Status Analysis of Efforts to Improve Teachers Well-Being

Kexin Han

University of Southampton

* Email:kh2e20@southamptonalumni.ac.uk

ABSTRACT. Due to varying cultural backgrounds and the changing nature of society, teachers' well-being is evolving. Therefore, given the history of educational psychology, there is still much room for advancement in the field of teacher well-being research. The objectives of this study were to look at the current state of research on teachers' well-being and to explore both the drawbacks and advantages of doing so. Future research on methods of enhancing teachers' well-being, particularly from the viewpoints of reducing the influence of negative variables and promoting the growth of positive ones, may benefit from its rich theoretical base.

Keywords: Well-being, Teachers Well-being, Stress, Burnout, School Climate, Teachers Efficacy, Job Satisfaction

1   INTRODUCTION

Numerous studies in the field of educational psychology have been done with the goal of enhancing students' wellbeing. The educational environment is significantly influenced by both students and teachers. However, there aren't many studies that discuss methods for enhancing teachers' wellbeing. The National Association of School Masters and Union of Women Teachers commissioned a survey in 1996, and it found that 66 percent of teachers said they had actively considered leaving in the previous five years due to work discontent [10]. Investigating practical methods to enhance teachers' wellbeing is thus required. To do end, this study aims to wrap up the research on teaching well-being, which can serve as a theoretical foundation for subsequent research.

2   UNDERSTANDING OF 'WELL-BEING'

The study of wellbeing has grown in popularity among psychologists, who now examine it from both a scientific and daily interpersonal perspective. Instead of studying wellbeing as a mental disorder, there has been an increase in knowledge of the positive and negative effects for well-being since the 1960s as a result of a change in research approach. [14]. Based on these various study traditions, some researchers examine the causes and consequences of happiness, self-esteem, optimism, and other positive well-

being indicators, whilst other psychologists concentrate on the adverse repercussions, such as anxiety, stress, and burnout. However, each theoretical structure contains two features for each of them. Psychological well-being [6][14], occupational well-being [18], professional well-being theory (teachers well-being), and subjective well-being [8][14] all hold prominent positions in the field of well-being research. [4] [11][16].

2.1   Subjective Well-being

Hedonism and eudemonism, often known as subjective well-being and psychological well-being, are two philosophical schools that have been studied in depth. [14].A cognitive assessment of life satisfaction and an emotional element made up of both positive and negative characteristics are incorporated in the subjective well-being model, which is one branch of the traditional research [8]. Generally speaking, life satisfaction refers to a person's assessment of their life as a whole, which is constant and mostly unaffected by their feelings and opinions at the moment. [8]. n contrast to that, the emotional aspects—both positive and negative—align with people's current experiences [8]. In other words, people's happiness is influenced by the ratio of positive to bad aspects.

However, there is still some ambiguity about this paradigm and other ideas. In certain research, for instance, life satisfaction and optimism are equal. Furthermore, according to some, optimism is a sign of bad effect. Based on the definition, Lucas et al. developed a multitrait-multimethod matrix to analyze the criminant validities of this model in order to test its validity. The results of the experiment provide strong support for the discriminant validityof (a) positive affect from negative affect, (b) life satisfaction from positive and negative affect, (c) life satisfaction from optimism and self-esteem, and (d) optimism from negative affect (and positive affect) (see table 1 to 9) [8]. In brief, the subjective wellbeing paradigm is an accepted one in the field of well-being research.

Table 1. Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix of Subjective Well-being Measures in Study 1 CR [8]

Measure	Time 1 self-report			Time 2 self-report			Informant report		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Time 1 self-report									
1. Life satisfaction	(.84)								
2. Positive affect	.52	(.85)							
3. Negative affect	−.36	−.14	(.83)						
Time 2 self-report									
1. Life satisfaction	.77	.44	−.32	(.87)					
2. Positive affect	.45	.67	−.10	.43	(.89)				
3. Negative affect	−.26	−.11	.66	−.30	−.14	(.85)			
Informant report									
1. Life satisfaction	.48	.28	−.16	.49	.29	−.14	(.86)		
2. Positive affect	.31	.43	−.14	.28	.44	−.01	.49	(.88)	
3. Negative affect	−.21	−.02	.26	−.21	−.13	.35	−.35	−.23	(.85)

Note. Correlations are based on 212 participants. All correlations above .18 are significant at $p < .01$. Coefficient alphas are in parentheses; convergent validity coefficients are in bold.

