



Safe Schools, Thriving Teachers: Reimagining Educational Planning to Mitigate School Violence and Support Educator Well-Being

Nur Muhabibudin^{1,2}, Zamroni³, Hasan Baharun⁴

¹ STAI Sangatta, Indonesia

^{2,3} Universitas Islam Negeri Aji Muhammad Idris Samarinda, Indonesia

⁴ Universitas Nurul Jadid Probolinggo, Indonesia

Corresponding Author ✉ nurmuhabibudin@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

School violence and declining educator well-being present interconnected challenges for educational quality and institutional sustainability. Conventional educational planning often treats school safety, violence prevention, and teacher well-being as separate administrative concerns, limiting the capacity of schools to address their structural and relational dimensions. This study aims to examine how educational planning can be reimagined as an integrated strategy for mitigating school violence while strengthening educator well-being. The study employed an integrative literature review of recent academic publications on school violence prevention, whole-school approaches, teacher well-being, school climate, and educational planning. The literature was analyzed thematically to identify recurring patterns, mechanisms, and planning implications. The synthesis indicates that effective educational planning requires four interconnected dimensions: preventive school safety planning, supportive organizational conditions, relational and participatory governance, and continuous monitoring and response. Evidence also indicates that teacher well-being depends not only on individual coping strategies but also on workload, school climate, leadership support, collegial relationships, student-related demands, and access to organizational resources. Therefore, school safety planning should move beyond incident response toward a whole-school framework that simultaneously protects students and educators. The study proposes an integrated planning framework connecting risk identification, preventive intervention, educator support, stakeholder participation, monitoring, and continuous improvement.

Key words: *school violence; teacher well-being; educational planning; school safety; whole-school approach*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received

July 02, 2026

Revised

August 18, 2026

Accepted

September 30,
2024

Journal Homepage

<https://ojs.staialfurqan.ac.id/IJoASER/>

This is an open access article under the CC BY SA license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

INTRODUCTION

Schools are expected to function as safe and supportive environments in which students can learn and educators can perform their professional responsibilities without fear of violence, discrimination, or psychological harm (DePaoli & McCombs, 2023; Thobane et al., 2023). However, school violence remains a significant educational and social concern because its consequences extend beyond individual incidents and can affect relationships, learning conditions, organizational climate, and the well-being of teachers (Peist et al., 2024; Reddy et al., 2024). Recent research shows that violence and disruptive behavior in schools can become an organizational problem when schools lack effective preventive systems and supportive environments (McLaughlin et al., 2026; Mariani & Schiff, 2025). Yang et al., (2022), for example, found that teacher victimization was significantly associated with emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. These findings indicate that school violence should not be understood solely as a student protection issue. It also represents a risk to the sustainability of the teaching workforce and the quality of the educational environment.

The problem becomes more complex because educational planning has traditionally emphasized curriculum implementation, academic achievement, infrastructure, human

resources, and financial management, while school safety and educator well-being have often received less systematic attention as core planning dimensions (Sarzhanova & Nurgabdeshev, 2025; Chatzipanagiotou & Katsarou, 2023). From a theoretical perspective, this creates a problem of fragmented planning, in which violence prevention, teacher well-being, school climate, and educational quality are addressed through separate programs. The Job Demands-Resources perspective suggests that employee well-being is influenced by the interaction between occupational demands and available resources (Demerouti, 2025). Zhou et al., (2024), through a meta-analysis of 173 studies involving 89,876 participants, found that teacher well-being is associated with work-related resources, social relationships, competence, motivation, and work-life balance. Therefore, addressing educator well-being only through individual coping or psychological interventions may not sufficiently address organizational conditions that generate stress and vulnerability (Nwoko et al., 2023).

