

Evaluating educators' resilience and well-being: implications for sustainable professional development

Cathy D. Rafael

College of Advanced Education
Ifugao State University – Potia Campus
Potia, Alfonsolista Ifugao
Email: rafaelcathy1120@gmail.com

Lotis Kaye M. Collado

College of Advanced Education
Ifugao State University – Potia Campus
Potia, Alfonsolista Ifugao
Email: lotiscollado@gmail.com

Abstract: This study evaluates educators' resilience and well-being in San Mateo North District schools, San Mateo Isabela composed of 172 educators and a total enumeration were used in the study, focusing in the implications for sustainable professional development. A survey questionnaire, adapted from the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) to measured educator's resilience and well-being. INSET 2024 served as an intervention. Employing a mixed-methods research approach, combining descriptive, correlational, and inferential analyses in examining the relationship and differences of educators' resilience and well – being across demographic profiles. The study found a significant relationship between demographic profiles and educators' resilience and well-being. However, no significant differences were found in educators' resilience and well-being before and after the intervention.

Keywords: Resilience, Well-Being, Sustainable Professional Development

Date Submitted: May 25, 2025

Date Accepted: June 18, 2025

Date Published: June 23, 2025

INTRODUCTION

The teaching profession though frequently regarded as valuable and rewarding, is becoming increasingly burdened with challenges that can profoundly affect the mental health and well-being of educators (Škobo, 2024; Hammoudi Halat et al., 2023; Katsarou et al., 2023). Teachers encounter a multifaceted and challenging work environment, characterized by academic pressures, disruptive student behaviours, and a rising occurrence and intensity of crises (Dixon, 2023; Fitzgerald et al., 2022; Van Prooyen, 2024). The presence of these stressors may lead to burnout, reduced job satisfaction, and potential attrition, which can ultimately result in a deterioration of educational quality (Singh, 2024; Van Dop, 2024; Taylor, 2023; Singh, 2024).

Resilience empowers teachers to effectively cope with the pervasive stress, potential burnout, and ultimate attrition that can plague the profession. It is a multifaceted and inherently unstable construct, shaped by the intricate interplay between the internal assets of the individual teacher and the external environment in which they operate. Purewal, A., 2025; Han, et al 2025. Resilience is not merely an innate quality but rather a dynamic process that is profoundly influenced by the specific context in which a teacher works (Flores, 2018). Collaborative methodologies have demonstrated the capacity to significantly enhance the resilience of teachers

who are operating in particularly challenging circumstances (Rwodzi, C., & De Jager, L., 2021). Individual attributes, such as altruistic motivations and a strong sense of self-efficacy, emerge as pivotal individual protective factors that can bolster a teacher's resilience (Salvo-Garrido, et al 2024; Duan, et al 2023). Teacher resilience, when coupled with their accumulated knowledge, honed skills, and a range of other essential qualities, collectively contributes to a robust foundation of learning support for students (Zhang & Luo, 2023). Definitions of resilience have expanded beyond mere recovery from stress, now encompassing sustained growth as a result of healthy responses to stressful situations (Entesari et al., 2020).

Recent studies show that effective strategies can greatly improve the ability of educators to withstand challenging situations. Hernández et al. (2024) conducted an investigation into a pilot program that utilized cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) techniques designed to improve resilience among university faculty. The results indicate that these programs significantly enhance educators' capacity to address challenges efficiently, providing them with the necessary skills to handle adversity and foster a supportive learning atmosphere.

In-Service Training (INSET) programs for teachers in the Philippines are gaining recognition as vital for providing educators with the skills needed to effectively address both routine challenges and crises. A study conducted by Tupas et al (2020) examined the alignment of these training programs with the principles of Education 4.0, focusing on digital literacy, collaboration, and innovative teaching methodologies. The findings indicated that, although there are initiatives to integrate contemporary themes into INSET, a significant number of programs primarily emphasize content-driven training instead of practical, experiential learning opportunities. This gap underscores a crucial opportunity for enhancement, as successful crisis management demands both theoretical understanding and practical skills applicable in real-world situations. Moreover, the findings revealed a variation in educators' views on the effectiveness of INSET across various regions, indicating that INSET programs should be more customized to address the unique needs of teachers.

