

Indicators of Social Emotional Health (Sehs-T) and Resilience in the Latvian Teachers' Sample

Guna Svence, Ilze Briška, Vineta Apse

University of Latvia, Latvia

ABSTRACT

In crisis situations, on the one hand, teachers must be resilient, know not only how the didactic of the subject works, but also technologies, the psychology of pupils, classroom management, self-regulation, time management, self-compassion etc. Research on teachers' social emotional health and resilience is important for quality learning and well-being at school, especially during the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. The following paper provides a description of the study that was carried out in Latvia on the problems of teachers' social and emotional health distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic, and in the context of an international study in the Erasmus + project research "Teacher resilience: problems and solutions. Supporting teachers to face the challenge of distance teaching". Therefore, the samples are denoted by $N_1 = 23$, $N_2 = 635$, $N_3 = 380$, $N_4 = 245$. The main question of the paper is: Which of the variables (burnout, work engagement strategies) most significantly predict teachers' social-emotional health indicators?

The results showed that there were statistically significant positive correlations between teachers' SEHS-T, teacher engagement, and emotional burnout rates. The other results show low scores from SEHS-T which could indicate that teachers' self-confidence could be problematic, which could be explained by their uncertainty about their work during distance learning in a stressful COVID-19 crisis and that they need support for developing their strengths. The other results show that Resilience are moderate medium, but about 18% of the sample demonstrates the lowest Resilience scores. Results from SEHS-T: the subscale of teacher work engagement Cognitive engagement ($p < 0.001$) is significant in predicting SEH-T indicators.

Introduction

Scientists have concluded in their research that the teacher's profession is one of the most stressful professions (Clipa, 2017; Kim & Buric, 2020). The teachers' daily life is always full of duties, challenges as well as contact with people from

various groups (Sandoval-Hernández, Knoll, & Gonzalez, 2012), but starting with March 2020, COVID-19 pandemic introduced large changes in the education system in the entire world, which has caused more challenges than ever before (Carrillo & Flores, 2020; Cardullo, Wang, et al., Burton & Dong, 2021). According to US researchers Gail Wagnild and Heather M. Young's developed concept of resilience, when facing depressing vices of life, individuals with high resilience can adapt, re-establish the balance and avoid the impact of potentially harmful stress (Wagnild & Young, 1993; Wagnild, 2004, as mentioned in Svence, 2016). Susan Beltmen et al. have indicated that teachers' resilience is a research field that provides the opportunity to understand what allows teachers to endure when faced with challenges and offers an additional perspective for the research of stress, burnout, and its component exhaustion (Beltman, et al., Mansfield, & Price, 2011). Like in other countries of the world, in Latvia due to the COVID-19 pandemic emergency, the work of schools was restricted from March 13, 2020; thus, teachers were forced to meet previously unexperienced teaching conditions, adjusting to online teaching. Such an unexpected and fast moving from face-to-face to distance teaching is referred to as "emergency remote teaching" in scientific literature (Carrillo & Flores, 2020; Hodges, et al., Moore, Lockee, Trust & Bond, 2020). Emergency remote teaching differs from correspondence education with its related difficulties because face-to-face educational institutions are mostly not ready to provide suitable infrastructure for online teaching, and teachers lack information and experience to teach by distance (Zhang, 2020, as mentioned in Carrillo & Flores, 2020). Results of an end of the school year survey conducted by the Ministry of Education and Science in cooperation with Edurio online platform from May 26 till June 12, 2020, indicate a potential lack of the teaching infrastructure and experience to provide distance teaching for the teachers of Latvia. Surveying 4662 teachers in comprehensive secondary and vocational secondary educational institutions in Latvia, it was concluded that "when teaching by distance, 76% of the teachers spent more time than teaching face-to-face" while "74% of the teachers often or very often felt overworked during distance teaching" (IZM and Edurio survey, 2020).

In case of emergency remote teaching not only technological but also pedagogic challenges should be considered. Online teaching creates the need to reconsider the teaching approaches used in face-to-face classes. In the virtual classroom the teacher is more like a moderator and consultant, and researchers consider that lessons cannot be organised the same way they are in the physical classroom. Therefore, learning, especially management and feedback, is to be differently organised. Innovations in teaching methods to engage students need to be introduced, thus stimulating students' learning. Especially, new approaches are required to keep the students' attention while they are looking in the screen. First, to plan a suitable pedagogical course for distance teaching, it is necessary

to increase the technological skills of the involved participants (Mukhtar et al., 2020; Verawardina et al., 2020; Thomas & Rogers, 2020; Eyles, et al. Gibbons & Montebruno, 2020 as mentioned in Ferri, et al.Grifoni & Guzzo, 2020).

Scientists consider that although teachers may understand at the cognitive level that remote education is necessary, at the emotional level they may not accept changes and, thus, suffer from burnout (Kin & Kareem, 2018 as mentioned in Sokal, et al., Eblie Trudel, & Babb, 2020). There is a risk that teachers who are used to teach only face-to-face will feel that, when teaching remotely, they are less effective as teachers, therefore their results, and thus also their students' learning outcomes, will get worse (Eblie Trudel, & Babb, 2020; Cardullo, et al., Wang, Burton & Dong, 2021).

A study in Latvia on the relationship between teachers' autonomy and burnout and self-efficacy indicators during remote teaching (Kalniņa, 2021) reveals that most teachers feel exhausted, experience difficulties to deal with challenges and cooperate with the children's parents. However, findings of the qualitative research do not indicate to the teachers' inability to meet challenges. That leads to a thought that the teacher's profession includes resilience as one of the features of the profession.

Scientists predict that although teachers' work efficiency may reduce initially, taking into consideration the new requirements, their self-efficacy may renew over time, now when they learn to adapt to the new distance education situation (Sokal, et al.Eblie Trudel, & Babb, 2020).

Social Emotional Health

The research employs the notions social emotional health (Furlongs, 2014, Gajdasova, 2018, as mentioned Svence et al., 2022)1) and resilience (Wagnild, 2016). The notion of social emotional health has developed from the notion of mental health, which is also now used by some researchers. Mental health is defined as such a situation of well-being in which the individuals may realize their potential, may cope with the stress of everyday life, are able to work productively as well as may contribute to society. Researchers have suggested defining mental health as a total of positive feelings and life (Furlong et al., 2014). In 2014 Michael Furlong together with his group of researchers designed Social Emotional Health Survey (SEHS). This survey allows measuring four constructs forming social emotional health (SEH) and the total SEH factor (Boman et al., 2020). The main principle of SEHS is related to the assumption that the individual's feeling of psychological flourishing is partly based on the living conditions, which contributes to the disposition of internal cognition, i.e. creates individual schemes. These schemes are related to the individual's confidence about oneself, others, about emotional competence and resilience (Furlong et al., 2014).

He refers to the total SEH factor as Covitality, which in its meaning is the same as well-being or psychological well-being (Timofejeva, et al., 2016).

In another study in 2014 social emotional health is defined as the ability to regulate emotions, for example, the ability to regulate and control emotions, and emotional intelligence that is expressed as the ability to recognise emotions and use them constructively.

Studying scientific literature on teachers' social emotional health, teachers' well-being and mental health are mentioned most frequently (Aelterman et al., 2007) define it as a positive emotional condition which is a result of harmony between the sum of environmental factors, on the one hand, and teachers' personal needs and hopes, on the other hand. Other researchers have also used this definition, for example. Brichero et al. (2009). Acton et al. (2015) define teachers' well-being as "individual personal professional fulfilment, feeling of satisfaction and happiness that develop when collaborating with colleagues and students".

Resilience

In research literature the notion of resilience is defined in several ways. Mostly, it is the individual's ability, as a personality feature or a dynamic process. If resilience is an individual's ability, then it is the ability to overcome adverse life experiences, to adjust, to renew and continue successful functioning after hard and difficult life events (Svence, 2015). Resilience also includes the individual's ability to increase the competence while overcoming adverse conditions (Bobek, 2010). This quality allows teachers to continue their pedagogical practice (Brunetti, 2006, as mentioned in Beltman et al., 2011). Researchers have discovered that teachers' resilience is the ability and skill to adapt and recover after difficult situations that is reinforced by individual factors, for example, high self-efficacy, high motivation, ethical goals, flexibility and sense of humour (Price, et al. Mansfield & McConney, 2012), as well as some social factors related to teacher's work, for example, the ability to work effectively according to the administrative team management (Price et al., 2012), mentor's support. It is also affected by a favourable psychological climate at school (Gibbs & Miller, 2014), good relationships with colleagues (White, Peters, 2011), positive evaluation of the teacher's professional performance, material security and professional development opportunities (Crosswell & Beutel, 2013).

Burnout

When studying the phenomenon of emotional burnout, Maslach has concluded that emotional burnout is related to sustained response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stress factors at work (Maslach et al., 1996; Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Emotional burnout comprises three main factors:

1. Emotional exhaustion, which is explained as a feeling of huge emotional drain and work overload, which may also interact between themselves; careless attitude to the people around and a feeling that everything a person is doing is useless. Emotional exhaustion derives from extensive intensity of feelings and a feeling of disappointment; the employees develop a feeling that they will not be able to work the way they did up to now. Emotional exhaustion is also mentioned as the main component of the burnout syndrome. In especially tough cases, a person may experience a nervous breakdown. Emotional tiredness and lack of emotions are mentioned as the most characteristic feelings when experiencing emotional exhaustion. (Schwarzer et al., 2000).
2. Depersonalization. This term involves a cynical, callous attitude to other people. The employee becomes impersonal and formal when contacting other people, clients, colleagues, and the management. The employee develops a desire to distance from executing the work duties and creates a negative and exaggerated idea about the execution of work duties (Maslach et al., 1996). The employee feels negative emotions against other people, especially the ones that they must contact on daily basis, like students, students' parents, or clients (Kahn, 1992).
3. The lack of personal achievements can be characterised as a general dissatisfaction with what has been accomplished or achieved. Disappointment in oneself, feeling oneself as worthless and perceiving oneself negatively from the professional point of view may also be expressed. The feeling of the lack of personal achievements is developed when there exists a feeling of hopelessness from the fact that teachers feel that they cannot teach anything to the students anymore (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Research approves that these three dimensions of burnout are different and reflect the multidimensional essence of the construct of emotional burnout. (Byrne, 1994; Lee & Ashforth, 1996).

Emotional burnout is studied in the context of work-related stress. K. Maslach with her colleagues W. Schaufeli and M. Leiter define emotional burnout as a sustained response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stress factors at work and indicate that its expressions include the dimensions of exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficiency (Maslach et al., 1996; 2001; Maslach & Leiter, 2016).

Teacher Work Engagement

The teacher work engagement model was developed by Klassen and his colleagues (Klassen et al., 2013). To research better teacher engagement, 4 components were included: cognitive engagement, which characterises teachers' attention span and level of effort while performing the duties; emotional engagement, which characterises the teacher's positive emotional reactions at the workplace; social engagement: students, which characterises mutual relationships between

the students and the teacher; social engagement: colleagues, which characterises teachers' engagement in relationship with their colleagues (Klassen et al., 2013).

Work engagement comprises personal interest in one's work and pleasant feelings about the work process itself (Van Beek et al., Hu, Schaufeli, Taris & Schreurs, 2012). Researchers characterise work engagement as a positive and persistent emotionally cognitive and motivational condition that affects various psychic processes of the personality and determines the person's attitude to work and participation in this process (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Researchers define teacher work engagement as "a motivational conception that has to be attributed to the voluntary distribution of the individual's personal resources when performing the duties determined by the teacher's professional role" (Klassen et al., 2013, p. 34, referring to Christian, Garza & Slaughter, 2011). When analysing results of the research in the field of education, there have been named three main reasons that justify the researchers' interest in teacher work engagement:

- 1) promote students' academic achievements and involvement in the learning process;
- 2) better cope with work-related stress and emotional burnout;
- 3) more frequently take active roles in the workplace and contribute to school life (for example, support the colleagues). (Klassen et al., 2013).

Methodology

Research questions

The research questions put forth in this study:

1. What content units indicate to teachers' emotional health indicators – emotions and feelings, when working by distance?
2. Which of the variables (burnout, work engagement strategies) most significantly predict teachers' social emotional health indicators?

Samples

The paper summarises results of four studies of teachers, conducted in Latvia from 2019 till 2021 under the guidance of the author of the paper, University of Latvia professor Guna Svence within the context of both COVID-19 pandemic during the remote teaching and the international research Erasmus+ project "Teacher resilience: problems and solutions. Supporting teachers to face the challenge of distance teaching" No. 2020-1-LV01-KA226-SCH-094599. Therefore, the samples are denoted by $N1 = 23$ (Kalniņa, 2021), $N2 = 635$ (Erasmus+ project "Teacher resilience: problems and solutions. Supporting teachers to face the challenge of distance teaching" No. 2020-1-LV01-KA226-SCH-094599Pakse & Svence, data 2021), $N3 = 380$ (Birkāne & Svence, 2019), $N4 = 245$ (Lagzdīņa, 2021).

Methods

Several methods were applied in both parts of the research. The present paper looks at part of the gathered data. It analyses the data obtained in the studies that applied the following methods: Social Emotional Health Survey for teachers (Social-emotional Health Survey – Teachers, Furlong & Gajdosova, 2018, as mentioned in Svence et al.,2021), K. Maslach’s Burnout Inventory – General Survey (Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey, MBI – GS, Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996), Engaged Teacher Scale (Engaged Teacher Scale, ETS, Klassen et al., Yerdelen & Durksen, 2013), RS (Resilience Scale, Wagnild & Young, 1993, adapted during Erasmus+ project “Teacher resilience: problems and solutions. Supporting teachers to face the challenge of distance teaching” No. 2020-1-LV01-KA226-SCH-094599, data 2021).

Social Emotional Health Survey – Teachers (SEHS-T)

SEHS-T (Social Emotional Health Survey – Teachers) was employed to study the social emotional health of the teachers of Latvia. SEHS-T has not been previously adapted in the EU. The survey was selected because it corresponds to the school sector and the aim of this project – it studies teachers’ social emotional health. The survey comprises several subscales which characterise teachers’ social emotional health. SEHS-T consists of 48 statements, where each of them has to be evaluated on Likert scale from 1–6. The survey questions form 12 subscales, each containing 3 questions, and 4 scales – each containing 12 questions. The minimum number of points a respondent may receive on each scale is 12, but the maximum – 72, whereas on every subscale the minimum number of points is 4, the maximum – 24. As the survey is not standardised, the data obtained in it can be compared only with the potential arithmetic averages, which are 41 points on each scale and 14 points on each subscale accordingly. The initial measurement with the focus group ($N = 635$) indicated that in the sample of Latvia the SEHS-T scores are moderately high. The averages in the entire sample do not show the individual low scores of some teachers. Overall, it can be assumed that in the given sample teachers’ SEHS-T scores are moderately high or even high.

At the same time, it can be observed that the proportionally lowest scores are on the scale Self-belief and its subscale Persistence.

The first research question about SEHS-T data that approve difficulties in the sample of the teachers of Latvia has not been verified. The teachers of Latvia do not exhibit reported difficulties in this survey.

Resilience Scale

Resilience Scale (RS) scores range from 25 to 175. Scores greater than 145 indicate moderately high and high resilience, scores from 116 to 144 indicate moderately low to moderate levels of resilience, and scores from 115 and below

indicates low resilience (Wagnild, 2016, p. 82). Resilience Scale (RS) was used separately in Latvian sample and in Slovak sample.

Resilience short version Scale RS-25 scores from 14 to 98. Scores above 82 indicate moderately high and high level of resilience, scores from 65 to 81 indicate moderately low to moderate resilience, and scores from 64 and below indicates low resilience. Short version RS-25 was used in the whole sample. Cronbach alpha is 0.889.

Table 1. Results from Resilience scale of the sample of Latvia (N = 400)

Resilience – categories		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Low	11	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Low	58	14.5	14.5	17.3
	On the Low End	124	31.0	31.0	48.3
	Moderate	144	36.0	36.0	84.3
	Moderately High	56	14.0	14.0	98.3
	High	7	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	400	100.0	100.0	

Most scores of the sample of Latvia are located at the level of moderate resilience scores. Low and very low resilience scores are shown by almost 18% of the sample. More than 15% demonstrated high resilience scores.

Burnout scale

To operationalise the emotional burnout construct, in 1981 Christina Maslach and her colleague Susan E. Jackson developed an instrument – methodology “Maslach Burnout Inventory, MBI” which comprises all three burnout dimensions. Currently, five MBI modifications are used in research. They have been developed over the years and are meant for representatives of several professions: social professions, medical staff, teachers, the General Survey and the General Survey for Students.

The General Survey (Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey, GS; Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996) comprises fewer questions (16 questions) in difference from the initial version (22 questions); the questions are more general and are not aimed at a particular professional context. The second subscale MBI-GS is defined as cynicism (the component is characterised by cynicism and alienation from work; Maslach & Leiter, 2016), but the third subscale – as professional efficiency (burnout is characterised by the feeling of inefficiency and reduction of professional achievements; Maslach & Leiter, 2016). According to K. Maslach’s model, low scores on the third subscale indicate to high burnout and inefficiency, but high scores – to professional efficiency and work engagement.

The present study employed K. Maslach's 16 question Burnout Inventory – General Survey (Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey, MBI – GS, Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996; adapt. D. Caune, 2004, as mentioned Birkāne & Svence, 2019). The survey measures three dimensions (components) of emotional burnout: exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficiency. Within the framework of the study, Cronbach alpha for Burnout Inventory exhaustion scale is 0.89, for cynicism scale it is 0.82, and for the professional efficiency scale it is 0.83, which indicates to good reliability for scales.

Teacher Work Engagement Scale

Analysing the structure of the factors of teacher work engagement, a scale to measure teacher work engagement was developed as a result. The scale comprises four components – teacher work engagement factors, and it consists of 16 statements – 4 statements for each factor. The structure of ETS:

- 1) Cognitive Engagement – characterises the level of the teacher's attention and efforts while performing the professional duties.
- 2) Emotional Engagement – characterises the teacher's positive emotional reactions at work.
- 3) Social Engagement: Students – focuses on the aspects of the mutual relations between the teacher and the learner – pupil or student.
- 4) Social Engagement: Colleagues – characterises teachers' involvement in relationship with colleagues (Klassen et al., 2013).

Within the framework of this study, Cronbach alpha is 0.83 for teachers' Cognitive Engagement, 0.88 for Emotional Engagement, 0.75 for Social Engagement: Students and 0.75 for Social Engagement: Colleagues, which means that combining the survey questions in scales is reliable. Cronbach alpha for work engagement for all questions is 0.91, which indicates that all questions measure teacher work engagement.

Results

A summary of teachers' well-being during distance learning is shown in Table 2. Results from the research denoted with $N1 = 23$ (Kalniņa, 2021, as mentioned in Svence et al., 2021) indicate that the most frequently mentioned category in a positive context is the category of teachers' self-efficacy to cope with changes and challenges, as it was mentioned by 11% (or 10 respondents) of the focus group teachers in the content units. Table 2. Summary of teachers' sense of self during teaching by distance (as mentioned in Svence et al., 2021).

Table 2. Summary of teachers' sense of self during teaching by distance (as mentioned in Svence et al., 2021)

	Categories	%	Examples of content units
Teacher autonomy	Curriculum determination autonomy	8	"It is more difficult to offer a teaching process based on my ideas, to show visuals."
	General teaching autonomy	12	"I cannot control what the child is doing behind the screen, I have many children in the classroom, and their cameras are often switched off because they are home alone."
Teachers' self-efficacy	Instruction	3	"There is an opportunity to teach more by distance."
	Adapting education to the students' individual needs	3	"Weaker individual connection with the student, which reduces the child's responsibility during the learning process."
	Student motivation	13	"Part of students perceive distance learning very frivolously, I can very little impact on students' motivation."
	Maintaining discipline	10	"Positive experience is the students' politeness online and in writing. In distance learning even the naughtiest students have become especially polite, even humble, especially in correspondence."
	Cooperation with colleagues and parents	13	"Intolerance, dissatisfaction from parents, lack of support, parents who, when writing letters or complaints, do not think about teachers as persons having children who are also learning by distance."
	Cope with changes and challenges	11	"Taking into consideration the current circumstances and restrictions, I think I feel comparatively very well."
Emotional burnout	Exhaustion	16	"Work has occupied the entire day and even weekends; thus, I feel that exhaustion is approaching."
	Cynicism/ Depersonalization	5	"Depressive mood appears, do not fulfil the tasks. Radical. Sometimes the teacher can also feel unreal."
	Professional effectiveness	6	"I feel I am more vulnerable than previously, sometimes I also feel powerless and that is what I dislike most. I am used to solving cases fast and efficiently, as well as conflicts, to providing support and assistance to my students."

In this category, the content units in which the teachers answered that they were able to adapt to the changes and overcome the challenges of the distance learning process were analysed (example from the content units: "Overall, I feel pretty good because I'm used to this situation. I've learned a lot in the field of technology and I'm still doing it").

The second most frequently mentioned category in a positive context is maintaining the discipline of teachers' self-efficacy, which was mentioned by 7% (or 6 respondents) of the total sample. As the third, in a positive context, the teachers' autonomy category of curriculum determination autonomy is most often mentioned – by 5% (or 5 respondents) of the total sample. Teachers' self-efficacy

category Cooperation with colleagues and parents was mentioned in a positive context by 4% (or 4 respondents). 3% (or 3 respondents) mentioned in a positive context the content units that correspond to the general teaching autonomy of teachers. 2% (or 2 respondents) mentioned content units that correspond to the category of teacher self-efficacy of student motivation in a positive context. The least frequently mentioned categories in a positive context, each only 1% (or 1 respondent), are the categories of teachers' self-efficacy – instruction and adapting education to students' individual needs, as well as the emotional burnout category of exhaustion. Content units corresponding to the categories of emotional burnout, cynicism/depersonalization, and professional effectiveness, were not mentioned in a positive context in the narratives of the focus group of teachers.

The next example of the research is $N4 = 245$ (Lagzdīņa & Svence, 2021), which indicates that the scale of teacher work engagement Cognitive Engagement ($p < 0.001$) is significant in predicting SEH-T scores. This means that this scale, or its characterizing feature, statistically reliably affects the Teachers' SEH-T scale "Trust in others".

The results reveal the significance of Cognitive Engagement when predicting the SEH score. The more intensively, with mental effort, the teacher concentrates on performing the duties cognitively, the worse the teacher can further regulate and control the emotions and their expressions. The changing circumstances and the challenges teachers face during teaching by distance even more create anxiety and tiredness in the teacher's profession (Ferdig et al., 2020).

Table 3. Summary of the results of linear regression models (Lagzdīņa, 2021, as mentioned in Svence et al., 2021)

	Self-belief	Trust in others	Emotional competence	Passionate way of life
R^2	0.00	0.16	0.05	0.09
Scales*				
Cognitive engagement	–	+	–	–
Emotional engagement				
Social engagement: students	–			–
Social engagement: colleagues				
R^2	0.01	0.05	0.19	0.40
Scales*				
Exhaustion				
Cynicism	–	–	–	–
Professional efficiency	–		–	–

* "+" marks the scales that are statistically reliable to impact or predict the quantity.

The results demonstrate that in the teacher work engagement scale Cognitive Engagement is significant because it is the only one that statistically somewhat significantly predicted SEHS-T, namely the indicator “Trust in others”. Daily work in a distance regime has increased the distance between teachers and their relationship with colleagues; therefore, irritation and difficulties to control one’s emotional expressions have arisen.

The next example (Birkāne & Svence, 2019) statistically reliably shows total burnout – it affects teacher work engagement by 29.45%. It is observed that Cynicism and Professional efficiency indicators are statistically significant in the model. The Table also demonstrates that resilience indicators Self-organisation and Life acceptance predict teacher work engagement by 28.72%.

Table 4. Results of the linear regression model, affecting the data of teacher work engagement (Birkāne & Svence, 2019)

Impact factor	R^2	F	B	β
Resilience indicators				
<i>Constancy</i>	0.29	50.49 ***	28.00	
Self-organisation			0.56	0.34 ***
Self-reliance			0.05	0.03
Life acceptance			0.42	0.22 **
Burnout indicators				
<i>Constancy</i>	0.29	52.31 ***	69.36	
Exhaustion			-0.25	-0.05
Cynicism			-2.60	-0.36 ***
Professional efficiency			3.17	0.32 ***

Thus, the burnout indicators, such as cynicism, negatively affect teacher work engagement: the higher cynicism, the lower work engagement, and the higher professional efficiency, the higher work engagement. Whereas resilience indicators demonstrate: the higher teachers’ self-reliance and self-organisation, the higher work engagement.

All other calculations also conclude that exactly these resilience indicators predict teacher work engagement and are related with other work engagement indicators. Similarly, the mentioned burnout indicators – cynicism and professional efficiency are inversely proportional to predict work engagement.

Further on the paper deals with the result which from the work engagement measurement scale *Social Engagement: Colleagues* matches SEHS-T scale “Trust” and “Colleagues’ support”.

As the results of the below provided regression analysis table demonstrate, resilience indicators *Self-organisation* and *Life acceptance* are most closely related to social engagement with colleagues, while cooperation with colleagues is

affected with a minus sign by the *Burnout* indicators *Exhaustion* and *Cynicism*. At the same time, *Professional efficiency* predicts positively engagement with colleagues.

Table 5. Linear regression model for the significance of the subscale Social Engagement: Colleagues impacting work engagement (Birkāne & Svence, 2019)

Impact factor	R^2	F	B	β
Resilience test				
Constancy	0.19	29.18 ***	7.08	
Self-organisation			0.14	0.29 ***
Self-reliance			-0.04	-0.07
Life acceptance			0.14	0.24 **
Maslach's Burnout Inventory				
Constancy	0.14	29.18 ***	17.78	
Exhaustion			-0.31	-0.15 *
Cynicism			-0.36	-0.17 **
Professional efficiency			0.59	0.20 ***

Discussion

In the pandemic period the mental health of population starts to be of significant focus of European, state and government authorities. Mental health with an emphasis on the social emotional health of students and teachers at schools becomes of particular interest. Only teachers with good mental health can support and improve mental health of their students in every type of school.

Many studies have been conducted to find out the students' social emotional health (Halle & Darling-Churchill, 2016), but so far, less research is performed to study the teachers' social emotional health (SEH) (Snowden et al., 2015), as well as there is a lack of scientifically justified research methods and national support programmes for teachers on social emotional health of education professionals.

Communicating and receiving support at the workplace from at least one colleague, teachers can better focus on the work and perform their professional duties more qualitatively, which also corresponds with previous research that work engagement correlates positively with such organisational resources as colleagues' support, receiving feedback about the work outcomes (Bakker et al., 2008).

When teachers identify with their workplace – feeling themselves as a part of the whole, the feeling of belongingness is created, and teachers apply more effort and try to execute better their professional duties at the workplace, which corresponds to research – if the feeling of belongingness to the workplace is

raised, engagement in executing work duties increases (Urđan & Schoenfelder, 2006), and the feeling of belongingness to the team correlates positively with work satisfaction and self-efficacy (Skaalvik & and Skaalvik, 2016). The more intensively, with mental effort, the teacher concentrates on executing the work duties cognitively, the worse the ability to further regulate and control one's emotions and their expressions. The changing circumstances and challenges that teachers face during distance teaching even more create anxiety and tiredness in the teacher's profession (Ferdig et al., 2020).

Working daily in a remote teaching regime, the distance between the teachers and their relationship with colleagues has increased, thus also irritation and difficulties to control their emotional expressions arise. Other research also mentions that the teacher feels unhappy and emotionally unstable if colleagues' support or feedback about the work outcomes is not received (Bakker et al., Schaufeli, Leiter & Taris, 2008). There is negative correlation between teachers' empathy and exhaustion and cynicism. Other research also indicates that in the case of emotional and physical exhaustion, a person will most likely not be able to provide emotional support and will not be empathic to others (Nyatanga, 2014). The changing circumstances and challenges that teachers are currently facing even more create anxiety and tiredness in the teacher's profession (Ferdig et al., 2020).

If teachers feel emotionally tired, exhausted, and cynical, accordingly, they cannot be emphatic to the people around them. Teachers must try to be emphatic (the work takes place at cameras which frequently are not switched on), and teachers may not be judgmental of students although they sometimes feel like that. In difference from face- to-face teaching, the feedback about the work is not received immediately if students frequently do not switch on their cameras.

When doubts about the professional abilities increase, failing to succeed and receive feedback and trying too hard, teachers feel how their ability to regulate their emotional expressions reduce or that it is more difficult to control their emotions. Previous research mentions that a burnt-out teacher feels negative emotions toward other people, especially to those who need to be contacted on daily basis: students, students' parents (Kahn, 19922006).

Teacher work engagement is predicted negatively by cynicism, the emotional burnout indicator: cynicism explains 29.45% ($p < 0.001$) of the total teacher work engagement rate, 20.12% ($p < 0.001$) of the cognitive work engagement rate, 27.96% ($p < 0.001$) of the emotional work engagement rate, 20.34% ($p < 0.05$) of the social engagement with students and 14.46% ($p < 0.01$) of the social engagement with colleague's rate. Exhaustion may predict 14.46% ($p < 0.05$) of the social engagement with colleague's rate. Demographic indicators statistically reliably ($PR > 0.05$) do not predict higher teacher work engagement rates.

REFERENCES

- Alterman, A. & Engels, N., Van Petegem, K. & Jean Pierre Verhaeghe, J. P. (2007). *The well-being of teachers in Flanders: The importance of a supportive school culture*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055690701423085>
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187–200.
- Bakker, A., & Schaufeli, W. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(2), 147–154.
- Baumruk, R. (2004). The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business success. *Workspan*, 47, 48–52.
- Beltman, S., Mansfield, C. & Price, A. (2011). Thriving not just surviving: A review of research on teacher resilience. *Educational Research Review*, 6(3), 185–207. (https://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/5982/1/Beltman_et_al_paper_final_resubmission.pdf <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2011.09.001>)
- Birkāne, U. & Svence, G. (2019). Skolotāju iesaistes darbā, emocionālās izdegšanas un dzīvēsspēka rādītāju sakarības. *Baltic Journal of Psychology*. Rīga, Latvijas Universitāte. https://www.apgads.lu.lv/fileadmin/user_upload/lu_portal/apgads/PDF/Baltic_Journal_of_Psychology/Balt-Psy-Journal_2019-20.1-2.pdf
- Bobek, B. (2010). Teacher Resiliency: A Key to Career Longevity. <https://www.tandfonline.com/author/Bobek%2C+Becky+L>
- Boman, T., Kjellberg, A., Danermark, B. and Boman, E. (2020). The Need for Support and Adaptation in the Workplace among Persons with Different Types of Disabilities and Reduced Work Ability. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 22(1), 253–264. <http://doi.org/10.16993/sjdr.672>
- Brunetti, G. J. (2006). Resilience under Fire: Perspectives on the Work of Experienced, Inner City High School Teachers in the United States. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 812–825.
- Cardullo, V., Wang, C., Burton, M. & Dong, J. (2021). K-12 teachers' remote teaching self-efficacy during the pandemic. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 14(1), 32–45.
- Carrillo, C. & Assunção Flores, M. (2020). COVID-19 and teacher education: a literature review of online teaching and learning practices. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 466–487.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 89–136.
- Clipa, O. (2017). Teacher Stress and Coping Strategies. In O. Clipa (ed.), *Studies and Current Trends in Science of Education* (pp. 120–128). Suceava, Romania: LUMEN Proceedings.
- Crosswell, L., & Beutel, D. (2013). A bridge over troubling waters: a snapshot of teacher graduates' perceptions of their ongoing professional learning needs. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 144–158.
- Edurio (2020). Pētījums: Mācību gada noslēguma aptaujas, IZM un Edurio aptauju rezultāti, [Research: results of the end of school year survey, Ministry of Education and Culture and Edurio surveys]. <https://home.edurio.com/izm-gada-nosleguma-aptaujas>
- Erasmus+ project “Teacher resilience: problems and solutions. Supporting teachers to face the challenge of distance teaching” No. 2020-1-LV01-KA226-SCH-094599 data

Eyles, A., Gibbons, S. & Montebruno, P. (2020). COVID-19 school shutdowns: What will they do to our children's education? A CEP COVID-19 analysis Paper No.001. Centre for Economic Performance London School of Economics and Political Science Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK. http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/104675/3/Eyles_covid_19_school_shutdowns_published.pdf

Ferdig, R. E., Baumgartner, E., Hartshorne, R., Kaplan-Rakowski, R. & Mouza, C. (Eds). (2020). Teaching, Technology, and Teacher Education During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Stories from the Field. Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/216903/>

Ferri, F., Grifoni, P. & Guzzo, T. (2020). Online Learning and Emergency Remote Teaching: Opportunities and Challenges in Emergency Situations. MDP. <https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/10/4/86>

Furlong, M. J., You, S., Renshaw, T. L., Smith, D. C., & O'Malley, M. (2014). Preliminary development and validation of the Social and Emotional Health Survey for secondary students. *Social Indicators Research*, 117(3), 1011–1032.

Gibbs, S., & Miller, A. (2014). Teachers' resilience and well-being: A role for educational psychology. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 20(5), 609–621. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.844408>

Halle, T. G., & Darling-Churchill, K. E. (2016). Review of measures of social and emotional development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 45, 8–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2016.02.003>

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T. & Bond, A. (2020). The Difference Between Emergency Remote Teaching and Online Learning. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning>

IZM. (2013). Izglītības attīstības pamatnostādnes 2014.–2020. gadam [Ministry of Education and Science (2013). Educational development guidelines for 2014–2020]. <http://www.lsa.lv/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Izglitibasattistibaspamatnostadnes.pdf>

Yerdelen, S., Durksen, T., & Klassen, R. M. (2018). An international validation of the engaged teacher scale. *Teachers and Teaching*, 24(6), 673–689.

Kahn, W. A. (1992). To be fully there: psychological presence at work. *Human Relations*, 45, 321–50.

Kalniņa, L. (2021). Skolotāju autonomijas izjūtas, pašefektivitātes un emocionālās izdegšanas saistība attālināto mācību situācijā [The relationship between teachers' sense of autonomy, self-efficacy and emotional burnout in a distance learning situation]. LU, maģistra darbs [master theses in University of Latvia].

Kim, L. E. & Buric, I. (2020). Teacher Self-Efficacy and Burnout: Determining the Directions of Prediction Through an Autoregressive Cross-Lagged Panel Model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(8), 1661–1676.

Kin, T. M. & Kareem, O. A. (2017). Measuring teacher attitudes towards change: an empirical validation. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMIE.2017.086909>

Klassen, R. M., Yerdelen, S., & Durksen, T. L. (2013). Measuring teacher engagement: Development of the Engaged Teachers Scale (ETS). *Frontline Learning Research*, 1(2), 33–52.

Lagzdiņa, L. (2021). Skolotāju sociāli emocionālās veselības, emocionālās izdegšanas un iesaistes darbā rādītāju sakarības. LU, maģistra darbs [Relationships between indicators of teachers' socio-emotional health, emotional burnout and engagement in work. LU, master's thesis]

Mansfield, C. F., Beltman, S., Price, A., & McConney, A. (2012). "Don't sweat the small stuff." Understanding teacher resilience at the chalkface. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(3), 357–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.11.001>

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 103–111.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). Maslach Burnout Inventory manual (3rd edn.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Michael, S. C. T &, Rogers, C. (2020). Education, the science of learning, and the COVID-19 crisis. Springer Link. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11125-020-09468-z>

Mukhtar, K., Javed, K., Arooj, M., Sethi, A. (2020). Advantages, Limitations and Recommendations for online learning during COVID-19 pandemic era. PubMed.gov. Free PMC article. <https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.36.COVID19-S4.2785>

Rena, A. R. & Glasgow, P. (2015). Teacher wellbeing in neoliberal contexts: A review of the literature. Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online). <https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/ielapa.441680081120104>

Sandoval-Hernandez, A., Aghakasiri, P., Wild, J. & Rutkowski, D. (2012). Does Increasing Hours of Schooling Lead to Improvements in Student Learning? Policy Brief No. 1. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED561884.pdf>

Skaalvik, E. M. & Skaalvik, S. (2016). Teacher Stress and Teacher Self-Efficacy as Predictors of Engagement, Emotional Exhaustion, and Motivation to Leave the Teaching Profession. *Creative Education*, 7, 1785–1799.

Snowden, A., Stenhouse, R., Young, J., Carver, H., Carver, F., Brown, N. (2015). The relationship between emotional intelligence, previous caring experience and mindfulness in student nurses and midwives: a cross sectional analysis. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2014.09.004>

Sokal, L., Trudel, L. E. & Babb, J. (2020). Canadian teachers' attitudes toward change, efficacy, and burnout during the covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 1, 2666–3740.

Svence, G. (2016). *Dzīvesspēka kategorija Pozitīvās psiholoģijas skatījumā: attīstības iespējas* [Concept of resilience in positive psychology: developmental aspects]. Rīga: Zinātne.

Svence, G., Gajdasova, E., Petruyte, A., Kalnina, L., Lagzdina, L., Pakse, L. (2021). Teachers' social-emotional health indicators in the distance learning situation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Problems of Psychology in the 21st Century*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.33225/ppc/21.15.26>

Timofejeva, T., Svence, G. & Petrulytė, A. (2016). Theoretical and Practical Study Of The Concept Of Social And Emotional Health By Michael J. Furlong Applied To The Selection Of Teenagers And Youth. *Problems Of Psychology In The 21st Century*, 10(2). <http://www.scientiasocialis.lt/ppc/node/124>

Urduan, T. & Schoenfelder, E. (2006, October). Classroom effects on student motivation: Goal structures, social relationships, and competence beliefs. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(5), 331–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.04.003>

Van Beek, I., Hu, Q., Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Schreurs, B. H. J. (2012). For fun, love, or money: What drives workaholic, engaged, and burned-out employees at work? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 61, 30–55.

Verawardina, U., Asnur, L., Lubis, A. L., Hendriyani, Y., Ramadhani, D., Dewi, I. P., Darni, R., Betri, T. J., Susanti, W., & Sriwahyuni, T. (2020). Reviewing Online Learning

G. SVENCE, I. BRIŠKA, V. APSE. Indicators of Social Emotional Health (Sehs-T) and Resilience ..

Facing the COVID-19 Outbreak. *Journal of Talent Development and Excellence*, 12, 385–392. [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkozje\)\)/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=3027002](https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkozje))/reference/referencespapers.aspx?referenceid=3027002)

Wagnild, G. (2009). A review of the Resilience Scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, 17(2), 105–113. <https://doi.org/10.1891/1061-3749.17.2.105>

Wagnild, G. M. (2016). *The Resilience Scale User's Guide*. Resilience Center. Worden, Montana.

Wagnild, G. M., Young, H. M. (1993). Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the Resilience Scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, 1, 165–178.

White, J. (2011). R S Peters 1919–2011. In *The Routledge Encyclopaedia of Educational Thinkers*. Routledge. J. Palmer Cooper (Ed.). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305170796_R_S_Peters_1919-2011