

Level of Stress and Teaching Performance of Zamboanga Central School SPED Center During Covid-19 Pandemic: Basis for Intervention

Michelle A. Rufino

Teacher III  
Zamboanga Central School SPED Center  
Zamboanga Central District  
Department of Education, Division of Zamboanga City

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56293/IJASR.2022.5566>

IJASR 2023

VOLUME 6

ISSUE 5 SEPTEMBER – OCTOBER

ISSN: 2581-7876

**Abstract:** This study determined the teacher's level of stress and teacher's performance of Zamboanga Central School Sped Center during Covid-19 pandemic in Zamboanga City. The purpose of the study was to measure the different stressors experienced by the 93 teachers of Zamboanga Central School SPED Center and how does it affect their teaching performance during Covid-19 pandemic. The research design used was a descriptive correlational research design with various statistical tools such as descriptive means, Pearson r and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The study revealed that the teacher's level of stress in terms of relationship with colleagues, professional growth, working condition and student's behavior is "low stress". The teachers experienced stress brought about Covid-19 virus but still they could manage stress despite the different changes happening in their workplace. While the teacher's performance during pandemic is "Very Satisfactory". It means that the respondents had exceeded the minimum indicators for the said rating period but were not able to achieve the highest requirements for outstanding rating. Age, length of service, educational attainment and the ICT Level were negative predictors of the teacher's level of stress. On the other hand, indulging in research writing, pursuing a master and doctoral degree, coping with deadline reports were positive predictors of stress of teacher's. The school officials in the teacher training may intensify and design an intervention training programs specifically LAC sessions for teachers on stress management program.

**Keywords:** LAC session, predictors, stress management, indicators, teacher's performance

### Introduction

The resurgence of Covid-19 pandemic brought many challenges in the different endeavors of the way of life to the Filipino people. These pandemic challenges have changed the landscape on how the people live and how to cope with it. The coping mechanism brought by these challenges was so drastic. People in the different walks life re-invented themselves to be able to keep abreast of the changes and calling as the "new normal."

One of the most affected endeavors in our society is in the field education. Secretary Leonor Briones, Department of Education (DepEd) emphasized that the basic education learning continuity plan is the response of the Department of the challenges brought by the pandemic. The continuity plan for the continuous delivery of the basic education among millions of learners in the country should be adaptable to their geographical location and conditions. These will ensure that all learners will still be able to receive quality education in spite of the pandemic. To maintain the education of millions Filipino learners and for every school and to still attain its mission and vision which is to provide quality education to every Filipino learner.

Teachers experienced considerable stress as result of the COVID-19 pandemic, which is related to poorer mental health, coping and teaching. Supporting teachers' well-being is critical to prevent significant adverse consequences for teachers, their students, and the education system as a whole. The COVID-19 pandemic has placed significant demands on teachers. Teachers experienced stress especially on mental health and found it harder to cope and teach. The COVID-19 brought a complicated aspects in teaching because there were new innovations were implemented on remote teaching to address the needs of our learners to be able to continue their education and to keep abreast in the new normal education set-up. The person really affected of this changes or the new set-up in the education system

is the teacher. The teacher is the manager on how to deliver learnings to our children. The teacher faces many challenges especially the new mode of teaching. This may affect their physiological aspects, like mental health, safety and this may be the factors that affect their teaching performance of the teachers. Changes in workplace and home lives during the COVID-19 pandemic (time spent in self-isolation; use of distance learning including online tools; communication with students, their parents, and colleagues; technological and psychological support from school administrators; changes in daily routines; interaction with family members.

Teaching performance is mostly the ability to do or the enactment of the description, duties and responsibilities expected of the position or role. The internal and external forces such as environment, social interaction via media, and personal motivation can contribute to the quality of teaching performance.

With the changes due to Covid-19 virus, our Department of Education strengthen our basic education despite of the pandemic using different platforms on how to deliver our teaching to our learners through distance learning, it is said that the teachers are expected to perform well despite of the health condition because of Covid-19 virus which allow us to limit our movement. Simultaneously doing the trend of checking of modules, submitting of school reports, behavior management of the evolving population of students, attending numerous webinars, reporting and training eventually caused psychological issues such as stress, work dissatisfaction, disengagement, depression, and anxiety.