Building on these findings, Nguyen et al. (2024) performed an in-depth analysis of Teacher Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), highlighting their significance in promoting on-going professional development for educators. The investigation revealed twelve significant challenges associated with recent PLCs, highlighting the necessity for collaboration among educators to improve professional learning and crisis management skills. Integrating PLC frameworks into INSET programs allows educators to leverage shared experiences and engage in collective problem-solving, essential for fostering resilience.

Crisis management training equips educators to take proactive measures in identifying and mitigating potential risks within their schools, thereby strengthening their sense of agency and control over their professional environments (Payton, 2021). This empowerment is essential not only for individual well-being but also for cultivating a culture of resilience within educational institutions.

Programs focused on crisis management offer a significant method for improving the resilience and well-being of educators. These programs provide educators with crucial skills to navigate crises adeptly while cultivating a nurturing atmosphere among colleagues. Turner and Garvis (2023) highlight that the well-being of teacher educators is intricately connected to their capacity to handle stress and avert burnout.

This study aims to tackle the urgent requirement for improved educator well-being by creating crisis management education programs. These programs aim to enhance resilience and support ongoing professional growth. This study emphasizes the essential roles of trust, aiming

to create a strong framework that enables educators to successfully address challenges. This approach aims to improve the mental well-being and career development of educators in a progressively intricate educational environment.

Problem statement

The study seeks to assess the level of resilience and well-being of educators. This study aims to address the following:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, and ize of schools in term of number of educators?
2. What is the level of resilience and well-being of educators before and after participating in crisis management education program?
3. Is there a significant difference in the level of resilience and well-being of educators before and after participating in crisis management education program?
4. Is there a significant difference in the level of resilience and well-being among educators when grouped by age, gender, and school size as to the number of educators)?
5. What program maybe proposed to improve crisis management of San Mateo North District School?

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining descriptive, correlational, and inferential analyses in examining the relationship and differences of educators' resilience and well – being on their demographic profile.

The study conducted at San Mateo, Isabela involved a total of 172 public school teachers from the San Mateo North District School as respondents. A total enumeration sampling technique was used to ensure that all eligible teachers were included, maximizing the representativeness of the sample.

The researcher employed a survey questionnaire it includes 25 items adapted from the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC), created by Connor and Davidson (2003),The CD-RISC is a tool developed to assess an individual's capacity to recover from stress and sustain control, making it essential for measuring resilience in high-stress contexts like education, thus highlighting its relevance for this study.

Data collection was conducted via hard copy and face-to-face methods, with strict adherence to ethical standards, including informed consent and confidentiality. Descriptive statistics will summarize resilience and well-being levels and demographic profile of the educators, while paired sample t test, multiple regression, and ANOVA will analyze relationships and differences across groups. The findings aim to provide actionable insights to enhance the support systems and well-being of educators.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic profile of educators

Table 1.1 Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent

Valid	Male	44	26
	Female	128	74
	Total	172	100

Table 1.2 Age

		Age	
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	25-35 yrs old	64	37.0
	36-46 yrs old	62	36
	47 and above	46	27
	Total	172	100

Table 1.3 School

School		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Small schools (1-10 teachers)	92	54
	Large schools (11 and above teachers)	80	46
	Total	172	100

Table 1.1-1.3 shows the frequency and percentage of demographic profile in terms gender (male 44 and female 128), age (25-35 yrs old – 64 educators, 36-46 years old 62 educators, 47 and above years old are 46 educators), and school size (small school – 92 teachers, large schools – 80 teachers) a total of 172 educators of San Mateo North District School.

Table 2

Paired Samples Statistics						
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Mean	Error
Pair 1	BEFORE INSET	3.06	172	.337	.026	
	AFTER INSET	3.08	172	.306	.023	

Paired Samples Correlations			
	N	Correlation	Sig.

Pa	BEFORE INSET &								
ir	AFTER INSET	172	.127	.096					
1									
Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig.
		Me	Std.	Std.	95%	Confidence			(2-
		an	Deviation	Error	Interval	of the			tailed)
				Mean	Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pa	BEFORE INSET	-					-	1	
ir	PROGRAM &	.01	.425	.032	-.081	.047	.53	7	.591
1	AFTER INSET	7					8	1	

The mean difference is small, -.017. the t-value is also small -.538 and the p-value is, .591 (which is greater than .05). since $p > .05$, we retain the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between before and after INSET. It means that the mean score before INSET (3.06) does not change with the mean score after INSET (3.08).