Recent empirical studies provide important evidence concerning the relationship between school violence, school climate, and teacher well-being. (Yang et al., 2022) demonstrated that teacher victimization was positively associated with multiple dimensions of teacher burnout, while school climate played a moderating role in this relationship. Andersen et al., (2025) similarly reported an association between pupil aggression and teacher burnout, highlighting the importance of stress and social support in the workplace. Research on teacher well-being has also moved toward a broader conceptualization. Ozturk et al., (2024), through a systematic review, argued that teacher well-being should be approached holistically because existing studies have frequently emphasized either negative conditions such as stress and burnout or positive conditions such as flourishing and professional functioning. These studies collectively demonstrate that violence prevention and educator well-being cannot be separated from the organizational conditions of schools.

Research on school-based prevention further demonstrates the importance of moving beyond individual-level interventions toward whole-school approaches. Ponsford et al., (2024) found that whole-school interventions can influence school-level conditions associated with violence and student commitment. Similarly, Garza, (2025) reviewed school violence prevention programs and emphasized the continuing need for systematic approaches to violence prevention in elementary education. Research on educator well-being also indicates that interventions can produce positive outcomes. Beames et al., (2023), through a systematic review and meta-analysis, found that psychological interventions for teachers were associated with improvements in stress, anxiety, depression, burnout, and well-being. However, the existence of effective interventions does not automatically ensure their integration into school planning. The literature therefore points to a distinction between having interventions and institutionalizing them within the educational planning system (Millie, 2025; Martino et al., 2022).

This distinction identifies an important research gap and state of the art. Existing studies have generated substantial evidence about teacher victimization, school violence, teacher burnout, school climate, whole-school interventions, and educator well-being. However, these research areas are commonly examined as separate problems. Studies of school violence tend to emphasize prevention, victimization, bullying, or student safety, while studies of teacher well-being frequently focus on burnout, stress, mental health, job satisfaction, or individual and organizational support. The missing link concerns how these dimensions can be deliberately integrated into educational planning as a continuous school improvement process (Al-Zyoud et al., 2025). The novelty of the present study therefore lies in repositioning school safety and educator well-being as interconnected planning dimensions rather than as supplementary programs. This perspective shifts educational planning from a predominantly administrative and programmatic orientation toward a risk-informed, preventive, participatory, and well-being-oriented model of school improvement.

The Indonesian context makes this research particularly relevant. In January 2026, the Indonesian Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education issued Permendikdasmen No. 6 of 2026 on Budaya Sekolah Aman dan Nyaman, which replaced Permendikbudristek No. 46 of 2023. The new regulation defines safe and comfortable school culture in broader terms that

include spiritual needs, physical protection, psychological well-being, sociocultural security, and digital civility and safety (Bakar & Dewi, 2026). It also emphasizes humanistic, comprehensive, and participatory approaches. The regulation explicitly includes monitoring, evaluation, and funding as components of implementation. This policy development creates a strong contextual basis for rethinking educational planning. School safety is no longer limited to responding to violence after an incident occurs. It requires schools to build preventive cultures and integrate safety and well-being into institutional planning, implementation, monitoring, and continuous improvement (Gayathri et al., 2025).

Based on this theoretical, empirical, and policy context, this study focuses on how educational planning can integrate school safety, violence prevention, and educator well-being to support sustainable school improvement. The study aims to develop an integrated educational planning framework that connects risk diagnosis, participatory priority setting, preventive intervention, educator well-being support, responsive governance, and continuous monitoring and evaluation. This focus is justified because school safety and educator well-being share many organizational determinants, including leadership, school climate, social relationships, workload, institutional support, participation, and access to resources. Integrating these dimensions into educational planning can provide a more coherent basis for prevention and school improvement than treating them as isolated programs. Accordingly, the study addresses one central research question: How can educational planning integrate school safety, violence prevention, and educator well-being to support sustainable school improvement?

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach with an integrative literature review design (Raihan et al., 2025). This approach was selected because the study aimed to critically synthesize findings from diverse academic studies and develop an integrated educational planning framework rather than measure the statistical effect of a particular intervention. An integrative literature review allows empirical and conceptual studies to be examined together to identify recurring patterns, relationships, and theoretical insights concerning school violence, school safety, educator well-being, school climate, and educational planning. The design was therefore considered appropriate for answering the central research question concerning how educational planning can integrate school safety, violence prevention, and educator well-being to support sustainable school improvement.

