The Effect of Gender Differences on Psychological Well-being of Lecturers

Ema Yudiani[1]*, Jesyia Meyrinda[2], Siti Khosiyah[3], Husna Dendara[4]

[1,2,3]Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang, Indonesia
[4]Bangkok Hospital, Thailand

Abstract. Previous studies on gender differences in mental health has reported significantly different results. Inconclusive results have also been obtained from existing literature focused on differences in psychological well-being in organizations and industries between women and men. Therefore, this study aims to determine the effect of gender differences on psychological well-being of state Islamic religious universities lecturers. The study procedures were carried out with a quantitative method, focusing on 652 lecturers from Indonesian state Islamic universities. The selected respondents were assessed with the Ryff Psychological Well-Being Scale and the Bem Sex Role Inventory. The data obtained were then analyzed using MANOVA to determine differences between 2 gender groups, namely male and female. The results showed that there were significant gender differences in psychological well-being between male and female lecturers at state Islamic religious universities. In terms of autonomy and self-acceptance, men outscored women, while in terms of personal growth and positive relationships with others, women had higher scores. In addition, high masculinity was the most significant factor in both men's and women's psychological well-being.

Keywords: Gender, feminimetas, lecturer, masculinitas, MANOVA, psychological well-being

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.15575/psy.v11i2.37381

* Corresponding author: Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang, Kec. Seberang Ulu I, Kota Palembang, Sumatera Selatan 30267, Indonesia
E-mail: emayudiani_uin@radenfatah.ac.id

Introduction

The psychological well-being of individuals has emerged as a key study interest in the domains of psychology, sociology, and public health. A positive self-evaluation serves as an essential ingredient for happiness, life satisfaction, and contentment levels (Cordaro et al., 2024). Several studies have shown that the pursuit of happiness and well-being prevails in all human societies, but its understanding remains elusive and undefined. Important social and psychological factors, including academic pressures, socioeconomic status, and social environments, fuel the need for understanding psychological well-being. Studies focused on this area can contribute to national well-being, development levels, human resource management, productivity, loyalty, and workplace commitment. Although lecturers play an important role in shaping the future of nations, any adverse psychological effects on this demographic are troublesome.

The stress levels of educators appear greater under some conditions compared to other professions. Factors, such as professional misconduct among students, developing a positive classroom environment, differences in teaching styles, unfulfilled expectations of parents and students, pressure on students for grades, and parental guidance may potentially expose lecturers to tension, frustration, and aggression (Jensen, 2021; Masath et al., 2022; Mthiyane & Mudadigwa, 2021; Welsh, 2023). Psychological problems have been reported to disrupt psychological well-being and cause health problems and strains in interpersonal relationships (Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2021). Therefore, there is a pressing need to explore gender differences in the psychological well-being of a specific job category.

Several studies have explored gender differences in psychological well-being across various cultures and job categories (Kern et al., 2020; Mensah, 2021; Viertiö et al., 2021). Although a preponderance of studies showed gender-related differences, their

results are contrasting. Debates also continue regarding the misconceptions surrounding gender differences in psychological well-being, with empirical studies being relatively limited.

According to previous studies, there are differences in roles between lecturers at public universities and state Islamic religious colleges in Indonesia. Lecturers in these colleges have a crucial role in teaching Islamic values, the formation of faith, devotion to Allah SWT, and education of the nation. Therefore, these individuals must continuously improve in quality to facilitate the achievement of their noble goals. The exploration of gender differences is a new area of study due to the absence of literature on this area.

Gender differences in psychological well-being have long piqued the interest of several scholars. Through empirical studies spanning decades, it became evident that significant discrepancies existed between genders regarding their overall psychological well-being (Katsantonis, 2020; Yoon et al., 2023). Various factors contribute to these differences and the increasing awareness is due to stress-related issues, alongside attempts to understand emotional intricacies and reactions to stress and anxiety.

