BURNOUT AND WELL-BEING OF HIGH SCHOOL FACULTY IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DR. FELIX CHAVEZ
DR. SYLVIA M. YABAÑEZ
PAULINO AGRAVE
RONIE Q. ARAO-ARAO
BLESSIE JOY BALATICO

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to correlate between burnout and well-being of high school faculty in public schools. This study used the non-experimental quantitative research design utilizing specifically the descriptive-correlational method. The public secondary school teachers were the respondents of this study. The respondents were selected using the purposive sampling technique. The degree of burnout among Faculty is low indicating that psychological exhaustion is still experience at work. More particularly, the Faculty has low level of personal, work and client burnout. The Faculty has high level of well-being particularly higher in spiritual social and emotional. On the other hand, the faculty only has moderate Physical well-being. There is a significant inverse relationship between burnout and well-being. In other words, the increase in burnout would likely decrease the well-being of Faculty; while the decrease in burnout would likely increase the well-being of Faculty. Only the client burnout significantly predicts the well-being of Faculty, while physical and work burnout does not affect their well-being.

Keywords: education, burnout, well-being, high school faculty, public schools, correlation

---

INTRODUCTION

Better performing organizations clearly understand the health and work behavior equation. This is why bigger companies continuously monitor the well-being of their employees to ensure better productivity at work (Meyer & Parton, 2011). Moreover, one way to build competitive advantage for an organization is to improve the health status and well-being of your employees, and developing

healthier employees will result in a more productive workforce.

However, due to demands in productivity, many managers put certain amount of pressure of work to ensure that their people perform better and prepares them for challenges and actions. This constant pressure and demand can often lead to work-related stress (Huang, 2011), which then can cause psychological, emotional, physical and behavioral problems among employees and affects their overall well-being (Bupa's Health Information Team, 2011).

Several studies provide emphasis on the problem about work related stress. In fact, nearly three-quarters of American workers surveyed in 2007 reported experiencing physical symptoms of stress due to work. In particular, the startling two-thirds of Americans say that work is a main source of stress in their lives – up nearly 15 percent from those who ranked work stress at the top just a year before. Roughly 30 percent of workers surveyed reported "extreme" stress levels. According to the American Psychologist Association, the main causes of stress at work are low salaries (43 percent), heavy workloads (43 percent), lack of opportunity for growth and advancement (43 percent), unrealistic job expectations (40 percent), and job security (34 percent). Additional on-the-job stressors include longer work hours, lack of participation in decision-making, ineffective management style and unpleasant work environments that includes disruptive noise levels (APA, 2008).

Moreover, a Japanese poll conducted by the Health and Welfare Ministry in 2005 indicated that 45 percent of workers felt stress from their jobs. According to Huang and Mujtaba (2009) extreme stress can lead to decreased productivity and an overall negative impact to the organization itself. It is therefore important to recognize the causes of stress and then explore ways in which the management can reduce stress in themselves and their subordinates.

Teaching has been proven as a stressful job based on previous studies (Shirley & Kathy, 2002, Sveinsdottir et al. 2007). Sveinsdottir et al. (2007) reported that the working environment for teachers is highly stress-provoking. Maslach and Jackson (1984) defined teacher stress as an uncomfortable feeling, negative emotion such as anger, anxiety, and pressure which originated from work. Teachers in Selangor and Kula Lumper, Malaysia have been categorized as stressful teachers since they have to spend 74 hours per week in teaching, as well as involved in curriculum activities (Abdul, 2005). The outcomes of teachers' work-related stress are serious and may include burnout, depression, poor performance, absenteeism, low

levels of job satisfaction, and eventually the decision to leave the profession (Jepson & Forrest, 2006).

Nevertheless, there are only few studies have been conducted that investigates the relationship between stress and well-being. Among these are studies more specific among College Faculty (Pugliesi, 1999; Ryland & Greenfield, 1991), while others focus on healthcare providers (Balch et al., 2009; Goodman & Schorling, 2012). It is rare in the literature that is primarily focus on High School Teachers in Public schools. With the recent change of the educational system such as K-12, there is greater pressure and demand among high school teachers particularly in the workloads, paper works, and other documentary requirements to comply with the new policies and standards. With this, it is timely that assessment of work stress and well-being will be conducted to determine the work-health situation of the faculty which can be used for policy formulation related to human resource management in the Department of Education.