Data were collected through documentary techniques by systematically identifying, screening, selecting, and extracting information from relevant academic publications and policy documents (Chand, 2025). The search used combinations of keywords such as "school violence," "school safety," "teacher well-being," "educator well-being," "teacher burnout," "school climate," "whole-school intervention," "school violence prevention," "educational planning," and "school improvement." Studies were included when they examined school violence or teacher victimization, educator well-being or burnout, school climate or organizational support, whole-school interventions, or educational planning and school improvement. Publications unrelated to formal education settings, sources with insufficient methodological or conceptual information, and studies that did not contribute directly to the research question were excluded. Indonesian regulations and international policy documents were analyzed separately from academic studies because they served primarily as contextual and policy sources.

The data were analyzed using thematic analysis and integrative thematic synthesis (Baxter et al., 2024). The selected literature was first classified according to its main focus, followed by comparison of findings across studies to identify recurring patterns, relationships, and mechanisms. Relevant findings were then coded and grouped into broader themes related to school safety, violence prevention, educator well-being, school climate, organizational support, and educational planning. The resulting themes were synthesized into an integrated educational planning framework consisting of six dimensions: risk diagnosis, participatory priority setting, preventive intervention, educator well-being support, responsive governance, and continuous monitoring and evaluation. The analysis did not generate primary empirical data because the study relied exclusively on published literature and policy documents.

Consequently, the proposed framework represents a literature-based conceptual synthesis that requires further empirical testing across different educational contexts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. School Violence as a Systemic Risk to Educator Well-Being

The literature synthesis indicates that school violence should not be treated exclusively as a student protection issue. It also represents an organizational risk that can affect teachers' psychological well-being, professional functioning, and commitment to their schools. The evidence reviewed in this study shows a consistent relationship between exposure to aggression, disruptive student behavior, workplace victimization, and adverse teacher well-being outcomes.

Andersen et al., (2025), for example, examined Danish school teachers and found an association between pupils' aggressive behavior and subsequent teacher burnout. The study also highlighted the importance of stress and social support at work. Yang et al., (2022) similarly reported that teacher victimization was associated with teacher burnout and that school climate played a moderating role. These findings indicate that the consequences of school violence extend beyond the immediate victim and can influence the wider organizational environment.

Mudrák et al., (2026) further demonstrated that disruptive student behavior and workplace bullying were associated with teacher exhaustion, while supportive relationships among colleagues were associated with lower exhaustion. This finding is particularly relevant for educational planning because it shows that the same organizational environment can contain both risk factors and protective factors. The evidence therefore supports a shift from an incident-based understanding of school violence toward a systemic risk perspective. A school should not wait for serious incidents before allocating resources to safety. Planning should identify the conditions that increase exposure to violence and the organizational resources that can reduce its consequences.

Table 1. Evidence Linking School Violence, Organizational Conditions, and Educator Well-Being

Evidence dimension	Empirical finding	Planning implication
Pupil aggression	Aggressive pupil behavior is associated with teacher burnout	Include student aggression in school risk assessment
Teacher victimization	Teacher victimization is associated with burnout	Establish mechanisms for teacher protection and reporting
Workplace bullying	Workplace bullying is associated with teacher exhaustion	Strengthen organizational procedures and collegial support
School climate	School climate can moderate the relationship between victimization and burnout	Treat school climate as a preventive resource
Social support	Support from colleagues is associated with lower teacher exhaustion	Allocate resources for collaboration and peer support
Disruptive behavior	Persistent disruptive behavior creates additional occupational demands	Strengthen classroom management and behavioral support

Source: Synthesized from Andersen et al. (2022), Yang et al. (2022), and Mudrák et al. (2023).