In recent years, the teaching profession has assumed paramount importance, particularly the role of university faculty members. In the routine grind of life, beleaguered by families, societies, and institutions, self-perception often deteriorates. The teaching profession is widely considered to be strenuous, demanding knowledge, patience, tolerance, kindness, understanding, and adaptability. Therefore, improving individual faculty development programs remains essential.

Psychological well-being comprises diverse facets, including self-acceptance, life goals, general positive feelings, and emotional relationships with others. Incremental and situational factors have been reported to have a significant effect on psychological well-being (Ahmed et al., 2022; Thanoi et al., 2023). Consequently, its perception varies across fields of profession, sex, age, socioeconomic background, and culture (Jebb et al., 2020; Matud et al., 2022; Navarro-Carrillo et al., 2020).

The exploration of gender influences on the psychological well-being of university faculty members, regardless of disciplinary distinctions, extends into new realms of knowledge that present fresh challenges and raise novel questions to support academic endeavors, identity formation, and targeted knowledge acquisition. A systematic investigation into this area is expected to provide insights into promoting the academic, professional, and institutional fraternity's well-being.

Psychological well-being has long been a major concern in the lives of various individuals. In addition, it is influenced by several different variables, such as gender, age, occupation, and education (Das et al., 2020; Jebb et al., 2020; Matud et al., 2022; Morales-Rodríguez et al., 2020). Gender refers to the context of sociocultural constructions, roles, and relationships. These constructions commonly relate to the sexual division of labor, gender roles, and public/private spheres. Different roles assigned to men and women can lead to gender differences in psychological well-being. Women generally experience lesser levels due to the possession of fewer resources compared to men. Psychological well-being patterns also vary according to psychosocial determinants, hence, individual characteristics, such as gender, education, marital status, and occupation must be taken into consideration. Different life cycles and changes in occupational roles have been shown to affect perception.

The majority of previous studies on psychological well-being have examined either the social and economic conditions of a particular population or the participation of individuals in social service or social change programs (Morales-Rodríguez et al., 2020; Navarro-Carrillo et al., 2020; Wanberg et al., 2020). Consequently, there has been little understanding of the internal dimension of personal and group psychological well-being. Studies in developing nations have generally focused on social and economic discrimination or inequities. Although it is essential to understand gender differences in social conditions, this gender analysis fails to capture psychological sensitivity or subjective perceptions among genders. Women experience multiple discrimination due to differences in gender, ethnicity, and class. Women's psychological well-being is influenced by gender, ethnicity, social class, and global neoliberal changes. Gender itself must be examined in a wider socio-historical context, as well as with an understanding of the internal personal world of women. To explore the meaning and interpretation of psychological well-being, a quantitative approach is appropriate to generate possible hypotheses or understand emerging areas.

Therefore, this study aims to:
1) Determine the effect of gender differences on the psychological well-being of lecturers at state Islamic religious universities.
2) Examine the psychological well-being of lecturers at state Islamic religious universities in relation to demographic variables, such as marital status, job status, leadership attitude, and work experience

3) Determine the association between masculinity and femininity with the psychological well-being of women and men.

Hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:

H$_1$) There are significant gender differences in psychological well-being between male and female lecturers at state Islamic religious universities

H$_2$) The psychological well-being of lecturers in state Islamic religious universities has varied significantly in terms of demographic variables, such as marital status, job status, leadership attitude, and work experience.

Methods

The dimension of psychological well-being was the dependent variable, while masculinity, femininity, work experience, job status, and marital status, were the independent.

Participants and Design

This study adopted a survey approach to examine whether the psychological well-being of state Islamic religious universities was different based on gender (see Table 1). Furthermore, opinions were gathered from the sample population using the questionnaire technique. This was a quantitative study as it involved gathering numerical data and analyzing it using inferential statistics. A cross-sectional study design was used in this study as it studied this issue at one point in time (Cohen et al., 2017). The 2-proportion z-test was used to compare the 2 groups' opinions on the psychological well-being of lecturers. Furthermore, the design ensured an adequate sample size to achieve statistical significance. The effect size referred to White (2022) based on estimations, a sample size of 652 was essential to ensure 95% confidence and a margin of error of 6.3%.