Paired sample T test was computed to determine the significant difference on INSET training before and after to test the educators' resilience and well – being using this intervention. Results show that he scores before INSET (Mean =3.06, SD= .337) is equal to the scores AFTER INSET (Mean= 3.08, SD = .306) $t (-.538)$, $p > .05$. The null hypothesis is retained. It implies that there is no significant difference on Before and After INSET educators' resilience and well-being remains stable despite of training (Day et al. 2018). This finding aligns with previous study indicating that resilience is influenced by life experience rather than professional development alone (Lee et. al 2019).

Table 3 Significant differences of resilience and well – being when they group according to their profile

Table 3.1

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	95% Confidence Interval	Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Gender	2	2	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
	3	156	1.76	.431	.034	1.69	1.82	1	2
	4	14	1.57	.514	.137	1.27	1.87	1	2
	Total	172	1.74	.438	.033	1.68	1.81	1	2
age	2	2	3.00	.000	.000	3.00	3.00	3	3
	3	156	1.96	.782	.063	1.83	2.08	1	3
	4	14	1.07	.267	.071	.92	1.23	1	2
	Total	172	1.90	.795	.061	1.78	2.02	1	3

school	2	2	2.00	.000	.000	2.00	2.00	2	2
	3	156	1.62	.487	.039	1.54	1.70	1	2
	4	14	1.07	.267	.071	.92	1.23	1	2
	Total	172	1.58	.495	.038	1.51	1.66	1	2

Table 3.2

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Gender	5.230	2	169	.003
Age	9.256	2	169	.000
School	54.738	2	169	.000

Table 3.3

ANOVA

		Sum Squares	of Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Between Groups	.572	2	.286	1.502	.026
	Within Groups	32.172	169	.190		
	Total	32.744	171			
Age	Between Groups	12.502	2	6.251	11.049	.000
	Within Groups	95.614	169	.566		
	Total	108.116	171			
School	Between Groups	4.246	2	2.123	9.539	.000
	Within Groups	37.614	169	.223		
	Total	41.860	171			

Table 3.1 Descriptive statistics show the total Mean of gender (Mean=1.74), age (Mean = 1.90), school (Mean 1.58). Levene's test show that the data is heteroskedasticity, gender (F=5.230), Age (F= 9.256), School (F= 54.738), $p < .05$, indicating that there is significant difference on, age, gender and school for educators' resilience and well – being.

Table 3.3 ANOVA table shows that the F- value of gender (F=1.502), age (F= 11.049), school (f= 9.539) and a p=value (gender Sig = 0.26, age Sig=.000, school Sig = .000). Since the p-value $< .05$, we reject the null hypothesis that there's no significant differences in resilience and well-being of the educators when they are group according to their profile.

One way analysis of variance was performed to determine if there is significant difference of resilience and well – being of the educators when they are group according to their profile.

Results show that there is a significant difference and reject the null hypothesis. It implies that there is a significant difference of resilience and well-being of educators when they are group according to their profile.

Mix methods Studies shown that resilience increases when you're getting older and older (Klohn et al. 2018; Rasmussen et al 2019; Shiba et al 2019). Same as gender women are more resilient than men. Women's resilience rooted in relating coping strategies and linked to emotional intelligence and their social network enhanced their resilience while men's resilience tied to coping problem – focused (Zhou et al 2020; CampbelSills et al, 2019; Tamres, 2018). Supportive school environments, positive school climate, colleagues, stakeholders, institutions and school connectedness enhanced resilience among educators and learners (Shochet et al. 2018; Hamre et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2020)

Table 4 Significant Relationship of Resilience when they are grouped according to their profile
Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
INSET PROGRAM	3.06	.337	172
Gender	1.74	.438	172
Age	1.90	.795	172
School	1.58	.495	172

Table 4.2

Correlations					
		INSET PROGRAM	Gender	Age	School
Pearson Correlation	INSET PROGRAM	1.000	.101	-.348	-.169
	Gender	.101	1.000	.192	.286
	Age	.348	.192	1.000	.334
	School	.169	.286	.334	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	INSET PROGRAM	.	.093	.000	.013
	Gender	.003	.	.006	.000
	Age	.000	.006	.	.000
	School	.013	.000	.000	.
N	INSET PROGRAM	172	172	172	172
	Gender	172	172	172	172
	Age	172	172	172	172
	School	172	172	172	172

Table 4.2 the correlation matrix shows that the variable that are correlated with INSET Program are gender ($r = .101$, $p = .003$); age ($r = .348$, $p = .000$); and school ($r = .169$, $p = .013$).

