



# The Relationship between Conscientiousness and Flourishing among Selected Philippine Government High School Teachers

**Dr. Frederick Edward T. Fabella**

FEU Roosevelt, Cainta, Rizal, Philippines

**Gerry A. Anyayahan**

Manggahan High School, Pasig City, Philippines

**DOI: 10.47760/cognizance.2023.v03i07.001**

## ABSTRACT:

This study attempted to explore the relationship between the personality trait of Conscientiousness and the multi-dimensional psychological construct of Flourishing among government-employed high school teachers of the Philippine Department of Education. 54 high school teachers from Metro Manila volunteered to take part in this study. They were asked to answer the short-form questionnaire for the assessment of the seven facets of conscientiousness, a 5-point Likert scale instrument, which consists of 4 items for each of its 7 domains of Industriousness, Caution, Control, Perfectionism, Procrastination Refrainment, Task Planning and Tidiness totaling 28 items. The respondents were also asked to answer the Flourishing questionnaire, which uses a 7-point Likert scale and has 8 items. The results revealed that the respondents' overall responses to the conscientiousness instrument were generally positive. Moreover, with respect to flourishing, the respondents of this study yielded a result of *agree*, which infers that they are mostly doing well in life. Significant positive moderate relationships were found between the respondents' Flourishing scores and their Caution and Tidiness scores. Furthermore, a significant positive moderate relationship was found between the respondents' Flourishing scores and their age. Based on these findings, Caution, Tidiness and the respondents' age influence their Flourishing positively.

**Keywords:** *Conscientiousness, Flourishing, Philippine Department of Education, Teacher*

## INTRODUCTION

Due to the threat of the Covid-19 pandemic, in-person classes were not allowed in school years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. But for the first time in two years, schools nationwide opened their doors to all students for face-to-face classes. On Nov.2 of 2022, all schools that offer basic education began transitioning to full face-to-face classes<sup>1</sup>.

However, for government schools, there were anticipated challenges by teachers in returning to face to face classes such as adjustment to changes in the behavior and attitudes of the learners, the number of learners that can be accommodated by the limited classrooms, the amount of competencies that learners must acquire and the production of immediate reports among others<sup>2</sup>.

In order to successfully hurdle these challenges, it is believed that teachers must possess characteristics that would help make them become effective. It is believed that teachers need to exhibit patience, creativity, good communication skills and strong organizational skills. In addition, teachers should have a passion for teaching, a deep understanding of their subject matter and the ability to inspire learners<sup>3</sup>.

The personality of the teacher also plays an important role. In a study conducted in 20 schools in Australia with over 2000 students and 75 teachers, the following findings were made. A teacher's neuroticism is inversely correlated with students' self-efficacy, the teacher's agreeableness is essential for a student's conviction that the teacher will be able to support him or her personally and a teacher's conscientiousness encourages the student's belief that the teacher can support him or her academically<sup>4</sup>.

This study focused on conscientiousness as one of the personality factors of a teacher.

Conscientious individuals are hard-working, organized, reliable, responsible, are rarely impulsive and tend to keep their promises. The following are words that are often used to describe conscientious people: goal-oriented, persistent, forward-thinking, responsible, principled and organized<sup>5</sup>.

Conscientious people have been found to be high achievers in academics and even in professional life. As professionals they are highly productive, enjoy higher earnings, increased job satisfaction and healthy relationships. They also are more likely to land leadership roles. They tend to focus on a problem until it is resolved. Furthermore, they abide by certain life rules<sup>6</sup>.

In one study, it was found that more conscientious teachers are better at improving their students' conscientiousness<sup>7</sup>. In another study conducted in the Philippines, 457 high school teachers in the National Capital Region were selected as respondents. Their Big Five Personality Traits were measured and the leading trait found was the respondents' Agreeableness followed by Conscientiousness, Openness, Extraversion and lastly, Neuroticism<sup>8</sup>.

The Philippine basic education system underwent a radical transformation in 2013 when Republic Act No. 10533 was passed establishing the K-12 program which added Grades 11 and 12 as the senior high school phase<sup>9</sup>. However, after years of

implementation, teachers are now expressing dissatisfaction with this program. A survey commissioned by Philippine Senator Sherwin Gatchalian on 1,200 teachers revealed that 19 percent were “truly dissatisfied” and 25 percent were “somewhat dissatisfied.” This implies that 44 percent of the teachers surveyed were not satisfied with the K-12 program and its implementation<sup>10</sup>.

