



Psychological Well-Being of Teacher Professional Education Program (TPEP) Students: A Demographic Analysis

Desi Nurwidawati^{1*}, Miftakhul Jannah¹, Rizky Putra Santosa¹, Arfin Nurma Halida¹, Ainul Fahmiya¹, Nabila Rachman², Kususanto Ditto Prihadi³, Faiqoh Maulidyah¹, Fatkur Rohman Kafrawi¹, Faridha Nurhayati¹, Muhammad Reza¹

¹Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim, Malang, Indonesia

³University of Cyberjaya, Cyberjaya, Malaysia



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46245/ijorer.v5i6.669>

Sections Info

Article history:

Submitted: July 19, 2024

Final Revised: November 19, 2024

Accepted: November 21, 2024

Published: December 07, 2024

Keywords:

Demographic analysis;

Psychological Well-Being;

Teacher Professional Education;

Program Student.



ABSTRACT

Objective: This research aims to analyze the distribution of several demographic aspects of teacher professional education program (TPEP) students and explore the differences in psychological well-being in demographic aspects. **Method:** This research is quantitative. Participants were 816 teacher professional education program students who were obtained using purposive sampling techniques. The inclusion criteria for research participants are 1) teacher professional education program students and 2) willingness to become research participants and follow the process until completion. Data analysis uses the statistic descriptive. Data was analyzed using JASP software. **Results:** The results of this study present the demographic profile of TPEP students, which is categorized into several aspects. It was found that most TPEP students are women, while the dominant age of TPEP students is 21-24 years. In addition, most students are unmarried, and honorary teachers have a varied distribution of work experience. In this research, the analysis of differences in psychological well-being in demographic aspects is supported by previous research findings. **Novelty:** This study presents the demographic distribution of TPEP students, which can be used to develop psychosocial support through demographic characteristics to improve psychological well-being effectively.

INTRODUCTION

Teacher professional education program (TPEP) is an educational program conducted for those who have completed either a Bachelor's or Applied Bachelor's degree, as well as for those who have completed a Diploma IV, regardless of whether their background is in education. The program's objective is to provide prospective teachers with the opportunity to obtain an educator certificate in early childhood education, primary education, and secondary education. Psychological well-being (PWB) for TPEP students is paramount; TPEP students should have stable and increasing psychological well-being. Good psychological well-being is essential for TPEP students because it can affect their motivation, concentration, and learning achievement (Astuti et al., 2023). To simplify understanding, psychological well-being in TPEP students is identified as referring to the favorable and healthy emotional, mental, and social conditions possessed by students (Boomhower, 2020; Sining et al., 2022; Bhargava et al., 2022; Jiang, 2024). When students feel happy and motivated and have strong self-esteem, they tend to show greater interest in learning. They also tend to face challenges positively and strive for higher academic achievement.

We must understand that psychological well-being is an essential factor in the lives of TPEP students in improving their academic outcomes (Yu et al., 2023). Previous

research has shown that academic well-being can be influenced by various aspects of the educational environment, both physical and psychological. These various aspects play a role in the psychological well-being of TPEP students. This finding is consistent with a study conducted by Moeller et al. (2019), which demonstrated that social support and acceptance from the environment can positively influence students' psychological well-being.

This emphasizes the importance of supporting TPEP students in overcoming these transitional challenges to maintain their academic well-being. Tuominen et al. (2020) research suggests changes in achievement goal orientation during class transition. In the transition, students will intersect with learning difficulties in the adjustment process, impacting psychological well-being (Tuominen et al., 2020). Students who have successfully negotiated the transition process demonstrate a capacity to navigate their daily lives, including the ability to adapt to a novel environment, enhance intrinsic motivation for learning, manage time in a balanced manner, attend classes regularly, and complete tasks in a timely and effective manner. This transition process also occurs for TPEP students who experience grade or level increases.