METHOD

This study used the non-experimental quantitative research design utilizing specifically the descriptive-correlational method. Descriptive research design is often used as a pre-cursor to quantitative research designs, the general overview giving some valuable pointers as to what variables are worth testing quantitatively (Shuttleworth, 2008). Moreover, the correlation design is commonly used to test the relationship between two or more variables (Cresswell, 2003). In this the study, the relationship between burnout and well-being of the high school faculty in public schools was investigated.

The public secondary school teachers were the respondents of this study. The respondents were selected using the purposive sampling technique. This technique is a form of non-probability sampling in which decisions concerning the individuals to be included in the sample are taken by the researcher, based upon a variety of criteria which may include specialist knowledge of the research issue, or capacity and willingness to participate in the research (Oliver, 2006). Meanwhile, the selection of the respondents follows with criteria that he/she must be a secondary school teacher and has worked at least one year in the Department of Education.

Sets of survey questionnaires were used to gather data from the respondents. The survey form is divided into two sections, namely: work stress scale and well-being assessment tool. To ensure accuracy of measurements, the questionnaires were subjected to content

validity and reliability analysis.

The Burnout Scale is a Likert type tool that is consists of three areas, namely: personal, work, and client. This tool is adapted from Borritz & Kristensen, (2004) having high reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87 for Personal Burnout, 0.87 for Work Burnout, and 0.85 for Client Burnout. In evaluating the degree of burnout, the following measurement standard is used:

The Well-being Assessment Tool measures the well-being of the faculty in four areas, namely: physical, social, emotional, and spiritual. The tool has very high internal consistency with an overall Cronbach's alpha value of .87. In evaluating the level of Well-being, the following measure is used:

A written permission and endorsement were obtained from the Regional Director of Department of Education and the respective Division Superintendents to conduct the study. After the approval, a letter was attached to the endorsements and then submitted to the school heads of the selected schools.

The respondents of the study were informed ahead of the time before the conduct of the administration of the survey to give them a leeway at their convenient time. An informed consent was obtained from each of the respondents and they were made aware about the study and their rights to withdraw. The results were kept properly to ensure restriction from the access of others and maintain strictest confidentiality. As soon as the permission was granted, a schedule was made for the distribution and retrieval of the survey forms. After retrieval, the data were screened, encoded, tabulated, and analyzed. This could be seen in Chapter 3.

The following statistical tools were used to analyze the data. Mean and Standard Deviation was be used to measure the degree of burnout and level of well-being of the faculty. Pearson product moment correlation was employed to determine the relationship between burnout and well-being of faculty Multiple Regression analysis was used to determine the best predictor of faculty well-being.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Degree of Burnout

Table 1 shows the degree of burnout among Faculty in

the three aspects, namely: personal, work, and client. The degree is represented by the mean scores and the observed standard deviation which is less than one represents that the scores are not widely spread. In terms of personal burnout, the Faculty exhibit higher degree in the aspect of feeling of getting tired with a mean of 2.84, described as Moderate. This is followed by their feeling of physical exhaustion with a mean of 2.69. The lowest mean is 2.07 is the aspect of thinking of not taking it anymore, described as Low. The sub-mean is 2.45, described as low. This denotes that the Faculty sometimes experience personal burnout which can be attributed to their mental and physical efforts as part of their job being teachers. This further suggests that the teachers experienced exhaustion both physical and psychological but they were able to overwhelm most of it, but its presence at some degree still affect their daily work. This is supported by Thomas (2004) that even little personal burnout can provide interference with work productivity of employees and lessen their drive to give more and better output.

