

Teachers' Subjective Well-Being and Occupational Resilience

Chona C. Meneses

Teachers perform a wide range of roles and responsibilities that extend beyond classroom instruction (Siddiqui & Ahamed, 2020; Keiler, 2018; Miller, 2021). These include delivering educational and training activities, adhering to civil service regulations, maintaining regular class attendance, fulfilling professional duties, communicating with school stakeholders, carrying out tasks assigned by the state, and adapting to ongoing changes in the educational environment. In the course of performing these responsibilities, teachers inevitably encounter various challenges that influence both their work performance and overall health (Oliveira et al., 2025). While some teachers remain motivated and resilient despite these difficulties, others may experience reduced energy, diminished confidence, and a sense of powerlessness. Such differences in responses may be attributed to individual factors such as past experiences and personality traits, which shape how teachers perceive and cope with professional demands. These variations stress the importance of understanding the concepts of occupational resilience and subjective well-being (SWB), as both reflect how individuals evaluate and respond to their professional and personal experiences.

Although extensive research has examined teacher stress in the workplace (Jayman, 2026; Li et al., 2026; Sharma & Chand, 2025; Collie & Mansfield, 2022; Bidi et al., 2024), studies on teacher occupational resilience have only gained attention in recent years (Beltman et al., 2011). Occupational resilience is defined as a teacher's ability to adapt to changing conditions, overcome challenges, and sustain commitment to the profession (Baatz & Wirzberger, 2025). This concept is closely linked to SWB, which reflects teachers' overall life satisfaction and emotional state. These constructs provide a more comprehensive understanding of how teachers maintain effectiveness and stability in demanding educational contexts.

Given the increasing demands placed on educators, particularly in alternative education settings, it is essential to examine the occupational resilience and SWB of teachers. Understanding the relationship between these variables is crucial for improving teacher effectiveness and enhancing the quality of education.

Teachers' Subjective Well-Being

SWB is commonly used interchangeably with the concept of happiness in the literature (Liang et al., 2021; Vittersø, 2025; Diener et al., 2003; Khalil, 2025). It is also associated with related constructs such as well-being (Escaron et al., 2023; Turner et al., 2022), personal well-being (Mussone & Changizi, 2023; Morales et al., 2025), psychological well-being (Joshnloo, 2019; Moreta-Herrera et al., 2023; Stuart-Edwards, 2025), spiritual well-being (González-González et al., 2025; El Abiddine et al., 2025; Villani et al., 2019), emotional well-being (Morales et al., 2025), life satisfaction (Veenhoven, 2012; Simões et al., 2021), and quality of life (Skevington & Böhnke, 2018; Liu et al., 2023). Although these concepts are not identical, they are interconnected and collectively reflect an individual's sense of happiness and

life evaluation. SWB is treated as an umbrella concept encompassing different dimensions as an individual's overall self-appraisal of life (Krueger et al., 2009). Proctor (2014) described it as a person's global judgment of life satisfaction and framed it as both cognitive and affective evaluations of life experiences.

SWB consists of three core components: life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect (Myers & Diener, 1995). Life satisfaction represents the cognitive dimension, reflecting how individuals evaluate their lives as a whole (Vittersø, 2025). In contrast, positive and negative affect represent the emotional dimension, encompassing the frequency of pleasant and unpleasant emotional experiences (Diener, 1985). Positive affect includes emotions such as joy and enthusiasm, which support meaningful relationships and goal-directed behavior (Garg et al., 2026), while negative affect includes emotions such as sadness, fear, and anger (Leung & Lee, 2014). A higher prevalence of positive emotions relative to negative emotions indicates higher SWB (Das et al., 2020). Conversely, persistent negative affect can diminish overall well-being and hinder personal functioning (Gautam et al., 2024).

