THE IMPACT OF WORK STRESS ON TEACHERS' JOB SATISFACTION : A CASE STUDY OF QINGDAO HUANGHAI UNIVERSITY

*1. Xiaowei Zheng (M.B.A)**

2. Dhriwit Assawasirisilp (M.B.A)

Received : 24 April 2025
Revised : 16 May 2025
Accepted : 4 June 2025

Abstract

The objectives were: 1) To assess the teachers'job satisfaction at Qingdao Huanghai University. 2) To study Qingdao Huanghai University teachers' work stress. 3) To study the impact of work stress on job satisfaction. The sample consisted of 314 teachers, academic year 2024, using simple random sampling. The instrument used was a questionnaire. to collect data with an index of consistency (IOC) between 0.67 and 1.00 and the overall reliability of 0.95. Statistics used to analyze the data were mean and standard deviation. The hypothesis was tested by using the Pearson's correlation coefficient. The statistical significance was set at the 0.05 level.

The study's results indicated that: 1) This study shows that different dimensions of work stress have important impacts on job satisfaction. Based on general research patterns and the logic of this study, it is inferred that teacher work stress and job satisfaction usually show a negative correlation—i.e., the greater the work stress, the lower the job satisfaction may be. Conversely, when stress is within a controllable range, it is more conducive to maintaining relatively high job satisfaction. 2) Reducing work stress, especially the interference between work and leisure time, is an effective strategy to improve teachers' job satisfaction, which can significantly enhance teachers' job satisfaction and student satisfaction.

Keywords: university teachers, higher education, Qingdao Huanghai University, China, correlational study

1. student, Southeast Bangkok University, Thailand

**ผู้รับผิดชอบบทความ (Corresponding author) E-mail: 441458655@qq.com*

2. Assistant Professor, Advisor and Instructor of MBA program Southeast Bangkok University, Thailand

E-mail: dhriwit@yahoo.com

1. Background and Statement of the problem

In study by Eliza Mwakasangula.Kelvin Mwita (2020), The results of the study showed that there was a significant negative correlation between occupational stress and job satisfaction among public primary school teachers in Tanzania. Stresses related to the work environment, leadership, and workload can significantly reduce teachers' job satisfaction. In addition, the study found that gender (females) and education level were significantly negatively correlated with job satisfaction, while age was positively correlated with job satisfaction.

In study by Anna Toropova, Eva Myrberg & Stefan Johansson (2021), the results of the study showed: Among aspects of school working conditions, teacher workload, teacher cooperation and student discipline were most important for teacher job satisfaction.teachers with more experience of professional development and more efficacious teachers tended to have higher levels of job satisfaction. In addition, teacher cooperation carried much more importance for teachers' job satisfaction, while teacher perceptions of student discipline in school were crucial for job satisfaction of the least efficacious teachers.

In study by Ni Made Dwi Puspitawati, Ni Putu Cempaka Dharmadewi Atmaja (2021) The results show that work stress has the opposite effect on employee performance, and the greater the stress that employees feel at work, the lower their performance. Job stress has a negative effect on employee job satisfaction, that is, the higher the work pressure felt by employees, the lower job satisfaction of employees. The more satisfied an employee is at work, the better the employee performance improves.

In study by Pakri Fahmi, Sudjono, Parwoto, Supriyatno, Ahmad Badawi Saluy (2022), The results show that work motivation and work discipline have a positive effect on teacher performance, work motivation and work discipline have opposite effects on work stress, work stress has a negative effect on employee performance, the relationship between work discipline and employee performance mediates partly through work stress, and the relationship between work motivation and employee performance also mediates through work stress.

In study by Sandra Ingried Asaloei, Agustinus Kia Wolomasi, Basilius Redan Werang (2020). The results show that there is an inverse effect between teachers' work stress and performance. The more teachers enjoy their teaching life and work, the less pressure teachers will have, and the less psychological pressure teachers will have, and the more high-quality teaching work will be produced.