Table 1. Degree of Burnout of Faculty

BURNOUT	Mean	Std. Deviation	Description
PERSONAL			
1. How often do you feel tired?	2.84	0.77	Moderate
2. How often are you physically exhausted?	2.69	0.77	Moderate
3. How often are you emotionally exhausted?	2.46	0.73	Low
4. How often do you think: "I can't take it anymore"?	2.07	0.79	Low
5. How often do you feel worn out?	2.28	0.76	Low
6. How often do you feel weak and susceptible to illness?	2.40	0.78	Low
Sub-Mean	**2.45**	**0.61**	**LOW**
WORK			
1. Is your work emotionally exhausting?	2.19	0.86	Low
2. Do you feel burnt out because of your work?	2.08	0.77	Low
3. Does your work frustrate you?	1.71	0.79	Low
4. Do you feel worn out at the end of the working day?	2.15	0.81	Low
5. Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work?	1.94	0.73	Low
6. Do you feel that every working hour is tiring for you?	1.85	0.78	Low
7. Do you have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time?	3.32	1.28	Moderate
Sub-Mean	**2.18**	**0.60**	**LOW**
CLIENT			
1. Do you find it hard to work with clients?	2.07	0.83	Low
2. Do you find it frustrating to work with clients?	1.89	0.83	Low

4. Do you feel that you give more than you get back when you work with clients?	2.40	1.11	Low
5. Are you tired of working with clients?	1.85	0.82	Low
6. Do you sometimes wonder how long you will be able to continue working with clients?	2.12	0.91	Low
Sub-Mean	**2.04**	**0.71**	**Low**
OVERALL	**2.22**	**0.55**	**LOW**

In the aspect of work burnout, the Faculty have experienced low degree of work exhaustion as can be observed in the sub-mean value of 2.18. In particular, the highest mean is 3.32 which show that they seldom have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time. On the other hand, the lowest mean is represented by the feeling that every working hour is tiring with a value of 1.85. This denotes that the Faculty sometimes experience exhaustion at their work. Moreover, the findings suggest that the little amount of work burnout of teachers is attributed to being used to the demands of their profession and they can be able to acclimate to any work related stress. It is evident in the study of Taniajura (2007) that school environment factors such as workload and working conditions are potential stressors of teachers which can lead to burnout.

In client burnout, the Faculty have experienced a low degree in all items with a sub-mean value of 2.04. This means that the Faculty sometimes experience exhaustion in dealing with their clients. In particular, the highest mean is 2.12 in wondering how long they would be able to continue working with clients, which is described as low degree. On the other hand, the lowest mean is 1.85 in the feeling of tiredness in dealing with clients. This low degree of burnout with clients suggests that faculty are concerned with their students and never considered that serving their students would take a toll with them. Moreover, the results indicate that the teachers are satisfied with their clients which are part of their oath of being in the teaching profession. This is supported by Broome et al (2007) that better client engagement and satisfaction would lead to lesser burnout at work.

In summary, the highest degree is personal burnout with a value of 2.45, described as Low. It is followed by Work and Client with the value of 2.18 and 2.04, respectively. On the other hand, the overall degree of burnout among Faculty is low with a mean of 2.22. This means that the Faculty sometimes experience physical and psychological exhaustion at work. This further denotes that although they still experience little degree of burnout, the results are not yet

in the distressing stage and the teachers still maintains effectiveness in their work. This is supported by Schwarger and Hallum (2008) that self-efficacy moderates the relationship between stress and burnout, serving as a protective buffer against the negative effects of stress.

Level of Well-Being of Faculty

Table 2 shows the level of physical well-being of the Faculty. The results show that the highest mean is 3.91 in the aspect of seeking for professional advice when they feel something is wrong with their body. On the other hand, the lowest mean is 2.77 in the area of doing exercises to strengthen their muscles and joints. The sub-mean is 3.41 which can be described as moderate level. This suggest that physical well-being of Faculty is seldom manifested. This further suggests that the physical well-being of faculty is at the borderline especially that the Faculty are not maintaining their shape by doing only little exercise, which is detrimental to their health. This is supported by Booth et al (2012) that lack of exercise is the primary cause of chronic diseases which would impede the performance of employees.