SWB among teachers is shaped by a range of demographic, psychological, and socio-cultural factors (Kurrle & Warwas, 2025). The influence of these factors varies across individuals and educational contexts because of differences in culture, social environments, and geographical settings (Smith & Bond, 2019). High levels of SWB enable teachers to maintain better physical and mental health, enhance productivity, and foster positive relationships within the school community (Dreer, 2023). In contrast, low SWB can negatively affect teachers' personal functioning, job satisfaction, and professional performance (Assaf & Antoun, 2024).

The importance of teachers' SWB extends beyond individual welfare to educational effectiveness. Teachers who experience higher levels of well-

being are more likely to engage positively with students and contribute to a supportive learning environment (Karakasidou et al., 2025; Prananto et al., 2025; Wang & Jin, 2025). Conversely, those who struggle to cope with professional challenges may experience declining performance, reduced job satisfaction, or even leave the profession (Oliveira et al., 2025). Therefore, promoting and maintaining teachers' SWB is essential for supporting teacher retention, strengthening teacher–student relationships, and improving the overall quality of education.

Determinants and Correlates of Subjective Well-Being

Theoretical and empirical studies have identified various determinants and correlates of SWB (Das et al., 2020; Tamberg et al., 2026), although relatively few empirical studies fully align with theoretical models. Most research focuses on how these determinants influence evaluative (EVA) and emotional (EMO) dimensions of SWB. These determinants can be grouped into seven categories (Azizan & Mahmud, 2018; Salameh et al., 2022; Ngamaba, 2017; Ba, 2020; Nanor et al., 2021; Pontarollo et al., 2020; Tamberg et al., 2026): (1) basic demographics (e.g., age, gender, race/ethnicity), (2) socioeconomic status (e.g., income, education, employment), (3) health and functioning (e.g., physical and mental health, disability), (4) personality traits (e.g., self-efficacy, optimism, self-esteem), (5) social support (e.g., relationships and social satisfaction), (6) religion and culture (e.g., religiosity and cultural context), and (7) geography and infrastructure (e.g., living conditions and access to resources).

However, variability in conceptualization, measurement tools, study design, and sample characteristics limits comparability across studies. Differences in SWB dimensions, measurement instruments, and research design, particularly between cross-sectional and longitudinal studies, affect

the interpretation of findings. Additionally, cultural and contextual differences influence how SWB is understood and measured, further complicating generalization. Therefore, consistent frameworks and methodologies are necessary to improve comparability and strengthen the evidence base.

Occupational Resilience

In the context of rapid societal and professional change, occupational resilience has become increasingly important for coping with workplace challenges. Psychological resilience in professional life is often associated with three key attitudes: commitment, control, and challenge (Prisăcaru, 2025). Individuals who value their profession and believe in their competence are more likely to adapt to change and view difficulties as opportunities for growth rather than threats (Liu & Tong, 2022). Harland et al. (2005) further identified resilience factors such as external support (e.g., role models and family), internal strengths (e.g., optimism and empathy), and interpersonal problem-solving skills.

Teacher resilience, specifically, has gained attention only in recent years despite long-standing research on teacher stress (Beltman et al., 2011). It is defined as the ability to adapt to changing conditions, overcome challenges, and sustain commitment to the profession (Salvo-Garrido et al., 2025). Resilient teachers are characterized by attributes such as optimism, flexibility, problem-solving skills, emotional intelligence, and strong interpersonal relationships (Beltman et al., 2011). These qualities enable teachers to cope effectively with stress, maintain instructional quality, and support student development.

Empirical studies indicate that occupational resilience is positively associated with job satisfaction and negatively associated with burnout (Askaripoor et al., 2024; Piotrowski et al., 2022; Ibrahim & Hussein, 2024).

Resilient teachers are more likely to remain committed to the profession and effectively address students' academic and emotional needs (Salvo-Garrido et al., 2025). However, resilience may decline over time due to prolonged exposure to stress (Brouskeli et al., 2018). Hence, occupational resilience sustains teacher performance and well-being .