Creating psychological well-being also requires a positive environment. Research by Foellmer et al. (2021) shows that exposure to greenspace in the campus environment can contribute to the psychological well-being of TPEP students. TPEP students tend to prosper when their educational environment is comfortable and they can access green natural scenery. Resources in the environment can be an essential factor in reducing stressors and improving the psychological well-being of TPEP students.

When psychological well-being in TPEP students tends not to be fulfilled, it can also impact negative behavior. Psychological well-being can also be caused by feelings of burnout experienced by TPEP students (Hejazi et al., 2021; Gundogan, 2023). Burnout and engagement can impact TPEP students' well-being and academic achievement. TPEP students must be able to handle burnout in their academics. On the other hand, educators also have an essential role in paying attention to the factors that cause burnout (Mijakoski et al., 2022; Carroll et al., 2022). As a solution, TPEP students can reduce the use of digital technology and try to socialize in order to improve psychological well-being (Hietajärvi et al., 2019). By socializing, TPEP students will gain various experiences and can even discuss their academic problems, improving psychological well-being.

Psychological well-being is when an individual has a healthy mind and functions optimally without stress or mental problems (Yu et al., 2023). Optimal psychological functioning includes the individual's mental, physical, and social aspects. (Pramitha & Astuti, 2021). The existence of pressure and mental problems has the potential to hinder individuals from achieving psychological well-being. In order to achieve and maintain psychological well-being, it is essential to maintain a balance between the individual and the surrounding environment (Bloch-Jorgensen et al., 2018). Therefore, individuals must understand the various dimensions of psychological well-being to understand how someone can be said to be psychologically well.

They identified six dimensions of psychological well-being. The first aspect is self-acceptance, characterized by an individual's capacity to evaluate themselves positively. Individuals who can accept themselves can understand and accept their various strengths and weaknesses, both in the past and present, positively (Rachmawati et al., 2023). This facilitates individuals' ability to struggle in every phase of their lives (Crosswell et al., 2022). In contrast, individuals who are unable to accept themselves are

characterized by dissatisfaction with themselves, disappointment about various things that have happened in the past, inability to accept their own qualities, and inability to understand their abilities and weaknesses.

Second, positive relationships with others are characterized by how individuals can maintain warm, quality interpersonal relationships and trust each other (significant others). This also links to individuals' empathy and affection towards others (Ambarita, 2020). On the other hand, individuals who cannot have positive relationships with other people are characterized by few close relationships with others, have difficulty trusting others, have low sympathy, and are not interested in building agreements or compromising in maintaining relationships with others. Building positive relationships with others impacts increasing social support for individuals. In both women and men, social support creates feelings of love, care, and value, further facilitating better psychological well-being (Riszki et al., 2022).

Third autonomy; individuals in this dimension are characterized by the ability to control behavior without being utterly dependent on other people, able to think and take action even though they are under social pressure, and able to evaluate themselves according to their personal standards (Sya'idah et al., 2023). Meanwhile, individuals who cannot have this dimension are characterized by individuals who depend on other people's evaluations, cannot make their own decisions, rely on other people's decisions that are considered necessary and cannot think and take action under social pressure.

Fourth is environmental mastery. In this dimension, individuals who can exercise mastery over the environment are characterized by having the ability to modify their environment so that they can manage various needs and demands in their lives, being able to choose and foster an environment that suits their personal needs and values, being able to take advantage by utilizing various existing opportunities effectively and being able to control various rules originating from external activities. In contrast to individuals who do not have mastery over their environment, they feel unable to organize their lives in daily activities, modify various things around them to suit their needs, and lack awareness of the various opportunities around them. In their research, Páez-Gallego et al. (2020) emphasized the importance of environmental mastery, namely the ability to choose an environment that suits personal needs. This will influence every decision an individual makes in his life. Fifth is purpose in life. In this dimension, individuals have confidence in the meaning of life, which is meaningful both in the past and present, have a directed life goal, are consistent with the principles of their goals, and have goals in life. Meanwhile, individuals who do not have a goal in life feel that they have no hope, so life lacks meaning and direction, and they cannot take lessons from life in the past.