This adds to the burden of challenges that teachers continue to encounter when face to face classes were reintroduced. And this could affect the teachers’ functioning detrimentally.

One study revealed that workplace functioning may have something to do with flourishing<sup>11</sup>. According to Positive Psychology, flourishing is a multi-dimensional construct, which goes beyond simple happiness or wellbeing and depends on building and sustaining the five aspects of the PERMA model of happiness in one’s life. PERMA stands for positive emotions, engagement, relationships, meaning and accomplishments<sup>12</sup>.

Flourishing is believed to be the ultimate end-state in psychology. Flourishers are those individuals who possess both high levels of hedonic well-being and eudaimonic well-being<sup>13</sup>.

In a study on 1379 teachers, the mediating effect of flourishing in the relationship between psychological capital and burnout was investigated. It found that flourishing partially mediates the impact of psychological capital on the three teacher burnout symptoms of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and lack of professional accomplishment<sup>14</sup>.

A study on 331 university students attempted to explore the relationship of the Big Five Factors of Personality and flourishing. It was established that conscientiousness significantly predicts flourishing of students in a positive way<sup>15</sup>.

Based on the foregoing studies, this research attempted to explore the relationship between conscientiousness and flourishing among a selected number of government teachers.

Specifically, this study attempts to address the following research questions.

1. What is the respondents’ degree of Conscientiousness in terms of
  - 1.1 Industriousness;
  - 1.2 Caution;
  - 1.3 Control;

- 1.4 Perfectionism;
- 1.5 Procrastination Refrainment;
- 1.6 Task Planning and
- 1.7 Tidiness?
- 2. What is the respondents' degree of Flourishing?
- 3. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' Flourishing and their
  - 3.1 Industriousness;
  - 3.2 Caution;
  - 3.3 Control;
  - 3.4 Perfectionism;
  - 3.5 Procrastination Refrainment;
  - 3.6 Task Planning;
  - 3.7 Tidiness and
  - 3.8 Age?

## METHODOLOGY

The respondents who volunteered for this study were all government-employed high school teachers of the Philippine Department of Education. There were 9 males and 45 females. Their age ranged between 24 to 58 with a mean of 39.76 years. They were asked to answer the short-form questionnaire for the assessment of seven facets of conscientiousness<sup>16</sup>. It is a 5-point Likert scale instrument and consists of 4 items for each of its 7 domains of Industriousness, Caution, Control, Perfectionism, Procrastination Refrainment, Task Planning and Tidiness totaling 28 items. The respondents were also asked to answer the Flourishing questionnaire, which uses a 7-point Likert scale and has 8 items<sup>17</sup>.

## RESULTS

The following are the tabular presentation of the data gathered and the statistical treatments applied.

Table 1. Civil Status of the Respondents

Civil Status	Frequency
Single	15
Married	37
Separated	1
Spouse is deceased	1

Table 2. Years of Teaching of the Respondents

Duration	Frequency
Less than 1 year	1
1 – 3 years	10
3 – 6 years	4
6 – 9 years	16
9 – 11 years	9
11 – 13 years	2
13 – 15 years	1
15 – 17 years	10
17- 19 years	1

Table 3. Scale of Interpretation for Conscientiousness Domains

Label	Range
Not at all like me	1.000 – 1.800
Somewhat not like me	1.801 – 2.600
Neither like me nor not like me	2.601 – 3.400
Somewhat like me	3.401 – 4.200
Very much like me	4.201 – 5.000

Table 4. Conscientiousness: Industriousness Item Weighted Means

Statement	Weighted Mean N=54	Verbal Interpretation
1. I am always prepared.	4.074	Somewhat like me
2. I do more than what's expected of me.	4.037	Somewhat like me
3. I make an effort.	4.278	Very much like me
4. I work hard.	4.426	Very much like me
Overall weighted mean	4.204	Very much like me

Table 5. Conscientiousness: Caution Item Weighted Means

Statement	Weighted Mean N=54	Verbal Interpretation
5. I behave properly.	4.407	Very much like me
6. I look at the facts.	4.519	Very much like me
7. I make careful choices.	4.315	Very much like me
8. I think ahead.	4.148	Somewhat like me
Overall weighted mean	4.347	Very much like me