Table 1

Descriptive variable demographic characteristics of lecturers women and men

Characteristic		Women (n=286) n	Women (n=286) %	Men (n=359) n	Men (n=359) %	χ^2 Value
Work experience	5th	76	21.10	95	29.20	266.4***
	5-10th	113	45.10	118	33.40	
	>10th	108	33.80	124	37.40	
Job-status	Civil servants	235	68.90	268	70.50	57.69***
	Non-CS	73	31.10	69	29.50	
Material status	Married	105	65.10	136	78.89	46.53***
	Divorced/widowed	90	17.00	98	6.6	
	Single	91	17.90	125	14.51	
leadership attitude		286	100%	359	100%	

*Note: *** p <.001.*

Measurement

The instruments used in this study were Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scale (Ryff, 2014) and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) Scale (Donnelly & Twenge, 2017). Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scale consisted of 32 items representing the dimensions of Autonomy (6 items), Environmental Mastery (5 items), Personal Growth (5 items), Positive relationships with others (6 items), Purpose of Life (5 items), and Self-Acceptance (5 items). All items were written as favorable and unfavorable statements using a Likert scale (0 = Very unsuitable) to (4 = Very suitable). Cronbach's alpha value was (α .85 > .70) showing a good level of reliability in all dimensions, and factor loading was (t-value > 1.96) in all items. Overall, a fit model for Psychological Well-being was χ^2 = 40.797, p = .0016, RMSEA = .050 90% CI .030-.070, probability RMSEA = .472, CFI = .980, TLI = .960, SRMR = .032.

Previous studies referred to the BSRI to measure gender using the version by Ferguson et al., (2016). This was the most commonly used instrument worldwide to assess self-attributes of personality traits considered typical for each gender. The study team used 20 adjective items with 10 items measuring masculine characteristics, the other 10 measuring femininity characteristics. Furthermore, the response form was a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never or rarely true) to 7 (always or almost always true), with composite reliability (CR) value > .70, t-value >1.96, and fit index χ^2 (116) = 336.583, p-value = .0000, RMSEA = .078 (p < 0.05), RMSEA 90% CI = .069 − .088 (p < .05), RMSEA Probability <.05 = .000, CFI = .900, TLI= .868, and SRMR = .052. Cronbach's alpha of the 10 items on the masculinity scale was .83, while the other 10 items on the femininity scale was .80.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive analysis was carried out before determining the mean, standard deviation, data reliability, and whether or not the data distribution was standard for all variables. Before commencing the study, the measurement met the validity and reliability. The indication of valid was with a t-value < 1.96 [51] with a fit index (RMSEA < .06, 95% CI < .05, probability RMSEA > .05, CFI < .95, TLI < .95, SRMR < .08) (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). Subsequently, the measurements were reliable with a > .70 (Urbina, 2014). The data was normally distributed with skewness and kurtosis values of ± 2 (Flatt & Jacobs, 2019). For the hypothesis testing, this study applied MANOVA with M*plus* 7 software, (Multivariate Analysis of Variance) which was used to determine the effect of 1 or more independent variables on several interrelated dependent variables

(Cohen et al., 2007). MANOVA could provide information on how independent variables affected several dependent variables simultaneously, and whether there were significant differences between groups in the dependent variable (*Newsom Multiple Regression & Multivariate Quantitative Methods,* n.d.). Therefore, MANOVA made it easier to understand the relationship between variables more comprehensively.