2. Objectives

2.1 To assess teachers' job satisfaction in relation to their interactions with co-workers, parents, and students at Qingdao Huanghai University.

2.2 To investigate the effect of various dimensions of work stress (organizational conflicts, individual demands, work influence, and work-life balance) on teachers' job satisfaction.

2.3 To determine the extent to which work stress predicts job satisfaction among university teachers.

3. Expected benefits

Through the study of the impact of teachers' work stress on teachers' job satisfaction, the expected benefits can be brought in the following 3 aspects:

Enriching and Improving Theoretical Research: This study will enrich the theoretical basis in the fields of education, psychology and management, improve the influencing mechanism model between job stress and job satisfaction, and provide new perspectives and empirical data for academic research.

Practical significance to the school: to provide specific suggestions for Qingdao Huanghai University to improve teacher management, improve the school's management efficiency of teachers and improve the school's teaching quality.

Policy suggestions for government departments: provide reference for Qingdao education management department to formulate relevant teacher policies, and promote the scientific, standardized and humanized management of higher teachers in Qingdao.

4. Conceptual Framework

Independent Variable (X)		Dependent variable(Y)
X: Work stress		**Y: Job satisfaction**
X1: Indistinct organization and conflicts	⟷	Y1: Satisfaction with co-workers
X2: Individual demands and commitment		Y2: satisfaction with parents
X3: Influence at work		Y3: satisfaction with students
X4: Work to leisure time interference		

5. Research Methodology

Population and Sample

The number of teachers in Qingdao Huanghai University surveyed in this study was about (N) 1459. (Qingdao Huanghai University, 2024)

According to Yamane's sample size calculation formula (Yamane, 1973), the sample size is approximately (s) 314 teachers of Qingdao Huanghai University to ensure a 95% confidence level and (e) a margin of error of 5%. The calculation is as follows:

s = N/(1+ Ne 2) = 1459 /(1+ 1459 0.05 2)

A simple random sampling method was used in this study. This approach increases the likelihood that the sample is representative of the population and minimizes selection bias.

Instrument Development

This study used questionnaire as the research tool for data collection. This questionnaire is divided into 3 parts, as follows:

Part 1: Personal information including gender, age, years of work experience and education level

Part 2: The four categories of teachers' work stress (X1: Indistinct organization and conflicts, X2: Individual demands and commitment, X3: Influence at work, and X4: Work to leisure time interference) were rated according to the following scales.

Part 3: Three rating scales for job satisfaction (Y1: Satisfaction with co-workers, Y2: satisfaction with parents, Y3: satisfaction with students) were included and scored according to the following scales.

Instrument testing

The researcher conducted a quality assessment of the Questionnaire used in the study by performing a try-out with 30personnel unrelated to the research sample. The data collected were analyzed to determine reliability using Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient. The reliability analysis of the questionnaire indicates an Overall Paper Reliability coefficient of 0.95.

Work stress (overall is 0.93)	Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
Indistinct organization and conflicts	0.94	3
Individual demands and commitment	0.88	3
Influence at work	0.97	3
Work to leisure time interference	0.94	5
Job satisfaction (overall is 0.94)		
Satisfaction with co-workers	0.94	3
Satisfaction with parents	0.90	3
Satisfaction with students	0.98	8

Statistic Applied in Research

The statistics used in this study are: Percentage, Average ($\bar{x}$), Standard deviation (S.D) and Pearson correlation coefficient

6. Research Results

Part 1: The researcher analyzed the data of teachers who participated in the questionnaire survey, including gender, age and years of work experience, and conducted frequency and percentage analysis on the data. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Characteristics of the respondents

	Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender		
Male	94	30
Female	220	70
Total	**314**	**100**
Age		
20 - 29	76	24.2
30 - 39	142	45.3
40 - 49	53	16.7
50 - 59	43	13.8
Total	**314**	**100**
Marital status		
Married	278	88.5
Single	32	10.3
Divorce	4	1.3
Total	**314**	**100**

Table 1: Characteristics of the respondents (continue)

	Frequency	Percent (%)
Education		
Bachelor 's degree	34	10.7
Master 's degree	236	75.2
PhD	44	14.1
Total	**314**	**100**
Years of work experience		
1-3 years	38	12.4
4-9 years	102	32.5
10-12 years	116	36.8
More than 13 years	58	18.4
Total	**314**	**100**

Displays the number and percentage of participant data by gender, age, and years of work experience.

