Staff Stressors as Predictors of Teacher Efficacy among Lecturers

Yi-Xuan Tang[1], Ying-Leh Ling[2], Sheue-Nee Chang[3]

[1]SEGi University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

[2, 3]Politeknik Kuching Sarawak, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

This study examines the predictive relationship between staff stressors and teacher efficacy among lecturers in private higher education institutions in the Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region of China. A quantitative cross-sectional survey was conducted involving 407 full-time lecturers from three private higher education institutions. Staff stressors were measured across six dimensions: recognition, perceived organisational practices, factors intrinsic to teaching, financial inadequacy, home/work interface, and new challenges, while teacher efficacy was assessed in terms of instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. Data were analysed using SPSS 27.0 and Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) in SmartPLS 4.0. The findings indicated that staff stressors were at a moderate level ($M = 3.18$, $SD = .764$), with new challenges recording the highest mean ($M = 3.45$, $SD = .982$). Teacher efficacy was also moderate ($M = 2.83$, $SD = .709$). More importantly, staff stressors were a significant negative predictor of teacher efficacy ($\beta = -.616$, $t = 18.705$, $p < .001$), explaining 45.6% of the variance in teacher efficacy ($R^2 = .456$). The findings indicate that higher perceived work-related stressors are associated with lower confidence among lecturers in performing their teaching roles. Guided by the Job Demands–Resources model, the study highlights the importance of reducing excessive job demands and strengthening institutional support to sustain lecturers' teaching efficacy.

Keywords: Staff stressors; teacher efficacy; lecturers; private higher education; Job Demands–Resources model; PLS-SEM

INTRODUCTION

Lecturers in higher education are expected to perform increasingly complex roles that extend beyond classroom teaching. Their responsibilities commonly include curriculum development, student supervision, assessment, research and publication, administrative work, institutional quality assurance, community engagement, and continuous professional development. In private higher education, these responsibilities are often performed under conditions of tighter resources, market pressure, student recruitment demands, and performance-based evaluation. Such conditions can create sustained job demands that affect lecturers' psychological well-being and their confidence in performing core teaching responsibilities.

Occupational stress among educators is particularly important because teaching is an interpersonal and cognitively demanding profession. Stress does not merely affect the individual lecturer; it can influence instructional decisions, interactions with students, willingness to innovate, persistence when students encounter learning difficulties, and the overall quality of the learning environment. Excessive workload, insufficient administrative support, role ambiguity, limited resources, job insecurity, and competing work-family responsibilities have all been identified as potential sources of stress in educational settings (Agyapong et al., 2022; Han et al., 2020; Nwoko et al., 2023). In Chinese private higher education institutions, these demands may be intensified by institutional competition, resource constraints, performance requirements, and pressure to balance teaching and research.

Teacher efficacy provides an important lens through which the consequences of these demands can be understood. Teacher efficacy refers to educators' beliefs about their capacity to influence student learning, manage classrooms, engage students, and implement effective instructional strategies. Strong efficacy beliefs are associated with persistence, adaptive instructional behaviour, professional commitment, and positive student outcomes (Burić & Kim, 2020; Daumiller et al., 2021). Conversely, prolonged exposure to difficult

working conditions may erode confidence and reduce the psychological resources that lecturers need to respond effectively to instructional challenges.

Although teacher stress and teacher efficacy have been widely studied, evidence from private higher education in less-developed regions of China remains comparatively limited. The institutional conditions of private higher education differ from those of public universities, particularly in relation to resource availability, employment security, workload distribution, research support, and managerial practices. These contextual differences justify focused empirical investigation rather than assuming that findings from public institutions or school settings apply equally to private universities.

This paper therefore isolates one central relationship from the broader doctoral study: the predictive association between staff stressors and teacher efficacy. The analysis is guided by the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, which proposes that high job demands consume physical and psychological resources and, when not balanced by adequate resources, may result in exhaustion and impaired functioning (Bakker & Demerouti, 2023). Examining this direct relationship provides evidence that can assist institutional leaders in identifying whether stressors represent merely an employee well-being concern or a substantive factor associated with lecturers' teaching efficacy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Staff Stressors in Higher Education

Stressors are conditions or demands that require individuals to expend physical, cognitive, or emotional resources to cope. Within universities, stressors can arise from the structure of academic work itself as well as from the organisational environment. Han et al. (2020) conceptualised university teachers' job demands and resources as important antecedents of exhaustion, engagement, and job satisfaction. The academic role is especially susceptible to cumulative demands because teaching, research, service, and administrative responsibilities often occur simultaneously and compete for limited time.

