

This is a repository copy of *Gauging the Realities of Occupational Wellbeing and Training in scHools (GROWTH): A Survey on the Experiences and Needs of School Leaders, Teachers, and Teaching Assistants in England*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/202305/>

Version: Published Version

---

## Other:

Kim, Lisa [orcid.org/0000-0001-9724-2396](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9724-2396), Crellin, Sarah and Ding, Charly (2023) Gauging the Realities of Occupational Wellbeing and Training in scHools (GROWTH): A Survey on the Experiences and Needs of School Leaders, Teachers, and Teaching Assistants in England. UNSPECIFIED.

---

## Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

## Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



# **Gauging the Realities of Occupational Wellbeing and Training in scHools (GROWTH):**

## **A Survey on the Experiences and Needs of School Leaders, Teachers, and Teaching Assistants in England**

Dr Lisa E. Kim  
Dr Sarah Crellin  
Charly Ding

Department of Education, University of York, UK



Funded by the University of York's Internal Funding

19 July 2023

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Executive Summary</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Background	5
2.2. Aim and Research Questions	5
2.2.1. Occupational Wellbeing	5
2.2.2. Continuing Professional Development	5
<b>3. Methods</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1. Participants	6
3.2. Procedure	6
3.3. Materials	6
3.3.1. Career intention	6
3.3.2. Occupational wellbeing	6
3.3.3. Continuing Professional Development (CPD)	7
3.4. Data analysis	7
3.4.1. Quantitative data analysis	7
3.4.2. Qualitative data analysis	7
<b>4. Results</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1. School characteristics	8
4.2. Career Intentions	8
4.2.1. Leaving the school and job	9
4.2.2. Continuing in the same/similar role at the current school	9
4.2.3. Seeking a promotion at the current school	11
4.2.4. Moving to a different school for the same/similar job	11
4.2.5. Moving to a different school for a promotion	12
4.2.6. Retire	12
4.3. Reasons to stay	13
4.3.1. What helped staff to stay in the job?	13
4.3.2. What would help staff to stay in the job?	14
4.3. Professional and occupational wellbeing support	15
4.4. Continuing Professional Development	16
4.4.1. Previous CPD	16
4.4.2. CPD and its impact	17
4.4.3. Future CPD	18
4.4.4. Barriers to CPD	19
4.5. Additional comments on occupational wellbeing and CPD	20
<b>5. Discussion</b>	<b>21</b>
5.1. Occupational wellbeing and career intentions	21
5.1.1. Job satisfaction	21
5.1.2. Burnout	21
5.1.3. Reasons to stay	22

5.2. Professional and occupational wellbeing support	22
5.3. Continuing Professional Development (CPD)	23
5.3.1. Previous CPD	23
5.3.2. CPD and its impact	24
5.3.3. Future CPD	24
5.3.4. Barriers to CPD	24
5.4. Recommendations for policy and practice	25
<b>6. Resources</b>	<b>26</b>
6.1. Infographic on occupational wellbeing	26
6.2. Infographic on CPD findings	26
6.3. Animation on teacher wellbeing	26
<b>7. References</b>	<b>27</b>

## 1. Executive Summary

The Gauging the Realities of Occupational Wellbeing and Training in schools (GROWTH) project was led by the researchers at the University of York (Dr Lisa E. Kim, Dr Sarah Crellin and Charly Ding) with four co-production partners: Emma-Jane Birley (Coast and Vale Learning Trust), Jane Elsworth (Huntington Research School), Mari Palmer (North Yorkshire Coast Research School), Andrew Young (Pathfinder Teaching School Hub).

As part of the GROWTH project, an anonymous survey on occupational wellbeing and professional development needs was administered to school staff, focusing specifically on senior leaders, middle leaders, teachers and teaching assistants in May-June 2023. The 179 participants were 30 senior leaders (10 males, 20 females), 33 middle leaders (10 males, 22 females, 1 other), 62 teachers (21 males, 40 females, 1 other), and 54 teaching assistants (TA; 8 males, 46 females) around England, though mostly (75%) from North Yorkshire and York.

We found that career intentions of school staff were associated with different wellbeing factors, most consistently with job satisfaction and burnout. That is, job satisfaction was positively correlated with one's intention to stay in the same school and same job, negatively correlated with one's intention to move to a different school for the same job, and negatively correlated with one's intention to move to a different school for a promotion (except for senior leaders). Additionally, burnout was positively associated with one's intention to leave the school and job for all groups (except for teachers), and negatively associated with one's intention to stay in the same school and same job for senior leaders and TAs. Unlike the other three staff groups, loneliness was negatively correlated with senior leaders' intention to stay in the same school and same job. Looking into loneliness further, experiences of loneliness were more prevalent for senior leaders than other groups. Specifically, 56.7% of senior leaders reported experiencing loneliness always/often (40%) or some of the time (16.7%). Moreover, all group staff groups indicated that they had continuing professional development (CPD) needs. This was particularly for TAs who indicated that they had not participated in many CPD opportunities compared to the other groups. Opportunities to learn more about staff and student wellbeing, and teaching special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) students was a prevalent need across the four staff groups.

Recommendations for policy and practice are discussed. Specifically, schools are advised to examine the occupational wellbeing state of its staff and collaboratively discuss the availability and efficacy of current sources support, and collaboratively examine developing strategies and providing resources/support that would most benefit each staff group. A focus on senior leaders may be particularly helpful, for example by creating opportunities and environments to reduce senior leaders' experiences of loneliness. Moreover, schools and CPD providers are advised to understand and discuss ways to meet the CPD needs of each staff group, particularly TAs who particularly sought CPD on teaching special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) students.

*Acknowledgement:* This research project was supported by the University of York's Internal Funding (The York Policy Engine, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Partnerships and Engagement's Funds).

## 2. Introduction

### 2.1. Background

Many school leaders, teachers, and teaching assistants in England are suffering from low wellbeing. For example, findings indicate that the mental health and wellbeing of school leaders and teachers declined throughout the pandemic (Kim et al., 2022), which is concerning given that wellbeing indicators like burnout causally predict lower self-efficacy (Kim & Burić, 2020) and are associated with intentions to quit the profession (Madigan & Kim, 2021). Though many surveys of teacher wellbeing exist, data that examines the occupational wellbeing of multiple school staff groups (senior leaders, middle leaders, teachers, and teaching assistants) are rare. Such an assessment will help with understanding the wellbeing landscape of school staff, which can be used to build future work on how to address these needs most effectively and in bespoke ways.

Moreover, continuing professional development (CPD) for school staff is an essential aspect of ensuring that staff are effective in their positions. International and national data of teachers' experiences of CPD are available through OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey findings (OECD, 2019a, 2019b, 2019c). Again, experiences and needs of CPD for multiple staff groups are rare. Such information will be helpful, to ensure CPD is developed and delivered on content that is needed by schools, and is useful, effective, and accessible to all schools.

Findings from this cross-sectional survey will help identify resources and strategies that may help promote school staff wellbeing at the individual-, school-, and local-level, as well as delivering CPD activities that are needed, useful, effective, and accessible for schools. The study was led by the researchers at the University of York and co-produced in partnership with the Pathfinder Teaching School Hub, Coast and Vale Learning Trust, Huntington Research School, and North Yorkshire Coast Research School.