The last is personal growth. In this dimension, individuals who have personal growth are characterized by continuing to achieve their goals, being open to new things, and developing their potential to continue to grow and develop as a complete person to achieve self-actualization. Meanwhile, individuals who do not have personal growth are characterized by not having continuous life achievements (stagnation), having little or no desire to develop, feeling bored and uninterested in life, and being unable to develop potential and new things.

Previous studies have examined teachers' psychological well-being, but specific studies on TPEP students still need to be made available. Research conducted by Rachmawati et al. (2023) has discussed psychological well-being in TPEP students but is limited to pre-service training teachers. The novelty of this study lies in the composition

of participants, which includes pre-service training teachers, students, and in-service training teachers. In addition, previous studies tend to examine psychological well-being with a comparative approach or to measure the influence of other variables such as social support, self-compassion, stress level, and coping mechanism (Widiyastuti et al., 2024; Mukhlisa et al., 2024; Sesarelia et al., 2024; Aulia et al., 2024). The demographic descriptive approach in this study presents data on the distribution of various demographic aspects to inspire further research to examine psychological well-being based on various demographic aspects.

Based on these studies, this study aims to analyze the demographic distribution of TPEP students based on several aspects, including gender, age, marital status, teaching experience, employment status, level of education taught, and length of service. Furthermore, this study will explore the differences in psychological well-being conditions based on this demographic characteristic.

RESEARCH METHOD

This quantitative research is the most appropriate because it will describe descriptive results based on data or demographic aspects. Recruitment of research participants was carried out using the purposive sampling method, where researchers looked for potential participants who met the inclusion criteria and were willing to become research participants. The inclusion criteria for research participants are 1) students enrolled in the teacher professional education program and 2) willingness to participate in the research process until its conclusion. The total number of participants in this study was 819 TPEP students. The determination of this number is solely based on the researcher's analytical thinking regarding the feasibility and depth of data that may be obtained. Potential willing participants are asked to complete informed consent before participating in this study. The data in this study were analyzed using the JASP software for descriptive analysis.



Figure 1. Research flowchart.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Based on the research data, the demographic results are described as follows:

1. Demographic Results by Gender

Based on the results of research on 819 TPEP students, the following descriptive results were obtained likely in Table 1.

Table 1. TPEP students by gender.

No	Gender	N	Percentage (%)
1.	Man	200.0	24.4
2.	Woman	619.0	75.6
Total		819.0	

Table 1 shows that many respondents are female. The percentage is 75.6 percent. Male respondents totaling 200 people are equivalent to a percentage of 24.4 percent.

2. Demographic Results by Age

Based on the results of research on 819 TPEP students, descriptive results were obtained in Table 2.

Table 2. TPEP students by age.

No	Age	N	Percentage (%)
1.	21-24	468.0	57.1
2.	25-28	263.0	32.1
3.	29-33	76.0	9.3
4.	Unknown	12.0	1.5
Total		819.0	100.0

Table 2 shows that most respondents are aged 21-24, totaling 468 people, equivalent to a percentage of 57.1 percent. Next, respondents with an age range of 25-28 years totaled 263 people, equivalent to a percentage of 32.1 percent. Finally, respondents in the age range of 29-33 years consisted of 76 people, equivalent to a percentage of 9.3 percent. In addition, there are respondents whose age is unknown, totaling 12 people, equivalent to a percentage of 1.4 percent.

3. Demographic Results by Marital Status

Based on the results of research on TPEP students, the following descriptive results were obtained in Table 3.

Table 3. TPEP students by marital status.