However, this process is not deterministic. Organizational resources can interrupt the negative pathway. Leadership support, collegial relationships, professional competence, clear procedures, and a positive school climate can function as protective resources. This interpretation is consistent with the broader teacher well-being literature. Zhou et al., (2024),

through a meta-analysis, identified interpersonal relationships, professional competencies, motivation, and work environments as important factors associated with teacher well-being. Teacher well-being was also associated with job satisfaction, work engagement, occupational commitment, and lower turnover intentions.

The implication is that educational planning should treat teacher well-being as an organizational outcome. A school that plans only for student achievement while ignoring teacher safety and well-being may overlook conditions that directly influence the sustainability of teaching and learning. The quantitative evidence from teacher well-being interventions further strengthens this argument. Beames et al. (2023) reviewed 88 unique studies and included 46 studies in meta-analyses. Among randomized controlled trials, interventions produced a large effect on stress and moderate effects on anxiety, depression, professional burnout, and well-being.

The data demonstrate that teacher well-being can respond to structured intervention. However, intervention effectiveness alone does not justify an individualistic approach to teacher well-being. The review by Beames et al., (2023) also identified considerable variation in intervention characteristics and implementation conditions. Therefore, schools should combine individual support with organizational prevention. This distinction is important for educational planning. Counseling, psychological support, and stress-management programs may help teachers cope with occupational pressure. However, these interventions cannot replace efforts to reduce avoidable organizational risks, such as repeated aggression, unclear disciplinary procedures, excessive workload, weak leadership support, or inadequate professional assistance. The first analytical finding therefore answers part of the central research question: educational planning can integrate school safety and educator well-being by treating violence exposure as an organizational risk and by planning both preventive and supportive resources at the school level.

2. School Climate and Whole-School Planning as the Connecting Mechanism

The second major finding concerns the role of school climate. The reviewed evidence indicates that school climate provides an important mechanism through which educational planning can connect violence prevention with educator well-being. School climate includes the quality of relationships, perceptions of safety, leadership support, fairness, participation, inclusion, and shared expectations within the school. These dimensions are not independent of violence prevention. They influence how students and teachers experience the school environment and how willing they are to seek help when problems occur.

Nalipay, (2023), using TALIS 2018 data from five Asian societies, found that school climate dimensions were relevant to teacher job satisfaction and well-being. Mudrák et al., (2026) also found that supportive relationships within schools were associated with lower teacher exhaustion. These findings suggest that organizational relationships can function as protective resources. Whole-school interventions provide further evidence. Ponsford et al., (2024) reviewed whole-school interventions designed to promote student commitment to school and found evidence of reductions in violence perpetration and victimization. It also identified several pathways through which whole-school interventions can operate, including student participation, staff-student relationships, learning engagement, and parental involvement. The evidence can therefore be organized into four interconnected school-level resources.

Table 2. School-Level Protective Resources for Safety and Educator Well-Being

Protective resource	Mechanism	Expected contribution
Supportive leadership	Provides guidance, protection, and organizational resources	Reduces perceived occupational vulnerability
Positive staff-student relationships	Builds trust and improves communication	Supports early identification of problems
Teacher collaboration	Provides social and professional support	Reduces isolation and strengthens coping resources
Student participation	Gives students a role in shaping school conditions	Strengthens ownership and school commitment

Parent engagement	Extends prevention beyond the classroom	Supports consistent behavioral expectations
Inclusive school climate	Reduces discrimination and social exclusion	Strengthens psychological safety
Clear reporting procedures	Improves access to institutional support	Encourages early reporting and response
Digital safety practices	Addresses online risks and harmful interactions	Extends school safety into digital environments

Source: Synthesized from Nalipay (2023), Melendez-Torres et al. (2023), Ponsford et al. (2024), and the 2026 Indonesian school safety policy framework.