### 2.2. Aim and Research Questions

The aim of the research project was to explore the experiences of occupational wellbeing and professional development and understand ways in which these could be supported to enhance the provision for school leaders (senior and middle), teachers, and teaching assistants.

The Research Questions are:

#### 2.2.1. *Occupational Wellbeing*

1. What is the current state of occupational wellbeing across the four staff groups (i.e., senior leaders, middle leaders, teachers, teaching assistants)?
2. What support is assisting them with their occupational wellbeing?
3. What future support may assist them in their occupational wellbeing?

#### 2.2.2. *Continuing Professional Development*

4. What are the CPD needs across the three staff groups in the region?
5. What are the barriers to engaging in CPD?

### 3. Methods

#### 3.1. Participants

After cleaning and filtering the data, the survey responses of 179 were analysed: 30 senior leaders (10 males, 20 females), 33 middle leaders (10 males, 22 females, 1 other), 62 teachers (21 males, 40 females, 1 other), and 54 teaching assistants (TA; 8 males, 46 females). The mean ages were: 46.45 ( $SD= 7.11$ ) for senior leaders, 41.06 ( $SD= 8.70$ ) for middle leaders, 36.05 ( $SD= 8.84$ ) for teachers and 43.91 ( $SD= 11.18$ ) for TA. The mean years of experience was: 11.70 ( $SD= 6.39$ ) for senior leaders, 9.47 ( $SD= 6.07$ ) for middle leaders, 9.58 ( $SD= 7.78$ ) for teachers, and 9.30 ( $SD= 7.17$ ) for TAs. The majority (75%) of the participants reported to work in the local authority areas of North Yorkshire ( $n=105$ ), York ( $n=29$ ) with a range of other responses, including Scarborough ( $n=7$ ), Amber Valley ( $n=3$ ), and Leeds ( $n=2$ ).

#### 3.2. Procedure

Participants were recruited using convenience sampling; through the use of social media, and the professional networks, channels and contacts of the researchers and the four co-production partners. Eligible participants were senior leaders, middle leaders, teachers and teaching assistants in the UK who were invited to respond to the anonymous 15-minute Qualtrics survey between 16 May until 16 June 2023. After the completion of the anonymous survey, they could provide their contact details to be entered into a lottery of winning one of thirty £70 Amazon vouchers. Ethical approval for this study was received from the Department of Education, University of York.

#### 3.3. Materials

##### 3.3.1. Career intention

Questions on career intentions were adapted from the Working Lives of Teachers project (Adams et al., 2023). Specifically, the items asked participants to indicate their intentions to: (a) leaving the school and job; (b) continuing in the same/similar role at the current school; (c) seeking a promotion at the current school; (d) moving to a different school for the same/similar job; (e) moving to a different school for a promotion, and (f) retire. Responses were given on a Likert scale from 1 (*extremely unlikely*) to 5 (*extremely likely*).

##### 3.3.2. Occupational wellbeing

**Occupational self-efficacy:** The questions from the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) were contextualised to examine the general self-efficacy participants in the workplace. There were 10 items, an example item was “I can always manage to solve difficult problems at work if I try hard enough”. Responses were given on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The outcome measure was the average score across the items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of occupational self-efficacy.

**Burnout:** The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI; Demerouti & Bakker, 2008) was used. The OLBI consisted of 16 items, measuring two components of burnout: exhaustion and disengagement. An example item measuring exhaustion was: “There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work”. An example item measuring disengagement was: “I always find new and interesting aspects in my work” (reverse-coded). Responses were given on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The outcome measures were the

average scores in exhaustion and disengagement, with higher scores indicating higher level of exhaustion and disengagement, respectively.

**Job satisfaction:** The Brief Job Satisfaction Measure II (Judge et al., 1998) was used. This measure consisted of 5 items, including "I feel fairly satisfied with my present job". Responses were given on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The outcome measure was the average score, with higher scores indicating higher levels of job satisfaction.

**Loneliness:** The three-item UCLA Loneliness Scale (Hughes et al., 2004) was used. This measure consisted of 3 items: including "How often do you feel isolated from others?" Responses were given on a scale of 1 (*hardly ever or never*), 2 (*some of the time*), and 3 (*often*). The outcome measure was the average score, with higher scores indicating higher levels of loneliness. Moreover, a qualitative question was asked: "When do you feel most lonely at work?"

### 3.3.3. Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

Questions on CPD were adapted from the Working Lives of Teachers project (Adams et al., 2023) and OECD's Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS; OECD, 2018). Namely, we examined the following questions:

**Past CPD:** participants were asked to select CPD activities they had attended in the last 12 months and the organiser of the events. Experience of organising CPD events was asked by a Yes-or-No question.

**Future CPD:** participants were asked to select CPD training they would like to receive in the next 12 months.

**CPD barriers:** participants were asked to select barriers that they would face in the next 12 months when participating in CPD.

**CPD impact:** participants were asked to indicate the kind of impact that CPD had on their professional effectiveness, occupational wellbeing, and intention to stay in the role. Responses were given on a Likert scale from 1 (*extremely negative*) to 5 (*extremely positive*).

## 3.4 .Data analysis

### 3.4.1. Quantitative data analysis

All quantitative data analyses were conducted using SPSS 28. All output was organised by participants' jobs in school (senior leader, middle leader, teacher and TA). For the measures of occupational wellbeing (i.e., self-efficacy, job satisfaction, burnout, and loneliness) and career intentions, descriptive statistics were computed for each of the four staff groups. To analyse the relationship between occupational wellbeing and career intentions, a Spearman correlation was conducted between each occupational wellbeing construct and career intentions. All statistically significant correlations ( $p < .05$ ) were reported in the relevant tables. For the CPD measures, frequencies and percentages of the selected response options were reported in the tables.

### 3.4.2. Qualitative data analysis

Open-questions from the survey responses were coded inductively using reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2021), and the frequencies of the themes were counted. Some of the themes were similar across questions while others were unique to the specific question.



## 4. Results

### 4.1. School characteristics

This section provides an overview of the different types of schools participants worked in as well as an overview of the responses to the occupational wellbeing measures used in the survey.

The most frequent types of school participants reported to work in were primary and secondary schools (38.5% each), followed by special schools (7.8%), junior schools (5.6%), colleges (5.0%), middle schools (2.2%), infant schools and others (1.1% each). A detailed summary of this information is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

*Types of school participants work in*

	Infant school	Primary school	Junior school	Middle school	Secondary school	College	Special school	Other
Senior leader	0	13	2	0	8	1	4	2
Middle leader	1	5	0	3	19	2	3	0
Teacher	0	24	7	0	24	5	2	0
TA	1	27	1	1	18	1	5	0
Total (%)	2 (1.1%)	69 (38.5)	10 (5.6%)	4 (2.2%)	69 (38.5%)	9 (5.0%)	14 (7.8%)	2 (1.1%)

The descriptive statistics for each measure are reported in Table 2 by participant's position in school.