No	Marital Status	N	Percentage (%)
1.	No married yet	668.0	81.5
2.	Marry	148.0	18.1
3.	Widower/Widow	3.0	0.4
Total		819.0	100.0

Table 3 shows that most respondents are single or unmarried, 81.5 percent. There are 148 married respondents, equivalent to 18.1 percent. 0.4 percent of respondents are widowers.

4. *Demographic Results by Teaching Experience*

Based on the results of research on 819 TPEP students, the following descriptive results were obtained in Table 4.

Table 4. TPEP students by teaching experience.

No	Teaching Experience	N	Percentage (%)
1.	No experience	133.0	16.2
2.	There is experience	686.0	83.8
	Total	819.0	100.0

Table 4 shows that the majority of respondents, 83.8 percent, have teaching experience, while the remaining 16.2 percent have no teaching experience.

5. *Demographic Results by Level of Employment Status*

Based on the results of research on 819 TPEP students, the following descriptive results were obtained in Table 5.

Table 5. TPEP students by level of employment status.

No	Employment Status	N	Percentage (%)
1.	Honorary	444.0	87.7
2.	Permanent employees of the foundation	61.0	12.1
3.	Civil Servant	1.0	0.2
	Total	819.0	100

Table 5 shows that many respondents are honorary employees, 87.7 percent. There were 61 respondents with permanent foundation employee status, equivalent to 12.1 percent. One respondent is a civil servant.

6. *Demographic Results by Level of Education Taught*

Based on the results of research on 819 TPEP students, the following descriptive results were obtained in Table 6.

Table 6. TPEP students by education attained.

No	Education Taught	N	Percentage (%)
1.	Preschool	50.0	6.1
2.	Elementary School	356.0	43.5
3.	Junior High School	191.0	23.3
4.	Senior High School	222.0	27.1
	Total	819.0	100

Table 6 shows that many respondents are teachers at the primary school education level, with a percentage of 43.4 percent. Respondents who taught high school amounted to 222 people, equivalent to 27.1 percent. Next, respondents who taught

junior high school amounted to 191 people or 23.3 percent. 6.1 percent of respondents taught at the early childhood education level.

7. *Demographic Results by Length of Service*

Based on the results of research on 819 TPEP students, the following descriptive results were obtained in Table 7.

Table 7. TPEP students by length of service.

No	Length of Service	N	Percentage (%)
1.	0 years	94.0	11.5
2.	1 year	177.0	21.6
3.	2 years	243.0	29.7
4.	3 years	142.0	17.7
5.	4 years	42.0	5.1
6.	5 years	52.0	6.3
7.	6 years	22.0	2.7
8.	7 years	19.0	2.3
9.	8 years	10.0	1.2
10.	9 years	9.0	1.1
11.	10 years	5.0	0.6
12.	11 years	2.0	0.2
13.	13 years	1.0	0.1
14.	17 years	1.0	0.1
Total		819.0	100.0

Table 7 shows that the working period owned by respondents varies. Most respondents, namely 243 students, have a work period of 2 years, equivalent to a percentage of 29.7 percent. The subsequent distribution is respondents who have a working period of 1 year, 177 people, equivalent to a percentage of 21.6 percent. The third is students with a work period of 3 years, 142 people, equivalent to 17.7 percent. Furthermore, 94 students do not have work experience, which is equivalent to a percentage of 11.5 percent. The rest, students with a work period of 4 years to 17 years, each have a percentage of less than 10 percent. Based on the results of research on 819 TPEP students, the following descriptive statistical results were obtained in Table 8.

Table 8. Descriptive statistics of TPEP students' PWB.