The Sources of Faculty Stress Scale developed by Leung et al. (2000) provides a multidimensional view of faculty stress. In the present study, staff stressors are represented by six dimensions: recognition, perceived organisational practices, factors intrinsic to teaching, financial inadequacy, interface of home/work, and new challenges. Recognition concerns experiences such as being undervalued, inadequate performance feedback, and limited opportunities for advancement or development. Perceived organisational practices include role ambiguity, conflicting demands, inadequate guidance, weak social support, favouritism, organisational climate, and insufficient consultation. Factors intrinsic to teaching include tight schedules, clerical work, marking demands, teaching hours, and student appraisal. Financial inadequacy reflects limited research grants and insufficient financial assistance for further study. Home/work interface captures the intrusion of academic work into family and private life. New challenges include student quality and the requirement to keep pace with new techniques, ideas, technologies, and innovations.

These stressors are relevant to contemporary higher education because institutional change has accelerated the rate at which lecturers must adapt. Digital transformation, new pedagogies, quality assurance systems, changing student expectations, and performance metrics can create a continuing job demand. Research has also linked workload and institutional pressures to burnout and reduced occupational well-being (Agyapong et al., 2022; Klusmann et al., 2022). In private institutions, the pressure may be amplified when organisational expectations rise faster than the resources available to academic staff.

Teacher Efficacy

Teacher efficacy is commonly understood as a teacher's belief in his or her capability to organise and execute actions required to achieve desired teaching outcomes. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) conceptualised teacher efficacy across three domains: efficacy for instructional strategies, efficacy for classroom management, and efficacy for student engagement. Instructional strategies refer to confidence in selecting, adapting, and applying appropriate teaching and assessment methods. Classroom management concerns the ability to

establish routines, manage disruptive behaviour, and create an orderly learning environment. Student engagement refers to confidence in motivating learners, supporting struggling students, encouraging critical thinking, and helping students value learning.

Efficacy beliefs matter because they influence how lecturers interpret challenges and how much effort they are willing to invest when difficulties occur. Teachers with stronger efficacy are generally more persistent, more willing to experiment with instructional approaches, and more confident in responding to difficult classroom situations. Burić and Kim (2020) showed that teacher emotions and self-efficacy are reciprocally related, while other studies have linked efficacy with instructional quality, engagement, and professional well-being. Teacher efficacy is therefore not simply a personal attitude; it is a professional resource with implications for teaching behaviour and student learning.

Staff Stressors and Teacher Efficacy

The relationship between staff stressors and teacher efficacy can be explained through resource depletion. When lecturers face persistent demands such as excessive workload, conflicting responsibilities, inadequate support, or uncertainty, substantial cognitive and emotional resources are directed toward coping with those demands. Fewer resources remain available for lesson preparation, instructional innovation, student support, and reflective teaching. Over time, the experience of being unable to meet competing expectations may weaken lecturers' beliefs that they can successfully influence learning outcomes.

Empirical evidence generally supports a negative association between stressful working conditions and teacher efficacy. Han et al. (2021) reported meaningful relationships among faculty stressors, teacher efficacy, engagement, and teaching satisfaction. Klusmann et al. (2022) further demonstrated the educational consequences of emotional exhaustion by linking it to instructional quality and student outcomes. However, the magnitude and nature of the relationship can vary according to the type of stressor, individual coping resources, organisational support, and institutional context. This makes context-specific testing necessary, particularly in private higher education institutions where workload, resources, and employment structures may differ substantially from public-sector settings.