Table 2

*Means and standard deviations for occupational wellbeing measures*

	Job satisfaction	Self-Efficacy	Burnout	Disengagement	Exhaustion	Loneliness
Senior leader	4.05 (0.82)	4.25 (0.58)	2.73 (0.77)	2.31 (0.81)	3.15 (0.82)	1.58 (0.59)
Middle leader	3.61 (0.90)	3.86 (0.71)	2.97 (0.58)	2.89 (0.69)	3.05 (0.67)	1.69 (0.54)
Teacher	3.50 (0.74)	3.88 (0.68)	2.85 (0.57)	2.63 (0.72)	3.06 (0.53)	1.63 (0.57)
TA	4.00 (0.72)	3.86 (0.56)	2.70 (0.61)	2.47 (0.68)	2.92 (0.68)	1.71 (0.59)

### 4.2. Career Intentions

This section focuses on school staffs' career intentions to: (a) leaving the school and job; (b) continuing in the same/similar role at the current school; (c) seeking a promotion at the current school; (d) moving to a different school for the same/similar job; (e) moving to a different school for a promotion, and (f) retire.

#### 4.2.1. Leaving the school and job

The results of staff intentions to leave the job and school are presented in Table 3 and the statistically significant correlations between occupational wellbeing and this intention is reported in Table 4.

Table 3

*Frequency and percentages: Q1 Intention to leave the job and school*

	Extremely unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Extremely likely
Senior leader	10 (33.3%)	4 (13.3%)	5 (16.7%)	7 (23.3%)	4 (13.3%)
Middle leader	11 (33.3%)	8 (24.2%)	7 (21.2%)	5 (15.2%)	2 (6.1%)
Teacher	14 (22.6%)	27 (43.5%)	12 (19.4%)	5 (8.1%)	4 (6.5%)
TA	18 (33.3%)	11 (20.4%)	12 (22.2%)	11 (20.4%)	2 (3.7%)

Table 4

*Statistically significant correlations between wellbeing and Q1 Intention to leave the job and school*

	Senior leader	Middle leader	Teacher	TA
Job satisfaction	-.57	-.60	-.50	-.59
Burnout	.70	.62		.41
Exhaustion	.75	.40		.33
Disengagement	.57	.63		.38

Job satisfaction was consistently and negatively correlated with the intention to leave the school for all four groups. For senior leaders, middle leaders and TAs, burnout and both of its components (exhaustion and disengagement) were positively correlated with this intention.

#### 4.2.2. Continuing in the same/similar role at the current school

The results of staff intentions to stay at the same school in the same job are presented in Table 5 and the statistically significant correlations between occupational wellbeing and this intention is reported in Table 6.

Table 5

*Frequency and percentages: Q2 Intention to stay for the same job*

	Extremely unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Extremely likely
Senior leader	3 (10.0%)	5 (16.7%)	3 (10.0%)	6 (20.0%)	13 (43.3%)
Middle leader	1 (3.0%)	9 (27.3%)	4 (12.1%)	7 (21.2%)	12 (36.4%)
Teacher	3 (4.8%)	19 (30.6%)	15 (24.2%)	15 (24.2%)	10 (16.1%)
TA	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	16 (29.6%)	17 (31.5%)	19 (35.2%)

Table 6

*Statistically significant correlations between wellbeing and Q2 Intention to stay in the same school and same job*

	Senior leader	Middle leader	Teacher	TA
Loneliness	-.43			
Job satisfaction	.63	.58	.33	.63
Burnout	-.66			-.43
Exhaustion	-.67			-.33
Disengagement	-.61			-.38

Job satisfaction was consistently and positively correlated with this intention across the four groups. For senior leaders and TAs, burnout and its two components (disengagement and exhaustion) were negatively correlated with their intention to stay. Interestingly, loneliness was negatively correlated with this intention only among senior leaders.

Given the interesting finding that loneliness was associated with intention to stay in the same job for senior leaders only (Table 6), we looked into the prevalence of the loneliness experience across the jobs (Table 7). We found that 56.7% of senior leaders reported feeling lonely always/often (40%) or some of the time (16.7%).

Table 7

*Frequency and percentages: Loneliness*

	Always/Often	Some of the time	Occasionally	Hardly ever	Never
Senior leader	12 (40%)	5 (16.7%)	8 (26.7%)	4 (13.3%)	1 (3.3%)
Middle leader	4 (12.1%)	10 (30.3%)	8 (24.2%)	7 (21.2%)	3 (9.1%)
Teacher	5 (8.1%)	22 (35.5%)	14 (22.6%)	15 (24.2%)	4 (6.5%)
TA	13 (24.1%)	7 (13.0%)	14 (29.6%)	16 (25.9%)	3 (5.6%)
Total (%)	34 (19.4%)	44 (25.1%)	44 (25.1%)	42 (24%)	11 (6.3%)

Looking at the qualitative responses on when they felt most lonely at work, senior leaders recognised that specific situations at work caused feelings of loneliness. Different types of isolation were identified to be associated with this experience, such as the location of the senior leader's office outside the main building, lone-working at night and not being able to socialise with other staff at lunchtime as "I never get lunch". Others highlighted the nature of the role and type of work as they were unable to speak to others due to the confidentiality of the matter/situation they might be dealing with. This also extended to "when sat marking or inputting data alone for long periods" or meeting tight deadlines. Finally, feeling and dealing with "extreme stress" also caused feelings of loneliness for senior leaders.

#### 4.2.3. Seeking a promotion at the current school

The results of staff intentions to stay at the same school for a promotion are presented in Table 8 and the statistically significant correlations between occupational wellbeing and this intention is reported in Table 9.

Table 8

*Frequency and percentages: Q3 Intention to stay for a promotion*

	Extremely unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Extremely likely
Senior leader	14 (46.7%)	4 (13.3%)	9 (30.0%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (6.7%)
Middle leader	6 (18.2%)	17 (51.5%)	4 (12.1%)	5 (15.2%)	1 (3.0%)
Teacher	9 (14.5%)	22 (35.5%)	21 (33.9%)	8 (12.9%)	2 (3.2%)
TA	15 (27.8%)	9 (16.7%)	14 (25.9%)	11 (20.4%)	5 (9.3%)

Table 9

*Statistically significant correlations between wellbeing and Q3 Intention to stay in the same school and for a promotion*

	Senior leader	Middle leader	Teacher	TA
Age	-.51			-.57
Burnout				-.28

Being younger was correlated with this intention for senior leaders and TAs, as was burnout for TAs.

#### 4.2.4. Moving to a different school for the same/similar job

The results of staff intention to move to a different school for the same job are presented in Table 10 and the statistically significant correlations between occupational wellbeing and this intention is reported in Table 11.