This synthesis has direct relevance to the Indonesian context. Permendikdasmen No. 6 of 2026 defines Budaya Sekolah Aman dan Nyaman as a school culture designed to provide spiritual fulfillment, physical protection, psychological well-being, sociocultural security, and digital civility and safety. The regulation also emphasizes humanistic, comprehensive, participatory, promotive, preventive, and collaborative approaches (Bakar & Dewi, 2026). The policy therefore moves school safety beyond a narrow violence-response model. It frames safety as a cultural and organizational condition. This orientation is compatible with the empirical literature because the literature also points toward school-level relationships, participation, organizational support, and preventive intervention.

The analytical significance of this finding is that school climate can serve as the connecting mechanism between two policy objectives that are often separated: preventing violence and supporting educators. A school with weak relationships may experience a cycle in which disruptive behavior increases teacher stress, stress reduces teacher capacity to maintain constructive interactions, and deteriorating relationships create additional opportunities for conflict. In contrast, supportive leadership and collegial collaboration can provide resources that help teachers manage difficult situations and sustain constructive relationships with students.

The current Indonesian policy framework reinforces this conclusion. The Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education describes the 2026 policy as an expansion from violence prevention and response toward comprehensive protection involving physical, psychological, social, spiritual, and digital dimensions. It also emphasizes the participation of schools, families, communities, and media. Consequently, the second analytical finding is that whole-school planning provides the organizational mechanism through which school safety and educator well-being can be addressed simultaneously. The planning process should therefore involve multiple stakeholders rather than assigning responsibility exclusively to teachers or school leaders.

3. An Integrated Educational Planning Framework for Safe Schools and Thriving Teachers

The third finding synthesizes the evidence into an integrated educational planning framework. The framework responds directly to the central research question by translating the identified risk factors and protective resources into a continuous planning cycle. The literature suggests that effective planning should contain six interconnected functions: risk diagnosis, participatory priority setting, preventive intervention, educator well-being support, responsive governance, and continuous monitoring and evaluation.

Table 3. Proposed Monitoring Indicators for Integrated School Safety Planning

Planning domain	Process indicators	Outcome indicators
School safety	Staff and student participation in safety programs	Perceived physical and psychological safety
Violence prevention	Prevention activities implemented	Trends in reported incidents
Teacher well-being	Access to support and professional development	Stress, exhaustion, well-being, and job satisfaction
School climate	Stakeholder participation in climate assessment	Trust, belonging, inclusion, and relationship quality
Governance	Reporting and response	Response quality and

	procedures available	stakeholder confidence
Digital safety	Digital literacy and safety activities	Reported digital risks and perceived digital safety
Continuous improvement	Regular review meetings	Evidence of plan revision based on monitoring

The framework also has a direct connection with the 2026 Indonesian policy framework. Permendikdasmen No. 6 of 2026 explicitly promotes a shift toward promotive and preventive action, broader protection, participation, collaborative handling, and a humanistic, comprehensive, and participatory approach. The framework therefore translates the policy principles into an educational planning process.

The analytical relationship can be summarized as: Risk Information + Stakeholder Participation + Preventive Action + Organizational Support + Responsive Governance + Continuous Evaluation = Sustainable School Safety and Educator Well-Being. The framework also addresses an important limitation of fragmented interventions. If schools implement an anti-bullying program without improving reporting mechanisms, the program may have limited institutional reach. If schools provide teacher counseling without addressing repeated aggression or excessive workload, individual support may not resolve the organizational source of stress. If schools improve infrastructure without addressing relationships and school climate, physical improvements alone may not produce psychological safety.

An integrated planning approach avoids these fragmented responses by connecting intervention components within one institutional cycle. The findings consequently suggest that the concept of a safe school should be expanded. A safe school is not merely a school with fewer reported incidents. It is a school with systems that identify risks, prevent harm, support educators and students, provide accessible reporting mechanisms, respond appropriately, and continuously learn from evidence. Similarly, the concept of a thriving teacher should not be understood only as an individual teacher who demonstrates resilience. Teacher well-being also reflects the quality of the organizational environment in which professional work takes place.