Table 4.5

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.401 ^a	.161	.146	.311	
a. Predictors: (Constant), school, Gender, age					

Table 4.4

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.117	3	1.039	10.708	.000 ^b
	Residual	16.301	168	.097		
	Total	19.419	171			

a. Dependent Variable: INSET PROGRAM

b. Predictors: (Constant), school, Gender, age

The coefficient of determination R^2 is equal to .161 which means that 83% of the variance in INSET program is explained or accounted for by the independent variables combined. The result of the ANOVA also indicated that the model is significant an F-value of 10.708, $p < .001$. It means that the regression model is significant, or that the model fits the data.

Table 4.5

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.189	.113		28.147	.000
	Gender	.154	.057	.200	2.691	.000
	Age	-.148	.032	-.350	-4.641	.000
	School	-.074	.053	-.109	-1.411	.160

a. Dependent Variable: AFTER INSET PROGRAM GRANDMEAN

The value of constant is 3.189- this is the average INSET scores when all their variables are zero. Gender t – value is .154, $p < .001$; and age t – value is -.148, $p < .001$ a positive predictor of INSET for educators' resilience and well-being.

A multiple linear regression analysis was performed to determine whether gender, age and school size predict the relationship of resilience and well -being of educators in INSET program. Results show that the model is significant, $R^2 = .161$, adjusted $R^2 = .146$, $F = 10.108$, $p < .001$. and reject the null hypothesis. It implies that there is significant relationship of resilience when they are grouped according to their profile (age, gender and school).

Educators' resilience and well – being have a significant relationship and influenced by their demographic profile. Age plays a crucial role in educators' resilience and well – being,

older educators have a higher resilience due to experience and strategies than younger educators (Lee et al. 2019). Gender relationship in resilience of educators also emerged, with female educators reporting higher emotional exhaustion and burn out rates but easily to cope with strategies due to their emotional and social intelligence (Skaalvik,2017). Positive school environment, colleague relationship and support network of educators in school boost resilience and well-being (Wang et al. 2020) Access to resources, trainings (e.g., professional development, technology) and principal support enhances educators' resilience and well-being (Lee et al., 2019;Klasen et al.2017).

Program to improve crisis management of San Mateo North District School in Resilience and well-being of educators'

1. Comprehensive training programs that incorporate collaborative approaches to crisis management should be implemented, emphasizing both educational and practical skills.
2. Promote comprehensive reforms in educational settings that emphasize the importance of mental health resources, ongoing professional development, and nurturing leadership practices.
3. Leverage shared experiences and engage in collective problem-solving, essential for fostering resilience.
4. Disaster and climate change education including preparedness and recovery strategies, should be integrated into the curriculum to strengthen community resilience.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, suggesting any significant difference in educator resilience and management skills before and after the INSET training. This implies that the current training program may not effectively enhance educator resilience and crisis management capabilities. This may be attributed to limitations in training design, delivery, or evaluation.

The INSET training may employ inadequate methodologies, and inadequate practical application, whereas INSET training might focus too heavily on theoretical aspects (Fu and Zhang, 2024). Also, lack of collaboration, and training may disregard individual perspectives (Debes, 2021). Other than that, brief INSET training may insufficiently address educator resilience (Fu and Zhang, 2024; Pastor, et al., 2024). Moreover, INSET training may lack robust assessment tools to measure training effectiveness (Bundy et al., 2017), and the absence of constructive feedback and evaluation hinders skill refinement (Lalonde & Roux-Dufort, 2013). Furthermore, Pasto et al. (2024) highlighted the lack of administrative support and resources as crucial for teacher resilience. If INSET training lacks strong administrative backing, its impact may be diminished

The null hypothesis in significant differences of educators when they are group according to their profile is rejected. Results shows that the F- value of gender ($F=1.502$), age ($F= 11.049$), school ($f= 9.539$) and a p-value (gender Sig = 0.26, age Sig=.000, school Sig = .000). Since the p-value <.05, it implies that there is a significant difference in terms of educators' demographic profile. Studies shown when educators are getting older and older the more resilient, they are. Same to men and women, women are more resilient than men due to their coping strategies and

emotional intelligence unlike men they are focusing into problems. Positive support school environment, colleagues, students, parents and community promotes educators resilience and well-being and for them to be more effective in molding the learners'(Shoche et al. 2018; Hamre et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2019)

