of outcomes, were situated solely in clinical or community settings outside of compulsory schooling, or targeted exclusively special needs populations. These criteria ensured the review's focus on mainstream LSE program effectiveness.

Screening and Transparency

The process followed PRISMA 2020 principles for clarity in eligibility decisions. As this is a narrative review, no formal flowchart or numerical tally was included, but the selection process was documented transparently

Comparative Orientation

Finland and Australia were positioned as OECD benchmarks with strong implementation capacity, while India was examined as a resource-constrained system. This framing enabled diagnostic comparison of policy intent and delivery gaps

III. Model Effectiveness I: Finland – The Integrated, High-Autonomy Approach

Finland's international educational success is closely linked to its holistic approach to student well-being and skills development, which is embedded in its Life Skills Education (LSE) model.

A. Policy Integration: Transversal Competences as the Curriculum Backbone

LSE in Finland is not treated as a standalone subject but is woven throughout all areas of learning. This is achieved through the Transversal Competences framework introduced in the 2014 reform of the *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education* (Finnish National Agency for Education, n.d.). These competences are designed to ensure that life skills are integrated across subjects and applied in daily life, work, and citizenship (NCEE, n.d.).

1. Curriculum Structure

The curriculum mandates that every subject from mother tongue and literature to mathematics, arts, and health education actively promotes transversal competences. These include: (1) thinking and learning to learn, (2) cultural competence, interaction, and self-expression, (3) managing daily life, (4) multiliteracy, (5) ICT competence, (6) working life competence and entrepreneurship, and (7) participation and building a sustainable future (Finnish National Agency for Education, n.d.; NCEE, n.d.).

2. Holistic and Future-Oriented Education

By embedding these competencies within the core curriculum, Finland positions life skills on equal footing with academic knowledge. This integration is supported by a trust-based

professional culture where teachers are given autonomy and accountability without the burden of excessive standardized testing (Sahlberg, 2007; Lutovac et al., 2024). As a result, the Finnish system prioritizes both academic achievement and student well-being, demonstrating that a balanced approach can strengthen long-term educational outcomes.

B. Pedagogical Model: Teacher Autonomy, Research-Based Training, and Implementation Fidelity

The efficacy of Finland's integrated LSE model rests heavily on the expertise and autonomy afforded to its teachers.

Teacher Expertise as the Lever

Finnish teachers are required to complete a Master's degree in education, combining strong academic foundations with advanced pedagogical training. This preparation is highly research-driven and includes long-term teaching practices, often lasting a full academic year, which equip teachers with both theoretical knowledge and classroom experience (Sahlberg, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2017). The rigorous preparation process has been widely credited with ensuring that Finland's teaching profession maintains high competence and social prestige.

Autonomy and Flexibility

Teachers in Finland enjoy significant professional autonomy, allowing them to design lessons, choose teaching methods, and adapt assessments to the needs of their students. This flexibility is particularly critical for Life Skills Education (LSE), as soft skills such as socio-emotional learning and problem-solving cannot be effectively delivered through rigid, standardized methods (Finnish National Agency for Education, n.d.; Lutovac et al., 2024).

Implementation Fidelity

The success of Finland's integrated LSE framework depends not only on curriculum design but also on implementation fidelity, which is safeguarded by a trust-based system that empowers highly qualified teachers to carry out national goals with professional discretion (Sahlberg, 2007). High teacher capacity and systemic trust ensure that transversal competences are not diluted into superficial coverage but are embedded meaningfully in everyday teaching practices. Without this robust teacher input, Finland's holistic approach would risk losing coherence and effectiveness.

C. Evidence of Effectiveness in SEC and PSA (Leveraging PISA/OECD Data) PISA Outcomes

Finland is consistently recognized for its strong performance in international assessments

such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), which reflects the

country's robust foundation in cognitive skills and problem-solving abilities (OECD, 2023a). This outcome aligns closely with the curriculum's explicit emphasis on *thinking and learning to learn* as one of the transversal competences embedded in the National Core Curriculum (Finnish National Agency for Education, n.d.).