Table 10

*Frequency and percentages: Q4 Intention to move to a different school for the same job*

	Extremely unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Extremely likely
Senior leader	12 (40.0%)	11 (36.7%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)	4 (13.3%)
Middle leader	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.2%)	7 (21.2%)	8 (24.2%)	1 (3.0%)
Teacher	16 (25.8%)	22 (35.5%)	16 (25.%)	5 (8.1%)	3 (4.8%)
TA	18 (33.3%)	13 (24.1%)	15 (27.8%)	7 (13.0%)	1 (1.9%)

Table 11

*Statistically significant correlations between wellbeing and Q4 Intention to move to a different school for the same job*

	Senior leader	Middle leader	Teacher	TA
Job satisfaction	-.51	-.46	-.37	-.37
Self-Efficacy	-.49			
Burnout	.41			
Disengagement	.46	.52		
Age	-.48	-.38		

Job satisfaction was consistently and negatively correlated with this intention. For senior leaders and middle leaders, higher levels of disengagement and being younger were also correlated with this intention.

#### **4.2.5. Moving to a different school for a promotion**

The results of staff intentions to move to a different school for a promotion are presented in Table 12 and the statistically significant correlations between occupational wellbeing and this intention is reported in Table 13.

Table 12

*Frequency and percentages: Q5 Intention to move to a different school for a promotion*

	Extremely unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Extremely likely
Senior leader	13 (43.3%)	8 (26.7%)	4 (13.3%)	1 (3.3%)	4 (13.3%)
Middle leader	10 (30.0%)	11 (33.3%)	4 (12.1%)	6 (18.2%)	2 (6.1%)
Teacher	35 (56.5%)	10 (16.1%)	11 (17.7%)	6 (9.7%)	0
TA	22 (40.7%)	14 (25.9%)	8 (14.8%)	9 (16.7%)	1 (1.9%)

Table 13

*Statistically significant correlations between wellbeing and Q5 Intention to move to a different school for a promotion*

	Senior leader	Middle leader	Teacher	TA
Job satisfaction		-.52	-.39	-.22
Self-Efficacy			-.48	
Burnout			.26	
Disengagement		.46	.34	
Age	-.43	-.52		-.31

Job satisfaction was negatively correlated with this intention for all groups except for senior leaders. Being younger was correlated with this intention among senior leaders, middle leaders and TAs. For middle leaders and teachers, disengagement was positively associated with this intention. For teachers, self-efficacy was also negatively correlated with this intention.

#### **4.2.6. Retire**

The results of staff intentions to retire is presented in Table 14 and the statistically significant correlations between occupational wellbeing and this intention is reported in Table

15.

Table 14

*Frequency and percentages: Q6 Intention to retire*

	Extremely unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Extremely likely
Senior leader	18 (60.0%)	5 (16.7%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)	3 (10.0%)
Middle leader	17 (51.5%)	10 (30.3%)	3 (9.1%)	2 (6.1%)	0
Teacher	38 (61.3%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.7%)	8 (12.9%)	2 (3.2%)
TA	43 (79.6%)	5 (9.3%)	4 (7.4%)	0	1 (1.9%)

Table 15

*Statistically significant correlations between wellbeing and Q6 Intention to retire*

	Senior leader	Middle leader	Teacher	TA
Job satisfaction			-.52	-.28
Self-Efficacy			-.53	-.39
Burnout			.35	
Disengagement			.47	
Age	.54		.27	

Job satisfaction and self-efficacy were negatively correlated with this among teachers and TAs. For teachers and senior leaders, being older was associated with this intention. In addition, burnout (and disengagement) was positively correlated with this intention among teachers.

### 4.3. Reasons to stay

#### 4.3.1. What helped staff to stay in the job?

Six main themes emerged from the responses to the open-ended question on what has been the most helpful in increasing their intention to stay in their role during the last 12 months, which is presented in their order of frequency.

1. School support ( $n=32$ )
2. Sources of job satisfaction ( $n=14$ )
3. Personal and professional growth and development ( $n=14$ )
4. Other ( $n=11$ )
5. Personnel and structural changes ( $n=9$ )
6. Financial incentives and career progression ( $n=7$ )

Intra-school support was identified more frequently than inter-school support. Receiving support from senior leaders, teachers, governors, TAs and line managers were all identified as being helpful in increasing staff intentions to stay in their job. This was identified fairly evenly across all four staff groups.

Job satisfaction through experiencing feelings of success, feeling valued as part of the school ethos and culture were highlighted, particularly by senior leaders, as being helpful. However, within this category, working with students was considered to be the most helpful as staff (particularly TAs) either felt and/or believed they were “during [doing] something meaningful to young people” or that just being with students was enough to increase their intention to stay.

Continuing Professional Development (CPD) was recognised as being the most helpful within the theme of *personal and professional growth and development*. TAs most frequently identified the importance that CPD played in not only developing themselves but also supporting their intention to stay in their job.

Across all staff groups, some reported that nothing would make a difference in terms of helping to increase their intention to stay. This response was categorised as *other*. There could be many positive and negative reasons and factors for this answer but the responses did not give any additional information to clarify this.

As part of *personnel and structural changes*, a series of sub-themes were developed, which was evenly distributed in terms of frequency. These included: staff having already moved to a new school, increased administrative support, a new headteacher joining the school, schools getting back to normal (post-pandemic) and changes to time/workload through workload reduction, changing work patterns, and a better commute to and from work.

Interestingly, financial support (through a pay rise/increase) and career incentives (e.g., promotion) were identified as being the least helpful.

#### **4.3.2. What would help staff to stay in the job?**

Participants were also asked to identify what would be helpful in increasing their intentions to stay in their job over the next 12 months. Again, responses were categorised into six main themes, which is presented in their order of frequency:

1. Personnel and structural changes ( $n=19$ )
2. Effective support, communication and engagement ( $n=17$ )
3. Financial incentives and career progression ( $n=15$ )
4. Personal and professional growth and development ( $n=13$ )
5. Sources of job satisfaction ( $n=8$ )
6. Unsure ( $n=3$ )

This time *personnel and structural changes* was identified as being the most helpful thinking about intention to stay in the job over the next 12 months. Responses (particularly senior and middle leaders) identified strategies in reducing time/workload; namely, by having less contact time (teaching time), reduction in paperwork, more Senior Leadership Team (SLT) time, working contracted hours only and reducing their responsibilities. An increase in funding was also recognised as being potentially helpful to pay for more staff as well as provide much-needed classroom repairs.

School support was again identified as being helpful but this theme broadened to include effective communication and engagement. The focus remained on effective

intra-school support such as governor support as well as having opportunities to socialise with staff. Effective communication between staff and having leaders that listened were also recognised as key, particularly for TAs and teachers.

*Financial support and incentives* were recognised as being helpful over the next 12 months. Receiving a pay rise was identified more frequently particularly by TAs but also across all staff groups. Promotional opportunities were also highlighted by TAs, teachers and middle leaders.

Within *personal and professional growth and development*, CPD was recognised again as the most helpful within this theme. TAs once more recognised this more than any other group. However, it is important to note that this represents just a few responses in total ( $n=5$ ). Support for wellbeing in terms of “checking in on staff” as well as “praying” were also identified by a few staff ( $n=3$ ).

Within *sources of job satisfaction*, the school environment, ethos and positive culture were identified as helpful for senior leaders. However, for teachers and TAs the allocation of classes and understanding of the job were noted as helpful such as being designated “classes within specialism”, remaining in a specific year group (e.g., Y6) as well as being consulted on the job were all highlighted.