Results show that the model is significant, $R^2 = .161$, adjusted $R^2 = .146$, $F = 10.108$, $p < .001$. and reject the null hypothesis. It implies that there is significant relationship of resilience when they are grouped according to their profile (age, gender and school size). Age, gender and school size has an impact for the resilience and well – being of educators. Positive school environment, peer support, training and experiences shared by getting older in age and more experience and strategies shared by educators will foster and strengthen their resilience and well – being in coping in different adversities in education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed:

Enhance training design, delivery and evaluation before, during, and after INSET (In-Service Education and Training) to enhance crisis management. Encourage interdisciplinary teamwork, school-community partnerships, and collaboration between administrators and educators to create a supportive environment that promotes resilience among educators.

Leverage demographic factors, specifically age and gender differences, to tailor the training approach. Acknowledge different coping mechanism used by men and women to foster resilience and incorporate gender sensitivity.

Fostering a supportive school environment through community engagement and collaborative initiatives will further promote educators' resilience and well – being.

Sustain professional development by providing ongoing support through regular workshops, coaching, mentoring, and access to resources to maintain educators' resilience and crisis management capabilities.

Gather feedback from participants, address their concerns, and tailor training programs to meet the needs of educators, promoting engagement and resilience.

Utilize mixed-methods approaches, longitudinal studies, and control groups to assess the effectiveness of training, identifying areas for improvement while considering the significant difference and relationship within demographic profile.

By implementing these recommendations, educators can develop greater resilience and crisis management skills, ultimately enhancing the well-being of the school community.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American psychologist*, 44(9), 1175.
- Bundy, J., Pfarrer, M. D., Short, C. E., & Coombs, W. T. (2017). Crises and crisis management: Integration, interpretation, and research development. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1661-1692.
- Campbel-Sills, L., Simmons, J. M., & Stein, M. B. (2019). Resilience and mental health. *Psychological Medicine*, 49(10), 1651-1661. doi:10.1017/S0033291718002074

- Day, C. Stobart, G., & Sammons, P. (2018). Teacher Resilience: What does it mean and how can it be developed? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 75.
- Debeş, G. (2021). Teachers' perception of crisis management in schools. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 8(2), 638-652.
- Dixon, J. (2023). Teacher mental health and wellbeing: What, why and how. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 50, 158-207.
- Duan, S., Chu, W., & Liu, H. (2023). "Seeking resilience, sustaining development": A self-narrative study of early career English teacher resilience from an ecological perspective. *Sustainability*, 15(16), 12386.
- Entesari, E., Yousefi, M. H., & Eslami, H. (2020). A mixed-method study of Iranian EFL teachers' achieving resiliency: implications for teacher development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00096-w>
- Flores, M. A. (2018). Teacher Resilience in Adverse Contexts: Issues of Professionalism and Professional Identity. In Springer eBooks (p. 167). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76690-4_10
- Fu, Q., & Zhang, X. (2024). Promoting community resilience through disaster education: Review of community-based interventions with a focus on teacher resilience and well-being. *PLoS ONE*, 19(1), e0296393.
- Hammoudi Halat, D., Soltani, A., Dalli, R., Alsarraj, L., & Malki, A. (2023). Understanding and fostering mental health and well-being among university faculty: A narrative review. *Journal of clinical medicine*, 12(13), 4425.
- Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., & Allen, J. P. (2018). Systems of support for teacher professional development. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(3), 247-262. doi:10.1177/002487117753329
- Han, S., Su, C., & Qi, Y. (2025). From challenges to assets: Collaborative autoethnography on the transcultural journeys as teacher educators. *Journal of International Students*, 15(4), 171-188.
- Hernández, A. L., Barcelata-Eguiarte, B., & Fuentes, N. I. G. A. L. (2024). Pilot Program on CBT to Promote Resilient Potential in University. *Academic Performance: Students, Teachers and Institutions on the Stage*, 19, 129.
- Klasen, R. M., Wilson, T. E., & Siu, A. F. (2019). Teacher motivation and student – teacher relationships: A systematic review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31(3), 661-685. doi:10.1007/s10648-019-09485-6
- Klohn, E. C., Mendelsohn, G. A., Rivers, S. E., & Wilson, C. E. (2018). Social support and stress in romantic relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 115(4), 571-593. doi:10.1037/pspi0000135
- Lalonde, C., & Roux-Dufort, C. (2013). Challenges in Teaching Crisis Management: Connecting Theories, Skills, and Reflexivity. *Journal of Management Education*, 37(1), 32-57.
- Lee, J., & Wadesango, N. (2018). The impact of in-service training on teacher motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 7(2)
- Lee, J., Lee, Y., Kim, B. (2019). Age and Resilience in teachers: A meta – analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86, 102794. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2019.102794
- Nguyen, H. T. T., Duong, N. T., & Dang, T. T. P. (2024). A Comprehensive Analysis of Teacher Professional Learning Communities: A Scopus Based Review (2019–2024). *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(8), 158-179.
- Pastor, M. J. D., Acosta, R. L., & Aquino, M. U. (2024). Resiliency Practices in Educational Crisis Management Among School Administrators. *International Journal of Education*, 17(1), 71-78.