Table 6. Conscientiousness: Control Item Weighted Means

Statement	Weighted Mean N=54	Verbal Interpretation
9. I act impulsively when something is bothering me. (reverse-scored)	2.370	Somewhat not like me
10. I do unexpected things. (reverse-scored)	2.611	Neither like me nor not like me
11. I make a fool of myself. (reverse-scored)	3.852	Somewhat like me
12. I make rash decisions. (reverse-scored)	3.186	Neither like me nor not like me
Overall weighted mean	3.005	Neither like me nor not like me

Table 7. Conscientiousness: Perfectionism Item Weighted Means

Statement	Weighted Mean N=54	Verbal Interpretation
13. I continue until everything is perfect.	4.019	Somewhat like me
14. I detect mistakes.	3.796	Somewhat like me
15. I go straight for the goal.	4.093	Somewhat like me
16. I try to outdo others.	2.537	Somewhat not like me
Overall weighted mean	3.611	Somewhat like me

Table 8. Conscientiousness: Procrastination Refrainment Item Weighted Means

Statement	Weighted Mean N=54	Verbal Interpretation
17. I am easily distracted. (reverse-scored)	3.185	Neither like me nor not like me
18. I have difficulty starting tasks. (reverse-scored)	3.333	Neither like me nor not like me
19. I put off unpleasant tasks. (reverse-scored)	3.000	Neither like me nor not like me
20. I waste my time. (reverse-scored)	3.907	Somewhat like me
Overall weighted mean	3.356	Somewhat like me

Table 9. Conscientiousness: Task Planning Item Weighted Means

Statement	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
21. I am a goal-oriented person.	4.167	Somewhat like me
22. I do things according to a plan.	4.167	Somewhat like me
23. I like to plan ahead.	4.259	Very much like me
24. I make plans and stick to them.	4.037	Somewhat like me
Overall weighted mean	4.158	Somewhat like me

Table 10. Conscientiousness: Tidiness Item Weighted Means

Statement	Weighted Mean N=54	Verbal Interpretation
25. I am not bothered by messy people. (reverse-scored)	2.574	Somewhat not like me
26. I leave a mess in my room. (reverse-scored)	3.611	Somewhat like me
27. I leave my belongings around. (reverse-scored)	3.667	Somewhat like me
28. I often forget to put things in their proper place. (reverse-scored)	3.444	Very much like me
Overall weighted mean	3.324	Neither like me nor not like me

Table 11. Scale of Interpretation for Flourishing

Label	Range
Strongly disagree	1.000 – 1.857
Disagree	1.858 – 2.715
Slightly disagree	2.716 – 3.573
Neither agree nor disagree	3.574 – 4.431
Slightly agree	4.432 – 5.289
Agree	5.290 – 6.147
Strongly agree	6.148 – 7.000

Table 12. Flourishing Item Weighted Means

Statement	Weighted Mean N=54	Verbal Interpretation
1. I lead a purposeful and meaningful life	6.093	Agree
2. My social relationships are supportive and rewarding	6.019	Agree
3. I am engaged and interested in my daily activities	5.926	Agree

4. I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others	6.222	Strongly agree
5. I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me	6.222	Strongly agree
6. I am a good person and live a good life	6.315	Strongly agree
7. I am optimistic about my future	6.185	Strongly agree
8. People respect me	6.167	Strongly agree
Overall weighted mean	6.144	Agree

Table 13. Relationship between Industriousness and Flourishing

Pearson r computation	
X Values $\Sigma = 227$ Mean = 4.204 $\Sigma(X - Mx)^2 = SSx = 19.134$ Y Values $\Sigma = 331.75$ Mean = 6.144 $\Sigma(Y - My)^2 = SSy = 35.325$	X and Y Combined N = 54 $\Sigma(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 3.953$ R Calculation $r = \frac{\Sigma((X - Mx)(Y - My))}{\sqrt{(SSx)(SSy)}}$ $r = 3.953 / \sqrt{(19.134)(35.325)} = 0.152$ Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.152
r = 0.152 The P-Value is .272544. The result is not significant at $p < .05$ .	

Table 14. Relationship between Caution and Flourishing

Pearson r computation	
X Values $\Sigma = 234.75$ Mean = 4.347 $\Sigma(X - Mx)^2 = SSx = 15.927$ Y Values $\Sigma = 331.75$ Mean = 6.144 $\Sigma(Y - My)^2 = SSy = 35.325$	X and Y Combined N = 54 $\Sigma(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 8.059$ R Calculation $r = \frac{\Sigma((X - Mx)(Y - My))}{\sqrt{(SSx)(SSy)}}$ $r = 8.059 / \sqrt{(15.927)(35.325)} = 0.3398$ Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.3398
r = 0.3398 The P-Value is .011941. The result is <b>significant</b> at $p < .05$ .	