Theoretical Framework: Job Demands–Resources Model

The Job Demands–Resources model provides the principal theoretical explanation for the hypothesised relationship. The JD-R model distinguishes job demands from job resources. Job demands are aspects of work that require sustained effort and are therefore associated with physiological or psychological costs. Job resources, in contrast, help employees achieve work goals, reduce demands, or stimulate growth and development (Bakker & Demerouti, 2023). The model predicts a health-impairment process in which excessive demands deplete energy and increase exhaustion.

Applied to higher education, workload, administrative requirements, role conflict, insufficient recognition, work-family interference, and constant adaptation can function as job demands. When these demands accumulate, lecturers may experience resource loss and emotional exhaustion. Teacher efficacy may consequently be lower when lecturers perceive that fewer psychological resources are available to manage classrooms, engage students, and implement instructional strategies effectively. The model therefore provides a theoretically coherent basis for expecting staff stressors to negatively predict teacher efficacy.

Research Objective and Hypothesis

The objective of this paper is to examine whether staff stressors significantly predict teacher efficacy among lecturers in private higher education institutions.

H1: Staff stressors are significantly and negatively associated with teacher efficacy among lecturers.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Setting

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design. The research setting comprised three private higher education institutions in the Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region of China. The institutions represented different institutional profiles, including applied talent development, humanities and social sciences, and internationalisation within an ethnic-region higher education context. The design was appropriate for estimating the levels of the constructs and testing their predictive association at a defined point in time; it was not intended to establish temporal order or causality.

The target population consisted of 1,890 full-time lecturers across the three participating institutions. The population sizes were 639, 523, and 728 lecturers, respectively. Random sampling with proportional allocation was used to obtain representation across institutions and faculties. Based on the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) approach, the minimum required sample was approximately 320. To account for unusable questionnaires, 480 questionnaires were distributed. After data screening, 407 valid responses were retained for analysis.

Measures

Staff stressors were measured using an adapted Sources of Faculty Stress Scale (SFSS) based on Leung et al. (2000). The instrument covered six dimensions: recognition, perceived organisational practices, factors intrinsic to teaching, financial inadequacy, home/work interface, and new challenges. Items were rated on a five-point scale, with higher scores indicating stronger perceived sources of stress. The instrument included stressors such as feeling undervalued, role ambiguity, conflicting demands, excessive clerical work, heavy marking and teaching loads, inadequate research grants, work intruding into family life, and pressure to keep up with new techniques and technologies.

Teacher efficacy was assessed using the Chinese version of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES-C), based on Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). The 24-item measure comprised three eight-item domains: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. Responses were recorded on a five-point scale. The questionnaire was adapted to the Chinese lecturer context, and a back-translation process was used to strengthen linguistic consistency.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were generated using SPSS version 27.0. The measurement and structural models were assessed using SmartPLS version 4.0 and Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). The structural analysis focused on the direct path from staff stressors to teacher efficacy. Statistical significance was evaluated through bootstrapping, using the criteria of $t > 1.96$, $p < .05$, and a 95% confidence interval that did not include zero. Model explanatory power was evaluated using the coefficient of determination (R^2).

RESULTS

Descriptive Results for Staff Stressors

The overall staff stressor score was moderate (M = 3.18, SD = .764). Among the six dimensions, new challenges recorded the highest mean (M = 3.45, SD = .982) and was the only dimension classified at a high level. Perceived organisational practices (M = 3.32, SD = .959) and home/work interface (M = 3.29, SD = .967) followed, indicating that institutional practices and the spillover of work into personal life were important sources of pressure. Factors intrinsic to teaching recorded M = 3.24 (SD = .969), financial inadequacy M = 2.96 (SD = .988), and recognition M = 2.88 (SD = .953).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for staff stressors (N = 407)

Dimension	Mean	SD	Level
Recognition	2.88	0.953	Moderate

Perceived organizational practices	3.32	0.959	Moderate
Factors intrinsic to teaching	3.24	0.969	Moderate
Financial inadequacy	2.96	0.988	Moderate
Home/work interface	3.29	0.967	Moderate
New challenges	3.45	0.982	High
Overall staff stressors	3.18	0.764	Moderate