Results and Discussion
Result
The characteristics of this study data could be observed from the descriptive statistics presented in the following Table 2, which presented the results of the descriptive analysis. Furthermore, the skewness and kurtosis were between ± 2. Data on the 5 variables also showed good reliability with Cronbach's alpha above .70

Assumption Test of MANOVA
In this study, 2 assumptions must be made before conducting the *MANOVA* test, namely normality and homoscedasticity. Both assumptions were tested to discover whether the results of the assumptions were met or not using the appropriate test for each assumption. Normality tests for MANOVA could be done in 2 stages, namely multivariate normality test and univariate normality test. Table 3 showed the results of testing the normality assumption using the Henze-Zirkler test (Gravetter et al., 2021).

The results of testing the assumption of multivariate normality, showed that the test significance value = .8120532 and p-value = .11 (*p*>.05). This concluded that multivariate normality distributed data was fulfilled. Furthermore, this conclusion could be observed based on the *p-value* >, suggesting that all data was normally distributed and was continued for the assumption of univariate normality using the *Henze-Zirkler* test.

Table 3 presented the results of the assumption testing for univariate normality in each dependent variable. According to the table, with univariate normally distributed data and a significance level of 5% (*α*=.05), it could be concluded that the data for each variable Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive relationships with others, Purpose of Life, and Self-Acceptance were univariate normally distributed. This showed that the assumption of univariate normality was met for each dependent variable.

In this study, 2 types of homoscedasticity tests could be done, namely the variance and the covariance matrix homogeneity test. The following were the results of testing the assumption of homogeneity of variance using the *Levene* test.

Table 2
Descriptive Analysis Result

Variable	Mean	SD	α	Skewness	Kurtosis
Autonomy	3.14	.68	.73	.06	-.31
Environmental Mastery	3.85	.81	.90	-.48	-.56
Personal Growth	3.10	.71	.78	.23	.28
Positive relationships with others	3.44	.91	.90	-.27	-.58
Purpose of Lifeand	3.20	.87	.92	-.06	-.39
Self-Acceptance	3.50	.70	.85	-.03	-.38

Table 3
Normality of univariate test results

Test	Variable	Statistic test	*p*-value
Henze-zirkler	Autonomy *(Y₁)*	.9796	.7612
	Environmental Mastery *(Y₂)*	.9605	.5634
	Personal Growth *(Y₃)*	.9512	.4832
	Positive relationships with others *(Y₄)*	.9741	.5817
	Purpose of Life *(Y₅)*	.9704	.6201
	Self-Acceptance *(Y₆)*	.9407	.7340

Table 4
Homogenitas variant test results

Test	Variable	Statistic test	*p*-value
Levene	Autonomy *(Y₁)*	1.6731	.1836
	Environmental Mastery *(Y₂)*	.0058	.7899
	Personal Growth *(Y₃)*	.3418	.7275
	Positive relationships with others *(Y₄)*	.9741	.5817
	Purpose of Life *(Y₅)*	.9704	.6201
	Self-Acceptance *(Y₆)*	.9407	.7340

Table 4 showed the results of testing the homogeneity of variance. Based on the table, it was known that the data variance was homogeneous and the significance level was 5% (*α*=.05). Furthermore, it was concluded that the data variance for each variable Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive relationships with others, Purpose of Life and Self-Acceptance was homegen. This suggested that the assumption of homogeneity of variance is met for each dependent variable. The conclusion was obtained based on the test results of the P-value > *α*, showing that the assumption of homogeneity of the covariance matrix was met. Due to all assumptions having been met, the *MANOVA* significance test could be conducted.

MANOVA Significance Test
MANOVA significance test was conducted to observe gender differences based on masculinity and femininity groups on Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive relationships with others, Purpose of Life, and Self-Acceptance. The MANOVA significance test was carried out in 2 stages, namely the simultaneous *MANOVA* significance test using *Roy's Largest Root* Test = .48484, *p*-value = .006322, where the results of

the *MANOVA* significance test were simultaneously obtained. In this study, the P-value was smaller than the significance level used of 5% (α=.05), this showed that the conclusion for this test was that there was an effect of gender differences in masculinity and femininity on Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive relationships with others, Purpose of Life and Self-Acceptance. Furthermore, a partial test was carried out to discover which percentage of Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive relationships with others, Purpose of Life, and Self-Acceptance was influenced by masculinity and femininity gender groups.