The proposed framework therefore positions school safety and educator well-being as mutually reinforcing components of educational quality. This provides a stronger conceptual basis for educational planning because it connects prevention, organizational capacity, teacher sustainability, and school improvement within one framework.

CONCLUSION

School violence and educator well-being should be addressed as interconnected dimensions of educational quality. Recent evidence shows that violence, disruptive behavior, workplace victimization, and weak organizational support can undermine educator well-being, while positive school climate, leadership support, collegial relationships, participation, and whole-school interventions can strengthen protective conditions. The central argument of this study is that educational planning needs to move beyond fragmented programs. School safety should not be treated solely as a student protection issue, and teacher well-being should not be reduced to an individual responsibility. Both should become integrated components of school improvement.

The proposed framework consists of six interconnected dimensions: risk diagnosis, participatory priority setting, preventive intervention, educator well-being support, responsive governance, and continuous monitoring and evaluation. The framework provides a practical structure for translating evidence into school-level planning. For Indonesia, the implementation of Permendikdasmen No. 6 of 2026 creates a timely opportunity to institutionalize this approach. The regulation's emphasis on physical protection, psychological well-being, sociocultural security, spiritual needs, and digital safety provides a broad policy foundation for integrating safety and well-being into school planning. Safe schools require more than rules and procedures. They require organizational systems that enable students and educators to learn, work, and interact with dignity. Educational planning can provide the mechanism for building those systems and sustaining them through continuous improvement.

REFERENCES

- Al-Zyoud, N., Al-Hendawi, M., & Alodat, A. (2025). Stakeholder perspectives on challenges and improvements in student classification and progress monitoring in Qatari schools: A qualitative study. *Sustainability*, 17(22), 10042. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su172210042>.
- Andersen, L. P. S., Aust, B., & Winding, T. N. (2025). Pupils' aggressive behaviour towards teachers: identifying protective factors at organizational level examined in a follow-up study. *BMC psychology*, 13(1), 247. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02564-9>.
- Bakar, K. A. A., & Dewi, O. S. (2026). Transformasi Kebijakan Pendidikan dalam rangka Membangun Budaya Sekolah Aman dan Nyaman: Analisis Perbandingan Permendikbudristek Nomor 46 Tahun 2023 dan Permendikdasmen Nomor 6 Tahun 2026. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 11(02), 219–230. <https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v11i02.54542>.
- Baxter, R., Pusa, S., Andersson, S., Fromme, E. K., Paladino, J., & Sandgren, A. (2024). Core elements of serious illness conversations: an integrative systematic review. *BMJ supportive & palliative care*, 14(e3), e2268–e2279. <https://doi.org/10.1136/spcare-2023-004163>.
- Beames, J. R., Spanos, S., Roberts, A., McGillivray, L., Li, S., Newby, J. M., O'Dea, B., & Werner-Seidler, A. (2023). Intervention programs targeting the mental health, professional burnout, and/or wellbeing of school teachers: Systematic review and meta-analyses. *Educational psychology review*, 35(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09720-w>.
- Chand, S. P. (2025). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: Interviews, focus groups, observations, and document analysis. *Advances in Educational Research and Evaluation*, 6(1), 303–317. <https://doi.org/10.25082/AERE.2025.01.001>.
- Chatzipanagiotou, P., & Katsarou, E. (2023). Crisis management, school leadership in disruptive times and the recovery of schools in the post COVID-19 era: A systematic literature review. *Education Sciences*, 13(2), 118.
- Demerouti, E. (2025). Job demands-resources and conservation of resources theories: how do they help to explain employee well-being and future job design? *Journal of Business Research*, 192, 115296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20413866221135022>.
- DePaoli, J., & McCombs, J. (2023). Safe Schools, Thriving Students: What We Know about Creating Safe and Supportive Schools. *Learning Policy Institute*. <https://doi.org/10.54300/701.445>.
- Garza, S. (2025). *A Qualitative Study Examining the Perceptions of Teachers on Trauma-Informed Practices*. Evangel University.
- Gayathri, R. K., Vetrivelan, R., Rajesh, D., Balakrishnan, R., Kumar, R., & Kavitha, J. (2025). Strategic role of human resource management in enhancing occupational health and safety practices in business schools in India. *Texila International Journal of Public Health*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.21522/TIJPH.2013.13.02.Art083>.
- Mariani, M., & Schiff, M. (2025). The importance of prevention in school safety planning and response. *Journal of School Health*, 95(3), 280–290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.13528>.
- Martino, W., Kassen, J., & Omercajic, K. (2022). Supporting transgender students in schools: Beyond an individualist approach to trans inclusion in the education system. *Educational Review*, 74(4), 753–772. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2020.1829559>.
- McLaughlin, A., Walls, J. H., & Kruse, S. (2026). Principal discipline decision-making: Choices and challenges. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 54(4), 1389–1407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432251330958>.
- Millie, J. (2025). Limits of bureaucratisation in Islamic education. *Religion, State & Society*, 53(3), 188–201.
- Mudrák, J., Záborská, K., Kollerová, L., Jakerlová, J., Sedláček, M., & Šed'ová, K. (2026). Psychological capital in an integrative JD–R model of teacher burnout: evidence from a nationwide sample of Czech lower-secondary teachers. *Social Psychology of Education*, 29(1), 72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-026-10245-7>.
- Nalipay, M. J. N. (2023). What Aspects of School Climate Matter Most to Asian Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Well-Being? Evidence from the TALIS 2018. *Teachers College Record*, 125(3), 264–288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681231171804>