No	Definition	Score
1.	Minimum	77.0
2.	Maximum	236.0
3.	Mean	159.2
4.	Standard Deviation	17.2

Table 8 shows that psychological well-being has a lowest value of 77 and a highest value of 236 with an average value of 159.2. The standard deviation is 17.2, indicating that the data distribution does not vary because the standard deviation value is lower than the average.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate the mapping of demographic aspects of TPEP students. The demographic characteristics discussed in this study include gender, age, marital status, teaching experience, employment status, and level of education taught to the tenure of TPEP students. The research data shows that the teaching profession is dominated by women, with a presentation of more than 50.0%. The dominance of women in the teaching profession is inseparable from the concept of gender that has developed, where teaching has been seen as a profession that is parallel to the role of motherhood, making female teachers tend to have mastered the natural ability to educate and shape the morals of students.

Regarding psychological well-being, gender differences have been studied in several dimensions. Compared to men, women show higher levels of psychological well-being in positive relationships with others and personal growth (Wijaya et al., 2023). Looking at the age difference of TPEP students, most are aged 21 to 24. At this age, individuals are in the early adult stage of development. In this phase, individuals are ready to take responsibility and play a role in accepting their position as part of society. At this stage, individuals are expected to be able to actualize themselves. In TPEP students, the stage is one part of fulfilling the need for self-actualization (Krismona et al., 2022). In examining the relationship between psychological well-being and age in the workplace, research by Gunawan et al. (2019) indicates that as individuals age, their psychological well-being tends to improve.

Furthermore, this study highlights the demographic aspect of TPEP students' marital status. As many as 80.0% of the participants were single or unmarried. This is in line with the data showing the age distribution of TPEP students, which is dominated by early adult individuals under the age of 25. In this regard, most TPEP students involved as participants needed to gain previous teaching experience. In terms of employment status, 87.0% are honorary employees. Honorary teachers try to fulfill their needs to achieve welfare. One of the reasons for this may be attributed to the comparatively lower income earned by honorary teachers compared to government associated teachers. Honorary teachers must improve their academic learning capacity by influencing and innovating with available facilities, updating learning methods, and increasing their capacity (Aisyah et al., 2020). Therefore, the TPEP program is one of the steps that honorary teachers can take to self-actualize and achieve better psychological well-being.

In this study, the levels of education taught by TPEP students varied from preschool to elementary school, JHS, and SHS. Most students teach at the elementary school level, as indicated by a percentage of 40.0%. This is in line with data from the Ministry of Education and Culture and Research, which shows that of the total teachers in Indonesia, most teachers teach at the elementary school level, which is 43.8% of all teachers in the country (Aisyah et al., 2020). The last demographic data discussed in this study is about the duration or tenure of work, which is obtained in a diverse distribution; most data has a tenure of one to three years. This work period falls within the category of short work periods. The majority of participants are in the position of novice teachers. Various situations may arise during the teaching and learning process that could impact the psychological well-being of an educator. Prior research has indicated that novice teachers frequently encounter emotional exhaustion and stress during teaching (Reynolds et al., 2021). In essence, this is because the teaching profession is often perceived as a role that requires a considerable investment of

intellectual, emotional, and physical effort, in addition to the pressure to provide an excellent standard of education (Kurt et al., 2021). The occurrence of stressful situations in the workplace has been linked to psychological distress, which, if sustained over an extended period, can result in burnout due to emotional distress and dissatisfaction (Fiorilli et al., 2019).

The existence of these demographic differences certainly has an impact on psychological well-being in TPEP students; students with different demographic statuses will have different psychological well-being. As explained by Ryff, the formation of psychological well-being in individuals can be caused by several factors, namely internal factors and external factors, where the demographic aspects that have been discussed are included in both factors. Further research can explore teachers' psychological well-being, including how internal and external factors significantly influence it and how it can be improved. The high psychological well-being of teachers will also impact higher involvement and empathy toward students (Mercer & Gregersen, 2020).

CONCLUSION

Fundamental Findings: The study results show various distributions of demographic aspects in teacher professional education program (TPEP) students that can be described in each aspect. Most participants are female, with the dominance of participants aged 21-24. Additionally, students are unmarried, and the majority have teaching experience with honorary status spread across various levels of education.