Table 15. Relationship between Control and Flourishing

Pearson r computation	
X Values $\Sigma = 162.25$ Mean = 3.005	X and Y Combined N = 54 $\Sigma(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 6.964$



$\sum(X - Mx)^2 = SSx = 21.436$ Y Values $\sum = 331.75$ Mean = 6.144 $\sum(Y - My)^2 = SSy = 35.325$	R Calculation $r = \frac{\sum((X - My)(Y - Mx))}{\sqrt{(SSx)(SSy)}}$ $r = 6.964 / \sqrt{(21.436)(35.325)} = 0.2531$ Meta Numerics (cross-check) $r = 0.2531$
$r = 0.2531$ The P-Value is .064809. The result is not significant at $p < .05$ .	

Table 16. Relationship between Perfectionism and Flourishing

Pearson r computation	
X Values $\sum = 195$ Mean = 3.611 $\sum(X - Mx)^2 = SSx = 16.083$ Y Values $\sum = 331.75$ Mean = 6.144 $\sum(Y - My)^2 = SSy = 35.325$	X and Y Combined $N = 54$ $\sum(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 3.451$ R Calculation $r = \frac{\sum((X - My)(Y - Mx))}{\sqrt{(SSx)(SSy)}}$ $r = 3.451 / \sqrt{(16.083)(35.325)} = 0.1448$ Meta Numerics (cross-check) $r = 0.1448$
$r = 0.1448$ The P-Value is .296171. The result is not significant at $p < .05$ .	

Table 17. Relationship between Procrastination Refrainment and Flourishing

Pearson r computation	
X Values $\sum = 181.25$ Mean = 3.356 $\sum(X - Mx)^2 = SSx = 28.075$ Y Values $\sum = 331.75$ Mean = 6.144 $\sum(Y - My)^2 = SSy = 35.325$	X and Y Combined $N = 54$ $\sum(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 7.487$ R Calculation $r = \frac{\sum((X - My)(Y - Mx))}{\sqrt{(SSx)(SSy)}}$ $r = 7.487 / \sqrt{(28.075)(35.325)} = 0.2377$ Meta Numerics (cross-check) $r = 0.2377$
$r = 0.2377$ The P-Value is .083494. The result is not significant at $p < .05$ .	

Table 18. Relationship between Task Planning and Flourishing

Pearson r computation	
X Values $\Sigma = 224.5$ Mean = 4.157 $\Sigma(X - Mx)^2 = SSx = 18.787$ Y Values $\Sigma = 331.75$ Mean = 6.144 $\Sigma(Y - My)^2 = SSy = 35.325$	X and Y Combined N = 54 $\Sigma(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 4.624$ R Calculation $r = \frac{\Sigma((X - My)(Y - Mx))}{\sqrt{((SSx)(SSy))}}$ $r = 4.624 / \sqrt{((18.787)(35.325))} = 0.1795$ Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.1795
r = 0.1795 The P-Value is .194025. The result is not significant at $p < .05$ .	

Table 19. Relationship between Tidiness and Flourishing

Pearson r computation	
X Values $\Sigma = 179.5$ Mean = 3.324 $\Sigma(X - Mx)^2 = SSx = 42.829$ Y Values $\Sigma = 331.75$ Mean = 6.144 $\Sigma(Y - My)^2 = SSy = 35.325$	X and Y Combined N = 54 $\Sigma(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 15.02$ R Calculation $r = \frac{\Sigma((X - My)(Y - Mx))}{\sqrt{((SSx)(SSy))}}$ $r = 15.02 / \sqrt{((42.829)(35.325))} = 0.3861$ Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.3861
r = 0.3861 The P-Value is .003932. The result is <b>significant</b> at $p < .05$ .	

Table 20. Relationship between Age and Flourishing

Pearson r computation	
X Values $\Sigma = 2145$ Mean = 39.722 $\Sigma(X - Mx)^2 = SSx = 3754.833$ Y Values $\Sigma = 331.75$ Mean = 6.144 $\Sigma(Y - My)^2 = SSy = 35.325$	X and Y Combined N = 54 $\Sigma(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 130.278$ R Calculation $r = \frac{\Sigma((X - My)(Y - Mx))}{\sqrt{((SSx)(SSy))}}$ $r = 130.278 / \sqrt{((3754.833)(35.325))} = 0.3577$ Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.3577
r = 0.3577 The P-Value is .007918. The result is <b>significant</b> at $p < .05$ .	