Table 5 presented the results of partial *MANOVA* significance testing. In the MANOVA, where the factor was gender (men, women) and the dependent variables were the 6 well-being scales, statistically significant differences were found, F(6, 3398) = 9.61, p < .001. The results showed statistically significant differences in 4 of the well-being dimensions (see table 6). Although the effect size was small, women had higher mean scores compared to men in positive relations with others and personal growth, while men scored higher than women in self-acceptance and autonomy.

The bivariate correlations between the psychological well-being scale and the masculinity and femininity scores in male and female participants were presented in table 7. In both genders, masculinity had a significantly higher association with psychological well-being. Except for autonomy, femininity was likewise correlated to higher ratings in all areas of well-being for both genders. Furthermore, apart from positive relationships with others, the proportion of variance in the aspects of well-being was smaller compared to that of masculinity. For female lecturers, the degree of the masculine correlation coefficient was lower for both genders when it came to self-acceptance, environmental mastery, life purpose, and personal progress.

From the results of the bivariate correlation analysis, the results showed that H₁ "there were significant gender differences in psychological well-being between male and female lecturers at state Islamic religious college" was accepted, predicting that masculinity was more associated than femininity with both men's and women's psychological well-being.

Comparison Test

Hypotheses H₁ "There were significant gender differences in psychological well-being between male and female lecturers at state Islamic religious college" and H₂ "The psychological well-being of lecturers in state Islamic religious college varied significantly in terms of demographic variables such as demographic

variables such as marital status, job status, leadership style, and work experience" was validated. A total of 2 hierarchical regressions (one for each gender) were conducted to determine the relevance of gender and occupation in the women's and men's psychological well-being. Marital status, job status, and work experience as a dummy variable were entered in step 1 to control their effect. In step 2, masculinity and femininity were included for analysis. Finally, in step 3, leadership style as a dummy variable was entered. All variables, except dummy variables, were focused on lessening multicollinearity. All variables, except the dummy variable (Gravetter et al., 2021).

Table 7 showed the results for the women's group and the men's group. *Rs* for regression were, in both groups, significantly different from zero in each model. Table 8 showed the summary results of the hierarchical regression analysis for the female and male lecturer groups.

Table 5

MANOVA partial significance test results.

	Women (n=286)		Men (n=359)		$F_{(1.3398)}$	d-value
	M	SD	M	SD		
Autonomy (Y₁)	26.35	5.20	25.11	4.18	12.81**	.12
Environmental Mastery (Y₂)	27.29	5.68	24.87	5.49	4.35*	-.06
Personal Growth (Y₃)	36.39	6.12	36.85	5.89	5.62**	.07
Positive relationships with others (Y₄)	27.38	4.45	27.49	4.54	0.65	.04
Purpose of Life (Y₅)	27.86	5.81	28.16	4.78	2.73	.06
Self-Acceptance (Y₆)	28.37	5.63	27.80	4.33	8.78**	-.11

Note: * = p < .05; ** = p < .01. d-value = Cohens's d, Means (M), standard deviations (SD)

Table 6

Bivariate correlations between psychological well-being scores for female and male groups and traits of femininity and masculinity

	Women		Men	
	Masculinity	Femininity	Masculinity	Femininity
Autonomy (Y₁)	.30***	.16***	.21***	.17***
Environmental Mastery (Y₂)	.20***	.19***	.18***	.11***
Personal Growth (Y₃)	.34***	-.04	.20***	-.09
Positive relationships with others (Y₄)	.30***	.18***	.32***	.18***
Purpose of Life (Y₅)	.29***	.15***	.48***	.25***
Self-Acceptance (Y₆)	.19***	.21***	.41***	.30***