Implication: This study has mapped the demographic distribution, allowing further analysis of psychological well-being. **Limitations:** This study is limited to describing and analyzing the distribution of demographic aspects of TPEP students; a deeper analysis of psychological well-being in each demographic criterion is needed. **Future Research:** To determine whether demographic differences affect psychological well-being, future research can study the level of psychological well-being based on demographic distribution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher acknowledged the respondent's willingness to participate in the research, TPEP students in this research. LPPM, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, and the Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, for funding and ensuring research quality with contract number B/31882/UN38.1/LK.04.00/2024.

REFERENCES

- Aisyah, A., & Chisol, R. (2020). Rasa syukur kaitannya dengan kesejahteraan psikologis pada guru honorer sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Psikologi Proyeksi*, 13(2), 109-122. <https://doi.org/10.30659/jp.13.2.109-122>
- Ambarita, T. F. A. (2020). Korelasi psychological wellbeing dengan burnout pada perawat Rumah Sakit Jiwa Prof. Ildrem Pemprov Medan. *Jurnal Psikologi Universitas HKBP Nommensen*, 6(2), 78-91. <https://doi.org/10.36655/psikologi.v6i2.138>
- Astuti, N. P. E., & Sari, N. P. A. P. (2023). Tingkat perhatian guru sekolah dasar terhadap kebutuhan aspek psikologis siswa dalam pembelajaran. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 7(6), 3622-3629. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v7i6.6437>

- Aulia, W., Yanti, O. N., Abdullah, R. A., Taliki, S. N., Ibrahim, J. N., Agustin, D., Permatasari, N. I., Kusumaninggar, T. S., Hasanah, R. N., & Saputra, R. D. (2024). Kesejahteraan psikologis dan tingkat stress pada mahasiswa tingkat akhir di unimus. *Journal Nursing Research Publication Media (NURSEPEDIA)*, 3(1), 58–66. <https://doi.org/10.55887/nrpm.v3i1.71>
- Bazargan-Hejazi, S., Shirazi, A., Wang, A., et al. (2021). Contribution of a positive psychology-based conceptual framework in reducing physician burnout and improving well-being: A systematic review. *BMC Medical Education*, 21, 593–600. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-03021-y>
- Bhargava, S., & Sharma, R. (2024). Student engagement through teamwork skills: The mediating role of psychological well-being. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, 14(2), 271–292. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-06-2022-0126>
- Bloch-Jorgensen, Z. T., Cilione, P. J., Yeung, W. W. H., & Gatt, J. M. (2018). Corrigendum: Centeredness theory: Understanding and measuring well-being across core life domains. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1648–1654. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01648>
- Boomhower, M. (2020). Supporting international school student social-emotional well-being. *The Organizational Improvement Plan at Western University*, 125, 1–10.
- Carroll, A., Forrest, K., Sanders-O'Connor, E., et al. (2022). Teacher stress and burnout in Australia: Examining the role of intrapersonal and environmental factors. *Social Psychology of Education*, 25, 441–469. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-022-09686-7>
- Crosswell, A. D., Sagui-Henson, S., Prather, A. A., Coccia, M., Irwin, M. R., & Epel, E. S. (2022). Psychological resources and biomarkers of health in the context of chronic parenting stress. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 29(2), 175–187. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-021-10007-z>
- Fiorilli, C., Benevene, P., De Stasio, S., Buonomo, I., Romano, L., Pepe, A., & Addimando, L. (2019). Teachers' burnout: The role of trait emotional intelligence and social support. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2743–2756. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02743>
- Foellmer, J., Kistemann, T., & Anthonj, C. (2021). Academic greenspace and well-being—Can campus landscape be therapeutic? Evidence from a German university. *Wellbeing, Space and Society*, 2, 100003–100007. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wss.2020.100003>
- Gunawan, L. R., & Hendriani, W. (2019). Psychological well-being pada guru honorer di Indonesia: A literature review. *Psikoislamedia Jurnal Psikologi*, 4(1), 105–113.
- Gundogan, S. (2023). The relationship of COVID-19 student stress with school burnout, depression, and subjective well-being: Adaptation of the COVID-19 student stress scale into Turkish. *Asia-Pacific Education Research*, 32, 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00641-2>
- Hietajärvi, L., Salmela-Aro, K., Tuominen, H., Hakkarainen, K., & Lonka, K. (2019). Beyond screen time: Multidimensionality of socio-digital participation and relations to academic well-being in three educational phases. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 93, 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.11.049>
- Jiang, J. (2024). Impact of music learning on students' psychological development with mediating role of self-efficacy and self-esteem. *PLoS ONE*, 19(9), e0309601–e0309605. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0309601>

