



Concept Note

Beyond Correlation: Proposing a Dual-Pillar Framework for Teacher Support Based on the Paradoxical Disconnect Between Well-being and Resilience

Dr. Nilda V. San Miguel

Oogong Elementary School

Department of Education, Sta. Cruz Sub-Office, Laguna, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Teacher well-being and resilience are widely recognized as central to teacher retention, instructional effectiveness, and overall school health (Akbar & Mauna, 2020; Beltman, 2021). Yet, the assumption that well-being and resilience are linearly correlated has rarely been interrogated. This concept note emerges from a recent empirical study on teachers in the Lumban Sub-Office, Division of Laguna revealing high levels of both well-being and resilience but no significant statistical correlation between them (Pascual & San Miguel, 2021; San Miguel, 2022). This paradox calls for a conceptual shift. The paper will introduce a Dual-Pillar Framework, positioning well-being and resilience as distinct but complementary pillars of teacher support. Pillar 1, Systemic Well-being, emphasizes institutional conditions such as workload management, positive school culture, and wellness initiatives. Pillar 2, Capacity for Resilience, focuses on skill-building, cognitive reframing, and spiritual meaning-making as internal adaptive capacities. By examining the paradox through a theoretical and practical lens, this article aims to guide policymakers and school leaders toward more nuanced, effective teacher support systems. While previous studies have underscored the importance

ARTICLE HISTORY

Editor-in-Chief:

Marie Paz E. Morales, PhD

Received:

October 10, 2025

Revised:

October 19, 2025

Accepted:

October 28, 2025

KEYWORDS:

Teacher Well-being, Teacher Resilience, Dual-Pillar Framework, Systemic Support in Education, Adaptive Capacity

of these constructs, few have critically examined their relationship as independent yet interconnected domains. This proposed article aims to address this gap by re-theorizing the connection, or lack thereof, between well-being and resilience. It will also situate the argument within the broader context of global education reform, emphasizing the implications of this paradox for both teacher development and educational quality.

Introduction

The global education sector is facing a critical challenge in teacher retention and instructional effectiveness. Across systems, teacher well-being and resilience are viewed as crucial for sustaining high-quality teaching and learning (Akbar & Mauna, 2020; Beltman, 2021). Policymakers and institutions invest heavily in well-being programs, assuming that these efforts automatically strengthen teacher resilience (Mansfield et al., 2016). However, emerging empirical evidence, including data from the Lumban Sub-Office, challenges this assumption (Pascual & San Miguel, 2021). Despite high levels of both well-being and resilience, the absence of a statistical correlation suggests that they may function as independent constructs. This problem is of both theoretical and practical importance, as interventions designed under a flawed assumption may fail to meet teachers' actual needs (Truzoli et al., 2021). In many systems, teacher well-being programs are implemented as a single strategy to strengthen resilience. However, these efforts often lack a nuanced understanding of how external supports and internal adaptive capacities interact. Teachers operate within complex ecosystems where institutional demands, community expectations, and personal values intersect. Recognizing the duality of well-being and resilience provides a stronger foundation for designing effective interventions.

Current support systems for teachers often rest on the untested assumption that improving well-being will automatically enhance resilience. This linear model overlooks the possibility that resilience can be sustained even in the absence of high well-being, or vice versa (Beltman, 2021). Such oversimplification can lead to interventions that strengthen one pillar while neglecting the other, resulting in partial or unsustainable support. This assumption can lead to misaligned interventions, where resources are invested in wellness initiatives without building teachers' adaptive capacities or addressing structural barriers. In under-resourced environments, teachers may depend on spiritual or communal resilience mechanisms to sustain their work, highlighting the inadequacy of single-pillar approaches.

This proposed article aims to:

- a. Present empirical evidence challenging the assumed well-being–resilience correlation;

- b. Introduce a novel Dual-Pillar Framework for conceptualizing teacher support; and
- c. Outline differentiated strategies for strengthening well-being and resilience as independent constructs.

Conceptual Framework/Theoretical Lens

This article critiques the prevailing assumption that resilience is a direct outcome of well-being. Building on the Conservation of Resources Theory (Hobfoll, as cited in Mansfield et al., 2016) and recent teacher resilience scholarship (Beltman, 2021; Mansfield et al., 2016), it proposes a dual-resource model in which well-being and resilience are sourced, maintained, and depleted through different mechanisms. Spiritual resilience, as highlighted in the empirical findings of Pascual and San Miguel (2021), may serve as an independent resource, allowing teachers to sustain their professional purpose even under conditions of low systemic well-being. This dual perspective acknowledges that well-being and resilience can coexist, intersect, or diverge depending on context. An educator might demonstrate resilience amid low systemic support by relying on internal resources such as purpose and faith. Conversely, a well-resourced environment may support well-being without necessarily enhancing adaptive resilience, especially in crisis situations.