Descriptive Results for Teacher Efficacy

Teacher efficacy was moderate overall (M = 2.83, SD = .709). Instructional strategies had the highest mean (M = 2.91, SD = .821), followed by student engagement (M = 2.81, SD = .904). Classroom management recorded the lowest mean (M = 2.75, SD = .890). The pattern indicates that lecturers were relatively more confident in planning and implementing instruction than in managing classroom challenges, although all three domains remained within the moderate range.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for teacher efficacy (N = 407)

Dimension	**Mean**	**SD**	**Level**
Instructional strategies	2.91	0.821	Moderate
Classroom management	2.75	0.89	Moderate
Student engagement	2.81	0.904	Moderate
Overall teacher efficacy	2.83	0.709	Moderate

Common Method Bias

Because all variables were collected from the same respondents at the same time, common method bias was assessed using Harman's single-factor test. An unrotated exploratory factor analysis produced 10 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. The first factor accounted for 35.23% of the total variance, below the study's 40% criterion, indicating that a single factor did not dominate the covariance among the measures. Nevertheless, Harman's test is a limited diagnostic; therefore, common method bias cannot be ruled out completely, and the findings should be interpreted cautiously.

Measurement Model Assessment

The reflective first-order constructs demonstrated satisfactory indicator reliability and internal consistency. Outer loadings ranged from .819 to .894 for the six staff-stressor dimensions and from .759 to .853 for the three teacher-efficacy dimensions. Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability exceeded .70 for every first-order construct, while all first-order AVE values exceeded .50. For the second-order teacher-efficacy construct, Cronbach's alpha was .938 and composite reliability was .944. Its AVE was .446, below the conventional .50 benchmark; this represents a limitation, although the strong composite reliability and satisfactory lower-order loadings provide supporting evidence of internal consistency.

Table 3. Reliability and convergent-validity results for constructs used in the present analysis (N = 407)

Construct	**Loading range**	**Cronbach's α**	**CR**	**AVE**
Recognition (REC)	.847–.858	.906	.930	.727
Organizational practices (POP)	.819–.862	.903	.928	.721
Factors intrinsic to teaching (FIT)	.867–.878	.894	.926	.759
Financial inadequacy (FI)	.875–.881	.854	.911	.773
Home/work interface (HWI)	.857–.878	.889	.923	.750

New challenges (NC)	.873–.894	.861	.915	.782
Instructional strategies (IS)	.759–.824	.918	.933	.635
Classroom management (CM)	.797–.853	.922	.938	.682
Student engagement (SE)	.802–.849	.912	.931	.694
Teacher efficacy (TE)	—	.938	.944	.446

Discriminant validity was supported by the heterotrait–monotrait ratio. The HTMT value between the second-order staff-stressor and teacher-efficacy constructs was .648, below the .90 criterion. Across the relevant first-order constructs, HTMT values ranged from .394 to .668, also below .90.

Staff stressors were specified as a reflective–formative higher-order construct. Collinearity among its six dimensions was not problematic: VIF values ranged from 1.816 to 2.003, below the 3.3 criterion. The outer weights were FI = .321 ($p < .001$), FIT = .201 ($p = .023$), HWI = .179 ($p = .036$), NC = .141 ($p = .111$), POP = .159 ($p = .059$), and REC = .262 ($p = .002$). Although the weight for new challenges was not significant, its indicator loadings exceeded .70; it was therefore retained on theoretical and measurement grounds.

Table 4. Formative assessment of the staff-stressor higher-order construct (N = 407)

Dimension	**VIF**	**Outer weight**	**p**
FI	1.816	.321	< .001
FIT	1.842	.201	.023
HWI	2.003	.179	.036
NC	1.998	.141	.111
POP	1.898	.159	.059
REC	1.860	.262	.002

Predictive Relationship between Staff Stressors and Teacher Efficacy

The PLS-SEM analysis showed that staff stressors were significantly and negatively associated with teacher efficacy. The standardised path coefficient was β = −.616. Bootstrapping produced a t-value of 18.705 and p < .001. The 95% confidence interval ranged from −.684 to −.557 and therefore did not include zero. The hypothesis that staff stressors negatively predict teacher efficacy was supported.

Table 5. Structural model predictive relationship.