Relationship Between Teachers' Subjective Well-Being and Occupational Resilience

Teachers' SWB is closely associated with their ability to adapt to and overcome professional challenges. Research indicates that teachers with higher levels of SWB tend to exhibit greater resilience and cope more effectively with workplace demands and stressors (Beltman et al., 2011). This relationship is further strengthened by social and emotional support, as teachers with strong support networks report higher levels of well-being and enhanced resilience (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017).

The positive effects of subjective well-being extend to teachers' professional satisfaction and commitment. Resilience has been identified as a key mechanism linking SWB and job satisfaction, as teachers with greater well-being are better equipped to manage occupational stress and remain committed to their profession (Zee & Koomen, 2016). Consequently, teachers who possess both high well-being and resilience are more likely to sustain long-term performance and remain in the teaching profession (Roeser & Eccles, 2015).

Beyond its impact on teachers themselves, subjective well-being also influences educational outcomes. Teachers who are emotionally healthy and resilient create more positive classroom environments, foster stronger teacher–student relationships, and contribute to improved student outcomes (Çetin et al., 2025). Thus, the interconnected relationship between subjective well-

being and occupational resilience plays a vital role in promoting teacher effectiveness, professional longevity, and overall educational quality.

RESEARCH FOCUS: Occupational Resilience and Subjective Well-Being of Teachers in the Alternative Learning System

This study assessed the levels of Alternative Learning System (ALS) teachers' occupational resilience and SWB and examined the relationship between them. Using descriptive–correlational research design, descriptive research was used to systematically gather, analyze, and interpret data on existing conditions and practices while correlational research determined the degree of relationship between variables and allowed for predictive analysis. This design was appropriate for identifying how SWB relates to occupational resilience and how this relationship varies according to factors such as sex, age, educational qualification, and years of service.

The participants consisted of 46 ALS teachers, selected as the entire study group and categorized based on demographic variables. Data were collected using two instruments: the Teacher Well-being Questionnaire (TWQ) and the Occupational Resilience Scale (ORS), along with a personal information sheet. The TWQ, a Likert-scale instrument with 75 items, measured various dimensions of teachers' well-being, while the ORS, composed of 17 items, assessed teachers' occupational resilience. Both instruments used scaled responses, and mean scores were computed and interpreted using established descriptive categories. Data analysis involved computing weighted means to determine levels of well-being and resilience, followed by statistical procedures to examine relationships between variables.

The results in Table 1 indicate that ALS teachers demonstrate a good level of SWB overall ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .46$). Across the three dimensions, teachers reported good levels in physical and environmental health ($M = 3.38$,

SD = .46), mental and emotional health (M = 3.71, SD = .47), and spiritual and social health (M = 4.03, SD = .50), with the latter obtaining the highest mean. The consistently low standard deviation values suggest minimal variability, indicating that responses are closely clustered and relatively uniform across participants.

Table 1

Level of ALS teachers' subjective well-being as an entire group

Teachers' wellbeing	Mean	SD	Description
Physical and environmental health	3.38	.46	Good
Mental and emotional health	3.71	.47	Good
Spiritual and social health	4.03	.50	Good
Over-all Mean	3.70	.46	Good

Legend: 0.00-0.83 Very poor; 0.84-1.67 Poor; 1.68-2.50 Fair; 2.51-3.33 Moderate; 3.34-4.17 Good; 4.18-5.00 Very good

The ALS teachers generally maintain a positive outlook, balanced work-life conditions, and stable emotional and social functioning. However, the comparatively lower mean in physical and environmental health suggests that while overall well-being is favorable, environmental and physical factors may still pose moderate challenges. While ALS teachers demonstrate generally positive well-being, sustaining this level requires continuous institutional support and attention to physical and environmental conditions.