#### 4.3. Professional and occupational wellbeing support

This section focuses on the extent to which school staff agreed that they felt supported in their professional effectiveness (Table 16), occupational wellbeing (Table 17), and professional development (Table 18) at school.

Table 16

*Frequency and percentages: Professional effectiveness support*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Senior leader	0	2 (6.7%)	3 (10.0%)	14 (46.7%)	11 (36.7%)
Middle leader	2 (6.1%)	3 (9.1%)	8 (24.2%)	17 (51.5%)	3 (9.1%)
Teacher	0	6 (9.7%)	13 (21.0%)	37 (59.7%)	6 (9.7%)
TA	2 (3.7%)	7 (13.0%)	12 (22.2%)	21 (38.9%)	12 (22.2%)

Table 17

*Frequency and percentages: Occupational wellbeing support*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Senior leader	2 (6.7%)	3 (10.0%)	3 (10.0%)	14 (46.7%)	8 (26.7%)
Middle leader	1 (3.0%)	8 (24.2%)	9 (27.3%)	14 (42.4%)	1 (3.0%)
Teacher	0	9 (14.5%)	26	25 (40.3%)	2 (3.2%)



			(41.9%)		
TA	4 (7.4%)	7 (13.0%)	15 (27.8%)	18 (33.3%)	10 (18.5%)

Table 18

*Frequency and percentages: Professional development support*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Senior leader	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (6.7%)	16 (53.3%)	10 (33.3%)
Middle leader	2 (6.1%)	3 (9.1%)	9 (27.3%)	14 (42.4%)	5 (15.2%)
Teacher	3 (4.8%)	5 (8.1%)	13 (21.0%)	33 (53.2%)	8 (12.9%)
TA	3 (5.6%)	7 (13.0%)	15 (27.8%)	17 (31.5%)	12 (22.2%)

The pattern of responses for the feeling of being supported in professional effectiveness and professional development appeared to be similar. Generally, more than half of the participants reported feeling supported in the workplace. The support for occupational wellbeing, however, appeared to be lower than the other two types, though it was still close to or larger than the majority.

#### 4.4. Continuing Professional Development

##### 4.4.1. Previous CPD

This section focuses on school staffs' professional development (CPD); specifically on (a) the types of professional development activities undertaken by the participants over the last 12 months (Table 19), (b) the provider of the majority of external professional development activities undertaken over the last 12 months (Table 20), and (c) who organised, designed and delivered the in-school CPD (Table 21).

Table 19

*Frequency and percentages: Professional development activities last 12 months*

	Offline course	Online course	Conference	Qualification	Visit other schools	Visit other organisation	Peer/ self observation	Professional network	Professional literature
SL	27 (90.0%)	28 (93.3%)	19 (63.3%)	8 (26.7%)	22 (73.3%)	8 (26.7%)	16 (53.3%)	21 (70.0%)	21 (70.0%)
ML	29 (87.9%)	24 (72.7%)	16 (48.5%)	12 (36.4%)	11 (33.3%)	7 (21.2%)	21 (63.6%)	19 (57.6%)	11 (66.7%)
T	49 (79.0%)	47 (75.8%)	36 (58.1%)	13 (21.0%)	28 (45.2%)	9 (14.5%)	28 (45.2%)	21 (43.5%)	33 (53.2%)
TA	42	45	21	15	9	2	18	24	22

	(77.8%)	(83.3%)	(38.9%)	(27.8%)	(16.7%)	(3.7%)	(33.3%)	(44.4%)	(40.7%)
--	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	--------	---------	---------	---------

*Note:* SL = Senior Leader, ML = Middle Leader, T = Teacher, TA = Teaching Assistant.

Table 20

*Frequency and percentages: Provider of CPD*

	Own school/MAT/ Federation	Local Authority	Teaching School Hub	External Organisations
Senior leader	15 (50.0%)	6 (20.0%)	3 (10.0%)	3 (10.0%)
Middle leader	22 (66.7%)	5 (15.2%)	3 (9.1%)	2 (6.1%)
Teacher	29 (46.8%)	4 (6.5%)	28 (45.2%)	1 (1.6%)
TA	36 (66.7%)	5 (9.3%)	4 (7.4%)	4 (7.4%)

Table 21

*Frequency and percentages: Organising, designing and delivering CPD*

	Yes	No
Senior leader	29 (96.7%)	1 (3.3%)
Middle leader	25 (75.8%)	8 (24.2%)
Teacher	19 (29.0%)	43 (71.0%)
TA	9 (16.7%)	44 (83.3%)

The majority of CPD opportunities were from online and offline courses. Senior leaders tended to have participated in more CPD activities (63.0%) than other staff groups: middle leaders (54.2%), teachers (48.4%), and TAs (40.7%).

CPD was provided mostly in schools, MATs or federations. Teaching School Hubs were most accessed by teachers.

Senior and middle leaders tended to organise, design and deliver in-school CPD.

#### **4.4.2. CPD and its impact**

This section focuses on CPD impact in terms of professional effectiveness (Table 22), occupational wellbeing (Table 23,) and intention to stay (Table 24).

Table 22

*Frequency and percentages: Professional effectiveness*

	Extremely Negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Extremely Positive
Senior leader	0	1 (3.3%)	4 (13.3%)	17 (56.7%)	8 (26.7%)

Middle leader	0	7 (21.2%)	4 (12.1%)	19 (57.6%)	3 (9.1%)
Teacher	3 (4.8%)	7 (11.3%)	27 (43.5%)	22 (35.5%)	2 (3.2%)
TA	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.7%)	10 (18.5%)	29 (53.7%)	10 (18.5%)

Table 23

*Frequency and percentages: Occupational wellbeing*

	Extremely Negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Extremely Positive
Senior leader	1 (3.3%)	3 (10.0%)	7 (23.3%)	14 (46.7%)	5 (16.7%)
Middle leader	1 (3.0%)	1 (3.0%)	4 (12.1%)	16 (48.5%)	10 (30.3%)
Teacher	1 (1.6%)	5 (8.1%)	36 (58.1%)	16 (25.8%)	3 (4.8%)
TA	2 (3.7%)	0	20 (37.0%)	21 (38.9%)	9 (16.7%)

Table 24

*Frequency and percentages: Intention to stay*

	Extremely Negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Extremely Positive
Senior leader	0	1 (3.3%)	12 (40.0%)	11 (36.7%)	6 (20.0%)
Middle leader	0	2 (6.1%)	19 (57.6%)	9 (27.3%)	3 (9.1%)
Teacher	1 (1.6%)	4 (6.5%)	36 (58.1%)	16 (25.8%)	4 (6.5%)
TA	0	6 (11.1%)	23 (42.6%)	15 (27.8%)	8 (14.8%)

Overall, CPD seemed to have few negative consequences and was more effective in improving professional effectiveness than wellbeing or intention to stay.

#### 4.4.3. Future CPD

This section focuses on participants' responses to which area(s) they were in most need of professional development in the next 12 months (Table 25).