Table 2. Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix of Subjective Well-Being Measures in Study 2 CR [8]

Measure	1991 self-report			1994 self-report			Informant report		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1991 self-report									
1. Life satisfaction	(.82)								
2. Positive affect	.47	(.76)							
3. Negative affect	−.48	−.32	(.83)						
1994 self-report									
1. Life satisfaction	**.68**	.29	−.32	(.82)					
2. Positive affect	.30	**.56**	−.20	.52	(.83)				
3. Negative affect	−.43	−.21	**.61**	−.51	−.36	(.85)			
Informant report									
1. Life satisfaction	**.41**	.26	−.24	**.52**	.38	−.30	(.88)		
2. Positive affect	.47	**.42**	−.22	.48	**.41**	−.30	.56	(.81)	
3. Negative affect	−.32	−.15	**.45**	−.38	−.25	**.44**	−.47	−.43	(.85

Note. Correlations are based on 109 participants. All correlations above .23 are significant at $p < .01$ Coefficient alphas are in parentheses; convergent validity coefficients are in bold.

Table 3. Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix of Subjective Well-Being Measures in Study 3 CR[8]

Measure	1	2	3	1	2	3
1. SWLS	(.88)					
2. PANAS–PA	.42	(.81)				
3. PANAS–NA	−.36	.03	(.78)			
1. Life satisfaction	.77	.47	−.39	(.90)		
2. ABS–PA	.51	**.60**	−.38	.65	(.94)	
3. ABS–NA	−.49	−.15	**.66**	−.58	−.57	(.92)

Note. Correlations are based on 172 participants. All correlations above .15 are significant at $p < .01$. Coefficient alphas are in parentheses; convergent validity coefficients are in bold. SWLS = Satisfaction With Life Scale; PANAS = Positive and Negative Affect Schedules; PA = positive affect; NA = negative affect; ABS = Affect Balance Scale.

Table 4. Table 4 Multifruit-Multimethod Matrix of Life Satisfaction, Optimism, and Self-Esteem Measure in Study 1 CR[8]

Measure	Time 1 self-report			Time 2 self-report			Informant report		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Time 1 self-report									
1. Life satisfaction	(.84)								
2. Optimism	.60	(.81)							
3. Self-esteem	.59	.57	(.85)						
Time 2 self-report									
1. Life satisfaction	**.77**	.59	.53	(.87)					
2. Optimism	.47	**.76**	.54	.52	(.87)				
3. Self-esteem	.49	.52	**.65**	.55	.57	(.85)			
Informant report									
1. Life satisfaction	**.48**	.41	.35	**.49**	.36	.49	(.86)		
2. Optimism	.40	**.50**	.34	.34	**.46**	.39	.56	(.82)	
3. Self-esteem	.32	.27	**.31**	.29	.27	**.40**	.56	.56	(.82)

Note. Correlations are based on 212 participants. All correlations above .18 are significant at $p < .01$. Coefficient alphas are in parentheses; convergent validity coefficients are in bold.

Table 5. Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix of Life Satisfaction, Optimism, and Self-Esteem Measures in Study 2 CR[8]

Measure	1991 self-report			1994 self-report			Informant report		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1991 self-report									
1. Life satisfaction	(.82)								
2. Optimism	.59	(.84)							
3. Self-esteem	.65	.66	(.89)						
1994 self-report									
1. Life satisfaction	**.68**	.31	.36	(.82)					
2. Optimism	.49	**.58**	.43	.55	(.85)				
3. Self-esteem	.51	.48	**.53**	.55	.72	(.89)			
Informant report									
1. Life satisfaction	**.41**	.28	.31	**.52**	.42	.42	(.88)		
2. Optimism	.53	**.44**	.40	.46	**.40**	.46	.60	(.68)	
3. Self-esteem	.43	.26	**.27**	.47	.36	**.45**	.58	.67	(.89)

Note. Correlations are based on 109 participants. All correlations above .23 are significant at $p < .01$. Coefficient alphas are in parentheses; convergent validity coefficients are in bold.