From Table 1, we can see the data of 314 respondents who participated in the questionnaire survey as follows:

In terms of gender, there is a relatively large difference in the proportion between females and males. There are 220 female respondents, accounting for 70%, and 94 male respondents, accounting for 30%.

Regarding the age of the respondents, the largest number of respondents are in the age group of 31 to 39 years old, with 142 people, accounting for 45.3%. Followed by the respondents in the age group of 20 to 29 years old, with 76 people, accounting for 24.2%. There are 53 respondents aged between 40 and 49 years old, accounting for 16.7%, and 43 respondents aged between 50 and 59 years old, accounting for 13.8%.

In terms of educational attainment, the vast majority of the teaching staff have a master's degree, with 236 people, accounting for 75.2%. There are 34 people with a bachelor's degree, accounting for 10.7%, and 44 people with a doctor's degree, accounting for 14.1%.

As for the working years of the respondents, the largest number of respondents have worked for 10 to 12 years, with 116 people, accounting for 36.8%. Next are those who have worked for 4 to 9 years, with 102 people, accounting for 32.5%. The third largest group are those who have worked for more than 13 years, with 58 people, accounting for 18.4%. The fourth largest group are those with a working experience of 1 to 3 years, with a total of 38 people, accounting for 12.4%.

These characteristics reflect the diversity of the sample group and also provide a basis for the subsequent analysis.

Part 2: Analysis of Survey Results on Work Stress among Teachers at Qingdao Huanghai University

The researchers analyzed the survey data on the work stress of teachers at Qingdao Huanghai University, and used descriptive statistical methods to analyze the data. The mean value (X) and the standard deviation (S) are shown in Tables 2 to 6 respectively.

Table 2: Work stress, overall factors, and the means and standard deviations of all factors

Work stress	n = 314		
	$\bar{x}$	S.D	Level
Indistinct organization and conflicts	2.95	1.09	Normal
Individual demands and commitment	2.72	1.10	Normal
Influence at work	2.79	1.17	Normal
Work to leisure time interference	2.99	1.07	Normal
Total Average	**2.86**	**1.10**	**Normal**

From the table, it can be seen that "Work to leisure time interference" has the highest mean (2.99), indicating that the pressure perceived by the sample in this dimension is relatively more prominent. "Individual demands and commitment" having the lowest mean (2.72), making it the dimension with relatively weaker pressure perception. The means of "Indistinct organization and conflicts" (2.95) and "Influence at work" (2.79) lie between the two, with minimal differences. The standard deviation (S) for each dimension ranges from 1.07 to 1.17, suggesting similar data dispersion across work stress dimensions. The sample demonstrates high consistency in pressure perception for each dimension, with no significant extreme values. The total average mean (2.86) and the "Level" of each dimension are both "Normal", indicating the work stress of the overall sample is at a normal level. Based on the analysis of the table results, the conclusion is as follows: The work stress of the sample remains within the normal range across all dimensions and overall. There are no extreme cases where pressure in a certain dimension is abnormally high or low, and the overall pressure state is relatively balanced and stable. "Work to leisure time interference", with its relatively higher mean, can serve as a key observation dimension for subsequent management or intervention, prompting further exploration of potential ways to optimize the balance between work and leisure.