Career Readiness Outcomes (Tertiary Attainment)

The strong Life Skills Education (LSE) foundation in Finland also translates into career readiness and educational attainment. Finland maintains a tertiary completion rate slightly above the OECD average, suggesting that its integrated model supports long-term outcomes (OECD, 2023b). Although recent data show a decline in tertiary attainment among young adults, rising unemployment remains most pronounced among those without upper secondary education, underscoring the protective role of comprehensive skills development (OECD, 2023c). Moreover, the benefits of tertiary education significantly narrow the gender employment gap, highlighting the importance of a strong educational foundation supported by life skills (OECD, 2023c).

IV. Model Effectiveness II: Australia – The Structured, Accountability-Driven Approach

Australia applies a more structured and outcomes-focused approach to LSE, combining mandated curriculum content with evidence-based implementation

A. Curriculum Framework: Explicit Integration of SEL and VET Programs

The Australian Curriculum (Version 9.0) establishes national expectations for student learning and includes general capabilities such as personal and social capability (which map to SEL) and cross-curriculum priorities that support socio-emotional development (Australian Curriculum, n.d.). Schools are explicitly expected to foster students' social and emotional development through curriculum design and pedagogical practice (Smiling Mind, 2022). In addition, Australia integrates Vocational Education and Training (VET) programs in the final years of secondary schooling (Grades 11–12), ensuring students develop both interpersonal (SEL) and technical competencies that align with workforce demands.

B. Focus on Fidelity and Quality: Program Selection and Implementation Suppor

Unlike Finland, which relies heavily on professional trust and teacher autonomy, Australia emphasizes *systemic accountability and process fidelity* to ensure the quality of Life Skills Education (LSE) delivery.

1. Evidence-Based Programs

Australian education systems prioritize the adoption of *evidence-based LSE and SEL programs* that are pragmatic, scalable, and grounded in theory. Programs are selected based on rigorous evaluations, including randomized controlled trials (RCTs) or quasi-experimental studies, and must demonstrate measurable positive outcomes such as improved academic achievement, increased pro-social behavior, or reduced emotional distress (Learning Policy Institute, 2023).

2. Importance of Fidelity

A growing body of literature highlights that the *effectiveness of SEL interventions is significantly enhanced when implemented with high fidelity.* Programs delivered with adherence, consistency, and quality produce stronger socio-emotional and academic outcomes than those facing implementation gaps (Learning Policy Institute, 2023). In the Australian context, fidelity is further safeguarded by structured implementation frameworks, which provide teachers with training, resources, and ongoing professional support to ensure adherence to program guidelines (Fox, Sharma, & Leif, 2021).

3. Scalability and Comparative Models

Both Finland and Australia achieve strong LSE outcomes, but their implementation models differ. Finland relies primarily on high teacher expertise and professional trust (input quality), while Australia ensures impact through *systematic evaluation, structured documentation, and accountability mechanisms* (Fox et al., 2021). For resource-constrained systems such as India, Australia's structured, evidence-based approach may provide a more feasible and scalable pathway than Finland's high-trust, high-cost teacher training model.

C. Career Readiness and Global Alignment Employer Demand Alignment

The emphasis on interpersonal skills aligns closely with employer expectations in modern civilian occupations, which often demand public interaction, adaptive problem-solving, and responsiveness to varying work pace and feedback (Learning Policy Institute, 2023).

Engagement with Indian Education

Australian institutions are actively engaging with Indian secondary schools to strengthen career readiness (CR). For example, the University of Melbourne's *Schools Engagement Program* has reached over 50,000 students in Andhra Pradesh, delivering career guidance, labour market insights, and life planning support to enhance social mobility and employability (University of Melbourne, 2024). This partnership underscores the global relevance of structured CR models.

V. LSE in India: Policy Intent vs. Implementation Reality (A Deep Dive)

While India's education policy documents articulate a commitment to Life Skills Education (LSE) comparable to global standards, analysis of policy and supporting frameworks reveals both ambition and structural gaps.