Table 6. Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix of Life Satisfaction, Optimism, and Self-Esteem Measures in Study 3 CR[8]

Measure	1	2	3	1	2	3
1. SWLS	(.88)					
2. LOT	.57	(.87)				
3. Self-esteem	.54	.69	(.89)			
1. Life satisfaction	.77	.61	.58	(.90)		
2. Hopelessness Scale	.49	**.53**	.54	.60	(.84)	
3. FIS	.43	.61	**.71**	.47	.48	(.93)

Note. Correlations are based on 172 participants. All correlations above .15 are significant at $p < .01$. Coefficient alphas are in parentheses; convergent validity coefficients are in bold. SWLS = Satisfaction With Life Scale; LOT = Life Orientation Test; FIS = Feelings of Inadequacy Scale.

Table 7. Multitrait-Multimethod Martrix of Positive Affect, Negative Affect, and Optimism Measures in Study 1 [8]

Measure	Time 1 self-report			Time 2 self-report			Informant report		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Time 1 self-report									
1. Positive affect	(.85)								
2. Negative affect	−.14	(.83)							
3. Optimism	.55	−.38	(.81)						
Time 2 self-report									
1. Positive affect	**.67**	−.11	.51	(.89)					
2. Negative affect	.10	**.66**	−.30	−.14	(.85)				
3. Optimism	.47	−.31	**.76**	.43	−.32	(.87)			
Informant report									
1. Positive affect	**.43**	−.02	.38	**.44**	.13	.38	(.88)		
2. Negative affect	−.14	**.26**	−.20	−.01	**.35**	−.18	−.23	(.85)	
3. Optimism	.32	−.23	**.50**	.22	−.30	**.46**	.56	−.50	(.82)

Note. Correlations are based on 212 participants. All correlations above .18 are significant at $p < .01$. Coefficient alphas are in parentheses; convergent validity coefficients are in bold.

Table 8. Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix of Positive Affect, Negative Affect, and Optimism Measures in Study 2 [8]

Measure	1991 self-report			1994 self-report			Informant report		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Time 1 self-report									
1. Positive affect	(.76)								
2. Negative affect	−.32	(.83)							
3. Optimism	.51	−.57	(.84)						
1994 self-report									
1. Positive affect	**.57**	−.20	.30	(.83)					
2. Negative affect	.22	**.62**	.44	−.35	(.85)				
3. Optimism	.27	−.40	**.58**	.38	−.64	(.85)			
Informant report									
1. Positive affect	**.42**	−.22	.36	**.41**	.31	.35	(.81)		
2. Negative affect	−.15	**.45**	−.26	−.25	**.45**	−.33	−.43	(.85)	
3. Optimism	.31	−.32	**.44**	.34	−.36	**.40**	.58	−.57	(.68)

Note. Correlations are based on 109 participants. All correlations above .23 are significant at $p < .01$. Coefficient alphas are in parentheses; convergent validity coefficients are in bold.

Table 9. Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix of Positive Affect, Negative Affect, and Optimism Measures in Study 3 [8]

Measure	1	2	3	1	2	3
1. PANAS–PA	(.81)					
2. PANAS–NA	−.03	(.78)				
3. LOT	.45	−.48	(.87)			
1. ABS–PA	**.60**	−.38	.66	(.94)		
2. ABS–NA	−.15	**.66**	.53	−.57	(.92)	
3. Hopelessness Scale	.27	−.40	**.53**	.55	−.55	(.84)

Note. Correlations are based on 172 participants. All correlations above .15 are significant at the $p < .01$ level. Coefficient alphas are in parentheses; convergent validity coefficients are in bold. PANAS = Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; PA = positive affect; NA = negative affect; LOT = Life Orientation Test; ABS = Affect Balance Scale.

2.2   Psychological Well-being

Psychological well-being is a significant area of well-being research that is based on hedonism and eudaimonism [14]. Psychological well-being is concerned with how a person feels about their own "engagement with existential issues of life" and ongoing personal growth [6]. Additionally, it is a multidimensional model of well-being that takes into account both positive and negative psychological functioning and is made up of six different aspects of psychological functioning. In conclusion, these dimensions encompass a wide range of well-being, including how people view themselves and their past lives (Self-Acceptance), how they feel they are constantly growing and developing (Personal Growth), whether they believe their life has a purpose and is meaningful (Purpose in Life), whether they have positive relationships with others, how well they are able to manage their lives and their environment (Environmental Mastery), and more. With data from a sample of 1108 persons who took part in telephone interviews, Ryff and Keyes examined the connection between the six components and people's wellbeing after testing the reliability and validity. The findings demonstrate a beneficial relationship between each component of psychological functioning and people's well-being [15]. As a result, this model might be viewed as combining theoretical research with experimental model in the field of well-being study.