Table 3: Project Analysis of the Factors of Indistinct Organization and Conflicts

Indistinct organization and conflicts	n = 314		
	$\bar{x}$	S.D	Level
1. Your job responsibilities and roles are not clearly defined.	3.29	1.26	Normal
2. Conflicts within the team are frequent.	3.48	1.25	Normal
3. Organisational structure is chaotic and leads to inefficient communication.	2.86	1.44	Normal
4. You often have to deal with conflicts caused by vague responsibilities.	3.29	1.31	Normal
5. Clear processes and division of labour can significantly improve your work efficiency.	3.18	1.35	Normal
Total Average	**3.22**	**1.09**	**Normal**

It can be seen from the table that:

Frequent team conflicts (3.48): The mean value is the highest, indicating that the sample has the strongest perception of "frequent conflicts within the team", reflecting that the problem of contradictions in team collaboration in the work scenario under this dimension is relatively prominent.

Inefficient communication caused by chaotic organizational structure (2.86): The mean value is the lowest, indicating that the sample has a relatively weak perception of the pressure of "inefficient communication caused by chaotic organizational structure", or this phenomenon is not significant in actual work.

Mean values of the remaining items (2.86–3.48): The mean values of "unclear definition of job responsibilities and roles", "handling conflicts due to blurred responsibilities", and "clear process division of labor improves efficiency" are close, indicating that the sample has a relatively balanced perception of the derivative problems of organizational unclear.

Inefficient communication caused by chaotic organizational structure (S = 1.44): The standard deviation is the largest, indicating that there are significant differences in the perception of this item among the samples. Some groups have a high degree of recognition, while others are the opposite.

Frequent team conflicts (S = 1.25): The standard deviation is relatively small, and the sample has a high consistency in the perception of "frequent team conflicts", with concentrated recognition.

The total average mean value is 3.22, and the standard deviation is 1.09, with a level of "Normal", indicating that the overall work pressure related to "organizational unclear and conflicts" is within the normal range, and there is no extreme pressure state.

According to the data results in the table, the following preliminary conclusions can be drawn:

Characteristics of pressure distribution: The sample's perception of pressure on each subdivision item of "organizational unclear and conflicts" is at a normal level. Among them, "frequent team conflicts" is the most prominent source of pressure, while the perception of pressure of "inefficient communication caused by chaotic organizational structure" has the greatest difference.

Directions for management optimization: Intervention can be prioritized for "frequent team conflicts" (such as optimizing the team collaboration mechanism). At the same time, pay attention to the group differences of "inefficient communication caused by chaotic organizational structure", further investigate the reasons for the differences, and formulate targeted improvement measures.

Table 4: Factor Analysis of Individual Demands and Commitment Items

Individual demands and commitment	n = 314		
	$\bar{x}$	S.D	Level
1. There is a conflict between your job requirements and personal values.	2.74	1.32	Normal
2. You often have to make sacrifices between work and personal life.	3.21	1.44	Normal
3. You are willing to take the initiative to take on work tasks that go beyond the scope of your duties.	4.02	1.02	Normal
4. Your work has a positive impact on one's career development.	2.70	1.38	Normal
5. The current job requirements are highly compatible with your abilities.	2.82	1.30	Normal
Total Average	**3.10**	**0.94**	**Normal**

From the data analysis in the table, it can be concluded as follows: The sample size is (n = 314), and the data covers 5 dimensions of individual needs and commitment, all labeled at the Normal level, indicating no abnormal skewness in the data distribution. Among them, Dimension 3 (taking the initiative to assume responsibilities): The mean value ($\bar{x}$ = 4.02) is the highest, showing that employees actively perform in "taking the initiative to undertake work tasks beyond their responsibilities" and have a strong willingness to participate. Dimension 4 (positive impact of work on career development): The mean value ($\bar{x}$ = 2.70) is the lowest,

reflecting relatively low recognition among employees regarding work's promotion of career development. The total average ($\bar{x}$ = 3.10): The overall level is moderately above average, indicating a passable comprehensive state of individual needs and commitment.

For the standard deviation (S) analysis: In Dimension 3 (S = 1.02), the standard deviation is the smallest, with low data dispersion, meaning employees' attitudes in this dimension are highly consistent. The standard deviations of the remaining dimensions (1.30–1.44) are relatively high, indicating greater differences in employees' attitudes toward dimensions such as "sacrifices between work and personal life" and "conflicts between job requirements and personal values".