## DISCUSSION

Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 present the responses to the items in the 7 domains of Conscientiousness. Based on Table 4, it can be seen that that the overall weighted mean for the Conscientiousness domain of Industriousness is 4.204, which has a verbal interpretation of *very much like me*. In addition, it can be observed in Table 5 that the overall weighted mean for the Conscientiousness domain of Caution is 4.347, which indicates a verbal interpretation of *very much like me*. Furthermore, based on Table 6, the overall weighted mean for the Conscientiousness domain of Control is 3.005, which has a verbal interpretation of *neither like me or nor not like me*.

It can be observed in Table 7 that for the Conscientiousness domain of Perfectionism, the overall weighted mean is 3.611, which indicates a verbal interpretation of *somewhat like me*. Moreover, in Table 8, it can be seen that the overall weighted mean for the Conscientiousness domain of Procrastination Refrainment is 3.356, which has a verbal interpretation of *somewhat like me*. Additionally, for the Conscientiousness domain of Task Planning, the overall weighted mean of 4.158 can be seen in Table 9. This has a verbal interpretation of *somewhat like me*. And lastly, in Table 10, it can be seen that for the Conscientiousness domain of Tidiness, the overall weighted mean is 3.324, which indicates a verbal interpretation of *neither like me nor not like me*.

In Table 12, the item weighted means for Flourishing is indicated. Item 6 statement, “I am a good person and live a good life” has the highest weighted mean of 6.315, which has a verbal interpretation of *strongly agree*. Item 3 statement, “I am engaged and interested in my daily activities” has the lowest weighted mean which is 5.926, which has a verbal interpretation of *agree*. The overall weighted mean for Flourishing is found to be 6.144, which indicates a verbal interpretation of *agree*.

Tables 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 present the Pearson r computations between the respondents’ scores in the 7 domains of Conscientiousness and their Flourishing scores.

The Pearson r computation between the Conscientiousness domain of Industriousness and Flourishing can be seen in Table 13. An r value of 0.152 was obtained and based on the p value of .272544, there was no significant relationship found between the respondents’ Industriousness and Flourishing scores. In addition, Table 14 presents the Pearson r computation between the Conscientiousness domain of Caution and Flourishing. An r value of 0.3398 was obtained and based on the p value of .011941, there was a significant moderate positive relationship found between the respondents’ Caution and Flourishing scores. Furthermore, it can be observed in Table 15, that the Pearson r computation between the Conscientiousness domain of Control and Flourishing yielded an r value of 0.2531 and based on the p value of .064809, no significant relationship was found between the respondents’ Control and Flourishing scores.

Table 16 presents the Pearson  $r$  computation between the Conscientiousness domain of Perfectionism and Flourishing. An  $r$  value of 0.1448 was obtained and based on the  $p$  value of .296171, no significant relationship was found between the respondents' Perfectionism and Flourishing scores. Moreover, it can be seen in Table 17 that the Pearson  $r$  computation between the Conscientiousness domain of Procrastination Refrainment and Flourishing produced an  $r$  value of 0.2377. Based on the  $p$  value of .083494, no significant relationship was found between the respondents' Procrastination Refrainment and Flourishing scores. In addition, it can be observed in Table 18 that an  $r$  value of 0.1795 was obtained from the Pearson  $r$  computation between the Conscientiousness domain of Task Planning and Flourishing. Based on the  $p$  value of .194025, no significant relationship was found between the respondents' Task Planning and Flourishing scores. And lastly, Table 19 presents the Pearson  $r$  computation between the Conscientiousness domain of Tidiness and Flourishing. An  $r$  value of 0.3861 was obtained and based on the  $p$  value of .003932, a significant moderate positive relationship was established between the respondents' Tidiness and Flourishing scores.

It can be seen in Table 20 that the Pearson  $r$  computation between the respondents' age and Flourishing yielded an  $r$  value of 0.3577. And with a  $p$  value of .007918, a significant positive moderate relationship was found between the respondents' age and Flourishing scores.

## CONCLUSIONS

In terms of Conscientiousness, the respondents of this study produced results of *very much like me* in the domain of Industriousness, *very much like me* in the domain of Caution, *neither like me or nor not like me* in the domain of Control, *somewhat like me* in the domain of Perfectionism, *somewhat like me* in the domain of Procrastination Refrainment, *somewhat like me* in the domain of Task Planning and *neither like me nor not like me* in the domain of Tidiness.