Core Argument / Innovation

The core argument of this article is that the well-being–resilience relationship is not linear but multifaceted and parallel (Beltman, 2021). The innovation is the proposed Dual-Pillar Framework:

1. Pillar 1: Systemic Well-being — institutional support mechanisms such as workload management, wellness programs, and a positive school culture (Pascual & San Miguel, 2021).
2. Pillar 2: Capacity for Resilience — individual skill-building, meaning-making, and spiritual grounding (San Miguel, 2022).

The paradox of high well-being and high resilience with no correlation is evidence of the independence of these pillars, not an anomaly (Truzoli et al., 2021). The framework further argues for multi-level interventions that empower teachers to be active participants in their well-being and resilience-building processes. By integrating institutional reforms with personal development strategies, the Dual-Pillar Framework provides a balanced, sustainable approach to teacher support.

Discussion

This section will examine what it means for teachers to experience resilience without well-being, or well-being without resilience. The risks of hidden struggles, emotional burnout, and unaddressed systemic issues will be explored (Mansfield et al., 2016). The strong role of spiritual resilience found in the study underscores the need for approaches that honor teachers' internal capacities without overburdening them (Pascual & San Miguel, 2021). The framework will be contextualized for resource-constrained and high-demand environments typical in Global South educational systems (San Miguel, 2022). For instance, teachers in marginalized communities may display remarkable perseverance despite inadequate infrastructure and systemic support. Their resilience often draws on intrinsic motivations, social bonds, and spiritual beliefs. However, such resilience can be eroded over time if systemic well-being remains neglected. Likewise, in well-resourced environments, insufficient resilience training can leave teachers vulnerable when faced with unexpected disruptions.

Implications

The findings of this study highlight important implications for both research and practice. The paradox between well-being and resilience calls for a rethinking of current approaches to teacher support. Researchers and practitioners can design more targeted interventions that strengthen both systemic and individual capacities.

For Research: The article calls for a paradigm shift in measuring well-being and resilience as separate dependent variables. Future studies should explore how long-term resilience is sustained when well-being is low (Beltman, 2021).

For Practice: Policymakers and school leaders should adopt differentiated support strategies:

- Wellness days, peer support groups, and workload management to strengthen systemic well-being (Pascual & San Miguel, 2021);
- Resilience training, mentoring, and spaces for reflective practice to build adaptive capacities (Mansfield et al., 2016).

Leaders must be trained to assess and support both pillars independently. Expanding this research agenda can contribute to more robust theoretical models and practical applications. Future studies might include longitudinal tracking, comparative cultural analyses, and mixed-method approaches to better capture the dual dynamics of well-being and resilience. In addition, training programs should equip educational leaders with tools to detect early warning signs of teacher distress, even when resilience appears outwardly strong. This proactive stance can help prevent burnout and strengthen both systemic well-being and personal resilience in tandem.

Conclusion

The future of robust educational systems depends on moving beyond simplistic support models. By recognizing well-being and resilience as distinct but equally essential pillars, school systems can design more responsive and humane teacher support programs (Beltman, 2021). The Dual-Pillar Framework offers a conceptual and practical pathway for sustainable teacher development, ultimately benefiting learners and communities (Pascual & San Miguel, 2021). Ultimately, the Dual-Pillar Framework urges educational stakeholders to move from reactive, fragmented solutions toward integrated, proactive approaches. Such a paradigm acknowledges the complexity of teaching as both a profession and a vocation, elevating the discourse on teacher support to a more strategic and sustainable level.



References

- Akbar, Z., & Mauna, M. (2020). Protective factors for teacher resilience in elementary special educations. *Journal of Education Research*, *12*(3), 45–59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4108/eai.30-11-2020.2303753>
- Beltman, S. (2021). Understanding and examining teacher resilience from multiple perspectives. In C. F. Mansfield (Ed.), *Cultivating teacher resilience* (pp. 11–26). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-5963-1_2
- Mansfield, C. F., Beltman, S., Broadley, T., & Weatherby-Fell, N. (2016). Building resilience in teacher education: An evidence-informed framework. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *54*, 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.11.016>
- Pascual, E. A., & San Miguel, N. V. (2021). School culture and teachers' work values. *International Journal of Research Publications*, *84*(1), 196–208. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP100841920212225>
- San Miguel, N. V. (2022). School leaders' resilience amidst pandemic in the District of Victoria. *International Journal of Research Publications*, *92*(1), 657–672. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP100921120222742>
- Truzoli, R., Pirola, V., & Conte, S. (2021). The impact of risk and well-being on online teaching experience in high school Italian teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *37*(6), 1515–1530. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12533>