Note: *** = p<.001

Table 7
Model summary hierarchical regression psychological well-being measure for the women's and men's group

Women's group

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	β	t-value	β	t-value	β	t-value
Job status	.14	4.69**	.10	3.46**	.11	3.77**
Work experience	.02	.20*	.03	1.49*	.03	.86*
Singel	.05	.45*	.08	.98*	.10	1.05*
Divorced widowed	-.01	-.20	-.03	-1.49	-.03	-1.48
Masculinity			.48	15.77**	.31**	14.39**
Femininity			.21	5.86**	.13**	6.10*
leadership attitude					-.14	5.04*
Adjusted R²		.05		.20		.18
R² Change		.05		.14		.15
ANOVA F-value, df		6.54 (4.1794)***		58.89(62.792)***		46.02(81.567)***

Men's group

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	β	t-value	β	t-value	β	t-value
Job-status	.10	2.39*	.11	1.42*	.11	2.98*
Work experience	.05	3.09*	.05	1.99*	.07	1.59*
Singel	-.10	-3.10	-.10	-.30*	-1.10	-3.45*
Divorced/ widowed	-.07	2.09*	-.09	-2.40*	-.09	-2.41*
Masculinity			.45	14.22**	.29	10.02**
Femininity			.19	4.88**	.15	4.75**
leadership attitude					.11	5.55***
Adjusted R²		.08		.21		.19
R² Change		.08		.19		.15
ANOVA (F-value, df)		5.65 (3.1683)***		46.79(31.672)***		35.13(70.455)***

Note: *β* = Standardized regression coefficient. R² = percentage of explained variance. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

In both groups, each model was significantly different. The most relevant variables in psychological well-being in the female lecturer group were high masculinity having a job status, experienced in working (professional) and single, and high femininity having a low leadership attitude. These results were in agreement with previous studies that gender differences in managerial positions and leadership among women were low compared to men in Western countries (Børve, 2017). The results of this study, however, were not limited to Western countries, in Asian countries, specifically Indonesia, the role of leadership in women was still low.

Another variable that was most relevant for psychological well-being in the male lecturer group was masculinity. Other variables that were relevant to the psychological well-being of men were their job status, high leadership traits, femininity, and not being single, divorced, or widowed.

Furthermore, it was important to note that the BSRI evaluated masculinity and femininity when analyzing this correlation (Ferguson et al., 2016). The BSRI masculinity scale included traits like independence, assertiveness, strength, individualism, or ambition that were stereotypically linked with men and were considered socially acceptable. Previous studies showed that the attributes or qualities that were stereotypically linked with women, such as warmth, empathy, compassion, care, or the yearning to belong, make up the femininity scale.

Discussion
The purpose of this study was to analyze the relevance of gender differences to the psychological well-being of adult individuals. Female and male groups exhibited different leadership attitudes and job status because work experience and marital status determine an individual's position in the social structure and both variables have been associated with all 6 dimensions of psychological well-being. Although difference effect size results were small, statistically significant differences were found between women and men in several dimensions of psychological well-being, with men scoring higher than women in terms of self-acceptance and autonomy, and women scoring higher than men in terms of personal growth and positive relationships with others. Therefore, the first and second hypotheses of this study were accepted. Other study results, which found lower scores for women, compared to men, in terms of self-acceptance and autonomy, had also been found in studies conducted in individualistic countries, such as the United States, and in collectivist countries such as Japan (Ahrens & Ryff, 2006; Katsantonis, 2020; Matud et al., 2022). This study, specifically in Indonesia, provided different results from previous studies. Although statistically significant differences were found in 4 of the 6 dimensions of psychological well-being in this study, the effect size of differences was very small. This could be because the women and men in this study had different levels of job status and work experience. In studies conducted in other countries, education, and work experience were relevant to well-being. The third hypothesis predicted that women and men with a higher job status could have greater well-being than less qualified workers. This hypothesis was confirmed in studies conducted in other countries showing that well-being was associated with employment and job level (Ahrens & Ryff, 2006; Navarro-Carrillo et al., 2020; Viertiö et al., 2021).

Conclusion

In conclusion, data from this study supported the perspective that adherence to traditional gender roles and occupations was relevant to the well-being of Indonesian women and men. This study also showed that those who had self-concepts that included masculine-instrumental and feminine-expressive characteristics had greater psychological well-being. These results showed that psychological well-being based on gender of female PTKIN lecturers had a higher psychological well-being value compared to male PTKIN lecturers. When viewing psychological well-being based on work experience, it was observed that PTKIN lecturers whose work period was more than 10 years (>10 years) had high psychological well-being. Meanwhile, lecturers who had less than 5 years of work experience (<5 years) were lower. As for Leadership traits, it was found that higher leadership attitudes were in both gender groups but low on the masculine side.

According to previous studies, the practical implications of these conclusions were beneficial in designing initiatives and programs that strived to improve the well-being of both men and women and develop more gender equality. Furthermore, these results challenged gender preconceptions by showing that internalizing traits and actions that were often associated with men were linked to higher psychological well-being in both genders. This was the same for characteristics viewed as stereotypically "feminine". However, there was less correlation between their wellbeing.

References

Ahmed, R. R., Soomro, F. A., Channar, Z. A., Hashem E, A. R., Soomro, H. A., Pahi, M. H., & Md Salleh, N. Z. (2022). Relationship between Different Dimensions of Workplace Spirituality and Psychological Well-Being: Measuring Mediation Analysis through Conditional Process Modeling. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(18), 11244. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811244

Ahrens, C. J. C., & Ryff, C. D. (2006). Multiple Roles and Well-being: Sociodemographic and Psychological Moderators. *Sex Roles*, *55*(11–12), 801–815. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9134-8

Børve, H. E. (2017). Men in kindergartens: Work culture and gender. *Early Child Development and Care*, *187*(7), 1083–1094. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2016.1154853

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2017). *Research methods in education* (8th Edition). Routledge.

Cordaro, D. T., Bai, Y., Bradley, C. M., Zhu, F., Han, R., Keltner, D., Gatchpazian, A., & Zhao, Y. (2024). Contentment and self-acceptance: Wellbeing beyond happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *25*(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-024-00729-8

Das, K. V., Jones-Harrell, C., Fan, Y., Ramaswami, A., Orlove, B., & Botchwey, N. (2020). Understanding subjective well-being: Perspectives from psychology and public health. *Public Health Reviews*, *41*(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-020-00142-5

Donnelly, K., & Twenge, J. M. (2017). Masculine and feminine traits on the bem sex-role inventory, 1993–2012: A cross-temporal meta-analysis. *Sex Roles*, *76*(9–10), 556–565. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0625-y

Ferguson, L. J., Vittersø, J., & Gunnel, K. E. (Eds.). (2016). *A gendered perspective: Handbook of Eudaimonic Well-Being*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42445-3

Flatt, C., & Jacobs, R. (2019). Principle assumptions of regression analysis: testing, techniques, and statistical reporting of imperfect data sets. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *21*, 484–502. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422319869915

Gravetter, F. J., Wallnau, L. B., Forzano, L.-A. B., & Witnauer, J. E. (2021). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences* (Edition 10). Cengage.