Initial conclusions drawn from the table data:

Employees excel in "taking the initiative to assume work tasks", and the organization can continue to incentivize this behavior. For the issue of low recognition of "the impact of work on career development", it is necessary to optimize the design of career development paths. Given the significant attitude differences in some dimensions, it is recommended to further explore employees' needs through research to enhance the pertinence of management.

Table 5: Factor Analysis of Influence related Projects at Work

Influence at work	n = 314		
	$\bar{x}$	S.D	Level
1. You have the right to participate in important decisions at work.	3.12	1.34	Normal
2. Your superiors will seriously consider your suggestions.	3.33	1.26	Normal
3. The results of your work contribute directly to the team's goals.	3.08	1.30	Normal
4. You have enough autonomy at work.	2.39	1.26	Normal
5. Your opinion is respected and valued in the team.	2.81	1.31	Normal
Total Average	**2.95**	**1.09**	**Normal**

From the data analysis in the table, the following can be concluded: The sample size is (n = 314), and all dimensions are labeled at the "Normal" level, indicating no abnormal skewness in the data distribution—results are representative.

Dimension 2 (superiors' serious consideration of suggestions): With the highest mean ($\bar{x}$ = 3.33), it shows employees believe their superiors highly value their suggestions, and the work opinion feedback mechanism is relatively effective. Dimension 4 (work autonomy): With the lowest mean ($\bar{x}$ = 2.39), it reflects employees' lower satisfaction with "work autonomy", possibly due to issues like insufficient work freedom or decisionmaking constraints.

The total average ($\bar{x}$ = 2.95): The overall perception is moderate, indicating employees' comprehensive sense of "influence at work" is average, with room for improvement.

Standard deviations of dimensions range from (1.26) to (1.34), showing relatively high data dispersion. Especially in Dimension 1 (S = 1.34) and Dimension 3 (S = 1.30), employees' feelings differ significantly regarding "the right to participate in important decisions" and "the direct contribution of work results to team goals"—some perceive strongly, while others weakly.

For "insufficient work autonomy" (Dimension 4), the organization can optimize the work authorization mechanism to grant more decision-making space.

For highdispersion dimensions (like decisionmaking participation and work contribution), research is advised to understand employees' diverse needs, followed by targeted management adjustments (e.g., strengthening communication, clarifying individual work value).

Continue the advantage of "superiors' serious consideration of suggestions", enhance employees' participation sense, and further boost their perception of work influence.

Table 6: Factor result Analysis of Projects on Work to Leisure Time Interference

Work to leisure time interference	n = 314		
	$\bar{x}$	S.D	Level
1. Work often encroaches on your rest or family time.	2.93	1.31	Normal
2. It's hard for you to be completely out of work during nonworking hours.	2.93	1.32	Normal
3. Your leisure activities are frequently cancelled or adjusted due to the demands of work.	2.71	1.21	Normal
4. Work pressure prevents you from fully enjoying your leisure time.	2.76	1.27	Normal
5. Achieving a worklife balance is crucial for you.	2.63	1.28	Normal
Total Average	**2.79**	**1.17**	**Normal**

Based on the data in the table, it can be seen that for Items 1 and 2 (work encroaching on restfamily time, difficulty in disengaging from work during nonworking hours), the mean values are both (2.93), at a relatively high level. This indicates that employees generally believe work obviously encroaches on rest and family time, and they are still affected by work during nonworking hours, making it hard to completely disengage. For Item 5 (the importance of worklife balance), the mean value is the lowest ($\bar{x}$ = 2.63), but it still reflects employees'

strong demand for "worklife balance", indirectly showing that the current balance state has not fully met the demand. The total average ($\bar{x}$ = 2.79) is at a moderate level overall, indicating that the interference of work on leisure time is a common issue, though it has not reached an extremely severe degree.