Furthermore, with respect to Flourishing, the respondents of this study yielded a result of *agree*, which may indicate that they are generally doing really well in life.

Significant positive moderate relationships were found between the respondents' Flourishing scores and their Caution and Tidiness scores. Furthermore, a significant positive moderate relationship was found between the respondents' Flourishing scores and their age.

Based on these results, Caution, Tidiness and the respondents' age influence their Flourishing positively.

## Ethical Considerations

The researchers declare that they strictly adhered to the ethics of research. Informed consent was obtained, freedom to withdraw at any time from the study was made known to the participants, their identities were anonymized, the participants were not exposed to any physical, psychological or social harm and the results were used for research purposes only. The researchers further ensured steps to prevent bias in their interpretation of the data. Lastly, there was no conflict of interest in the conduct of the study.

## REFERENCES

1. Hernando-Malipot, M. (2022, August 21). Ph schools to open SY 2022-2023 with face-to-face classes. Manila Bulletin. <https://mb.com.ph/2022/8/21/ph-schools-to-open-sy-2022-2023-with-face-to-face-classes>.
2. *Top 10 guaranteed problems of teachers in the first week of face to face classes this SY 2022-2023*. Helpline PH. (2022, August 31). <https://helplineph.com/opinion/guaranteed-problems-of-teachers/>
3. Llego, M. A. (2022, August 27). Top Qualities of an Effective Teacher. TeacherPH. Retrieved August 27, 2022 from, <https://www.teacherph.com/qualities-effective-teacher/>
4. *The personality of a teacher*. The Personality of a Teacher. (2018, February 20). <https://www.philippinesbasiceducation.us/2018/02/the-personality-of-teacher.html>
5. Gordon, S. (2022, April 26). *Understanding how conscientiousness affects your behavior*. Verywell Mind. <https://www.verywellmind.com/how-conscientiousness-affects-your-behavior-4843763>
6. Sussex Publishers. (n.d.). *Conscientiousness*. Psychology Today. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/basics/conscientiousness>
7. Cheng, Albert and Zamarro, Gema, Measuring Teacher Conscientiousness and its Impact on Students: Insight from the Measures of Effective Teaching Longitudinal Database (April 22, 2016). EDRE Working Paper No. 2016-05, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2768970> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2768970>
8. Gonzales, J. V., & Rosales, Ma. J. D. (2022). Big Five Personality Traits and its Relationship to Teachers' Performance Evaluation in the Public High Schools. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences* 2022, 11(1), 93–104.
9. What went before: The K-12 program. INQUIRER.net. (2018, April 7). <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/980733/what-went-before-the-k-12-program>
10. Mercado, N. A. (2022, July 18). *44% of Filipinos not satisfied with K-12 Basic Education Program, survey says*. INQUIRER.net. <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1629671/fwd-44-of-filipinos-dissatisfied-with-k-12-program-survey>
11. Redelinghuys, K., & Rothmann, S. (2020). Exploring the prevalence of workplace flourishing amongst teachers over time. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 46. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v46i0.1764>
12. Ackerman, C. E. (2018, May 9). *What is flourishing in positive psychology?* PositivePsychology.com. <https://positivepsychology.com/flourishing/>
13. Schotanus-Dijkstra, M., Pieterse, M.E., Drossaert, C.H.C. et al. What Factors are Associated with Flourishing? Results from a Large Representative National Sample. *J Happiness Stud* 17, 1351–1370 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-015-9647-3>
14. Freire, C., Ferradás, M. del, García-Bértoa, A., Núñez, J. C., Rodríguez, S., & Piñeiro, I. (2020). Psychological capital and burnout in teachers: The mediating role of flourishing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(22), 8403. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17228403>



15. Pradhan, R.K., Jandu, K. Evaluating the Impact of Conscientiousness on Flourishing in Indian Higher Education Context: Mediating Role of Emotional Intelligence. *Psychol Stud* 68, 223–235 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-022-00712-4>
16. Franzen, P., Arens, A. K., Greiff, S., van der Westhuizen, L., Fischbach, A., Wollschläger, R., & Niepel, C. (2022). Developing and validating a short-form questionnaire for the assessment of seven facets of conscientiousness in large-scale assessments. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 104(6), 759–773. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2021.1998083>
17. Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2009). New measures of well-being: Flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 39, 247-266.