Table 25

*Frequency and percentages: CPD needs in the next 12 months*

	Safeguarding	Subject /Phase knowledge	SEND	Assessment	Curriculum design and planning	Classroom/Group management	Technology	Multicultural/multilingual setting	School culture	Student and staff mental health	Working with others	School management
SL	8 (26.7%)	7 (23.3%)	4 (13.3%)	4 (13.33%)	5 (16.7%)	2 (6.7%)	3 (10.0%)	1 (3.3%)	10 (33.3%)	9 (30.0%)	4 (13.1%)	7 (23.3%)
ML	1 (3.0%)	7 (21.2%)	8 (24.2%)	4 (12.12%)	9 (27.3%)	1 (3.0%)	5 (15.2%)	2 (6.1%)	5 (15.2%)	8 (24.2%)	6 (18.2%)	1 (3.0%)
T	7 (11.3%)	16 (25.8%)	25 (40.3%)	16 (25.81%)	22 (35.5%)	18 (29.0%)	9 (14.5%)	21 (33.9%)	20 (32.3%)	31 (50.0%)	15 (24.2%)	3 (4.8%)

TA	6 (11.1%)	10 (18.5%)	29 (53.7%)	5 (9.26%)	6 (11.1%)	8 (14.8%)	8 (14.8%)	7 (13.0%)	5 (9.3%)	19 (35.2%)	6 (11.1%)	2 (3.7%)
----	--------------	---------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	---------------	--------------	-------------

*Note:* SL = Senior Leader, ML = Middle Leader, T = Teacher, TA = Teaching Assistant.

Teachers listed the greatest number of CPD needs. The most needed CPD was developing and contributing to a positive school culture for the senior leaders, and curriculum design and planning for middle leaders. Student and staff mental health and teaching/supporting students with SEND were reported as the two most needed CPD by teachers and TAs and also notably by senior and middle leaders.

#### 4.4.4. Barriers to CPD

Finally, this section focuses on identified barriers staff are facing in participating in professional development activities over the next 12 months as reported in Table 26.

Table 26

*Frequency and percentages: Barriers to CPD*

	Time	Funding	Lack of cover	Cost of cover	Lack of opportunity	Lack of support from superior/colleague	No barriers
Senior leader	11 (36.7%)	13 (43.3%)	9 (30.0%)	7 (23.3%)	3 (10.0%)	0	6 (20.0%)
Middle leader	19 (57.6%)	14 (42.4%)	15 (45.5%)	14 (42.4%)	4 (12.1%)	6 (18.2%)	1 (3.0%)
Teacher	20 (32.3%)	25 (40.3%)	18 (29.0%)	14 (22.6%)	13 (21.0%)	19 (30.7%)	8 (12.9%)
TA	26 (48.2%)	22 (40.7%)	15 (27.8%)	6 (11.1%)	27 (50.0%)	11 (20.4%)	8 (14.8%)

Time and funding appeared to be consistent barriers to attending CPD. Middle leaders and TAs reported more barriers than the other staff groups.

Participants were asked (in an open-question) about CPD barriers they might have already faced or be facing over the next 12 months and what would help remove these. In total, six themes were identified which are highlighted below in order of frequency:

1. Finances and incentives ( $n=42$ )
2. Time and workload ( $n=15$ )
3. Cover, cost, choice and location ( $n=24$ )
4. School support and professional development opportunities ( $n=13$ )
5. External agencies ( $n=3$ )
6. Other ( $n=6$ )

*Finances and incentives* were identified as a way to remove the CPD barrier. Participants reported that schools receiving more or better funding would enable schools to invest in CPD opportunities and staff development. Teachers, senior leaders and TAs particularly recognised and identified this more than middle leaders.

Providing opportunities for staff to attend CPD such as allowing them time out of class as well as building in CPD opportunities outside of normal school hours were identified as ways to remove the barriers. This was particularly highlighted by middle leaders but also teachers and teaching assistants. Senior leaders did not feel this was a barrier to their own CPD instead they recognised workload and time wasting activities as being a barrier.

Providing staff *cover* was noted more frequently as a category within this theme. Being able to provide flexible cover to attend CPD was highlighted particularly by middle leaders. However, CPD costs were cited as a barrier with a suggestion of providing free CPD and training for staff, having a location closer to school or moving it to online CPD. Equally, it was identified that having more staff would help to remove the CPD barrier possibly as a way to provide more flexible cover.

In terms of the theme *school support and professional development opportunities*, receiving senior leader support and recognition was identified. For example, senior leaders recognising the value of CPD was suggested by TAs. This also tied in with teachers identifying the importance of planning in CPD opportunities as part of everyone's job.

Finally, *external agencies* such as Ofsted inspections and Local Authority (LA) activities (e.g., moderation and Ofsted preparation) were identified as barriers to accessing CPD by senior leaders.

#### **4.5. Additional comments on occupational wellbeing and CPD**

The very last question of the survey asked participants to identify whether there was anything else they might like to share about their occupational wellbeing and/or professional development needs and experiences. This question provided rich and varied data that has been themed into the following categories, which is presented in the order of frequency:

1. Increasing demands of role (*n*=23)
2. No (*n*=16)
3. Levels of job satisfaction (*n*=13)
4. Occupational wellbeing (*n*=9)
5. Financial issues (*n*=9)
6. Lack of support and provision (*n*=7)
7. Behaviour and attitudes (*n*=6)

The most frequently noted theme highlighted the *increasing demands placed on roles*. These varied from changes to role/levels of responsibility, workload and long hours, parental demands, under-resourcing and in-school demands such as SEND/safeguarding and school development priorities. Senior leaders and TAs particularly identified increasing demands on their roles.

*Levels of job satisfaction* varied. A few participants felt negativity as "I don't feel there's much to work for". Some were both positive and negative "I love my job but sometimes I feel I'm working on autopilot". A couple highlighted they were making plans to leave whilst one had recently joined the teaching profession from a "highly stressful job" and

another had moved from a teaching role to a TA role. TAs particularly highlighted levels of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

*Occupational wellbeing* highlighted the physical and emotional responses of particularly teachers and TAs. Participants referred to feelings of stress, anxiety, anger and worry. Some also highlighted the lack of occupational wellbeing at their school.

*Financial issues* related more to personal finances as well as the school budget. The low pay not keeping up with cost of living, pay deficits, redundancy, incorrect contractual claims, and pay not reflecting the level of responsibility were highlighted particularly by teachers and senior leaders. This corresponds with participants citing *financial and career progression* as helpful as part of intention to stay over the next 12 months ([see section 4.3.2.](#))

In-school *lack of support and provision* referred to CPD opportunities and unsupportive or less supportive staff. This theme also highlighted the lack of SEND provision and also the lack of support from external agencies such as the LA and Child and Mental Health Services (CAMHS).

Finally, a few participants highlighted issues surrounding *behaviour and attitudes* in schools. A lack of respect from parents, students and staff was identified by TAs as well as ineffective behaviour policies or limited sanctions was identified by TAs and senior leaders. One teacher also highlighted severe issues towards staff including verbal and physical abuse whilst another recognised issues towards other students including bullying and negative behaviour.