Table 2. Level of Physical Well-Being of Faculty

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Description
PHYSICAL			
1. I maintain a desirable weight.	3.52	1.17	High
2. I engage in vigorous exercises such as brisk walking.	2.86	1.03	Moderate
3. I do exercises designed to strengthen my muscles and joints.	2.77	1.00	Moderate
4. I warm up and cool down by stretching before and after vigorous exercise.	2.85	1.11	Moderate
5. I feel good about the condition of my body.	3.86	0.85	High
6. I get 7-8 hours of sleep each night.	3.42	1.04	Moderate
7. My immune system is strong and I am able to avoid most infectious diseases.	3.79	0.98	High
8. My body heals itself quickly when I get sick or injured.	3.54	0.95	High
9. I have lots of energy and can get through the day without being overly tired.	3.56	0.99	High
10. I listen to my body; when there is something wrong, I seek professional advice.	3.91	1.90	High
Sub-Mean	**3.41**	**0.65**	**Moderate**

It can be gleaned in Table 3 that the overall level of social well-being of faculty is high with a value of 4.22. This means that the social well-being of Faculty is oftentimes manifested. In particular, the highest mean is 4.46 in the aspect of getting along with their members of the family, while the lowest mean is 3.91 in their feeling of good impression when meeting with people. This denotes that the Faculty have good interpersonal relationships with people at home and at work which could give positive results at work. This is supported by Bryson et al (2014) that social well-being has better impact to employees' job performance and satisfaction in their work.

Table 3. Level of Social Well-Being of Faculty

SOCIAL	Mean	SD	Description
1. When I meet people, I feel good about the impression I make on them.	3.91	0.88	High
2. I am open, honest, and get along well with other people.	4.23	0.73	High
3. I participate in a wide variety of social activities and enjoy being with people who are different than me.	4.03	0.81	High
4. I try to be a "better person" and work on behaviors that have caused problems in my interactions with others.	4.29	0.79	High
5. I get along well with the members of my family.	4.46	0.74	High
6. I am a good listener.	4.33	0.66	High
7. I am open and accessible to a loving and responsible relationship.	4.40	0.71	High
8. I have someone I can talk to about my private feelings.	4.17	0.90	High
9. I consider the feelings of others and do not act in hurtful or selfish ways.	4.21	0.80	High
10. I consider how what I say, might be perceived by others before I speak.	4.14	0.82	High
Sub-Mean	**4.22**	**0.53**	**HIGH**

Table 4 shows the level emotional well-being of the Faculty. The results show that the highest mean is 4.43 in the aspect of avoiding alcohol in forgetting problems. On the other hand, the lowest mean is 3.09 of being a chronic worrier.

The sub-mean is 3.83 which can be described as high level. This suggests that the emotional well-being of Faculty is oftentimes manifested. It can further denote that the Faculty are emotionally healthy as they can address well their stressful work, personal problems, and have positive outlook in life, and thus exhibit higher social support from their co-workers. This is supported by Kivimaki (2005) that strong social support can provide better emotional

stability to a person and can improve its productivity at work.

Table 4. Level of Emotional Well-Being of Faculty

EMOTIONAL	Mean	SD	Description
1. I find it easy to laugh about things that happen in my life.	4.15	0.80	High
2. I avoid using alcohol as means of helping me forget my problems.	4.43	1.04	High
3. I can express my feelings without feeling silly.	3.81	0.96	High
4. When I am angry, I try to let others know in non- confrontational and non-hurtful ways.	3.55	0.98	High
5. I am a chronic worrier.	3.09	0.97	High
6. I recognize when I am stressed and take steps to relax through exercise, quiet time, or other activities.	3.73	0.99	High
7. I feel good about myself and believe others like me for who I am.	3.81	1.02	High
8. When I am upset, I talk to others and actively try to work through my problems.	3.62	0.95	High
9. I am flexible and adapt or adjust to change in a positive way.	4.07	0.84	High
10. My friends regard me as a stable, emotionally well-adjusted person.	4.08	0.88	High
Sub-Mean	**3.83**	**0.65**	**HIGH**

Table 5 shows the level of spiritual well-being of the Faculty. The results show that the highest mean is 4.68 in the aspect of believing life as precious gift that should be nurtured. On the other hand, the lowest mean is 4.22 in their feeling confident of touching someone else lives in a positive way. The sub-mean is 4.42 which can be described as high level. This suggests that the spiritual well-being of Faculty is oftentimes manifested. It can further denote that the Faculty have better spiritual outlook of motivating others and feeling of compassion especially to those who needed them. The high level of spiritual well-being of Faculty indicates that they have better subjective feeling of happiness; they affirm of their self-worth, they are able to manage an interpersonal relationship with an open and accepting attitude, and possessing an internal positive energy (Yang, Yen, & Chen, 2010).