Predictive path	**β**	**Mean**	**SD**	***t***	***p***	**95% CI**
SS → TE	−.616	−.623	.033	18.705	< .001	[−.684, −.557]

The coefficient of determination for teacher efficacy was $R^2 = .456$. Thus, the staff stressor construct explained 45.6% of the variance in teacher efficacy in the tested model. This represents meaningful in-sample explanatory power for a behavioural and educational outcome and indicates that staff stressors are an important statistical predictor of lecturers' efficacy beliefs in the present sample.

As an additional predictive-relevance assessment in the broader thesis model, PLSpredict yielded positive Q^2predict values for all 21 teacher-efficacy indicators (.146–.216). The PLS-SEM RMSE was lower than the linear-model benchmark for every indicator, suggesting high out-of-sample predictive power for teacher efficacy in the broader model. Because that model also included credible feedback, these results provide supplementary evidence and should not be attributed solely to the direct staff-stressor path examined in this paper.

DISCUSSION

The central finding is that staff stressors are significantly and negatively associated with teacher efficacy among lecturers in private higher education institutions in Ningxia. The magnitude of the path coefficient (β =

−.616) indicates that higher exposure to staff stressors is associated with substantially lower teacher efficacy. This result is consistent with broader literature showing that persistent job demands, emotional exhaustion, and adverse organisational conditions can weaken teachers' professional functioning and confidence (Han et al., 2021; Klusmann et al., 2022).

The result can be interpreted through the JD-R model. Academic work requires lecturers to continuously invest cognitive, emotional, and temporal resources. When demands remain high, these resources are progressively depleted. A lecturer who must simultaneously manage heavy teaching schedules, administrative work, student expectations, performance evaluation, research demands, and family responsibilities may have less energy available for instructional planning, classroom problem-solving, and student engagement. Repeated experiences of resource insufficiency may therefore be associated with weaker beliefs among lecturers that they can perform teaching tasks successfully.

The descriptive findings provide additional insight into the structural result. New challenges emerged as the strongest stressor dimension. This suggests that adaptation itself has become a significant source of pressure. Lecturers are expected to keep pace with new technologies, pedagogical innovations, institutional reforms, and changing student profiles. When institutions introduce new requirements without sufficient training, time, technical support, or opportunities for gradual adjustment, change can be experienced as an additional burden rather than a professional resource. This may be especially consequential for efficacy because successful adaptation is closely tied to lecturers' confidence in using instructional strategies and responding to unfamiliar classroom demands.

Perceived organisational practices and the home/work interface also recorded comparatively high mean scores. Organisational stressors such as role ambiguity, conflicting demands, inadequate guidance, limited social support, and insufficient consultation may reduce lecturers' sense of control over their work. The home/work interface indicates that academic demands extend beyond formal working hours. When research, marking, preparation, or administrative tasks regularly intrude into personal and family time, opportunities for recovery are reduced. The JD-R model suggests that insufficient recovery contributes to resource depletion and makes employees more vulnerable to the negative effects of subsequent job demands.

The moderate overall level of teacher efficacy is also noteworthy. Lecturers reported the greatest efficacy in instructional strategies and the lowest in classroom management. This pattern suggests that lecturers may retain reasonable confidence in subject-related and instructional competencies while feeling less confident about managing behavioural, motivational, or classroom-process challenges. Because stress consumes attention and emotional regulation resources, classroom management may be particularly vulnerable when lecturers are already overloaded. Difficult classroom interactions can also create a feedback loop in which stress weakens efficacy, and lower efficacy makes classroom difficulties feel more demanding.

The finding that staff stressors explain 45.6% of the variance in teacher efficacy indicates a practically meaningful relationship between the perceived work environment and efficacy beliefs within the present sample. Teacher efficacy is often treated primarily as an individual psychological characteristic that should be strengthened through professional development. The present results indicate that institutional conditions must also be considered. Training lecturers to become more confident may have limited impact if organisational systems continue to generate excessive, conflicting, or poorly supported demands. Efficacy development should therefore combine individual capability building with organisational interventions that address the sources of stress.