When categorized by sex, both male (M = 3.68, SD = .49) and female (M = 3.72, SD = .42) teachers exhibited similarly good levels of SWB. Female teachers showed slightly higher mean scores across all dimensions, although the differences were minimal and not practically significant. In both groups, spiritual and social health remained the strongest dimension, indicating that relational and value-based factors are central to teachers' well-being. The

negligible variation between groups suggests that SWB is not strongly influenced by sex, but rather by shared professional experiences and working conditions.

Table 2

Level of occupational resilience of ALS teachers

Variables	Mean	SD	Description
Entire group	3.01	.29	Good
Sex			
Male	2.98	.29	Good
Female	3.04	.29	Good
Educational Attainment			
Bachelors	3.00	.29	Good
Masters	3.08	.27	Good
Age			
Young	3.05	.33	Good
Middle	3.02	.32	Good
Old	2.97	.22	Good
Length of Experience			
Short	2.98	.27	Good
Average	3.00	.35	Good
Long	3.09	.18	Good

Legend: 1.00-1.75 Very poor; 1.76-2.50 Poor; 2.51-3.25 Good; 3.26-4.00 Very good

Table 2 shows that ALS teachers possess a good level of occupational resilience ($M = 3.01$, $SD = .29$), indicating their ability to adapt to challenges and manage stress. Across all demographic variables, sex, educational attainment, age, and length of experience, resilience levels remained consistently “good,” with only slight variations. Teachers with longer experience showed marginally higher resilience ($M = 3.09$), suggesting that experience may contribute to coping skills, although not to a statistically

significant extent. The low standard deviation values across all groups further indicate consistency in responses.

ALS teachers are generally capable of navigating workplace demands, recovering from setbacks, and maintaining functionality under pressure. However, the “good” level, rather than “very good,” indicates room for further development, particularly in strengthening coping strategies and adaptive capacity. Resilience is not solely dependent on demographic factors but is shaped by professional context and support systems. Teachers’ ability to persist despite challenges reflects both individual competence and the demands of the ALS environment.

Table 3

t-test results of the difference in occupational resilience according to variables

Variables	Mean	t-value	df	Sig level
Sex				
Male	2.98	-.678	44	.502
Female	3.04			
Educational attainment				
Bachelors	3.00	.727	44	.471
Masters	3.08			

Table 4

ANOVA in the occupational resilience according to variables

Variables	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig. level	
Age	Between Groups	.040	2	.020	.229	.796
	Within Groups	3.728	43	.087		
	Total	3.767	45			
Length of experience	Between Groups	.066	2	.033	.381	.685
	Within Groups	3.702	43	.086		
	Total	3.767	45			

As shown in Table 3, statistical analysis using t-test, and Table 4. ANOVA, revealed no significant differences in occupational resilience across sex ($t(44) = -0.678, p > 0.05$), educational attainment ($t(44) = 0.727, p > 0.05$), age ($F(2,43) = 0.229, p > 0.05$), and length of experience ($F(2,43) = 0.381, p > 0.05$). These findings indicate that occupational resilience is relatively uniform among ALS teachers, regardless of demographic characteristics. Resilience is more strongly influenced by shared professional conditions rather than individual background factors.

The results are consistent with Francisco and Buri (2024), which similarly found no significant demographic differences in resilience. Additionally, findings by Beltman et al. (2011), Patan et al. (2025), and Tachado and Tumarong (2024) support the absence of variation based on experience. Critically, this uniformity highlights that resilience development may require systemic interventions rather than targeted demographic-based strategies.

Table 5

Linear regression analysis on the predictors of teachers' occupational resilience

ALS teachers' subjective well being	Coefficients			t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Beta	Standard Error	Standardized Beta		
Physical & environmental health	-1.687	.203	-2.680	-8.315**	.000
Mental & emotional health	1.543	.208	2.511	7.403**	.000
Spiritual & social health	.070	.103	.122	.676	.503

As shown in Table 5, regression analysis revealed that physical and environmental health ($t = -8.315, p = .000$) and mental and emotional health ($t = 7.403, p = .000$) significantly predict ALS teachers' occupational resilience. This indicates that teachers' physical conditions, work environment, and emotional stability directly influence their ability to cope with professional

challenges. In contrast, spiritual and social health ($t = 0.676$, $p = .503$) was not found to be a significant predictor, suggesting that while it contributes to overall well-being, it does not directly enhance resilience in measurable terms.