Table 5. Level of Spiritual Well-Being of Faculty

SPIRITUAL	Mean	SD	Description
1. I believe life is a precious gift that should be nurtured	4.68	0.72	Very High
2. I take time to enjoy nature and the beauty around me	4.47	0.87	High
3. I take time alone to think about what's important in life - who I am, what I value, where I fit in, and where I'm going.	4.33	0.87	High
4. I have belief in the importance of things beyond myself.	4.40	0.85	High
5. I engage in acts of caring and good will without expecting something in return.	4.49	0.77	High
6. I feel sorrow for those who are suffering and try to help them through difficult times.	4.37	0.80	High
7. I feel confident that I have touched the lives of others in a positive way.	4.22	0.85	High
8. I work for peace in my interpersonal relationships, in my community, and in the world at large.	4.27	0.90	High
9. I am content with who I am.	4.51	0.81	Very High
Sub-Mean	**4.42**	**0.68**	**HIGH**

Table 6 presents the summary of the level of well-being of Faculty. It can be observed that the highest mean is 4.39 in the aspect of spiritual well-being and is followed by social well-being and emotional well-being with the mean of 4.22 and 3.83, respectively. On the other hand, the lowest mean is 3.41 in the Physical aspect which manifest a moderate level in that area. The overall mean for well-being is 3.96, described as High. This means that the well-being of faculty is oftentimes evident. It can be argued that the physical well-being is only at moderate level since most of their time is spent at school doing their job as teacher, which entails a lot of physical efforts especially in giving lectures and activities for their students. This can be explained by Wyn (2007) that despite some examples of schools embracing a notion of well-being, many still fails to provide adequately for a holistic view of health and wellbeing. As a matter of fact, many public schools in the Philippines do not have facilities for rest and recreation for Faculty.

Table 6. Summary of the Level of Well-Being of Faculty

Well-Being	Mean	Description
Physical	3.41	Moderate
Social	4.22	High
Emotional	3.83	High
Spiritual	4.42	High
Overall	**3.84**	**HIGH**

Relationship Between Burnout and Well-Being of Faculty

Table 7 shows the relationship between burnout and well-being of Faculty. The results show that the p-value is .000, with a negative Pearson product coefficient of -.295. This implies that there is a significant inverse relationship between burnout and well-being ($p<.05$). In other words, the increase in burnout would likely decrease the well-being of Faculty; while the decrease in burnout would likely increase the well-being of Faculty.

This result is supported by the findings of Burke et al (2010) that burnout has negative contribution to the well-being of employees, and specifically associated with poor mental health and job dissatisfaction. Moreover, the results also supported the findings of Pillay et al (2014) that there is a negative association between burnout and well-being in a sample of Australian teachers.

Table 7 Relationship Between Burnout and Well-Being of Faculty

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	WELL-BEING		
	R	p-value	Remarks
Burnout	-.295	.000	Significant

Predictors of Well-Being of Faculty

Table 4 shows the predictors of well-being of Faculty. The results indicate that only the client burnout significantly predict the well-being of Faculty as shown in the p-value that is less than .05, with beta value of -.260. This means that for every unit increase in the value of client burnout, there is a corresponding decrease in the well-being by .260. In other words, the burnout with clients contributes to the decrease in well-being of Faculty. On the other hand, the physical and work burnout indicators do not predict the overall well-being of faculty as shown in the p-value that is above .05. This means that physical and work burnout do not contribute to their well-being.

Meanwhile, the amount of variance that can be explained by the model is 10.3 %. This means that 89.7% can be explained by other factors other than the independent variables.