2.3   Occupational Well-being

The study of well-being is aligned with a particular setting, an occupational context, as opposed to the universal and context-free paradigm of well-being presented above. In his model of mental health, Warr identified four main aspects that can be used to examine the connection between workplace factors and employees' well-being [19]. The four major dimensions are listed below. Affective well-being is typically equivalent to assessing pleasure or unhappiness [19]. Aspiration correlates with a person's interest in

and level of motivation in their work environment [19]. Autonomy is a term used to describe a person's degree of freedom, which entails finding a balance between acting on their own convictions and according to rules [19]. Competencies refer, finally, to self-efficacy and individual success [19].

Thus, the occupational well-being model is developed based on the psychological well-being model and the mental health model, focused on the behavioral dimension rather than just affect and motivation. It stands out among the five dimensions. The affective, social, and professional well-being dimensions, which are articulated in the psychological well-being model and the mental health model, can all be covered by three of them. The extendable aspect of affective well-being contributes to organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and emotional tiredness [18]. Depersonalization and level of self-efficacy in interpersonal interactions at work are two components of the social well-being dimensions [18]. Autonomy, aspiration, and professional competence are all included in the professional well-being dimension [18][19]. Additionally, the occupational well-being model now includes two additional dimensions. One is cognitive fatigue, which may be a reflection of employees' cognitive abilities. Examining employees' well-being can be beneficial in light of the complicated nature of the work [18]. The psychosomatic dimension that coincides with psychosomatic problems is another; it plays a significant role in occupational well-being [18]. In light of this, the occupational well-being model is a multidimensional model that can be understood by quantitative study among 1252 Dutch teachers using the confirmatory analysis method and second-order factor analysis. [18]

3   TEACHERS WELL-BEING

The majority of research discuss several different aspects of professional and occupational well-being. However, few studies are concentrated on the specific business or school. The next section will move the focus to the classroom and describe the current state of the teachers' well-being study.

3.1   Current Situation of Teachers Well-being

It is undeniable that teachers are under increased stress and burnout as a result of the increasingly demanding test scores used to evaluate their work and the growth in the number of children entering school [17]. Nearly 50% of teachers quit their jobs during the first five years of their careers, according to a poll, but those who stay in the profession also experience the same things [11]. This is likely due to stress and burnout symptoms. It is apparent that studies and not just educational departments give little thought to the wellbeing of teachers, which creates a challenging status quo for them.The "Double Reduction Policy" has resulted in the same problem that teachers are currently facing. In order to lessen the stress of the extensive homework and the after-school training on the children, the ministry of education announced the "Double Reduction Policy" in 2021. This policy is centered on strengthening the quality of education and student wellbeing. However, every coin has two sides. Chinese teachers are

under a great deal of strain as a result of the policy. because teachers must accomplish the same promotion rate goal as before in less time. In other words, there is less research focusing on teachers' well-being despite the fact that it is threatened. What types of factors harm teachers' well-being? Will the efficiency of teaching and learning be negatively impacted by these symptoms? Exist any effective methods for enhancing teachers' well-being? Even if there aren't many studies looking at them, the next section will come to a conclusion regarding the current state of the field.

3.2   The Factor of Decreasing Teachers Well-being： Stress & Its Negative Effects in Teaching-Learning

According to the context of education, traditional research on teachers' well-being focuses on the causes and effects of stress, burnout, and anxiety on teachers' wellbeing. [2][9][10][12][13]. In earlier research, teacher well-being has been referred to as "deficit terms," which relates to how stress affects teacher burnout and retention issues [13]. Prior to that, it is necessary to identify the primary sources of stress. Because identifying methods for preventing and releasing stress, as well as assisting in the elimination of the elements that contribute to a decrease in student well-being, may be helpful.