## 5. Discussion

This research provides some important findings in terms of understanding and identifying the needs and experiences of 179 senior leaders, middle leaders, teachers and teaching assistants (TAs). This is vital to further our understanding of how to effectively support school staff's occupational wellbeing as well as to meet their professional development needs both now and into the future.

### 5.1. Occupational wellbeing and career intentions

#### 5.1.1. Job satisfaction

The importance of high job satisfaction for staff career intentions was found. Specifically, for all staff groups (senior and middle leaders, teachers and TAs), job satisfaction was positively correlated with one's intention to stay in the same school and same job, negatively correlated with one's intention to move to a different school for the same job, and negatively correlated with one's intention to move to a different school for a promotion (except for senior leaders).

The qualitative data also reflects this finding as *sources of job satisfaction* were identified as the second most frequent theme in helping staff to stay in their jobs over the last 12 months. TAs identified working with students as a key aspect of their role providing job satisfaction. Senior leaders, meanwhile, recognised the importance of fostering a positive school environment and a culture of feeling valued. Therefore, ensuring all staff groups experience high levels of job satisfaction may help in school staff retention.

#### 5.1.2. Burnout

Similar to job satisfaction, though not as consistently across the four groups, burnout was positively associated with one's intention to leave the school and job for all groups (except for teachers), and negatively associated with one's intention to stay in the same school and same job for senior leaders and TAs. It is interesting that along a continuum of

position, role and pay, it is both senior leaders and TAs, at each end, who were less likely to stay at the school as a result of burnout.

These two staff groups also recognised an increase in the demands linked to their current jobs. Senior leaders particularly highlighted increased demands from others such as parents, in-school (e.g., SEND/ safeguarding, school development priorities) and external agencies (e.g., LAs, DfE and Ofsted). In contrast, TAs identified changes to their roles and responsibilities, workload demands and under-resourcing issues. These findings do not suggest that these two staff groups have reached burnout but instead are identifying the perceived changes to their roles, which may have placed increasingly more pressure on them. As a result, they may be more aware of how these increasing demands were impacting their role and how they were dealing with these. Thus, explorations of how staff occupational wellbeing can be supported, particularly for senior leaders and TAs who reported increased demand on their roles, are warranted.

Senior leaders were the only staff group in which loneliness was correlated with the intention to stay at the school in the same job. In total, 56.7% of senior leaders reported that they felt lonely at work at least some of the time. This was both an interesting and alarming finding. The qualitative data from senior leaders highlighted a range of circumstances as to when they felt lonely. This ranged from where the office was sited (e.g., outside the main building), the types of activities that created isolation (e.g., confidential issues, inputting data, lone-working at night) to physical responses such as stressful situations. Therefore, governors, senior leadership teams, and LAs should consider ways to reduce their experiences of loneliness.

### **5.1.3. Reasons to stay**

The qualitative data gives some clarification as to what could help increase staff's intentions. Firstly, *personnel and structural changes* were most frequently identified including: a reduction in workload/paperwork, having less contact (teaching) time, more senior leadership team time and only working contracted hours. In addition, more school funding was suggested to employ more staff. Effective intra-school support, communication and engagement was also identified such as: support from governors, opportunities to socialise with staff, having leaders who listen to their staff as well as effective communication channels within the school. Therefore, it is suggested that some school-level operational changes may be helpful to provide more effective levels of support and communication. However, to reduce some of the unnecessary bureaucracy being undertaken in schools, policymakers and schools should work together to identify and implement the necessary changes.

## **5.2. Professional and occupational wellbeing support**

Senior leaders reported the highest agreement in receiving support for professional effectiveness (83.4%), occupational wellbeing (73.4%), and professional development (86.6%) compared to middle leaders (61-69%), teachers (44-52%), and TAs (54-66%).

These findings highlight the disparity between senior leaders' and other school staffs' perceptions as to the effectiveness of support in place, which may be associated with the CPD provisions that are accessed but more likely the perceptions of effectiveness in supporting their needs. Senior leaders need to ensure they are aware of their staffs' views to ensure that the support in place is as effective as possible.

Out of the three types of support (professional effectiveness, occupational wellbeing and professional development), occupational wellbeing was perceived to be the least supported by teachers, TAs and middle leaders compared to the two professional types of support. This perhaps indicates the natural focus within schools on the development of professional skills to support the persons' professional role in comparison to the development of personal skills to support the individual person overall. This is further highlighted when triangulating the data with CPD needs over the next 12 months as student and staff mental health CPD was identified as being needed the most by teachers and then TAs (after SEND CPD).

In terms of occupational wellbeing support, fewer staff thought that this was effective which highlights a potential development gap. This was further highlighted through some of the qualitative comments about occupational wellbeing at school as staff expressed certain physical and emotional responses as to how they felt including stress, anxiety, anger, worry (e.g., don't want to get angry). A small number ( $n=3$ ) highlighted the lack of occupational wellbeing support and the importance of staff "checking in" to make sure others were feeling alright. Thus, considering the occupational wellbeing support that is in place in schools and ensuring their accessibility and effectiveness may need to be considered by school.

### **5.3. Continuing Professional Development (CPD)**

#### **5.3.1. Previous CPD**

The majority of CPD opportunities that participants reported undertaking were a mixture of online and offline courses. The greater uptake of online learning as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic appears to have continued beyond the pandemic with a mixture of both modes of CPD still being offered and thus undertaken. Senior leaders tended to have participated in more CPD activities whilst TAs tended to have participated in fewer CPD activities than any other staff group. This is an interesting finding given that TAs reported feeling the least supported in their professional development compared to other groups (54%), but identified professional development activities as being helpful in increasing their intention to stay in their job over the last 12 months as well as increasing their intention to stay over the next 12 months. Therefore, school leaders need to consider what types of professional development activities are available to their TAs and incorporate more opportunities over the next 12 months. Additionally, CPD providers need to consider the range and types of CPD and support in place for TAs so that they can develop their personal and professional skills to be more effective in their role that can then lead to greater job satisfaction.

Most CPD was accessed either through Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs), federations and/or own schools. This was mostly organised, designed and delivered by senior and middle leaders. This is not a surprising finding, as in-school CPD tends to be one of the tasks assigned to senior and middle leadership roles, with a Wellcome report on teacher CPD challenges recommending that it may be effective for schools to appoint a senior leader whose role is to look after the CPD needs of all school staff (Perry et al., 2022). There appeared to be little uptake of external CPD, with noted barriers to attending CPD including funding, providing and arranging cover to attend CPD as well as CPD costs. Interestingly, teachers were the only staff group to access a larger proportion of CPD from Teaching School



Hubs, perhaps as they are usually the focus of many CPD opportunities given the content and funding support focus.

### **5.3.2. CPD and its impact**

Overall, CPD seemed to be more effective in improving professional effectiveness than wellbeing or intention to stay. However, this is perhaps to be expected as middle leaders, teachers and TAs all perceived the support for professional development and professional effectiveness more positively (see [section 4.2.](#)) than occupational wellbeing support. Therefore, school leaders and CPD providers may wish to consider providing CPD on occupational wellbeing.