- Nwoko, J. C., Emeto, T. I., Malau-Aduli, A. E. O., & Malau-Aduli, B. S. (2023). A systematic review of the factors that influence teachers' occupational wellbeing. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 20(12), 6070. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20126070>.
- Ozturk, M., Wigelsworth, M., & Squires, G. (2024). A systematic review of primary school teachers' wellbeing: Room for a holistic approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1358424. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1358424>.
- Peist, E., McMahon, S. D., Davis-Wright, J. O., & Keys, C. B. (2024). Understanding teacher-directed violence and related turnover through a school climate framework. *Psychology in the Schools*, 61(1), 220–236. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23044>.
- Ponsford, R., Melendez-Torres, G. J., Miners, A., Falconer, J., & Bonell, C. (2024). Narrative synthesis of effectiveness. In *Whole-school interventions promoting student commitment to school to prevent substance use and violence, and improve educational attainment: a systematic review*. National Institute for Health and Care Research. <https://doi.org/10.3310/DWTR3299>.
- Raihan, M. M. H., Subroto, S., Chowdhury, N., Koch, K., Ruttan, E., & Turin, T. C. (2025). Dimensions and barriers for digital (in) equity and digital divide: A systematic integrative review. *Digital Transformation and Society*, 4(2), 111–127. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DTS-04-2024-0054>.
- Reddy, L. A., Martinez, A., Perry, A. H., McMahon, S. D., Espelage, D. L., Anderman, E. M., Astor, R. A., & Worrell, F. C. (2024). Violence directed against teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A social-ecological analysis of safety and well-being. *School psychology*, 39(5), 510. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000562>.
- Sarzhanova, G., & Nurgabdeshev, A. (2025). Mapping psychological well-being in education: A systematic review of key dimensions and an integrative conceptual framework. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 9(3), 327–349. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202534832>.
- Thobane, M., Artz, L., & Ngubane, M. (2023). *Educators' perceptions of school-related gender-based violence: A case study of four schools in Alexandra and Soweto, Gauteng*. Gender, Health, and Justice Research Unit, University of Cape Town.
- Yang, C., Chan, M., Lin, X., & Chen, C. (2022). Teacher victimization and teacher burnout: Multilevel moderating role of school climate in a large-scale survey study. *Journal of school violence*, 21(2), 206–221. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2022.2041023>.
- Zhou, S., Slep, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2024). Factors associated with teacher wellbeing: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 36(2), 63. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09886-x>.