A. Policy Intent: Nep 2020 And The Official Indian Life Skills Framework

1. NEP 2020 Mandate

The *National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020)* explicitly aims to dismantle rigid silos between learning domains and promote multidisciplinary, holistic education. It emphasizes *conceptual understanding over rote learning and summative assessments,* while embedding life skills such as creativity, critical thinking, ethics, communication, cooperation, teamwork, and resilience into the core of the education system (Ministry of Education, 2020). These principles align India's policy vision with global frameworks that prioritize 21st-century competencies.

2. Unicef/Ncert Comprehensive Life Skills Framework

This policy intent is operationalized through the *Comprehensive Life Skills Framework,* jointly developed by UNICEF and NCERT for the Indian context. The framework identifies *10 core life skills,* clustered into four dimensions:

- Empowerment: Self-awareness, resilience, communication

- Citizenship: Empathy, participation

- Learning: Critical thinking, creativity, problem-solving

- Employability: Negotiation, decision-making

This structured framework highlights India's recognition of LSE as a cross-cutting enabler of academic, personal, and social development (UNICEF India, 2019).

B. Analysis Of Policy Translation: The Gap Between National Mandate And Classroom Practice

1. The Dominance Of Academics

Despite India's policy commitment to holistic education, many schools continue to prioritize reading, mathematics, and test performance over life skills and socio-emotional development. This focus reflects the pressure of high-stakes examinations, which often drives schools to allocate time and resources to tested subjects at the expense of LSE (Dream a Dream, 2021).

2. Impact Of Academic Pressure

The entrenched culture of academic pressure has been linked to negative student outcomes, including mental health distress and suicides. For example, academic stress is cited as a significant risk factor in adolescent suicides in India. In a national study, approximately 22.85% of adolescent suicide cases were associated with academic stress. (BMC Psychiatry, 2023). Also, media reports and official statistical compilations have noted that students in India often face overwhelming performance expectations, contributing to psychological distress (e.g. Times of India, 2025).

3. The "Add-On" Dilemma

When LSE is introduced in practice, it is often framed as an optional or peripheral subject rather than integrated across the curriculum. This peripheral positioning makes it vulnerable: during periods of academic overload, LSE slots are repurposed for additional academic content.

C. Implementation Barriers (Grey Literature And Local Research Findings)

The systemic weakness of LSE in India stems from poor implementation fidelity, undermined by gaps in teacher training, infrastructure, assessment, and equity.

1. Teacher Capacity And Training Gaps

Teachers consistently report that insufficient training is the biggest obstacle to delivering effective LSE. Participatory and interactive teaching methods are central to life skills pedagogy, yet most teachers lack preparation for such approaches (Central Square Foundation, 2020; IJES, 2023). As a result, LSE is often perceived as an additional, uncompensated responsibility in an already crowded timetable, which reduces commitment and quality (IJIP, 2023).

2. Infrastructure And Resource Deficits

Unlike Finland or Australia, India struggles with endemic infrastructure shortages, particularly in rural schools. Many lack ICT facilities, libraries, and safe play areas required for experiential learning. Overcrowded classrooms further restrict the use of collaborative, student-centered methods essential for teaching socio-emotional and teamwork skills (Dream a Dream, 2021; UDISE+, 2023). These limitations reduce the scope of LSE to superficial delivery rather than meaningful practice.

3. Assessment Challenges And Cultural Context

Life skills are qualitative and context-sensitive, yet existing assessment systems in India are largely quantitative and fail to reflect diverse social and linguistic realities. This leads to inaccurate or irrelevant data, reinforcing the dominance of test-based academic subjects over skills like critical thinking or resilience (CSF, 2020; IJIP, 2023). There remains a

pressing need for culturally contextualized, low-burden tools that teachers can embed within formative instruction.

4. Equity And Exclusion

Persistent inequalities exacerbate the implementation gap. Girls, rural students, and those
from Scheduled Castes/Tribes face higher dropout rates and reduced access to LSE programs (CSF, 2020). Since life skills training can foster resilience, aspirations, and agency, its absence among marginalized groups reduces its potential as a tool for social mobility and gender equity.