For Item 3 (leisure activities adjusted due to work), the standard deviation is the smallest (S = 1.21), and employees have a high consistency in perception of this dimension—meaning most people agree that work often leads to the cancellation or adjustment of leisure activities. The standard deviations of the remaining dimensions (1.27–1.32) are relatively balanced, indicating that employees have little difference in perception of various specific interference scenarios (such as work pressure affecting leisure experience) and are generally troubled by similar issues.

Part 3: Analysis of Survey Results on Job Satisfaction among Teachers at Qingdao Huanghai University

Researchers analyzed the survey data on the job satisfaction of teachers at Qingdao Huanghai University and used descriptive statistical methods to dissect the data. The results of the mean value ($\bar{x}$) and the standard deviation (S) are shown in Tables 7 to 10 respectively.

Table 7: The mean values and standard deviations of teachers' job satisfaction, overall factors, and all factors

Job Satisfaction	n = 314		
	$\bar{x}$	S.D	Level
Satisfaction with coworkers	2.16	0.87	Normal
satisfaction with parents	2.07	0.79	Normal
satisfaction with students	2.32	0.86	Normal
Total Average	**2.23**	**0.65**	**Normal**

Data analysis in the table reveals:

Satisfaction with students: With the highest mean ($\bar{x}$ = 2.32), it shows teachers are most satisfied with work experiences at the student level, reflecting positive teacherstudent interactions or teaching feedback.

Satisfaction with parents: With the lowest mean ($\bar{x}$ = 2.07), it indicates teachers' relatively low satisfaction with parent-related work (such as communication and collaboration), suggesting potential pain points in homeschool cooperation.

Total average ($\bar{x}$ = 2.23): The overall satisfaction remains at a moderate level, implying room for enhancing teachers' job satisfaction.

Total average (S = 0.65): The smallest standard deviation reflects low data dispersion in overall satisfaction, showing high consistency in teachers' perception of job satisfaction. Standard deviations of subdivided dimensions (0.79–0.87) are balanced. Notably, "satisfaction with parents" has a relatively lower standard deviation (S = 0.79), indicating minimal perceptual differences—teachers commonly share similar dissatisfaction with homeschool cooperation.

Table 8: Analysis of Data Results on Factors of Satisfaction with Co – workers

Satisfaction with Co – workers	n = 314		
	$\bar{x}$	S.D	Level
1. You have a good relationship with your colleagues and are supportive of each other.	2.15	1.02	Normal
2. Colleagues can collaborate efficiently to complete team tasks.	2.51	1.06	Normal
3. You trust your colleagues' professional skills and work attitude.	2.29	1.09	Normal
4. The communication channels within the team are open and transparent.	2.23	1.02	Normal
5. Your colleagues respect and recognise your work contributions.	2.37	1.08	Normal
Total Average	**2.38**	**0.86**	**Normal**

According to the data analysis in the table, it can be seen that:

Item 2 (colleagues collaborating to complete tasks): With the highest mean value ($\bar{x}$ = 2.51), it indicates that teachers consider the collaboration efficiency among colleagues relatively high, and the team's task execution ability is recognized.

Item 1 (colleague relationship and support): With the lowest mean value ($\bar{x}$ = 2.15), it shows that teachers' satisfaction with the "intimacy and mutual support in colleague relationships" is relatively low, and the team's emotional bond may need strengthening.

Total average ($\bar{x}$ = 2.38): Overall, it is at a moderate level, reflecting that there is room for improvement in colleagues' satisfaction, though the basic collaboration experience is passable.

Total average (S = 0.86): With the smallest standard deviation, the data dispersion of overall satisfaction is low, meaning teachers' perception consistency of colleagues' satisfaction is relatively high. Standard deviations of each subdivided dimension (1.02–1.09) are relatively balanced. Among them, Item 3 (S = 1.09) has a slightly higher standard deviation, indicating certain individual perceptual differences among teachers regarding "trust in colleagues' professional skills and work attitude".