These findings align with Beltman et al. (2011), who emphasized the link between well-being and resilience, and with Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2017), who highlighted the role of emotional and social support in enhancing coping capacity. Furthermore, Zee and Koomen (2016) and Roeser and Eccles (2015) noted that well-being strengthens resilience and job satisfaction, while Cetin et al. (2025) emphasized its impact on classroom outcomes. However, the non-significance of spiritual and social health suggests a more complex relationship, where these factors may function indirectly or interact with other variables. Improving teachers' physical, environmental, and emotional conditions is critical for strengthening occupational resilience and sustaining effective teaching performance.

Conclusion

ALS teachers generally demonstrate a good level of subjective well-being, reflected in their satisfaction with both personal and professional life. This contributes to positive outcomes such as improved health, productivity, and meaningful relationships within the school and community. They are also capable of effectively managing challenges and adapting to the demands of the ALS context. Moreover, physical and environmental health, as well as mental and emotional health, significantly influence teachers' occupational resilience. Strengthening teachers' well-being is essential for enhancing their capacity to cope with challenges and sustain effective performance.

Bibliography

- Askaripoor, T., Siadat, M., Saleh, E., & Aghaei, H. (2024). Resilience, job satisfaction, occupational stress, and occupational accidents among healthcare professionals: A Bayesian network analysis. *Work*, 79(3), 1357–1367. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-240178>
- Assaf, J., & Antoun, S. (2024). Impact of job satisfaction on teacher well-being and education quality. *Pedagogical Research*, 9(3), Article em0204. <https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/14437>
- Azizan, N. H., & Mahmud, Z. (2018). Determinants of subjective well-being: A systematic review. *Environment-Behaviour Proceedings Journal*, 3(7), 135–141. <https://doi.org/10.21834/e-bpj.v3i7.1228>
- Ba, M. (2020). Determinants of subjective well-being and invariance measurement: Evidence from German and Ghanaian data. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(8), 61–85. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2020.88006>
- Baatz, J., & Wirzberger, M. (2025). Resilience as a professional competence: A new way towards healthy teachers? *Social Psychology of Education*, 28, 56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-024-10010-8>
- Beltman, S., Mansfield, C. F., & Price, A. (2011). Thriving not just surviving: A review of research on teacher resilience. *Educational Research Review*, 6(3), 185–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2011.09.001>
- Bidi, S. B., Alapati, V., Dmello, V. J., Weesie, E., Gil, M. T., Shenoy, S. S., Kurian, S., & Rajendran, A. (2024). Prevalence of stress and its relevance on psychological well-being of the teaching profession: A scoping review. *F1000Research*, 12, Article 424. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.131894.2>
- Brouskeli, V., Kaltsi, V., & Loumakou, M. (2018). Resilience and occupational well-being of secondary education teachers in Greece. *Issues in Educational Research*, 28(1), 43–60. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier28/brouskeli.pdf>
- Çetin, G., Frank, J. L., & Jennings, P. A. (2025). Teacher self-efficacy beliefs and burnout: The mediating roles of interpersonal mindfulness in teaching and emotion regulation. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 33(2), 81–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10634266241272049>
- Collie, R. J., & Mansfield, C. F. (2022). Teacher and school stress profiles: A multilevel examination and associations with work-related outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 116, 103759. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103759>
- Das, K. V., Jones-Harrell, C., Fan, Y., Ramaswami, A., Orlove, B., & Botchwey, N. (2020). Understanding subjective well-being: Perspectives from psychology and public health. *Public Health*