At the same time, the results should not be interpreted as evidence that every form of pressure is harmful. The stressor profile shows that some demands may be experienced differently across individuals and contexts. Challenge demands can sometimes stimulate learning and development when lecturers possess adequate resources, autonomy, support, and time. The problem arises when demands exceed available resources or are perceived as obstructive, uncontrollable, or unfair. Institutional stress management should consequently focus not only on reducing workload numerically but also on improving the design, clarity, support, and perceived fairness of academic work.

IMPLICATIONS

Implications for Higher Education Management

The findings indicate that institutional leaders should treat staff stressors as a teaching-quality issue rather than solely as an employee wellness issue. Given the significant predictive association observed, policies that reduce unnecessary demands may help create conditions that support teaching efficacy, although the cross-sectional evidence does not establish that such policies will cause improvements. Institutions should review administrative procedures, reporting requirements, meeting loads, duplicated documentation, and non-teaching duties that consume lecturers' time without clear educational value.

New challenges require particular attention. When institutions introduce new technologies, curriculum requirements, assessment systems, or performance expectations, lecturers should receive structured training, technical assistance, realistic transition periods, and opportunities to practice. Change management that is accompanied by adequate resources is more likely to be interpreted as professional development rather than as an additional stressor.

Perceived organisational practices can be improved through clearer role expectations, transparent decision-making, consistent communication, accessible leadership, and fair workload allocation. Institutions should also strengthen mechanisms for lecturers to raise workload concerns and participate in decisions that directly affect teaching. Such practices can increase perceived control and reduce uncertainty, two conditions that are likely to protect professional efficacy.

The home interface suggests the need for workload policies that recognise recovery time. Leaders should monitor expectations surrounding after-hours communication, marking, research, and administrative deadlines. Flexible scheduling and realistic workload planning may help prevent academic responsibilities from continuously extending into personal life.

Implications for Lecturer Development

Professional development should be aligned with the stressors lecturers actually experience. Programmes on instructional technology, classroom management, student engagement, time management, and adaptive coping may be especially useful. However, such programmes should not shift responsibility for systemic workload problems entirely onto individuals. Individual coping strategies are most effective when supported by an organisational environment that provides adequate resources.

Because classroom management recorded the lowest efficacy mean, institutions may consider targeted support for managing diverse student needs, motivation, disruptive behaviour, and difficult classroom situations; the effectiveness of such support should be evaluated prospectively. Peer observation, mentoring, teaching communities, and practice-based workshops can provide lecturers with opportunities to build mastery experiences, which are central to efficacy development.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The study has several limitations. First, the cross-sectional design captures relationships at one point in time and cannot establish temporal or causal ordering. Although the structural model supports a predictive association, longitudinal research is required to determine whether increases in staff stressors precede subsequent reductions in teacher efficacy. Reciprocal effects are also plausible; lecturers with lower efficacy may perceive certain job demands as more stressful.

Second, the study relied entirely on self-report questionnaire data collected from the same respondents at one point in time. Although self-report is appropriate for assessing perceived stressors and efficacy beliefs, common method variance, social-desirability bias, and other response tendencies may have inflated or attenuated the observed association. The present data do not permit these sources of bias to be ruled out. Future studies should combine survey measures with interviews, workload records, classroom observations, student

feedback, or institutional administrative data. They should also apply procedural remedies, such as temporal separation, source separation, anonymity assurances, and counterbalanced item ordering, together with an appropriate statistical assessment of common method bias.

Third, the sample was drawn from three private higher education institutions in Ningxia. The region has distinctive economic, institutional, and cultural characteristics, and the findings should therefore be generalised with caution to public universities, institutions in more developed Chinese regions, or higher education systems in other countries. Multi-region and cross-national studies would help establish the robustness of the relationship.

Future research could also examine the six stressor dimensions as separate predictors of the three domains of teacher efficacy and report complete measurement-model evidence, including indicator loadings, Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, average variance extracted, and HTMT ratios, together with suitable model-fit and out-of-sample predictive-relevance indicators. Such a model would provide more actionable evidence by identifying, for example, whether organisational practices are particularly associated with classroom management efficacy or whether new challenges are more strongly associated with instructional-strategy efficacy. Longitudinal and mixed-method designs would further clarify how lecturers interpret and respond to different types of demands over time.