Table 9: Analysis of Data Results on Factors of satisfaction with parents

satisfaction with parents	n = 314		
	$\bar{x}$	S.D	Level
1. Your parents understand and support your career choice.	2.23	1.03	Normal
2. Your work schedule has not negatively affected family relationships.	2.50	1.05	Normal
3. You can effectively communicate with your parents about the pressures and challenges at work.	2.35	1.04	Normal
4. Your parents are proud of your career achievements.	2.28	1.12	Normal
5. There is less conflict between work and family responsibilities.	2.43	1.08	Normal
Total Average	**2.38**	**0.87**	**Normal**

As can be seen from the data analysis in the table:

Item 2 (Impact of work schedule on family relationships): With the highest mean value ($\bar{x}$ = 2.50), it indicates that teachers believe the negative impact of work arrangements on family relationships is relatively small, and their satisfaction with the "balance between work and family relationships" is relatively high.

Item 1 (Parents' understanding and support for career choice): With the lowest mean value ($\bar{x}$ = 2.23), it reflects that teachers perceive relatively insufficient understanding and support from parents regarding their career choices, possibly due to communication or cognitive differences.

Total average ($\bar{x}$ = 2.38): Overall, it is at a moderate level, indicating that teachers' comprehensive satisfaction with "parentsrelated aspects" is average, and there is still room for improvement.

Total average (S = 0.87): The standard deviation is the smallest, with low data dispersion for overall satisfaction, showing that teachers' perception consistency of parentsrelated satisfaction is relatively high.

Among the standard deviations of each subdivided dimension (1.03–1.12), Item 4 (Parents' pride in career achievements) has the highest standard deviation (S = 1.12), indicating that teachers have significant differences in perception regarding "parents' pride in their career achievements"—some teachers perceive it strongly, while others perceive it weakly.

Table 10: Analysis of Data Results on Factors of satisfaction with students

satisfaction with students	n = 314		
	$\bar{x}$	S.D	Level
1. Your interactions with studentstrainees make you feel fulfilled and satisfied.	2.03	1.03	Normal
2. Studentstrainees give positive feedback on your guidance or teaching.	2.47	1.15	Normal
3. You can clearly feel the respect and trust of the students.	2.50	1.04	Normal
4. Your work has a significant positive impact on the growth of students.	2.18	1.12	Normal
5. You are willing to devote more time to helping students solve problems.	2.43	1.08	Normal
Total Average	**2.28**	**0.97**	**Normal**

From the data analysis in the table, it can be seen that:Item 3 (feeling the respect and trust of students): With the highest mean value ($\bar{x}$ = 2.50), it indicates that teachers clearly feel the respect and trust from students, and the emotional bond between teachers and students is relatively close.Item 1 (sense of achievement from interactions with students): With the lowest mean value ($\bar{x}$ = 2.03), it reflects that teachers' satisfaction in "gaining a sense of achievement from interactions with studentstrainees" is relatively insufficient, possibly due to issues such as insufficient interaction depth or feedback on results.Total average ($\bar{x}$ = 2.28): Overall, it is at a moderate level, indicating that there is room for improvement in teachers' satisfaction at the student level, though some dimensions perform well.

Total average (S = 0.97): The standard deviation is the smallest, with low data dispersion for overall satisfaction, showing that teachers' perception consistency of satisfaction with students is relatively high.Among the subdivided dimensions, Item 2 (student feedback): With the highest standard deviation (S = 1.15), it indicates that teachers have significant differences in perception regarding "positive feedback from students on guidanceteaching" some teachers receive more feedback, while others receive less.

Discussion on the correlation between work stress and job satisfaction of teachers in Qingdao Huanghai University

In order to understand the relationship between work stress and job satisfaction of teachers at Qingdao Huanghai University, the Pearson correlation coefficient was obtained using statistical analysis methods. In the analysis, the researchers defined the symbols used in data analysis as follows:

R = Pearson correlation coefficient of the mean

		Work stress	Job satisfaction
Work stress	Pearson Correlation	1	-.725
	Sig. (2-tailed)		≤0.001
	N	314	314
Job satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	-.725	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	≤0.001	
	N	314	314
The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two- tailed) .			