Since the resurgence of the pandemic, Zamboanga City was not spared of its viciousness. Many people are infected by the disease. The Zamboanga City Inter-Agency Task Force (ZC-IATF) placed the city under lockdown due to its recorded higher covid cases. The city government was forced to declare lockdown of the city to minimize the spread of infection in the community. Mobility of people was controlled; major business establishments of the city were closed and other social gatherings were prohibited including schools in all levels.

The Division of Zamboanga City issued Division Memorandum (DM) No. 0039, s.2022 on the Alert Level 3 Classification Compliance of SDO and School Operations. This DM would imply that face to face classes in all schools of the Division are suspended to avoid contact with learners and infections. The teachers are advised to have Alternative Work Arrangement (AWA) in reporting to school.

The general objectives of this study was to find out on which among respondent's profile, their level of stress in terms of professional growth, relationship with colleagues, working condition, student's behavior are predictor of the teaching performance of 93 teachers in Zamboanga Central School SPED Center, Division of Zamboanga City. Specifically, the study aimed to: a). describe the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, length of service, highest educational attainment, ICT level are factors of subcomponents predict the teaching performance of the 93 respondents; b) to determine the level of stress in terms of professional growth, relationship with colleagues, working condition and student's behavior are factors affecting the teaching performance of the respondents during Covid-19 pandemic; c) determine the teaching performance of the respondents in terms of teaching and learning, pupil's outcome, professional growth and community involvement; and d) find out which of the demographic profile and level of stress in terms of professional growth, relationship with colleagues, working condition, student's behavior are factors predict the teaching performance of the respondents.

### Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to determine the level of stress and teaching performance of the teachers in selected elementary schools in Zamboanga City.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions;

1. What is the level of stress of the respondents in terms of :
  - 1.1 Relationship with colleagues
  - 1.2 Professional growth
  - 1.3 Working condition; and
  - 1.4 Students' behavior
2. What is the level of teaching performance of the respondents in terms of:  
-IPCRF Rating

- KRA 's 1- Content Knowledge and Pedagogy
  - 2- Diversity of Learners and Assessment and Reporting
  - 3- Curriculum and Planning
  - 4- Community Linkages and Professional Engagement and Personal
  - 5- Plus Factor
3. Is there a significant relationship between the level of stress and the teacher's performance?
  4. Is there a significant difference in the level of teacher's stress when variables are categorized according to age, educational attainment, and length of service?
  5. On the basis of the finding, what stress management plan could be designed?

**Scope and limitation**

This study aimed to determine the level of teachers' stress and performance. This study is limited to the teachers of Zamboanga Central School SPED Center. It was conducted in Dr. Varela St. Zone 1, San Jose Road, Zamboanga City.

The participants of the study are the 93 teachers.

**Method**

**Research Design**

Descriptive correlational research design, it is a research strategy that focuses on quantifying the collection and analysis of data. ((Sukamolson cited by 658). This study will employed descriptive correlational research, using these design is to determine the level of stress and teacher performance of Zamboanga Central School Sped Center during COVID-19 pandemic. Likewise, it described the level of stress among respondents and their teaching performance during Covid-19 pandemic. Significant differences in the level of stress and teacher's performance of the respondents when grouped according to age, length of service, educational attainment and ICT literacy. Significant correlation between the level of stress and the teaching performance of the respondent during pandemic.

**Research Participants**

The respondents of this study were the 93 teachers of Zamboanga Central School Sped Center. There are 79 as classroom advisers and 14 subject teachers.

**Table 1. Respondents**

| Grade Level  | No. of Teachers |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Kindergarten | 7               |
| I            | 10              |
| II           | 10              |
| III          | 11              |
| IV           | 13              |
| V            | 14              |
| VI           | 13              |
| SPED LSEN    | 5               |
| SPED PG      | 10              |
| TOTAL        | 93              |

The researcher used the purposive sampling method in conducting the study. Purposive sampling, also known as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling, is a form of non-probability sampling in which researchers rely on their own judgement when choosing members of the population to participate in their surveys.(Alchemer.com)

The best sampling procedure in the study because it's cost effective and time-effective sampling methods available. This is an appropriate method available if there are only limited number of primary data sources who can contribute to the study.