Based on this, some research have examined the teacher-student interactions as one of the primary reasons of teachers' stress [2][9][12][13]. A variety of physical, human, and social capital as well as other components make up the diverse community that is a school [13]. Expectations and interactions that foster mutual regard, trust, and cooperation are known as social capital [13]. Interactions, particularly those between teachers and students, are cyclical processes. First off, most kids exhibit poor attention spans, low motivation, subpar academic performance, and social incompetence while under extreme stress [9]. Second, it could be challenging for teachers to maintain their claims when dealing with these bad behaviors. However, when teachers overreact emotionally, it causes them to respond ineffectively, which results in severe misbehaviors [9]. Then, because they lack confidence in their ability to control the classroom and in the effectiveness of their instruction, teachers who lack the ability to effectively respond to difficult students will feel higher levels of stress and burnout [2][3][9]. Consequently, it is a vicious cycle that causes stress and burnout while also lowering teachers' well-being. On the other hand, according to empirical studies, the main sources of stress are educational transformation and educational policy [10][12]. Teachers' stress is a result of education reform and educational policy for three reasons. And they are all in agreement that they feel their professional life are being compromised [10]. First of all, the majority of teachers claim that they are forced to carry out rules that they don't think are in the best interests of the students. Next, more time is spent on administrative, external tasks, leaving less time for teachers to focus on the unique requirements of each student in their classrooms. And last, playing a key role in disseminating ideas that go against their own educational beliefs [10]. Therefore, educational policy changes that don't take into account the role of teachers or aren't written by them may cause stress in teachers and degrade their well-being.

The detrimental impact of stress on academic performance must be discussed after learning about the sources of stress. The primary effects are burnout and physical health

[13]. Burnout is viewed as a psychiatric syndrome that can happen to persons who work with other people in some manner [2]. It is characterized by emotional weariness, depersonalization, and decreased personal accomplishment. According to the previous remark, stress may be related to instructors' lack of confidence in the classroom [9], which implies that stress and self-efficacy have a negative link [2]. As a result, stress lowers instructors' sense of personal success, which eventually causes burnout. On the one hand, burnout among instructors may lower the quality of teaching and learning [2][7][5]. On the other hand, teachers who are burnt out might think about the retention issue [17]. The learning environment for children and the financial health of schools would both be affected by the stability of the teaching population [2]. From the standpoint of physical health, it is widely acknowledged that long-term exposure to work stress causes the hippocampus, the area of the brain most engaged in memory, to degenerate [2]. However, it may also result in more severe health risks such cardiovascular disease and gastrointestinal problems [2]. In conclusion, stress has a detrimental effect on the teaching-learning environment and instructors' health, both of which are related to the well-being of teachers.

3.3   The Factors of Increasing Teachers Well-being

In contrast to earlier studies that mostly examined stress, depression, and burnout among teachers, more and more researchers are now focused on discovering the positive elements that can contribute to teachers' wellbeing as opposed to just the negative ones [1][4][20]. Because research into identifying beneficial qualities may aid in schools and other social institutions taking steps to enhance teachers' well-being.

Although some research indicates a connection between favorable factors and teachers' well-being, for example, demonstrating that self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and recognition are the main factors influencing teachers' well-being [20], the majority of research focuses on a particular area to investigate that. Personal perspective, workplace perspective, and social perspective are three categories into which the elements can be divided [20]. Studies that emphasize the individual viewpoint of teachers stress that a teacher's well-being is a subjective concept that is unique to them [20]. However, a number of studies concentrate on the workplace, exploring the relationship between job characteristics and teachers' well-being, including job content, role complexity and conflict, autonomy and workload pressure, physical and material working conditions, school climate, and interpersonal relationships [20]. In addition, social viewpoint is an important topic of study. These studies emphasize the impact of teachers' professional status, pay, and the distrust-inducing environment brought on by social media [20].

There are numerous studies that address workplace variables that affect teachers' well-being, as was stated above. The organizational climate of schools and teachers' creativity, for instance, are positively correlated, as demonstrated by the Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire (OCDQ) [4]. It follows that an encouraging environment can contribute to teachers' wellbeing. Based on this, and particularly from the standpoint of the administrator-teacher working relationship, Butt used the qualitative study method to investigate the traits of a favorable and negative school climate [4].

Three themes emerged from this study: Climate and interpersonal communication facilitation of career growth and workplace learning, all of which are assessed according to educational background. They each have two sides as well. The good side can contribute to raising teachers' well-being, whereas the bad side lowers it [4]. In short, the research demonstrates that a pleasant (open) school atmosphere may enhance teachers' welfare, and depending on the three elements, other techniques may be investigated.