D. Documented Successes And Local Innovations

Despite systemic barriers, localized studies in India demonstrate that LSE interventions can deliver measurable improvements. A recent longitudinal study found that structured life skills programs significantly enhanced *critical thinking, self-awareness, and resilience* among adolescents from disadvantaged backgrounds (Ravindranath et al., 2024). Similarly, evidence from the *C2L (Childhood to Livelihood) program* showed positive impacts on socio-emotional outcomes and school engagement across multiple Indian states (Tagat et al., 2025). Complementary research in Puducherry further demonstrated that school-based LSE modules improved socio-emotional functioning and overall adjustment in adolescents (Surendran et al., 2023). Collectively, these findings suggest that program design and pedagogy—rather than policy intent alone—determine the success of LSE in the Indian context.

VI. Comparative Synthesis And Gap Analysis

The structural comparison highlights that while all three nations acknowledge the importance of LSE, the execution models differ drastically, leading to predictable effectiveness gaps.

A. Curriculum design comparison: integrated vs. Dedicated/add-on

LSE Integration Model	Finland	Australia	India
Primary Method	Integrated (Transversal Competences)	Structured/Explicit Integration (SEL/VET)	Dedicated/Add-on; Vulnerable to diversion
Fidelity Mechanism	High teacher capacity and autonomy	Evidence-based programs and quality checks	Policy reliance without systemic support
Systemic Risk	Requires high-cost, advanced teacher pipeline	Requires extensive program evaluation and fidelity monitoring	High risk of program dilution/neglect due to academic pressure

B. Foundational Discrepancies: Teacher Expertise And Systemic Trust

1. Teacher Education Divergence

One of the most critical drivers of the LSE effectiveness gap lies in the divergence in teacher preparation. Finland requires all teachers to complete *research-based Master's level training* that integrates theory, practice, and extended internships, producing a highly competent and autonomous teaching profession (Sahlberg, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2017). In contrast, India's teacher training system is often compressed into short, formal programs with limited classroom exposure. This results in a teaching workforce that is frequently ill-equipped and, in some cases, resistant to the participatory and interactive methodologies essential for LSE (Central Square Foundation, 2020; IJIP, 2023).

2. The Pedagogy Gap

Evidence from alternative schools in India demonstrates that effective LSE relies on *participatory and experiential pedagogy* rather than rote instruction. These schools, with flexible teaching methods, show significantly higher student outcomes in critical thinking and socio-emotional skills than mainstream schools (ScienceScholar, 2022). However, the dominant culture of rote learning in mainstream Indian education systems actively suppresses such pedagogies, meaning that LSE goals remain aspirational rather than attainable (Dream a Dream, 2021).

C. Outcome Comparison: SEC, PSA, and CR Gaps

1. PSA Gap (PISA Proxy)

While India has not participated consistently in PISA assessments, OECD evidence from high-performing systems such as Finland and Australia demonstrates strong problem-solving and cognitive skills development (OECD, 2023a). In contrast, India's education system, dominated by rote learning, continues to underinvest in *higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills,* reflecting a structural inability to institutionalize PSA (Ministry of Education, 2020).

2. Career Readiness Gap

Australia's integration of *Vocational Education and Training (VET) programs* during the final years of secondary schooling ensures explicit alignment between education and workforce needs (Australian Curriculum, n.d.). India, by contrast, remains focused primarily on *academic credentialing for competitive entrance exams*, with insufficient infrastructural support for vocational facilities or co-curricular programs. This lack of structural linkage weakens career readiness and limits adaptability in a rapidly changing labor market (CSF, 2020).

3. Equity Gap

The equity dimension is perhaps the most acute. In India, *gender and socio-economic disparities* continue to restrict access to quality LSE. Girls, rural students, and marginalized communities (Scheduled Castes/Tribes) face disproportionately high dropout rates and exclusion from life skills programming (UNICEF, 2019). Consequently, the benefits of LSE such as self-confidence, resilience, and aspiration remain unequally distributed, reinforcing cycles of inequality and limiting women's labor force participation (UNICEF, 2019; Dream a Dream, 2021).