According to the data in the table, there is a weak negative correlation between work stress and job satisfaction of teachers at Qingdao Huanghai University (r = -0.725), which is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

7. Discussions

This study shows that different dimensions of work stress have important impacts on job satisfaction. Based on general research patterns and the logic of this study, it is inferred that teacher work stress and job satisfaction usually show a negative correlation—i.e., the greater the work stress, the lower the job satisfaction may be. Conversely, when stress is within a controllable range, it is more conducive to maintaining relatively high job satisfaction. In this study, teachers' work stress in various dimensions is generally at a "Normal" level, without showing extremely high pressure, which provides a foundation for maintaining job satisfaction at a normal level. If the stress exceeds the normal range (such as overwork), it may negatively affect satisfaction by influencing teachers' emotions and work experiences. Overall, the research results are consistent with existing literature, emphasizing the importance of adopting appropriate work stress management in educational institutions to create good job satisfaction.

8. Recommendations

1) Implement flexible work arrangements to reduce work-to-leisure time interference, the dimension identified as the most prominent stressor.

2) "Explore the use of wearable stress-monitoring devices among teachers to collect real-time data on work stress levels.

3) In the short term, institutions should implement stress management workshops; in the long term, longitudinal studies should be conducted to observe dynamic stress patterns.

4) Given that 'work to leisure time interference' had the highest mean score among stress dimensions, immediate strategies to promote work-life balance are essential.

9. Acknowledgment

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to everyone I encountered throughout my studies. First and foremost, I extend my heartfelt thanks to my supervisor, Dr.Dhriwit Assawasirisilp, for her invaluable guidance, unwavering support, and insightful feedback during my academic journey. I am also deeply appreciative of all the teachers who shared their knowledge and expertise, whose encouragement significantly contributed to my progress.

I am truly grateful to my classmates for their support and camaraderie, both academically and in everyday life. Last but certainly not least, I would like to express my sincere thanks to my family for their endless love, understanding, and encouragement. Their unwavering support has been a constant source of strength, and for this, I am profoundly grateful.

10. References

Avanzi, L., Miglioretti, M., Velasco, V., Balducci, C., Vecchio, L., Fraccaroli, F., & Skaalvik, E. M. (2013). Cross-validation of the Norwegian Teacher's Self-Efficacy Scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 31*(1), 69–78.

Bermejo-Toro, L., Prieto-Ursúa, M., & Hernández, V. (2016). Towards a model of teacher well-being: Personal and job resources involved in teacher burnout and engagement. *Educational Psychology, 36*(3), 481–501.

Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2012). School climate and social-emotional learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(4), 1189–1204.

García-Carmona, M., Marín, M. D., & Aguayo, R. (2019). Burnout syndrome in secondary school teachers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Social Psychology of Education, 22*(1), 189–208.

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology, 43*(6), 495–513.

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(3), 741–756.

Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review, 53*(1), 27–35.

Liu, S., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2012). Chinese teachers' work stress and their turnover intention. *International Journal of Educational Research, 53*, 160–170.

McCarthy, C. J., Lambert, R. G., & Reiser, J. (2014). Vocational teachers' coping resources and job satisfaction. Teaching and Teacher Education, 40, 55–66.

Qingdao Huanghai University. (2024). About us. Retrieved from [Qingdao Huanghai University official website] (http://www.qdhhxy.edu.cn/)

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(4), 1059–1069.

Travers, C. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1996). *Teachers under pressure: Stress in the teaching profession. Routledge.*

Wang, H., Hall, N. C., & Taxer, J. L. (2019). Antecedents and outcomes of teachers' emotional labor: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 31*(3), 663–698.

Yin, H., Huang, S., & Wang, W. (2016). Work environment characteristics and teacher well-being: The mediation of emotion regulation strategies. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 13*(9), 907.

Zembylas, M., & Papanastasiou, E. C. (2004). Job satisfaction among school teachers in Cyprus. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(3), 357–374.

Zhao, X., Selman, R. L., & Haste, H. (2022). How teacher stress links to job satisfaction: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion. Teaching and Teacher Education, 119, 103856.