CONCLUSION

This study provides cross-sectional evidence of a substantial negative predictive association between staff stressors and teacher efficacy among lecturers in private higher education institutions in the Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region of China. Staff stressors were moderate overall, while new challenges emerged as the most prominent stressor. Teacher efficacy was also moderate, with instructional strategies rated highest and classroom management lowest. Most importantly, staff stressors were significantly and negatively associated with teacher efficacy ($\beta = -.616$, $t = 18.705$, $p < .001$), and the model explained 45.6% of the variance in teacher efficacy; this result should not be interpreted as evidence of causality.

The findings are consistent with the JD-R proposition that sustained job demands may deplete the resources required for effective professional functioning. For private higher education institutions, the findings suggest that efforts to support teacher efficacy should extend beyond individual training. It also requires attention to how academic work is organized, supported, communicated, and resourced. Reducing avoidable stressors, supporting adaptation to new challenges, improving organizational practices, and protecting lecturers' capacity to recover from work demands can create conditions in which lecturers are more able to sustain confidence in their teaching and respond effectively to students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge the lecturers from the participating private higher education institutions in the Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region who contributed their time and responses to the study. Their participation made this research possible.

REFERENCES

1. Abós, A., Sevil-Serrano, J., Kim, L. E., Klassen, R. M., & García-González, L. (2019). How should stressors be examined in teachers? Answering questions about dimensionality, generalizability and predictive effects using the Multicontext Stressors Scale. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16(18), 3388. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16183388
2. Agyapong, B., Obuobi-Donkor, G., Burback, L., & Wei, Y. (2022). Stress, burnout, anxiety and depression among teachers: A scoping review. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(16), 10460. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191610460
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2023). Job Demands–Resources theory: Ten years later. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10, 25–53.

4. Burić, I., & Kim, L. E. (2020). Teachers' emotions and self-efficacy: A test of reciprocal relations. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 1650. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01650
5. Chen, J., Cheng, H., Zhao, D., Zhou, F., & Chen, Y. (2022). A quantitative study on the impact of working environment on the well-being of teachers in China's private colleges. Scientific Reports, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-07246-9
6. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). SAGE.
7. Daumiller, M., Janke, S., Hein, J., Rinas, R., Dickhäuser, O., & Dresel, M. (2021). Do teachers' achievement goals and self-efficacy beliefs matter for students' learning experiences? Learning and Instruction, 101458. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2021.101458
8. Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using R: A workbook. Springer Nature.
9. Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. European Business Review, 31(1), 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203
10. Han, J., Perron, B. E., Yin, H., & Liu, Y. (2021). Faculty stressors and their relations to teacher efficacy, engagement and teaching satisfaction. Higher Education Research & Development, 40(2), 247–262. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1756747
11. Han, J., Yin, H., Wang, J., & Zhang, J. (2020). Job demands and resources as antecedents of university teachers' exhaustion, engagement and job satisfaction. Educational Psychology, 40(3), 318–329. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2019.1674249
12. Hu, J., Liu, H., Chen, Y., & Qin, J. (2018). Strategic planning and the stratification of Chinese higher education institutions. International Journal of Educational Development, 63, 36–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.03.003
13. Klusmann, U., Aldrup, K., Roloff, J., Lüdtke, O., & Hamre, B. K. (2022). Does instructional quality mediate the link between teachers' emotional exhaustion and student outcomes? Journal of Educational Psychology, 114(6), 1442. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000703
14. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30(3), 607–610. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308
15. Leung, T., Siu, O. L., & Spector, P. E. (2000). Faculty stressors, job satisfaction, and psychological distress among university teachers in Hong Kong: The role of locus of control. International Journal of Stress Management, 7(2), 121–138. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009584202196
16. Liu, Y., & Liao, W. (2019). Professional development and teacher efficacy: Evidence from the 2013 TALIS. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 30(4), 487–509. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2019.1612454
17. Nwoko, J. C., Emeto, T. I., Malau-Aduli, A. E. O., & Malau-Aduli, B. S. (2023). A systematic review of the factors that influence teachers' occupational wellbeing. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20(12), 6070. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20126070
18. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. Teaching and Teacher Education, 17(7), 783–805.