- Reviews*, 41(1), Article 25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-020-00142-5>
- Diener, E., Larsen, R. J., Levine, S., & Emmons, R. A. (1985). Intensity and frequency: Dimensions underlying positive and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(5), 1253–1265. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.48.5.1253>
- Diener, E., Scollon, C. N., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). The evolving concept of subjective well-being: The multifaceted nature of happiness. *Advances in Cell Aging and Gerontology*, 15, 187–219. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1566-3124\(03\)15007-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1566-3124(03)15007-9)
- Dreer, B. (2023). On the outcomes of teacher wellbeing: A systematic review of research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1205179. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1205179>
- El Abiddine, F. Z., Hallouche, M., Belhaouari, F., Aljaberi, M. A., Dadfar, M., Alduais, A., Lin, C.-Y., & Griffiths, M. D. (2025). Mediated effects of subjective well-being in the association of religiosity and religious belief with quality of life among patients with cancer: A cross-sectional study. *European Journal of Oncology Nursing*, 76, Article 102901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejon.2025.102901>
- Escaron, A. L., Vasquez, J., & Sonik, R. A. (2023). Associations between teacher wellbeing and social support for physical activity in two urban school districts during the early stages of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *Journal of Healthy Eating and Active Living*, 3(3), 134–145. <https://doi.org/10.51250/jheal.v3i3.65>
- Francisco, J., & Buri, C. (2024). The lived experiences of Alternative Learning System teachers in English literacy instruction. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(10), 265–279. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0441>
- Garg, S., Srivastava, K., & Puar, S. (2026). Psychological predictors of positive affect and meaningful work: A cross-sectional study. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, 35(1), 82–87. https://doi.org/10.4103/ipj.ipj_32_25
- Gautam, S., Jain, A., Chaudhary, J., Gautam, M., Gaur, M., & Grover, S. (2024). Concept of mental health and mental well-being, its determinants and coping strategies. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 66(Suppl. 2), S231–S244. https://doi.org/10.4103/indianjpsychiatry.indianjpsychiatry_707_23
- González-González, A., Andrade Palos, P., García-Chanes, R. E., Sánchez Hernández, M. E., & Betancourt Ocampo, D. (2025). Spirituality and religiosity as predictors of subjective wellbeing in older Mexican adults. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, Article 1663757. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1663757>

- Harland, L., Harrison, W., Jones, J. R., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2005). Leadership behaviors and subordinate resilience. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(2), 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190501100202>
- Ibrahim, B. A., & Hussein, S. M. (2024). Relationship between resilience at work, work engagement and job satisfaction among engineers: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, 24, Article 1077. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-18507-9>
- Jayman, M. (2026). The enemy within: Work-related stress and the education crisis. *Encyclopedia*, 6(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia6010010>
- Joshanloo, M. (2019). Investigating the relationships between subjective well-being and psychological well-being over two decades. *Emotion*, 19(1), 183–187. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000414>
- Karakasidou, E., Raftopoulou, G., Raftopoulou, K., & Touloupis, T. (2025). Positive education in schools: Teachers' practices and well-being. *Psychology International*, 7(2), Article 51. <https://doi.org/10.3390/psycholint7020051>
- Keiler, L. S. (2018). Teachers' roles and identities in student-centered classrooms. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 5(1), Article 34. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0131-6>
- Khalil, E. L. (2025). Questioning the 'subjective well-being' concept: Distinguishing wellbeing and happiness. *Acta Psychologica*, 253, 104702. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.104702>
- Krueger, A. B., Kahneman, D., Schkade, D., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2009). National time accounting: The currency of life. In A. B. Krueger (Ed.), *Measuring the subjective well-being of nations: National accounts of time use and well-being* (pp. 9–86). The University of Chicago Press.
- Kurrle, L. M., & Warwas, J. (2025). Teacher well-being—A conceptual systematic review (2020–2023). *Education Sciences*, 15(6), 766. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15060766>
- Leung, S., & Lee, A. (2014). Negative affect. In A. C. Michalos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 4308–4310). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_1923
- Li, S., Zhao, X., & Jeon, L. (2026). Teacher–child relationships and perceived stress among Head Start teachers: Examining the moderating roles of emotion regulation and workplace support. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 55, 441–465. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-025-09891-3>
- Liang, Z., Luo, H., & Liu, C. (2021). The concept of subjective well-being: Its origins and application in tourism research: A critical review with