### Research Instrument

The researcher adapted a survey questionnaire from (Fortunato T. Atrido Jr., 2021), to gather data for the study. The survey questionnaire used Likert Scale Model. It consists of two (3) parts: Part 1- is the Respondent's Profile Part II- is thirty (30) items construct to quantify the level of stress of the respondents in terms of relationship with colleagues; professional growth; working condition and students' behavior. Part III- was the enumeration of the teacher's performance form their Individual Performance Commitment Rating Form (IPCRF) results. Each statement of each part of the survey questionnaire has the value of very high indicates highly stress. For moderately high indicates stress; for low indicates less stressful; for very low indicates not all stress.

The validity and reliability of the study was conducted by people who are expert in the field of stress and teacher's performance. My school principal, the Master teachers and school designated guidance counselor. The medium of the instruction in the survey questionnaire was English language.

### Data Gathering and Procedure

The researcher gave the respondents enough time to answer the research questionnaire. Information of respondents was made confidential to ensure privacy of their data. In line with Republic Act 10173 or also known as the Data Privacy Act of

2012, the name of the school where the study was conducted was not revealed and the respondent's identities were classified for purpose of anonymity.

Proper acknowledgment of other authors that will be used in the study were cited in APA referencing classification. The researcher did not make up any data or results and plagiarism should be avoided.

In the conduct of the study, the researcher considered the appropriate research guidelines and research ethics were considered. The response of the respondents in the study were voluntary, in which they could withdraw anytime without penalty. Any physical or emotional distress towards certain topics were considered.

Before the conduct of the study a proposal is submitted to the school principal. If approved, it was sent to the School Research Evaluator for technical assistance in writing. The researcher was required to conduct the validity and reliability of instrument before the submission to the Office of Planning and Research, Division of Zamboanga City. Followed the Local Research Protocol per DepEd Memo 864, s. 2022.

The researcher presented an endorsement letter the consent to the principal explained the details of the study which includes the possible benefits, harms, confidentiality and right to withdraw. The researcher used the survey questionnaire hard copy to gather data from the participants. After getting the respondents consent of their participation, the researcher administered the instrument starting with demographics profile, level of stress on relationship with colleagues, professional growth, working condition, student's behavior and teaching performance through IPCRF. After the researcher read and explained the instruction to the participants. The teacher respondents were given 1 day to finish answering the questionnaire. After which, the researcher collected the answered questionnaire. The researcher tabulated the data collected from the participants using Microsoft Excel and eventually process the data collected using SPSS.

### Data Analysis

To be able to answer the research questions, the following statistical tools were used:

**Problem no.1**, level of stress of the respondents, the researcher used Descriptive Mean as it aims to describe the level of stress of teachers in their school.

**Problem no. 2**, the researcher used the Descriptive Mean, based on the teacher’s IPCRF rating for this school year 2021-2022.

**Problem no. 3**, ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA) was used for respondents’ answers in terms of age, t-test will be used for respondents’ answers in terms of sex, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for respondents’ answers for educational attainment, length of service and for ICT level. This is to show the significance difference using the group data.

**Problem no. 4** , Pearson Correlational test coefficient was used, where there was a measure of linear correlation between the sets of data , the level of stress and teachers performance.

**Results and Discussion**

This section presents the results generated using the researcher-developed instrument that describes the level of stress and teacher’s performance during Covid-19 pandemic.

1.What is the level of stress of the respondents in terms of: Relationship with Colleagues, Professional Growth, Working Condition and Student’s Behavior?

**Table 2. Teacher’s Level of Stress in terms of Relationship with Colleague**

| Statement                                                                       | Mean        | Verbal Description |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| The teacher.....                                                                |             |                    |
| 1. Show respect to co-teachers                                                  | 2.00        | Low                |
| 2. Practice open communication with co-teachers                                 | 2.05        | Low                |
| 3. Work as a team with colleagues                                               | 2.06        | Low                |
| 4. Consult about matters related to learning                                    | 2.08        | