

.....

# Human Well-Being for Sustainable Education: The Perspective of Private Elementary School Teachers

Mary Ann M. Temprosa  
*College of Education*  
*Silliman University*

This descriptive survey looked into how teachers of a private elementary school perceived human well-being so that opportunities could be identified to address gaps in current knowledge around teacher well-being and its flow-on effects on teaching practice and student learning. The study was conducted among 35 teacher education faculty members assigned to teach elementary school pupils. The teacher-respondents answered a researcher-prepared questionnaire composed of three parts: Part I, the study-participants' demographic profile; Part II, their perception of human well-being based on eight dimensions--material well-being, bodily well-being, social well-being, security, freedom of choice and action, psychological well-being, spiritual well-being and environmental sustainability; and, Part III, the respondents' sequencing of the eight dimensions of human well-being based on their perceived level of importance. Based on the data gathered, it was found out that the teacher-respondents perceived all the dimensions included in the study Very Important in achieving human well-being, with spiritual well-being as the most important and freedom of choice and action as the least important. The results, however, showed no evidence of Maslow's ranking of needs or evidence that these needs were in a hierarchical order. On the contrary, the results supported John Finnis's point that these needs, being categorized as dimensions of human well-being, are non-hierarchical, irreducible, and incommensurable basic reasons for human actions, which are referred to by Amartya Sen as valuable functioning or capability expansion.

**Keywords:** human well-being, environmental sustainability, sustainable education, perception

## INTRODUCTION

Conceptualization of human well-being has evolved over time because of its multi-dimensional nature; yet it has become ambiguous due to numerous, and often competing, interpretations instead of a universally acceptable definition (United Nations University, 2006; “Development and development,” 2011). Human well-being has become a complex concept that embraces many different ideas and perspectives and is often used interchangeably with terms such as life satisfaction, prosperity, needs fulfillment, human development, happiness, and the like without explicit discussions as to their distinctiveness (Clark, 2014; United Nations University, 2006).

The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) views human development as constituting an end rather than as a means in economic development (as cited in Balamoune-Lutz, 2004), a shift of focus from economic well-being to human well-being, which is consistent with the German philosopher Kant’s position that the advancement of humanity is the end and that human well-being (HWB) goes beyond economic growth and human development. Further, it is posited that measures covering material and physical components or welfarism are no longer encompassing, and inclusion of indicators such as good health is no longer enough to produce adequate measures of HWB, for while economic well-being is an important component of HWB, many other dimensions are equally important. Sabina Alkire (2002) stated that human flourishing, in its fullest sense, includes matters public and private, economic and social, and political and spiritual.

As human well-being cannot be directly observed, it cannot also be directly measured. Certain approaches to measuring human well-being have widened to incorporate various dimensions from different perspectives. Some common examples of these are the following: Amartya Sen’s Capability Approach (Alkire, 2002; Balamoune-Lutz, 2004), which defined human development not as an increase in GNP per capita or in consumption, health, and education measures alone but as an expansion of capabilities which refers to a person’s freedom to promote or achieve valuable functioning (i.e., beings and doings) that a person can achieve; John Finnis, who gives emphasis on basic reasons for action or basic human values; Martha Nussbaum who views human flourishing in terms of capabilities;

Manfred Max-Neef who has proposed axiological categories or matrix of human needs; Deepa Narayan et al. who have identified dimensions of human well-being according to the voices of the poor; Shalom Schwartz who has touched base on universal human values; Robert Cummins who emphasizes the quality of life domains; Maureen Ramsay who highlights the importance of universal psychological needs; Doyal and Gough who stress the importance of basic human needs; and others (as cited in Alkire, 2002). Despite all of these approaches and perspectives, understanding human well-being still continues to be a core task among researchers and policy-makers.

Moreover, determining whether human well-being has improved over time (United Nations University, 2006) and establishing the link between human well-being and sustainable education are crucial. Different countries have been working towards the achievement of the millennium development goals (MDGs) which started a global effort in 2000 to tackle the indignity of poverty (World Health Organization: WHO, 2018). The successor, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), also known as Global Goals, was designed in 2015 to serve as the "blueprint to achieve a better and more sustainable future for all" by 2030 ("THE 17 GOALS," 2015).

In the context of education, O'Flaherty and Liddy (2017) have pointed out that a 'global character of contemporary education has become evident in educational policy and discourse, and in the practice of teaching development education and in education for sustainable development. The Sustainable Development Goals set out by the United Nations advocate development education, education for sustainable development, and global citizenship education that encourage all learners to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to promote sustainable development and address global justice and sustainability issues. Education for sustainability is defined as a program wherein students actively investigate the underlying causes of unsustainable practices and actively plan for and instigate change in less understood and less commonly practiced areas (Kennelly et al., 2012). UNESCO (2013) has articulated that education is a catalyst for development and a health intervention in its own right, and this has been confirmed by the 2015 Incheon Declaration (2015) stating that education develops the skills, values, and attitudes that enable citizens to lead healthy and fulfilled lives, make informed decisions, and respond to local and global challenges.

Larson et al. (2017), in their study, "The Academic Environment and

Faculty Well-Being: The Role of Psychological Needs,” highlighted the centrality of psychological needs in understanding the relation between the academic environment and faculty well-being. Faculty members are said to constitute the core asset of every academic institution because they mentor the next generation of scholars who enable the institution to thrive into the future. Teacher well-being is linked not only to teachers’ physical well-being but also to school effectiveness and student achievement.

Turner and Thielking (2019) in their study on “Teacher Wellbeing: Its Effects on Teaching Practice and Student Learning” found out that when teachers used strategies to support their well-being, there were flow-on effects on their teaching practice and student learning. Also, Larson et al. (2017) has asserted that faculty members’ well-being have a significant positive impact on the well-being of the country and the world as more educated, more aware, more knowledgeable, and more responsible individuals will emerge through them. Teachers thus play a central role in the sustainability and growth of the institution; hence, consideration of the factors that contribute to their well-being is crucial.

With the hope to contribute to the achievement of sustainable education in its simplest sense, the study was conducted to look into how teacher education faculty members assigned to teach pupils in the elementary school of a private university perceived human well-being. The study specifically sought to find answers to two research questions: (1) What is the teacher-respondents’ perception of human well-being in terms of eight dimensions: (a) material well-being; (b) bodily well-being; (c) social well-being; (d) security; (e) freedom of choice and action; (f) psychological well-being; (g) spiritual well-being; and, (h) environmental sustainability? (2) What is the teacher-respondents’ sequencing of the eight dimensions of human well-being based on their perceived level of importance?

Based on the findings of the study, it is hoped that opportunities could be identified to address gaps in current knowledge on teacher well-being and its flow-on effects on teaching practice and student learning. The study, in particular, could be significant as its findings could serve as basis for the following: (1) for school administration, to make them see the benefit of directly gathering information from teachers in order to understand what personal and contextual factors affect their well-being at work and use these information to promote more holistic approaches to support their well-

being; (2) for school administration, to create and implement policies and support programs that explicitly support teacher well-being; (3) for school administration and teachers, to contribute to the achievement of sustainable education in the simplest sense by promoting students' success; (4) for more researchers, to help address the gaps in current knowledge on teacher well-being and its effects on teaching practice and student learning outcomes.

## METHODOLOGY

In this descriptive quantitative study, the teacher-respondents' perception of human well-being was assessed based on eight dimensions. The first six dimensions were those of Deepa Narayan et al.'s dimensions according to the Voices of the Poor (in Alkire, 2002): material well-being, bodily well-being, social well-being, security, freedom of choice and action, and psychological well-being. The 7th, spiritual well-being, was originally part of Narayan's et al. psychological well-being but was considered as a separate dimension in this particular study; and, the 8th and the last dimension, environmental sustainability, was added only for the purpose of this study to show agreement to UNDP's declaration that environmental sustainability underpins human well-being (World Health Organization: WHO, 2018).

**The Respondents.** Total enumeration was employed in choosing the 41 teacher-respondents who were teacher education faculty members assigned to teach elementary school pupils. They were requested to answer a researcher-prepared survey questionnaire, but six (6) of them opted out from participation and did not return the questionnaire given to them for reasons which may be not be relevant to this study.

**Research Instrument.** To gather the needed data, a researcher-prepared questionnaire composed of three parts was utilized. Part I dealt with the teacher-respondents' profile where they simply provided the information required: age, civil status, gender and number of years in the teaching service. Part II consisted of questions that generated answers that established the teacher-respondents' perception of human well-being based on the eight dimensions previously mentioned. Using a Likert scale of 1 (i.e., Unimportant) to 5 (i.e., Very Important) with some of the items having specific indicators, the respondents indicated their perception of the level of importance of each dimension. The last dimension of human well-being

in this study, environmental sustainability, had 21 indicators that were directly taken from the Environmental Sustainability Index (ESI) of the Socio-economic Development and Applications Center (2005); some of the indicators were also similar to the environmental indicators found in the study of Dong and Hauschild (2017). Part III consisted of questions on how the teacher-respondents would sequence the eight dimensions of human well-being, ranking them from numbers 1 (i.e., the most important) to 8 (i.e., least important) according to their perception of the level of importance of each dimension. The dimensions belonged to one of the different sets of dimensions of human development presented in Alkire's material on Dimensions of Human Development (2002).

**Data Analysis Procedures.** Percentage and mean were utilized to analyze the data gathered. Percentage was used to present the profile and rating of importance of every indicator under each dimension, and mean was used to present the overall rating of the perceived level of importance of every dimension. The means of the eight dimensions were ranked to show the teacher-respondents' perception of the level of importance of each dimension and indicator used in this study.

## RESULTS

The profile of the respondents, as shown in Table 1, includes four aspects: gender, civil status, age and years in service. As shown in the same table, among the 35 teacher-respondents, 11 or 31.43% were within the age range of 21 to 30, 10 or 28.57% were within 31 to 40 years old, 8 or 22.86% were within 41 to 50 years old, and 6 or 17.14% were 51 years old and above. This implies a trend of the school being dominated by the younger generation of teachers, which may be explained by the diminishing trend in the number of teachers as the age range goes higher, which can be gleaned from the data. Second, the data show that among the 35 teacher-respondents, 11 or 31.43% were single while 24 or 68.57% were married. This means that the number of married faculty members was more than double the number of the single ones. Third, the results also indicate that 6 or 17.14% of the teacher-respondents were male while 29 or 82.86% were female. This shows that the school was dominated by female faculty members. Lastly, Table 1 reveals that 20 or 57.14% of the teacher-respondents' had been in service

for about 1-10 years, 9 or 25.71% were within the range of 11-20 years, and 6 or 17.14 % had been in service for 21 years and above. It can be inferred that the school was dominated by the younger generation of faculty members who may still have more needs to address that affect their well-being in the workplace compared to those who had already been in the service for a longer period of time.

**Table 1***Profile of the Teacher-Respondents*

<b>Variable</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Age</b>		
21-30	11	31.43
31-40	10	28.57
41-50	8	22.86
51-above	6	17.14
<b>Civil Status</b>		
Single	11	31.43
Married	24	68.57
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	6	17.14
Female	29	82.86
<b>Years in Service</b>		
1-10	20	57.143
11-20	9	25.714
21 & above	6	17.143
Total	35	100.00

Table 2 which presents data on material well-being has three indicators: food, assets with five sub-indicators (i.e., house, lot, car, other properties, and savings) and work with five sub-indicators (i.e., good pay and privileges, rest and recreation, reward, promotion and personal development). Table 2 shows that majority of the respondents perceived food (94.29%) and house (88.57%), lot (60.00%), and savings 68.57%, which were under assets, as Very Important. However, majority of the teacher-respondents considered car (51.35%) and other properties (51.43%) to be neither Important nor Unimportant.

In terms of work-related indicators, majority of the teacher-respondents considered good pay and privileges (94.29), rest and recreation (74.29%), and personal development (80.00%) as Very Important while promotion (57.14%) and rewards (45.95%) as Important. A few, however, considered rewards (8.57%) and promotion (2.86%) to be Neither Important nor Unimportant.

**Table 2**  
*Teacher-Respondents' Perception of Material Well-being*

Indicator	Level of Perception					
	Very Important	Important	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somehow Unimportant	Unimportant	No Response
Food	33 (94.29%)	2 (5.71%)	0	0	0	0
Assets						
House	31 (88.57%)	3 (8.57%)	0	0	0	1 (2.86%)
Lot	21 (60.00%)	12 (34.29%)	0	0	2 (5.71%)	0
Car	2 (5.71%)	11 (31.43%)	18 (51.43%)	1 (2.86%)	2 (5.71%)	1 (2.86%)
Other	2 (5.71%)	13 (37.14%)	18 (51.43%)	0	0	2 (5.71%)
Properties	24 (68.57%)	9 (25.71%)	1 (2.86%)	0	0	1 (2.86%)
Savings						
Work	33 (94.38%)	2 (5.51%)	0	0	0	0
Good pay & Privileges	26 (74.29%)	9 (25.71%)	0	0	0	0
Rest & Recreation	15 (42.86%)	17 (48.57%)	3 (8.57%)	0	0	0
Rewards	14 (40.00%)	20 (57.14%)	1 (2.86%)	0	0	0
Promotion	28 (80.00%)	7 (20.00%)	0	0	0	0
Personal Development						
<b>Mean</b>	<b>20.82 (59.49%)</b>	<b>9.55 (27.29%)</b>	<b>3.73 (10.66%)</b>	<b>0.09 (0.26%)</b>	<b>0.36 (1.03%)</b>	<b>0.41 (1.17%)</b>

Bodily well-being also has three indicators: health, appearance and physical environment. Table 3 shows that 100% of the teacher-respondents perceived health to be Very Important. They also considered the physical environment (74.29%) Important although their ratings varied in terms of appearance: 48.57% of them rated appearance as Very Important; 40.00 % rated it as Important; and 5.71% perceived appearance as both Neither Important nor Unimportant and No Response.

**Table 3***Teacher-Respondents' Perception of Bodily Well-being*

Indicator	Level of Perception					
	Very Important	Important	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somehow Unimportant	Unimportant	No Response
Health	35 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
Appearance	17 (48.57%)	14 (40.00%)	2 (5.71%)	0	0	2 (5.71%)
Physical Environment	26 (74.29%)	9 (25.71%)	0	0	0	0
<b>Mean</b>	<b>26 (74.29%)</b>	<b>7.67 (21.90%)</b>	<b>0.67 (1.90%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.67 (1.90%)</b>

Social well-being has three indicators: being able to care for, bring up, marry, and settle children; self-respect and dignity; and peace, harmony, and good relations in the family, workplace and community. Table 4 shows that 100% of the respondents perceived peace, harmony, good relations in the family, workplace community as well as self-respect and dignity as Very Important for social well-being. Only 74.29% considered being able to care for, bring up, marry and settle children as Very Important while 22.86% and 2.85% considered it Important and Neither Important nor Unimportant, respectively.

**Table 4***Teacher-Respondents' Perception of Social Well-being*

Indicator	Level of Perception					
	Very Important	Important	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somehow Unimportant	Unimportant	No Response
Being able to care for, bring up, marry and settle children	26 (74.29%)	8 (22.86%)	1 (2.85%)	0	0	0
Self-respect and dignity	35 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0

Peace, harmony and good relations in the family, workplace and community	35 (100 %)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Mean</b>	<b>32.00 (91.43%)</b>	<b>2.67 (7.63%)</b>	<b>0.33 (0.94%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

The security dimension has six indicators: civil peace, a physically safe and secure environment, personal physical security, lawfulness and access to justice, security in old age and confidence in the future. Table 5 shows that majority of the teacher-respondents perceived civil peace (88.57%), a physically safe and secure environment (100.00%), personal physical security (80.00%), lawfulness and access to justice (88.57%), security in old age (94.29%), and confidence in the future (88.57%) as Very Important. The rest of the responses on all indicators fall under the Important category.

**Table 5**  
*Teacher-Respondents' Perception of Security*

Indicator	Level of Perception					
	Very Important	Important	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somehow Unimportant	Unimportant	No Response
Civil Peace	31 (88.57%)	8 (22.86%)	0	0	0	0
A physically safe and secure environment	35 (100 %)	0	0	0	0	0
Personal physical security	28 (80.00%)	7 (20.00%)	0	0	0	0
Lawfulness and access to justice	31 (88.57%)	2.67 (7.63%)	0	0	0	0
Security in old age	33 (94.29%)	2 (5.71%)	0	0	0	0
Confidence in the future	31 (88.57)	4 (11.43%)	0	0	0	0
Mean	31.50 (90.00%)	3.5 (10.00%)	0	0	0	0

The freedom of choice and action category had no specific indicator under it. In this fifth dimension, as shown in Table 6, majority (85.71%) of the teacher-respondents perceived this category to be Very Important.

**Table 6***Teacher-Respondents' Perception of Freedom of Choice and Action*

Indicator	Level of Perception					
	Very Important	Important	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somehow Unimportant	Unimportant	No Response
Freedom to choose and act appropriately	30 (85.71%)	5 (14.29%)	0	0	0	0
Mean	30 (85.71%)	5 (14.29%)	0	0	0	0

Spiritual well-being, as the sixth dimension, has two indicators: good relationship with God and harmony, which includes spiritual life and religious observance. Table 10 shows that all the teacher-respondents (100%) perceived a good relationship with something beyond the ego or God as Very Important, and majority of them (97.14%) perceived harmony, including spiritual life and religious observance, Very Important.

**Table 7***Teacher-Respondents' Perception of Spiritual Well-being*

Indicator	Level of Perception					
	Very Important	Important	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somehow Unimportant	Unimportant	No Response
Good relationship with God	35 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
Harmony (including spiritual life and religious observance)	34 (97.14%)	1 (2.86%)	0	0	0	0
Mean	34.5 (98.57%)	0.50 (1.43%)	0	0	0	0

Psychological well-being, as the seventh dimension, has three indicators: peace of mind, happiness, and contentment. Table 11 shows that all of the teacher-respondents considered peace of mind (100.00%) Very Important, and happiness (97.14%) and contentment (94.29%) Very Important as well. The negligible few, i.e., one (1), two (2), and one (1) study-participants, respectively, rated the three items Important.

**Table 8**  
*Teacher-Respondents' Perception of Psychological Well-being*

Indicator	Level of Perception					
	Very Important	Important	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somehow Unimportant	Unimportant	No Response
Peace of Mind	35 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
Happiness	34 (97.14%)	1 (2.86%)	0	0	0	0
Contentment	33 (94.29%)	2 (5.71%)				
Mean	34 (97.14%)	1 (2.86%)	0	0	0	0

Environmental sustainability is the last dimension of human well-being in this particular study, and this supports one of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (World Health Organization: WHO, 2018) which is environmental sustainability as this goal underpins human well-being. There are a total of 21 indicators in this dimension, and Table 12 shows that all (100%) the teacher-respondents considered all the indicators Very Important, with 100% mean for air quality, environmental health, water quality, and water quantity, except for participation in international collaboration which was rated as just a little more Important. The indicators that ranked a little below the 100% mean were formulation of eco-efficiency and human sustenance with 91.43% mean; natural resource management, reduction of air pollution, and reduction of ecosystem stress with 88.57% mean; biodiversity, environmental governance, reduction of waste and consumption pressure and reduction of water stress with 85.71% mean; science and technology with 82.86% mean; land with 80.00% mean; natural disaster vulnerability preparedness, reduction of population pressure, and reduction of trans-environmental pressure with 71.43% mean; greenhouse gas emission control with 65.71% mean; and private sector response with 54.29% mean.

**Table 9***Teacher-Respondents' Perception of Environmental Sustainability*

Indicator	Level of Perception					
	Very Important	Important	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somehow Unimportant	Unimportant	No Response
Air quality	35 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
Biodiversity	30 (85.71%)	5 (14.29%)	0	0	0	0
Eco-efficiency	32 (91.43%)	3 (8.57%)	0	0	0	0
Environmental governance	30 (85.71)	5 (14.29)	0	0	0	0
Environmental health	35 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
Greenhouse gas emission control	23 (65.71%)	12 (34.29%)	0	0	0	0
Human sustenance	32 (91.43%)	3 (8.57%)	0	0	0	0
Land	28 (80.00%)	7 (20.00%)	0	0	0	0
Natural disaster vulnerability preparedness	25 (71.43%)	10 (28.57%)	0	0	0	0
Natural resource management	31 (88.57%)	4 (11.43%)	0	0	0	0
Participation in international collaboration	17 (48.57%)	18 (51.43%)	0	0	0	0
Private sector response	19 (54.29%)	16 (45.71%)	0	0	0	0
Reduction of air pollution	31 (88.57%)	4 (11.43%)	0	0	0	0
Reduction of ecosystem stress	31 (88.57%)	4 (11.43%)	0	0	0	0
Reduction of population pressure	25 (71.43%)	10 (28.57%)	0	0	0	0
Reduction of trans-environmental pressure	25 (71.43%)	10 (28.57%)	0	0	0	0
Reduction of waste and consumption pressure	30 (85.71%)	5 (14.29%)	0	0	0	0
Reduction of water stress	30 (85.71%)	5 (14.29%)	0	0	0	0
Science and technology	29 (82.86%)	6 (17.14)	0	0	0	0
Water quality	35 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0

	35					
Water quantity	(100%)	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	28.95 (82.71%)	6.05 (17.29%)	0	0	0	0

As to the teacher-respondents’ ranking of their perceived level of importance of the eight dimensions of human well-being included in the study, Table 10 shows the following ranking, from the most important to the least important: (1) spiritual well-being, (2) bodily well-being, (3) psychological well-being, (4) security, (5) environmental well-being, (6) social well-being, (7) material well-being, and, (8) freedom of choice and action.

**Table 10**

*Teacher-Respondents’ Sequencing of the Eight Dimensions of Human Well-being Based on Their Importance*

<b>Eight Dimensions of Human Well-being</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Spiritual well-being	1
Bodily well-being	2
Psychological well-being	3
Security	4
Environmental well-being	5
Social well-being	6
Material well-being	7
Freedom of choice and action	8

**DISCUSSION**

The data gathered during the conduct of the study revealed that in terms of demographic profile, the school was dominated by female teachers who belonged to the 21 to 30 age bracket. They belonged to the younger batch of teachers, and the number diminished as the age range went higher. This is a common scenario among private schools in the Philippine context. Fresh graduates apply in private schools while waiting for their Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) results. Others believe that they will be able to build on their knowledge and skills if they start teaching in a private institution because of the stricter monitoring and supervision, considering

the scope that private schools cover compared to government or public schools. Being dominated by female faculty members was already expected since teaching itself is a female-dominated profession. It is also important to note that the number of married faculty members was more than double of the number of the single ones. Majority of the married faculty members, however, did not mostly consist of the newly-hired but of those who belonged to the next three age brackets: 31-40, 41-50, and 51 and above. These findings offer two implications: (1) the tendency of teachers to stay when they are already married because of the benefits married individuals get or because of the proximity of the school to their homes; or the tendency of the single ones to leave after a few years of experience to find better job opportunities. Having more experienced teachers staying until retirement may be beneficial to the school in terms of maintaining quality teaching and effective learning, but having teachers leaving the school may be counterproductive since the school needs to start all over again to train new entrants. Leaving the school, however, requires serious decision-making on the part of the teacher. If a teacher decides to work in a government school, he/she will have greater chances of being assigned in far-flung barangays before they get positions/items in more accessible areas though they may be assured of a better pay with allowances and a more attractive retirement package.

In terms of material well-being, majority of the teacher-respondents perceived food and certain assets (e.g., house, savings, and lot) very important. Majority of them, however, considered car and other properties to be neither important nor unimportant, which means that the importance of these material assets may depend on one's situation, functioning, or capability of achieving them (Baliamoune-Lutz, 2004). Also, the findings show that the teacher-respondents perceived the following as material well-being: receiving good pay and privileges; being given opportunities to engage themselves in rest and recreational activities; being sent to pursue graduate and post graduate studies or attend seminars and trainings; and getting a promotion, and received rewards and recognition in their present jobs because they were doing their duties and responsibilities well.

In terms of bodily well-being, health was unanimously considered to be very important. Along with it were appearance and physical environment which were likewise considered to be very important. One cannot be

healthy if he/she lives in a dirty or polluted environment or if he/she is not concerned with his or her physical appearance, including hygiene and sanitation. One must find time and exert effort doing some physical exercise, eating the right kind and amount of food, and having enough rest and sleep to be physically fit and healthy. Teachers' wellness is an important factor in the overall health of schools (Kang & Yoo, 2019).

In terms of psychological well-being, Balamoune-Lutz (2004), in a discussion on the measurement of human well-being, pointed out that it was worth noting that human well-being could sometimes be interpreted as human happiness. There may be interesting debates about happiness but recent indicators of happiness and well-being consider the inadequacy of purely economic indicators. Peace of mind and contentment, perceived to be very important by the teacher-respondents, are two of these immeasurable indicators of human values of well-being.

In terms of social well-being, the teacher-respondents valued relationships well, not only with their families but also with colleagues in the workplace and other members of the community. This is beneficial for "everyone can start to act to bring improvements in their relations with others within their local community and workplace, and to experience the self-reinforcing effect of visible results in improved well-being" (Crone & Dahl, 2012). Every individual's primary development task, particularly the teachers in this study, was one of contributing to society, helping guide future generations, and achieving mature, civic, and social responsibility. A person can make a contribution by raising a family or working towards the betterment of society, and hence develop a sense of productivity and accomplishment. If teachers lack the motivation to help learners move forward, they will develop a feeling of dissatisfaction with the relative lack of productivity.

Kang and Yoo (2019) posited that promoting teacher well-being may bring the teachers in an optimal condition to teach. In their study on music teachers' psychological needs and work engagement as predictors of their well-being, it was found out that relatedness was a strong predictor of psychological well-being among teachers who had already been in service for more than 30 years. They demonstrated the inner desire to look back on their experiences, and pass on experiential wisdom and receive recognition for their contribution.

In terms of security, majority of the teacher-respondents perceived civil peace, a physically safe and secure environment, personal physical security, lawfulness and access to justice, security during old age, and confidence in the future as very important because, according to Norwood (in Huitt, 2007), individuals need helping information. They sought to be assisted in seeing how they could be safe and secure. In Maslow's hierarchy of needs, this is the second of the first four levels: having safety/security or being out of danger. Security needs are important for survival, but they are not as demanding as physiological needs.

In terms of freedom of choice and action as a dimension of well-being, it is posited that a person who has achieved well-being feels free to do what he/she believes to be right and true, and feels accountable of the consequences of his/her action. Freedom to choose, however, is not meant to be abused, for it is grounded on the premise that actions to be done are meant to contribute to self-growth, and societal and environmental development. Norwood (as cited in Huitt, 2007) considers this as the pursuit for empowering information at the esteem level. It becomes innate among individuals to look for information on how they can realize their potentials.

In terms of spiritual well-being, all the respondents perceived good relationship with something beyond the ego or with God as very important, and majority of them perceived harmony, including spiritual life and religious observance, as very important. All religions and many cultures would consider this dimension as the realization of human purpose, including acquiring spiritual qualities, refining one's character, and contributing to the realization of societal needs. No one can doubt the teacher-respondents' perception, as Filipinos who had been known as citizens of "the only Christian country in Asia," the Philippines. Additionally, VanderWeele et al. (2017), in an article on "Health and Spirituality," pointed out that more explicit focus on spirituality could improve person-centered approaches to well-being and that more attention to spiritual matters could bring a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.

In terms of environmental sustainability, it can be inferred from the abovementioned data that the respondents were aware of the importance of the indicators of sustainable development and if the ratings are closely examined, a certain pattern can be established: from the simplest or most

basic need of water quantity and quality to the most complicated or global concern of being able to participate in international collaborations. The teacher-respondents gave higher ratings to those indicators that were directly related and familiar to them and to those that were within their control. They seemed not to rate those that were beyond their control, like participation in international collaborations, greenhouse gas emission control, reduction of trans-environmental pressure, and the like. The more the teacher-respondents become familiar with these indicators, the more they are able to raise the awareness of their pupils on how the latter could contribute to ensuring sustainable education and achieving sustainable development goals.

In terms of ranking the eight dimensions based on the teacher-respondents' perceived level of importance of these dimensions, human well-being takes on a whole new meaning when its economic, social, environmental, and other dimensions are fully integrated, and sustainable development can be considered in the wider context of human purpose (Crone & Dahl, 2012). Emphasis on the social, cultural, ethical and spiritual aspects of well-being can motivate changes in human behavior and can drive a bottom-up transformation in human society across all its many dimensions. Considering spiritual well-being as the most important dimension simply reflects the Filipino culture of having a strong faith in God and observing different religious beliefs and activities no matter how difficult life circumstances may be.

## CONCLUSION

Overall, the findings of this study support John Finnis's point that human needs that are categorized as dimensions of human well-being are non-hierarchical, irreducible, and incommensurable basic reasons for human actions. The dimensions are non-hierarchical because, at a certain point, any of the dimensions can be the most important; thus, the dimensions cannot be arranged in any permanent hierarchy. The dimensions are also incommensurable as each of them cannot be judged or gauged by the same standard as the other. Lastly, the dimensions are irreducible because each of them cannot be made less or smaller as each dimension already has its own basic reason. For instance, teachers fulfill their functioning as models to

their pupils, and as they continue to do their job, they are expected to continue enhancing their capacities and opportunities. Moreover, they are expected to continue developing their judgment in relation to the appropriate exercise of their capacities as teachers in order to achieve well-being in its fullest sense. Ideally, according to Crone and Dahl (2012), “The best measure of development would be that it enables every human being to fulfill his or her potential in life both in cultivating individual qualities, personality and capacities and in contributing to the advancement of society.”

## RECOMMENDATIONS

School administration can make a difference in the practice of gathering information directly from teachers to understand what personal and contextual factors affect their well-being at work and use these information to promote more holistic approaches to support their well-being, and create policies and support programs that explicitly support teacher well-being. Further studies may be conducted to look into the consistency between the teacher-respondents’ perception and behavior or action. Good perception translated into good action or behavior yields positive results. Lastly, education should be considered and added as an indicator of material well-being. It is important to note that knowledge empowers people for sustainability through quality education (Didham & Ofei-Manu, 2015). A wider scope of human well-being, and sustainable education campaigns and initiatives may be put in place by schools to make more communities informed and involved, especially that only little is known about sustainability issues and human well-being concerns by ordinary citizens around the world.

## REFERENCES

- Alkire, S. (2002). Dimensions of human development. *World Development*, 30(2), 181–205. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0305-750x\(01\)00109-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0305-750x(01)00109-7)
- Balioune-Lutz, M. (2004, February 2). On the measurement of human well-being: Fuzzy set theory and sen’s capability approach. Retrieved from WIDER Working Paper Series website: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/unu/wpaper/rp2004-16.html>

- Berglund, T., Gericke, N., Boeve-de Pauw, J., Olsson, D., & Chang, T. C. (2019). A cross-cultural comparative study of sustainability consciousness between students in Taiwan and Sweden. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 22(7), 6287–6313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-019-00478-2>
- Clark, D. A. (2014). Defining and measuring human well-being. *Global Environmental Change*, 833–855. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5784-4\\_66](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5784-4_66)
- Dang, N. A. (2017). Social well-being in Vietnam : Designing and preliminary results from a sampling survey. *The senshu social well-being review*, (4), 117–123. Retrieved from <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/120006786057/>
- Development and development paradigms: A (reasoned) review of prevailing visions. EASYPol Series 102 [Policy Support and Governance] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2011). Retrieved from Fao.org website: <http://www.fao.org/policy-support/tools-and-publications/resources-details/en/c/846758/>
- Crone, E. A., & Dahl, R. E. (2012). Understanding adolescence as a period of social–affective engagement and goal flexibility. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 13(9), 636–650. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3313>
- Didham, R. & Ofei-Manu, P. (July 2015). Sustainable lifestyles and education. Retrieved from <http://pub.iges.or.jp/modules/envirolib/view.php?docid=6063>.
- Ecosystems and human well-being millennium ecosystem assessment. (n.d.). Retrieved from [https://pdf.wri.org/ecosystems\\_human\\_wellbeing.pdf](https://pdf.wri.org/ecosystems_human_wellbeing.pdf)
- Dong, Y., & Hauschild, M. Z. (2017). Indicators for environmental sustainability. *Procedia CIRP*, 61, 697–702. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2016.11.173>
- Environmental sustainability index (ESI) | SEDAC. (2021). Retrieved from <https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/data/collection/esi>
- Huitt, W. (2007). Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Retrieved from <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/topics/regsys/maslow.html>
- Introduction to human well-being and ecological integrity. (n.d.). Retrieved from [www.coastalfirstnation.ca](http://www.coastalfirstnation.ca)
- Jumnianpol, S., Wun’gao, S., Nuangjamnong, N., Srisupan, P., & Chimmamee, M. (2017). Social well-being in Thailand 2016: Survey report. *The Senshu Social Well-Being Review*, 4, 75–93. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/156952966.pdf>
- Kang, S., & Yoo, H. (2019). Music teachers’ psychological needs and work engagement as predictors of their well-being. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 221, 58. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5406/bulcouresmusedu.221.0058>
- Kennelly, J., Taylor, N., Maxwell, T., & Serow, P. (2012). Education for sustainability and pre-service teacher education. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 28(1), 57–58.