- reference to China. *Tourism Critiques*, 2(1), 2–19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TRC-04-2020-0009>
- Liu, H., Gan, Q., Tan, J., Sun, X., Liu, Y., & Wan, C. (2023). The association between quality of life and subjective wellbeing among older adults based on canonical correlation analysis. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11, Article 1235276. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1235276>
- Liu, Q., & Tong, Y. (2022). Employee growth mindset and innovative behavior: The roles of employee strengths use and strengths-based leadership. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 814154. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.814154>
- Miller, M. B. (2021). *The impact of teacher roles outside the realm of education* (Master's thesis, Hollins University). Hollins Digital Commons. <https://digitalcommons.hollins.edu/mattheses/2>
- Morales Almeida, P., & Alemán Ramos, P. (2025). The subjectivity of subjective well-being. *SAGE Open*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244025132986>
- Moreta-Herrera, R., Oriol-Granado, X., González-Carrasco, M., Casas, F., Gómez-Baya, D., & Malo, S. (2023). Examining the relationship between subjective well-being and psychological well-being among 12-year-old children from 30 countries. *Child Indicators Research*, 16, 1851–1870. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-023-10042-0>
- Mussone, L., & Changizi, F. (2023). The relationship between subjective well-being and individual characteristics, personality traits, and choice of transport mode during the first lock-down in Milan, Italy. *Journal of Transport & Health*, 30, Article 101600. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2023.101600>
- Myers, D. G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy? *Psychological Science*, 6(1), 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1995.tb00298.x>
- Nanor, M. A., Poku-Boansi, M., & Adarkwa, K. K. (2021). Determinants of subjective wellbeing in rural communities: Evidence from the Juaben Municipality, Ghana. *Cities*, 113, Article 103140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103140>
- Ngamaba, K. H. (2017). Determinants of subjective well-being in representative samples of nations. *European Journal of Public Health*, 27(2), 377–382. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckw103>
- Oliveira, S., Roberto, M. S., Veiga-Simão, A. M., & Marques-Pinto, A. (2025). Addressing teacher occupational health in challenging times: The role of a positive organizational climate in buffering teachers' burnout. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 23(1), Article 42. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph23010042>
- Piotrowski, A., Sygit-Kowalkowska, E., Boe, O., & Rawat, S. (2022). Resilience, occupational stress, job satisfaction, and intention to leave