This result is supported by Bakker and Costa (2014) that burnout with clients and customers are commonly experienced by workers and negatively influence their well-being. In particular, being burnout weakens the gains cycle of daily job demands and self-undermining particularly the gain cycle of daily job resources and job crafting.

Table 8. Predictors of Well-Being of Faculty

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p-value
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.438	.122		36.305	.000
	Personal	.000	.064	.000	.005	.996
	Work	-.057	.070	-.075	-.805	.421
	Client	-.170	.052	-.269	-3.293	.001

Note: R= .320, R-square= .103, F= 8.726, P<.05

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn. The degree of burnout among Faculty is low indicating that psychological exhaustion is still experience at work. More particularly, the Faculty has low level of personal, work and client burnout. The Faculty has high level of well-being particularly higher in spiritual social and emotional. On the other hand, the faculty only has moderate Physical well-being. There is a significant inverse relationship between burnout and well-being. In other words, the increase in burnout would likely decrease the well-being of Faculty; while the decrease in burnout would likely increase the well-being of Faculty. Only the client burnout significantly predicts the well-being of Faculty, while physical and work burnout do not affect their well-being.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were offered. Since the Faculty still experience burnout even at low degree, there shall be programs in the school to be organized by administrators to lessen the psychological exhaustion of its Faculty members. Since the Faculty only has moderate physical well-being, it is suggested that DepEd shall provide facilities for the teachers to do exercises and workout, or conduct a program that shall facilitate development of the physical aspects of their employees. Since client burnout is a significant predictor of well-being, it is highly recommended that certain processes needs to be improve especially in the aspect of Faculty-client transactions, such as scheduling of consultation time, and support systems such as guidance counseling office to divide the workloads of teachers in dealing with students.

REFERENCES

American Diabetes Association (2008). Economic costs of diabetes in the U.S

American Psychological Association. (2008). Are Zero Tolerance Policies Effective in the Schools?. Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/ pubs/info/reports/zero-tolerance.pdf.

Angner, E., (2008). The philosophical foundations of subjective

measures of well-being. Capabilities and Happiness, 286-298.

Anspaugh, D., Hamrick, M., & Rosato, F. (2004). Wellness: Concepts and Applications 6th ed. Boston: McGraw Hill. "Wellness and Fitness for life"

Bakker, A. B., & Costa, P. (2014). Chronic job burnout and daily functioning: A theoretical analysis. Burnout Research, 1, 112–119.

Balch CM. (2009). Microscopic satellites around a primary melanoma: Another piece of the puzzle in melanoma staging. Ann Surg Oncol. 2009;16:1092–1094.

Barwais, F., (2011). Definitions of Well-being, Quality of Life, and Wellness in
National Wellness Institute of Australia Retrieved http://nwia. idwellness.org/2011/02/28/definitions-of-wellbeing-quality-of-life andwellness/ [accessed 8th September 2012].

Bates, K., Bates, H. & Johnston, R. (2003). Linking Service to providing. The business case for service excellence. International Journal of Service Industry Management. Vol. 14(2)

Booth, Roberts, and Laye (2012). Lack of exercise is a major cause of chronic diseases

Broome, K.M., Flynn, P.M., Knight, D.K., & Simpson, D.D. (2007). Program structure, staff perceptions, and client engagement in treatment. Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 33, 149-158.

Bryson, A., J Forth, J. and Stokes, L. 2014. Does worker wellbeing affect workplace performance? Department for Business and innovation and NIESR, BIS/14/1120, available from www.gov.uk/bis

Bupa's Health Information Team (2011). Retrieved from http://www. bupa.com.au/staticfiles/BupaP3/AboutBupaAustralia/MediaFiles/ PDFs/bupa-annual-review-2011.pdf.

Cameron, M., & Heidel, S. (2000). Behavioural risk management: A partnership between occupational health nursing and occupational psychiatry. AAOHN Journal, 48(11), 533- 541

Clarkin, J.F. (2005). Conceptualization and treatment of personality disorders. Psychotherapy Research, 16, 1–11

Coats D and Lehki R (2008), 'Good Work': Job Quality in a Changing Economy, London: The Work Foundation

Creswell, J.W. (2003). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Diener, E. (2009). Subjective well-being. In E. Diener (Ed.), The science of well- being (pp. 11–58): New York: Spring.