- Kang, & Yoo. (2019). Music teachers' psychological needs and work engagement as predictors of their well-being. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 221, 58. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5406/bulcouresmusedu.221.0058>
- Kim, E. S. (2014). Survey design and descriptive outcomes of Korean survey. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/oai.ir.acc.senshu-u.ac.jp:00010774>
- Konu, A. (2002). Well-being in schools: A conceptual model. *Health Promotion International*, 17(1), 79–87. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/17.1.79>
- Larson, L. M., Seipel, M. T., Shelley, M. C., Gahn, S. W., Ko, S. Y., Schenkenfelder, M., ... Heitmann, M. M. (2017). The academic environment and faculty well-being: The role of psychological needs. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 27(1), 167–182. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072717748667>
- McGillivray, M. (2007). Human well-being: issues, concepts and measures. In *Human Well-being* (pp. 1–22). Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230625600\\_1ofei-manu](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230625600_1ofei-manu), p., & didham, r. j. (2017). quality education for Sustainable Development: A priority in achieving sustainability and well-being for all. IGES, Number 28, 12. Retrieved from <https://www.iges.or.jp/en/pub/quality-education-sustainable-development/en>
- O'Flaherty, J., & Liddy, M. (2017). The impact of development education and education for sustainable development interventions: A synthesis of the research. *Environmental Education Research*, 24(7), 1031–1049. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2017.1392484>
- Olsson, D. (2015). The effectiveness of education for sustainable development. *Sustainability*, 7(11), 1–25. Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/a/gam/jsusta/v7y2015i11p15693-15717d59322.html>
- Partha Dasgupta. (2001). Human well-being and the natural environment. Retrieved from <https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/0199247889.001.0001/acprof-9780199247882>
- PHILIPPINES-WHO Country Cooperation Strategy 2017-2022. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://iris.wpro.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665.1/13584/WPRO-2017-DPM-003-eng.pdf>
- Porio, E., & See, J. (2017). Social well-being in the Philippines: Indicators and patterns. *The Senshu Social Well-being Review*, 4, 95–116. Retrieved from <http://ir.acc.senshu-u.ac.jp>
- Raising teacher quality is key to sustainable development. (2020). Retrieved from <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200310084009544>
- THE 17 GOALS | Sustainable Development. (2015). Retrieved from <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
- Tsai, M. C. (2018). International comparative survey on lifestyle and values: A report on the Taiwan survey. *The Senshu Social Well-Being Review*, 5, 105–116. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/211121048.pdf>

- Turner, K., & Thielking, M. (2019). Teacher wellbeing: Its effects on teaching practice and student learning. *Issues in Educational Research*, 29(3), 2019. Retrieved from <https://www.iier.org.au/iier29/turner2.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2013, April 10). Education for health and well-being. Retrieved from <https://en.unesco.org/themes/education-health-and-well-being>
- United Nations University. (2006). Understanding human well-being. Retrieved from <http://dro.deakin.edu.au/view/DU:30028707>
- VanderWeele, T. J., Balboni, T. A., & Koh, H. K. (2017). Health and spirituality. *JAMA*, 318(6), 519. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2017.8136>
- Wolff, L. A., Sjöblom, P., Hofman-Bergholm, M., & Palmberg, I. (2017). High performance education fails in sustainability? A reflection on Finnish primary teacher education. *Education Sciences*, 7(1), 32. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci7010032>
- World Health Organization: WHO. (2018, February 19). Millennium development goals (MDGs). Retrieved from [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/millennium-development-goals-\(mdgs\)](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/millennium-development-goals-(mdgs))
- Yazaki, K. (2016). Basic descriptive statistics of Japan social well-being survey. *The Senshu Social Well-Being Review*, 2, 99–109. Retrieved from [https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/Global\\_71799404.pdf](https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/Global_71799404.pdf)