- Krismona, E. B., Nurihsan, A. J., & Ilfiandra, I. (2022). Aktualisasi diri individu dewasa awal di wilayah Kabupaten Ngawi. *Analitika: Jurnal Magister Psikologi UMA*, 14(1), 59–65. <https://doi.org/10.31289/analitika.v14i1.6600>
- Kurt, G. Ö. K. Ç. E., Demir, B., & Atay, D. (2021). An exploratory study on Turkish EFL pre-service teachers' subjective well-being. *Zbornik Instituta za Pedagogoska Istrazivanja*, 53(1), 121–150. <https://doi.org/10.2298/ZIPI2101121K>
- Mercer, S., & Gregersen, T. (2020). *Teacher wellbeing*. Oxford University Press.
- Mijakoski, D., Cheptea, D., Marca, S. C., Shoman, Y., Caglayan, C., Bugge, M. D., Gnesi, M., Godderis, L., Kiran, S., McElvenny, D. M., Mediouni, Z., Mesot, O., Minov, J., Nena, E., Otelea, M., Pranjic, N., Mehlum, I. S., van der Molen, H. F., & Canu, I. G. (2022). Determinants of burnout among teachers: A systematic review of longitudinal studies. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(9), 5776–5781. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19095776>
- Moeller, R. W., & Seehuus, M. (2019). Loneliness as a mediator for college students' social skills and experiences of depression and anxiety. *Journal of Adolescence*, 73, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2019.03.006>
- Mukhlisa, V. N., & Nurmina, N. (2024). Hubungan antara self-compassion dengan kesejahteraan psikologis pada guru honorer sekolah dasar di Kota Padang. *Trend: International Journal of Trends in Global Psychological Science and Education*, 1(2), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.62260/intrend.v1i2.101>
- Páez-Gallego, J., Gallardo-López, J. A., López-Noguero, F., & Rodrigo-Moriche, M. P. (2020). Analysis of the relationship between psychological well-being and decision making in adolescent students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1195–1200. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01195>
- Pramitha, R., & Astuti, Y. D. (2021). Hubungan kesejahteraan psikologis dengan kesepian pada mahasiswa yang merantau di Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi*, 1(10), 1179–1186. <https://doi.org/10.59188/jurnalsostech.v1i10.211>
- Rachmawati, I., & Lidyasari, A. T. (2023). Psychological well-being of pre-service training teachers. *Jurnal Kajian Bimbingan Dan Konseling*, 8(3), 147–157. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um001v8i32023p147-157>
- Reynolds, B. L., Liu, S., Ha, X. V., Zhang, X., & Ding, C. (2021). Pre-service teachers learning to teach English as a foreign language to preschool learners in Macau: A longitudinal study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 720660–720664. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.720660>
- Riszki, F. A., Sutatminingsih, R., & Siregar, R. H. (2022). Pengaruh gratitude dan dukungan sosial terhadap psychological well-being wanita dewasa awal bekerja yang belum menikah. *Jurnal Psikologi Konseling*, 20(1), 1315–1326. <https://doi.org/10.24114/konseling.v20i1.36014>
- Sesarelia, A. N., Arsyad, M., & Putro, H. Y. S. (2024). Pengaruh coping mechanism terhadap psychological well-being pada mahasiswa. *Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling Ar-Rahman*, 10(1), 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.31602/jbkr.v10i1.14769>
- Sining, M., Sharaai, A. H., & Wafa, W. (2022). A study of social well-being among university students. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 27, 492–504. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-022-02029-w>
- Sya'idah, I. M., & Rohmana, W. I. M. (2023). Exploring psychological well-being of Indonesian pre-service English teachers as non-native speakers. *GUIDENA: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, Psikologi, Bimbingan Dan Konseling*, 13(4), 801–814. <https://doi.org/10.24127/gdn.v13i4.8906>