### **5.3.3. Future CPD**

School leaders identified CPD focused on developing the school culture as being needed the most over the next 12 months. School leaders also identified a positive school culture/ethos (e.g., feeling valued) as helpful in increasing their intention to stay in their role. Therefore, a positive school culture appears to be an important aspect to them personally and also in developing the school. For middle leaders, CPD focused on curriculum planning and design was identified. As most middle leaders are subject or pastoral leaders (Lipscombe et al., 2023), it is perhaps not surprising that this would be their main focus and need.

It is worth noting that student and staff wellbeing CPD and teaching SEND students were identified as a need across all staff groups (most notably teachers and TAs) but also middle and senior leaders. This is particularly in light of the finding that lack of in-school SEND support and provision was identified by senior leaders and another teacher identified the lack of external support from agencies such as Child and Mental Health Services (CAMHS).

CPD providers, whether in-school or out-of-school, should consider whether the training on offer meets the needs of all staff groups, and consider whether specific CPD opportunities should be provided to different staff groups in addition to providing whole-school staff training.

### **5.3.4. Barriers to CPD**

Time and funding appeared to be consistent barriers to participation in CPD across the staff groups. Middle leaders and TAs reported more barriers than any other staff group. Finances and incentives ( $n=42$ ) were identified as the main way in which to remove CPD barriers. Across all staff groups, an increase in school funding to “invest” in CPD was suggested as well as more practical issues such as having more flexible cover to release staff, providing Planning, Preparation and Assessment (PPA) time for Advanced TAs as well as building in reflection time for staff. Providing free CPD or reducing CPD costs as well as thinking about more online CPD events and, if in person, considering the location of the event were also highlighted. Therefore, policymakers should consider providing additional funding that can be spent on staff CPD, including money to provide the relevant cover, and school governors and senior leadership teams ring-fencing funds to use for CPD purposes.

#### 5.4. Recommendations for policy and practice

In regard to occupation wellbeing:

1. Though (close to) the majority of participants reported receiving occupational wellbeing support at school, there were still a large percentage of groups who reported neutral levels (e.g., 42% of teachers). Moreover, the increased demands on senior leaders and TA roles were noted. Thus, understanding the state of occupational wellbeing of all staff groups, sharing the support that is available to them, and collaboratively discussing what is and would be helpful in increasing staff occupational wellbeing would be helpful. Discussions of support may include resources and services (e.g., mentoring), school-wide strategies (e.g., open-door policies, collaborative communication channels) and inter-school support (e.g., participating in staff group-targeted networks and groups). These discussions may best be held separately for different staff groups to understand the experiences and needs of each group, and so identify how they can be best supported in their occupational wellbeing most effectively. Following these discussions, school governors and the senior leadership team are recommended to identify, implement, and evaluate the effectiveness of these support over time to ensure the efficacy of these sources of support to inform future strategies and decisions regarding occupational wellbeing.
2. The prevalence of loneliness for senior leaders was notable in this study. Examining ways that senior leaders can be supported, participating when dealing with confidential and difficult matters within each school is recommended: for example, by school governors, senior leadership team, and LAs. For example, one may consider providing opportunities and resources to be involved in senior leader support and network groups, and receive coaching or supervision opportunities should this be of interest to the senior leaders.

In regard to CPD:

3. Occupational wellbeing was identified as associated with intention to stay in the job, and an area where staff felt the least supported compared to professional effectiveness and professional development support. Moreover, staff and student mental health was identified as the most needed CPD area for teachers (50%), and the second highest for senior leaders (30%), middle leader (24%), and teaching assistants (35%). Thus, explorations of how staff wellbeing can be supported at the individual, school and system level should be explored by school staff, school governors, LAs, and policymakers.
4. Given the limited number of CPD opportunities that TAs reported undertaking, catering for their needs should be discussed by schools and CPD providers. Particularly, focus on teaching SEND students may be particularly useful as TAs spend the majority of their time working with groups and/or individuals of students, including students identified with a special educational need and/or disability. Therefore, to be confident and effective in their role, this training would appear to be vital in providing knowledge and support within this specialised area.

## **6. Resources**

Please visit the project website (<https://lisaekim.com/projects/growth-survey>) for access to the following resources developed from the current findings:

**6.1. Infographic on occupational wellbeing**

**6.2. Infographic on CPD findings**

**6.3. Animation on teacher wellbeing**

## 7. References

- Adams, L., CoburnCrane, S., Sanders-Earley, A., Keeble, R., Harris, H., Taylor, J., & Taylor, B. (2023). *Working lives of teachers and leaders – wave 1: Research report*.  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1148571/Working\\_lives\\_of\\_teachers\\_and\\_leaders\\_-\\_wave\\_1\\_-\\_core\\_report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1148571/Working_lives_of_teachers_and_leaders_-_wave_1_-_core_report.pdf)
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352.
- Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2008). The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory: A good alternative to measure burnout and engagement. In J. Halbesleben (Ed.), *Stress and burnout in health care* (pp. 65–78). Nova Science Hauppauge.
- Hughes, M. E., Waite, L. J., Hawkey, L. C., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2004). A short scale for measuring loneliness in large surveys: Results from two population-based studies. *Research on Aging*, 26(6), 655–672.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 17–34.
- Kim, L. E., & Burić, I. (2020). Teacher self-efficacy and burnout: Determining the directions of prediction through an autoregressive cross-lagged panel model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(8), 1661–1676.
- Kim, L. E., Oxley, L., & Asbury, K. (2022). “My brain feels like a browser with 100 tabs open”: A longitudinal study of teachers’ mental health and well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(1), 299–318.
- Lipscombe, K., Tindall-Ford, S., & Lamanna, J. (2023). School middle leadership: A systematic review. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(2), 270–288.
- Madigan, D. J., & Kim, L. E. (2021). Towards an understanding of teacher attrition: A meta-analysis of burnout, job satisfaction, and teachers’ intentions to quit. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 105, 103425.
- OECD. (2018). *OECD TALIS 2018 Teacher Questionnaire* (Version 2018).  
<https://www.oecd.org/education/school/TALIS-2018-MS-Teacher-Questionnaire-ENG.pdf>
- OECD. (2019a). *TALIS 2018 Country Note: England (UK)*.  
[https://www.oecd.org/education/talis/TALIS2018\\_CN\\_ENG.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/education/talis/TALIS2018_CN_ENG.pdf)
- OECD. (2019b). *TALIS 2018 Country Note: Volume II: England (UK)*.  
[https://www.oecd.org/education/talis/TALIS2018\\_CN\\_ENG\\_Vol\\_II\\_extended.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/education/talis/TALIS2018_CN_ENG_Vol_II_extended.pdf)
- OECD. (2019c). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. OECD Publishing.
- Perry, E., Halliday, J., Higginson, J., & Patel, S. (2022). *Meeting the challenge of providing high-quality continuing professional development for teachers: The Wellcome CPD Challenge Pilot Delivery Report* (p. 43). Wellcome.  
<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/id/eprint/29804>
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized self-efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in health psychology: A user’s portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35–37). NFER-NELSON.