Dimension	Finland (High Fidelity)	Australia (High Accountability)	India (Policy/Practice Chasm)
LSE Integration Model	Integrated (Transversal Competences)	Structured/Explicit Integration (SEL/VET)	Dedicated/Add-on; Vulnerable to diversion
Teacher Training & Capacity	Master's degree; Research-driven; High Autonomy	Structured training for program fidelity	Inadequate training; Low capacity; High perceived burden
Assessment Focus	Formative, Teacher-	Evidence-based evaluation	Summative,

	designed, holistic criteria	(RCTs); Aligned with CR metrics	Rote-focused; LSE assessment is challenging/neglected
Structural Barrier (India Gap)	N/A	N/A	Low implementation fidelity; Infrastructure gaps; Time constraints; Academic pressure

Table 2: Comparative LSE Model Analysis and Key Structural Gaps

I. Policy Recommendations for Enhancing LSE Effectiveness in India

The diagnosis confirms that India's challenge is less about policy intent and more about *structural delivery.* Addressing this gap requires reforms in *teacher preparation, curriculum integration, assessment culture, and infrastructure,* informed by lessons from Finland and Australia.

A. Recommendations for Teacher Education and Professional Development

1. Mandate Specialized LSE Certification

Teacher professional development should extend beyond one-off workshops. Structured certification programs in *Life Skills Education (LSE)* are needed, equipping teachers with the competence to confidently use *active learning and participatory pedagogies* (IJES, 2023).

2. Adopt Finland's Practical Focus on Practice

Teacher preparation programs such as the *Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP)* must expand *supervised classroom practice* and embed research-based pedagogical training. Extended practical exposure, as in Finland, is crucial for ensuring teachers can implement LSE effectively (Sahlberg, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2017)

3. Incentivize Rural Teaching Expertise

India faces persistent rural teacher shortages. Policy must *incentivize highly trained teachers to serve in disadvantaged areas,* ensuring that quality LSE instruction is not restricted to urban centers (CSF, 2020).

B. Strategies for Curriculum Integration and Assessment Reform

1. Shift to Integrated LSE (The Finnish Model)

India should embed *transversal skills* across all subjects, following Finland's model of *Transversal Competences.* This prevents LSE periods from being co-opted for exam preparation and signals that *socio-emotional learning (SEL)* is a *core learning outcome* (Finnish National Agency for Education, n.d.).

2. Adopt Structured SEL Modules (The Australian Model)

To achieve *scalability and accountability*, India can adapt Australia's model of *pre-packaged, evidence-based SEL programs* supported by rigorous evaluations and structured teacher training. Implementation fidelity must be a policy priority (Fox, Sharma, & Leif, 2021).

3. Reform Assessment Culture

India's exam-centric evaluation reinforces rote culture. A transition is needed towards *low-stakes, formative, and performance-based assessments* that qualitatively capture SEC and PSA. These tools should be *contextualized for India's cultural and linguistic diversity* to ensure validity and pedagogical utility (CSF, 2020; IJIP, 2023).

D. Policy Prescriptions for Resource Allocation and Infrastructure Enhancement

1. Targeted Infrastructure Investment

India should introduce *need-based funding models* for disadvantaged schools, prioritizing infrastructure that supports participatory pedagogy — including *libraries, labs, ICT facilities, and safe co-curricular spaces* (UDISE+, 2023).

2. **Strategic Career Readiness Development**

Secondary education must explicitly embed career readiness goals, expanding vocational programs and career guidance from Grade 9 onwards. Successful *public-private partnerships* such as the *University of Melbourne–Andhra Pradesh Schools Engagement Program*

—provide a replicable model for linking education with labor market needs (University of Melbourne, 2024).

3. **Address Equity Gaps**

LSE interventions must *prioritize marginalized groups* including girls, rural children, and Scheduled Caste/Tribe students — who face higher dropout risks. Recognizing LSE as a *tool of resilience and empowerment* is essential for tackling entrenched gender and caste inequities (UNICEF India, 2019; Dream a Dream, 2021).