Jebb, A. T., Morrison, M., Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2020). Subjective well-being around the world: trends and predictors across the life span. *Psychological Science*, *31*(3), 293–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797619898826

Jensen, M. T. (2021). Pupil-teacher ratio, disciplinary problems, classroom emotional climate, and turnover intention: Evidence from a randomized control trial. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *105*, 103415. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103415

Katsantonis, I. (2020). Factors associated with psychological well-being and stress: a cross-cultural perspective on psychological well-being and gender differences in a population of teachers. *Pedagogical Research*, *5*(4), em0066. https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/8235

Kern, M. R., Duinhof, E. L., Walsh, S. D., Cosma, A., Moreno-Maldonado, C., Molcho, M., Currie, C., & Stevens, G. W. J. M. (2020). Intersectionality and adolescent mental well-being: A cross-nationally comparative analysis of the interplay between immigration background, socioeconomic status and gender. *Journal of*

Adolescent Health, *66*(6, Supplement), S12–S20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.02.013

Masath, F. B., Hinze, L., Nkuba, M., & Hecker, T. (2022). Factors contributing to violent discipline in the classroom: Findings from a representative sample of primary school teachers in Tanzania. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *37*(17–18), NP15455–NP15478. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211015219

Matud, M. P., Bethencourt, J. M., Ibáñez, I., Fortes, D., & Díaz, A. (2022). Gender differences in psychological well-being in emerging adulthood. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, *17*(2), 1001–1017. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-021-09943-5

Mensah, A. (2021). Job stress and mental well-being among working men and women in Europe: The Mediating role of social support. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(5), 2494. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052494

Morales-Rodríguez, F. M., Espigares-López, I., Brown, T., & Pérez-Mármol, J. M. (2020). The relationship between psychological well-being and psychosocial factors in university students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(13), 4778. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17134778

Mthiyane, S., & Mudadigwa, S. (2021). The causes of ethical turpitude in schools: Evidence from four schools in Gauteng, South Africa. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Education Research*, *3*(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.51986/ijer-2021.vol3.02.01

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. (2017). *Mplus user's guide: Statistical analysis with latent variables, user's guide*. Muthén & Muthén.

Navarro-Carrillo, G., Alonso-Ferres, M., Moya, M., & Valor-Segura, I. (2020). Socioeconomic status and psychological well-being: Revisiting the role of subjective socioeconomic status. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 1303. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01303

Newsom, J. T. (n.d). Multiple regression & multivariate quantitative methods. (n.d.). *pdx.edu*. Retrieved from https://web.pdx.edu/~newsomj/mvclass/

Prilleltensky, I., & Prilleltensky, O. (2021). *How people matter: Why it affects health, happiness, love, work, and society*. Cambridge University Press.

Ryff, C. D. (2014). Psychological well-being revisited: advances in science and practice. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, *83*(1), 10–28. https://doi.org/10.1159/000353263

Thanoi, W., Vongsirimas, N., Sitthimongkol, Y., & Klainin-Yobas, P. (2023). Examining predictors of psychological well-being among university students: A descriptive comparative study across Thailand and Singapore. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *20*(3), 1875. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20031875

Urbina, S. (2014). Essentials of psychological testing. In *Essentials of psychology testing second edition* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey. www.wiley.com.

Viertiö, S., Kiviruusu, O., Piirtola, M., Kaprio, J., Korhonen, T., Marttunen, M., & Suvisaari, J. (2021). Factors contributing to psychological distress in the working population, with a special reference to gender difference. *BMC Public Health*, *21*, 611. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10560-y

Wanberg, C. R., Csillag, B., Douglass, R. P., Zhou, L., & Pollard, M. S. (2020). Socioeconomic status and well-being during COVID-19: A resource-based examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *105*(12), 1382–1396. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000831

Welsh, R. O. (2023). Navigating tensions in school discipline: examining school leaders, teachers, and the conversion of referrals into suspensions. *American Journal of Education*, *129*(2), 237–264. https://doi.org/10.1086/723064

White, M. (2022). Sample size in quantitative instrument validation studies: A systematic review of articles published in Scopus, 2021. *Heliyon*, *8*(12). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12223

Yoon, Y., Eisenstadt, M., Lereya, S. T., & Deighton, J. (2023). Gender difference in the change of adolescents' mental health and subjective wellbeing trajectories. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *32*(9), 1569–1578. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-022-01961-4