- Tuominen, H., Niemivirta, M., Lonka, K., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2020). Motivation across a transition: Changes in achievement goal orientations and academic well-being from elementary to secondary school. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 79, 101854-101858. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101854>
- Tuominen-Soini, H., Salmela-Aro, K., & Niemivirta, M. (2020). Achievement goal orientations and academic well-being across the transition to upper secondary education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(3), 290-305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2012.01.002>
- Widiyastuti, & Hardita, K. (2024). Familial social support and psychological well-being among Indonesian university students. *Journal of Islamic and Muhammadiyah Studies*, 6(1), 1597-1601. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jims.v6i1.1597>
- Wijaya, A., & Rossalia, N. (2023). Gambaran psychological well-being pada mahasiswa tahun pertama asal Indonesia yang berkuliah jenjang sarjana di Belanda. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi MANASA Desember*, 12(2), 12-31. <https://doi.org/10.25170/manasa.v12i2.4159>
- Yu, J., Kreijkes, P., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2023). Interconnected trajectories of achievement goals, academic achievement, and well-being: Insights from an expanded goal framework. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 108, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102384>

***Desi Nurwidawati, M.Sc (Corresponding Author)**

Department of Psychology,
Universitas Negeri Surabaya,
Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, kota Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60213
Email: desinurwidawati@unesa.ac.id

Miftakhul Jannah, Dr. Psychologist

Department of Psychology,
Universitas Negeri Surabaya,
Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, kota Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60213
Email: miftakhuljannah@unesa.ac.id

Rizky Putra Santosa, M.Si

Department of Psychology,
Universitas Negeri Surabaya,
Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, kota Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60213
Email: rizkysantosa@unesa.ac.id

Arfin Nurma Halida, M.A

Department of Psychology,
Universitas Negeri Surabaya,
Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, kota Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60213
Email: arfinhalida@unesa.ac.id

Ainul Fahmiya

Department of Psychology,
Universitas Negeri Surabaya,

Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, kota Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60213
Email: ainul.21071@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Nabila Rachman

Department of Psychology,
Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim,
Jl. Gajayana No.50, Dinoyo, Kec. Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur 65144
Email: 220401110221@student.uin-malang.ac.id

Kususanto Ditto Prihadi

Faculty of Psychology and Social Sciences,
University of Cyberjaya,
Persiaran Bestari, Cyber 11, 63000 Cyberjaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia
Email: prihadi@cyberjaya.edu.my

Elok Faiqoh Maulidiyah

Department of Psychology,
Universitas Negeri Surabaya,
Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, kota Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60213
Email: elok.22185@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Fatkur Rohman Kafrawi

Department of Pendidikan Profesi Guru,
Universitas Negeri Surabaya,
Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, kota Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60213
Email: fatkurrohman@unesa.ac.id

Faridha Nurhayati

Department of Pendidikan Jasmani, Kesehatan, dan Rekreasi
Universitas Negeri Surabaya,
Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, kota Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60213
Email: faridhanurhayati@unesa.ac.id

Muhammad Reza

Department of Pendidikan Guru Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini
Universitas Negeri Surabaya,
Jl. Lidah Wetan, Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, kota Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60213
Email: muhammadreza@unesa.ac.id