- the organization among nurses and midwives during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(11), 6826. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19116826>
- Pontarollo, N., Orellana, M., & Segovia, J. (2020). The determinants of subjective well-being in a developing country: The Ecuadorian case. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 21, 3007–3035. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00211-w>
- Prananto, K., Cahyadi, S., Lubis, F. Y., & Hinduan, Z. R. (2025). Perceived teacher support and student engagement among higher education students: A systematic literature review. *BMC Psychology*, 13(1), Article 112. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02412-w>
- Prisăcaru, A. (2025). The mediating role of psychological resilience and coping mechanisms in the relationship between personality traits and stress, anxiety and depression in a group of students. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(3), 556–581. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2025.133037>
- Proctor, C. (2014). Subjective well-being (SWB). In A. C. Michalos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 6437–6441). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2905
- Roeser, R. W., & Eccles, J. S. (2015). Mindfulness and compassion in human development: Introduction to the special section. *Developmental Psychology*, 51(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038453>
- Salameh, A. A., Amin, S., Danish, M. H., Asghar, N., Naveed, R. T., & Munir, M. (2022). Socio-economic determinants of subjective wellbeing toward Sustainable Development Goals: An insight from a developing country. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 961400. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.961400>
- Salvo-Garrido, S., Cisternas-Salcedo, P., & Polanco-Levicán, K. (2025). Understanding teacher resilience: Keys to well-being and performance in Chilean elementary education. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(3), Article 292. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15030292>
- Sharma, P., & Chand, T. (2025). A study on teacher stress: Causes, types, and management strategies in the educational system. *Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities*, 5(2), 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.5.2.4>
- Siddiqui, S., & Ahamed, M. M. (2020). Teachers' roles beyond and within the context: An ever-changing concept. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(1), 282–296. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no1.21>
- Simões, R. F. M., Nóbrega, J. C. L., Barbosa, J., Santos, T. T. M., Olinda, R. A., Menezes, T. N., Duarte, Y. A. O., Zatz, M., Alves, L. U., & Santos, S. (2021). Happiness, subjective well-being, and life satisfaction: A compared study between long-lived elderly people in Northeast and

- Southeast Brazil. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 13(1), 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v13n1p89>
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Teacher stress and teacher self-efficacy: Relations and consequences. In T. M. McIntyre, S. E. McIntyre, & D. J. Francis (Eds.), *Educator stress: An occupational health perspective* (pp. 101–125). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53053-6_5
- Skevington, S. M., & Böhnke, J. R. (2018). How is subjective well-being related to quality of life? Do we need two concepts and both measures? *Social Science & Medicine*, 206, 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.04.005>
- Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (2019). Cultures and persons: Characterizing national and other types of cultural difference can also aid our understanding and prediction of individual variability. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article 2689. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02689>
- Stuart-Edwards, A. (2025). Mindfulness, subjective, and psychological well-being: A comparative analysis of FFMQ and MAAS measures. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 17(2), e70019. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.70019>
- Tachado, A. M., & Tumarong, E. P. (2024). Teachers’ self-efficacy, practices, and difficulties in the Alternative Learning System (ALS). *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence*, 8(2), 112–124. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/view/692>
- Tachado, A. M., & Tumarong, E. P. (2024). Teachers’ self-efficacy, practices, and difficulties in the Alternative Learning System (ALS). *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence*, 8(2), 112–124. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/view/692>
- Tamberg, L. A., Fisch-Romito, V., & Steinberger, J. K. (2026). Determinants of well-being: A causal framework. *Social Indicators Research*, 182, Article 23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-026-03816-w>
- Turner, K., Thielking, M., & Prochazka, N. (2022). Teacher wellbeing and social support: A phenomenological study. *Educational Research*, 64(1), 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2021.2013126>
- Veenhoven, R. (2012). Happiness: Also known as “life satisfaction” and “subjective well-being.” In K. C. Land, A. C. Michalos, & M. J. Sirgy (Eds.), *Handbook of social indicators and quality of life research* (pp. 63–77). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2421-1_3
- Villani, D., Sorgente, A., Iannello, P., & Antonietti, A. (2019). The role of spirituality and religiosity in subjective well-being of individuals with

- different religious status. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, Article 1525. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01525>
- Vittersø, J. (2025). Happiness and wellbeing. In *Humanistic wellbeing* (pp. 17–34). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69292-5_2
- Vittersø, J. (2025). Life satisfaction. In *Humanistic wellbeing* (pp. 67–88). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69292-5_4
- Wang, S., & Jin, C. (2025). Supportive teachers, thriving students: Mindfulness, self-efficacy, and media engagement as pathways to well-being. *Acta Psychologica*, *259*, Article 105300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105300>
- Yarcheski, A., Mahon, N. E., & Yarcheski, T. J. (2001). Social support and well-being in early adolescents: The role of mediating variables. *Clinical Nursing Research*, *10*(2), 163–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105477380101000203>
- Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 981–1015. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626801>