According to the foregoing, focused on the workplace, this study aims to draw conclusions about the approaches or programs whose utility has been assessed in earlier empirical investigations. The conclusion would offer some encouragement to school administrators and well-being researchers from many cultural backgrounds.

4   SUGGESTIONS

There are two ways to investigate the methods for enhancing teachers' well-being in light of the preceding assertion. Studies may, on the one hand, concentrate on identifying methods that can help to lessen the detrimental aspects of teachers' wellbeing. Investigating various therapies, for instance, can assist instructors in managing their emotions while dealing with student misconduct. Maintaining a high degree of self-efficacy could help instructors feel better by causing them to be under less stress. Conversely, studies are designed to examine methods from the perspective of the beneficial elements that contribute to instructors' wellbeing. It implies that research can concentrate on some mindfulness programs, which can encourage the development of positive aspects, such as "the advice of building an open climate at school" and "schools' administrators training."

5   CONCLUSION

This study outlines the development of educational psychology research on teachers' well-being as well as the detrimental and beneficial aspects of that research. Psychology has a wide range of well-being studies that have been divided into a number of aspects, including subjective well-being, psychological well-being, and occupational well-being. Based on this, and concentrating on a particular workplace, the well-being of teachers is addressed. The present research on teachers' well-being focuses on both positive and negative aspects, some of which can serve to improve teachers' well-being. Examples of these negative elements include poor teacher-student interactions and educational policies. The methods of enhancing teachers' well-being may be investigated by removing negative influences and promoting positive factors. In conclusion, this research can serve as a theoretical foundation for future investigations into the wellbeing of teachers.

6 REFERENCES

1. [Aelterman, A., Engels, N., Van Petegem, K., & Pierre Verhaeghe, J. (2007). The well-being of teachers in Flanders: the importance of a supportive school culture. *Educational studies*, *33*(3), 285-297.

2. Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher education*, *16*(2), 239-253.

3. Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. (1995). A longitudinal study of psychological burnout in teachers. *Human relations*, *48*(2), 187-202.

4. Butt, R., & Retallick, J. (2002). Professional well-being and learning: A study of administrator-teacher workplace relationships. *The Journal of Educational Enquiry*, *3*(1).

5. Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of educational research*, *79*(1), 491-525.

6. Keyes, C. L. M., & Lopez, S. J. (2001). Towards a Science of Mental Health. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology (*pp. 45-59). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

7. Kinman, G., Wray, S., & Strange, C. (2011). Emotional labour, burnout and job satisfaction in UK teachers: The role of workplace social support. *Educational Psychology*, *31*(7), 843-856.

8. Lucas, R. E., Diener, E., & Suh, E. (1996). Discriminant validity of well-being measures. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *71*(3), 616.

9. Maag, J. W. (2008). Rational—Emotive Therapy to Help Teachers Control Their Emotions and Behavior When Dealing With Disagreeable Students. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *44*(1), 52-57.

10. Moriarty, V., Edmonds, S., Blatchford, P., & Martin, C. (2001). Teaching young children: Perceived satisfaction and stress. *Educational Research*, *43*(1), 33-46.

11. National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: teaching for America's future.* Author: New York.

12. Robertson, C., & Dunsmuir, S. (2013). Teacher stress and pupil behaviour explored through a rational-emotive behaviour therapy framework. *Educational Psychology*, *33*(2), 215-232.

13. Roffey, S. (2012). Pupil wellbeing—Teacher wellbeing: Two sides of the same coin?. *Educational and child psychology*, *29*(4), 8.

14. 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*, 141.

15. Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *69*(4), 719.

16. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *25*(3), 293-315.

17. Schussler, D. L., Jennings, P. A., Sharp, J. E., & Frank, J. L. (2016). Improving teacher awareness and well-being through CARE: A qualitative analysis of the underlying mechanisms. *Mindfulness*, *7*(1), 130-142.

18. Van Horn, J. E., Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Schreurs, P. J. (2004). The structure of occupational well-being: A study among Dutch teachers. *Journal of occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *77*(3), 365-375.

19. Warr, P. (1987). *Work, unemployment, and mental health*. Oxford University Press.

20. Yildirim, K. (2015). Testing the main determinants of teachers' professional well-being by using a mixed method. *Teacher Development*, *19*(1), 59-78.