VII. Conclusion: Bridging the Policy–Practice Divide

The comparative analysis of LSE models in *Finland, Australia, and India* underscores that India's education challenge lies not in policy design but in *structural delivery failures*. While the *NEP 2020* articulates aspirations comparable to high-performing systems, these remain unrealized due to three systemic barriers: limited teacher professional capacity, inadequate infrastructure, and a culture dominated by *high-stakes, summative assessment.*

Finland's model highlights the power of *professional trust and teacher autonomy,* grounded in rigorous research-based preparation. Australia demonstrates the effectiveness of *structured, evidence-driven program fidelity* to ensure consistent outcomes. Together, these approaches present complementary blueprints for reform in India.

To improve socio-emotional competencies (SEC), problem-solving abilities (PSA), and career readiness (CR), India must prioritize:

- Professionalizing teacher training with mandatory participatory pedagogy,

- Equitable resource allocation to support co-curricular and non-academic instruction, and

- Shifting assessment culture from rote-based summative evaluation toward contextualized, formative measures.

Bridging the policy–practice divide requires *systemic transformation* that treats LSE not as an "add-on," but as an intrinsic part of learning. Only then can India effectively prepare its vast student population for the *complex, dynamic, and interdependent demands of the 21st century.*

References :

1. Australian Curriculum. (n.d.). The Australian Curriculum, Version 9.0. https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/

2. Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D. A., & Taylor, G. J. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale—I. Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 38(1), 23–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3999(94)90005-1

3. BMC Psychiatry. (2023). The patterns, trends and major risk factors of suicide among Indian adolescents. BMC Psychiatry. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-05447-8

4. BMC Public Health. (2023). Defining life skills in health promotion at school: A scoping review. BioMed Central. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10758608/

5. CASEL. (2020). CASEL's SEL Framework: What are the SEL competencies?

6. https://casel.org/casel-sel-framework-11-2020/

7. Central Square Foundation. (2020). Life skills in India.

8. Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? European Journal of Teacher Education, 40(3), 291–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1315399

9. Desai, S., et al. (2010). The other half of the demographic dividend. International Institute for Population Sciences

10. Dream a Dream. (2021). Mapping life skills in India: Research, policy & implementation (Secondaryreport).

11. https://dreamadream.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Life-Skills-Mapping-Secondary-Report

12. Finnish National Agency for Education. (n.d.). National core curriculum for primary and lower secondaryeducation: Transversal competences as part of every subject.

13. Fox, R. A., Sharma, U., & Leif, E. (2021). The factors that count: Predicting implementation fidelity of evidence-based behavioural supports in Australian schools. International Journal of

14. Inclusive Education. Advance online publication.

15. Groeben, N., & Scheele, B. (2000). Verbal data and problem-solving: The RAPS-K. Language and Cognitive Processes, 15(4), 423–445.

16. Indian Journal of Psychology and Education (IJIP). (2023). Comparative analysis of life skills education. https://ijip.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/18.01.370.20231103.pdf

17. Learning Policy Institute. (2023). Evidence for social and emotional learning in schools. Banksia Gardens Community Services. https://banksiagardens.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Evidence-for-SEL-REPORT-v4.p df

18. Lutovac, S., Kaasila, R., & Tirri, K. (2024). Teachers' work today: Exploring Finnish teachers' narratives. Teaching and Teacher Education, 136, 104360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104360

19. Miller, A. L., Gouley, K. K., Seifer, R., Zakriski, A. L., Eguia, M., & Vergnani, M. (2015). Emotion knowledge skills in low-income children: A randomized controlled intervention study. Journal of Primary Prevention, 36(1), 1–23.

20. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf

21. NITI Aayog. (2023). Project SATH: Learnings for large-scale transformation in school education. Government of India.

22. National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2024). Career readiness competencies. NACE.

23. https://www.naceweb.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/2024/resources/nace-career-readiness-competencies-revised-apr-2024.pdf

24. National Center on Education and the Economy. (n.d.). Finland. https://ncee.org/finland/

25. OECD. (2013). AHELO: Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes – Feasibility Study Report. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264190597-en

26. OECD. (2019). PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What students know and can do. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en

27. OECD. (2021). OECD Career Readiness project: How schools can better prepare young people for working life in the 21st century. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/74ef1d2f-en

28. OECD. (2023a). PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The state of learning and equity in education. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en

29. OECD. (2023b). PISA 2022 Results (Volume II): Learning during – and from – disruption. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/bd104c7e-en

30. OECD. (2023c). OECD Survey on Social and Emotional Skills: Technical Report 2023. OECD

31. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-survey-on-social-and-emotional-skills-2023-techn ical-report_c37f1703-en.html

32. OECD. (2023d). Education at a Glance 2023: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en

33. OECD. (2023e). Educationpolicy outlook in Finland. OECD Publishing.

34. Ravindranath, S., Jacob, A., Talreja, V., & Bhat, S. (2024). Effectiveness of life skills intervention for children from disadvantaged backgrounds: Insights from a 4-year longitudinal study. Journal of Education. https://doi.org/10.1177/002205742211110477

35. Sahlberg, P. (2007). Education policies for raising student learning: The Finnish case. Journal of Education Policy, 22(2), 147–171. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930601158919

36. Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Goldman, S. L., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T. P. (1995). Emotional attention, clarity, and repair: Exploring emotional intelligence using the Trait Meta-Mood Scale. In J. W. Pennebaker (Ed.), Emotion, disclosure, & health (pp. 125–154). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10182-006

37. ScienceScholar. (2022). A comparative study based on life skills of students in alternative vs mainstream schools, Kerala.

38. Smiling Mind. (2022, March 1). What is Social and Emotional Learning?

39. https://blog.smilingmind.com.au/what-is-social-and-emotional-learning-sel

40. Surendran, G., Chinnakali, P., Dhandapani, M., & Ramasamy, A. (2023). Effect of life skills education on socio-emotional functioning among adolescents in Puducherry, India. Journal of Education and Health Promotion, 12, 355. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37727404/

41. Tagat, A., Naik, S., Chatterjee, U., & Singh, R. (2025). The impact of life skills education on socio-emotional school outcomes in India: Evidence from the C2L

(Childhood to Livelihood) program. BMC Public Health, 25(1), 195. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-21195-0

42. Times of India. (2025, August). Student suicides up 65% in a decade. Times of India. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/education/news/student-suicides-up-65-in-a-decade-ncrb-data-shows-sharper-rise-than-overall-suicides/articleshow/124248503.cms

43. UDISE+. (2023). School infrastructure report 2023–24. https://www.idreameducation.org/blog/school-infrastructure-report-2023-24/

44. UNESCO-UNEVOC. (n.d.). Life skills [Glossary entry]. TVETipedia. https://unevoc.unesco.org/home/TVETipedia%2BGlossary/lang%3De/show%3Dterm/term%3DLife%2Bskills

45. UNICEF. (n.d.). What are life skills? [Fact sheet]. https://www.unicef.org/mena/media/7016/file/English_4%20Pager_OL.pdf

46. UNICEF India. (2019). ComprehensiveLife Skills Framework. https://www.unicef.org/india/media/2571/file/Comprehensive-lifeskills-framework.pdf

47. University of Melbourne. (2024, November 27). More than 50,000 Indian students complete career development program in Andhra Pradesh. University of Melbourne News. https://www.unimelb.edu.au/newsroom/news/2024/november/50%2C000-indian-students-complete-career-development-program

48. World Health Organization. (1993). Life skills education for children and adolescents in schools (WHO/MNH/PSF/93.7A.Rev.2). Geneva: WHO. https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/63552

Ready to submit your research? Choose Auctores and benefit from:

➢ fast, convenient online submission
➢ rigorous peer review by experienced research in your field
➢ rapid publication on acceptance
➢ authors retain copyrights
➢ unique DOI for all articles
➢ immediate, unrestricted online access

At Auctores, research is always in progress.

Learn more https://auctoresonline.org/journals/psychology-and-mental-health-care