Payton, P. (2021). *Crisis Management Strategies for Sustaining Organizations During a Crisis*.

Purewal, A. (2025). *The Perception of Secondary Teacher's Personality Traits and the Implications They Have on Student Engagement and Success: A Phenomenological Study* (Doctoral dissertation, National University).

Rasmussen, P.R., Nielsen, B.L., & Gleisdorf, K. (2019). Teacher stress and teacher – self-efficacy. *Teaching and teacher education*, 86, 102794. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2019.102794

Rwodzi, C., & De Jager, L. (2021). Resilient English teachers' use of remote teaching and learning strategies in Gauteng resource-constrained township secondary schools. *Perspectives in Education*, 39(3), 62-78.

Salvo-Garrido, S., Polanco-Levicán, K., Dominguez-Lara, S., Mieres-Chacaltana, M., & Gálvez-Nieto, J. L. (2024). Relationships between Resilience and Self-Efficacy in the Prosocial Behavior of Chilean Elementary School Teachers. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(8), 678.

Schochet, P. Z., Xiadong, L., & Porter, A.C. (2018). Estimating program effects for teachers. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral statistics*, 43(6), 731-756. doi:10.3102/1076998618774859

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). *Positive psychology: An introduction* (Vol. 55, No. 1, p. 5). American Psychological Association.

Shiba, K., Mitsui, J., & Matsubara, E. (2019). Effects of mindfulness on stress reduction. *Journal of clinical Psychology*, 75(1), 15-26. Doi:10.1002/jclp.22734

Singh, Y. K., & Gautam, D. N. S. (2024). The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Teacher Mental Health: A Call to Action for Educational Policymakers. *Open Education Studies*, 6(1), 20240008.

Skallvik, E.M., Skaalvik, S. (2017). Teacher burnout and teacher self- efficacy: a study of relationships. *Teaching and Teacher education*, 66, 268-277. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.011

Škobo, M. (2024). Mental Health Challenges In the Educational Landscape of Serbia: Exploring Academic and Legal Perspectives. *Medicine, Law & Society*, 17(1).

Tamres, L. K. (2018). Coping in Resilience. In M.M. Robertson & A.C.H. Liu (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of behavioral medicine* (pp. 434-432). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-6439-6_1022

Taylor, M. A. (2023). *Teacher Attrition and Burnout: Factors Contributing to Intent to Leave* (Doctoral dissertation, Trevecca Nazarene University).

Tupas, F. P., & Noderama, R. P. (2020). Looking into In-Service Training for Teachers in the Philippines: Are They Gearing towards Education 4.0?. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(10), 4651-4660.

Van Dop, P. J. (2024). Factors of Teacher Retention and Attrition in a Post-Trauma Environment. <https://philippinesgraphic.com.ph/2024/04/05/26-million-filipino-learners-suffer-the-most-from-climate-change-save-the-children/>

Wang, Y., Zhang, J., & Liu, X. (2019). Teacher resilience and well-being: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review*, 27, 100283. Doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2019.100283

Wang, Y., Zhang, J., & Liu, X. (2020). School climate and teacher resilience: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(3), 531-544. doi:10.1037/edu000023

Yin, H., To, K. H., Keung, C. P. C., & Yi Tam, W. W. (2019). Professional learning communities count: Examining the relationship between faculty trust and teacher professional learning in Hong Kong kindergartens. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 82, 153–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.03.019>

Zhang, S., & Luo, Y. (2023). Review on the conceptual framework of teacher resilience [Review of Review on the conceptual framework of teacher resilience]. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. Frontiers Media. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1179984>