Forgeard, M. J. C., Jayawickreme, E., Kern, M. & Seligman, M. E. P. (2011).

Doing the right thing: Measuring wellbeing for public policy. International Journal of Wellbeing, 1(1), 79–106. http://dx.doi. org/10.5502/ijw.v1i1.15

Goodman, M.J. and Schorling, J.B. (2012) A mindfulness course decreases
burnout and improves well-being among healthcare providers. The International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine, 43, 119-128. doi:10.2190/PM.43.2.b

Gough, I., & McGregor, J., (2007). Well-being in developing countries: from theory to research: Cambridge Univ Pr.

Gould, D. 2007. Foundations of Sport & Exercise Psychology. 4th edition. 52, 452-453, 456. Human Kinetics. Champaign, IL, USA.

Huang W et al. (2011). An investigation into the effectiveness of traditional Chinese acupuncture (TCA) for chronic stress in adults: a randomised controlled pilot study.

Huang, Kuo-Ying and Mujtaba, B. G. (August 2009). Stress, task, and relationship orientations of Taiwanese adults: an examination of gender in this high-context culture. Journal of International Business and Cultural Studies, 3, 1-12

Jepson, E., & Forrest, S. (2006). Individual contributory factors in teacher stress: The role of achievement striving and occupational commitment. The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 183-197. doi:10.1348/000709905X37299

Kivimäki, M., Ferrie, J. E., Brunner, E., Head, J., Shipley, M. J., Vahtera, J., et al. (2005). Justice at work and reduced risk of coronary heart disease among employees: The Whitehall II study. Archives of Internal Medicine, 165 (19), 2245–2251.

Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen burnout inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. Work & Stress, 19, 192-207.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.

Malik S. (2005). Cardiovascular disease in U.S. patients with metabolic syndrome, diabetes, and elevated C-reactive protein.

Meyer, L., & Parton, R. (2011). How to drive value creation in the C-suite. Corporate Wellness Magazine, 18, 1-2.

Morrow, P. C. (2011). Managing organizational commitment: Insights from
longitudinal research. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79(1), 18-35

Pillay H. Well-Being, Burnout and Competence : Implications for Teachers.

Pugliesi K. (1999). "The Consequences of Emotional Labor: Effects on Work Stress, Job Satisfaction, Motivation and Emotion", Vol. 23(2).

Romas J. A & Sharma M,. Theoretical foundations of health education and health promotion. Sudbury, jones and arlett publishers; 2008

Ryland, E., & Greenfield, S. (1991). Work stress and well-being: An investigation of Antonovsky's sense of coherence model. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6(7), 39-54

Schwarger and Hallum (2008). Perceived Teacher Self-Efficacy as a Predictor of Job Stress and Burnout: Mediation Analyses

Shirley, L. K., Kathy, M. H. (2002). Stress hormones: How do they measure up? Biological Research for Nursing, 4 (2), 92-103.

Shuttleworth, M. (2008). Descriptive Research Design. Retrieved Mar 26, 2017 from Explorable.com: https://explorable.com/descriptive-research-design

Sveinsdottir, H., Gunnarsdottir, H.K., Fridriksdottir, H., 2007. Self-assessed occupational health and working environment

Taniajura (2007). Factors related to the job stress and Performance

Thomas, R.(2004). Issues and controversies in the understanding and diagnosis of compassion fatigue, vicarious traumatization and secondary traumatic stress disorder. International Journal of Emergency Mental Health, 6(2), 81-92.

World Health Organization (2001). Principles of Medicine

World Health Organizations (2014). Asset Management Practices, Investments
and Challenges

Wyn, J. (2007). Learning to "become somebody well": challenges for educational

policy', Australian Educational Researcher, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 35–52.

Yang, Yen, & Chen (2010).THE TRANSLATION, VALIDATION AND CULTURAL ADAPTATION OF FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT OF CHRONIC ILLNESS THERAPY - SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING 12 (FACIT-SP12) SCALE IN GREEK LANGUAGE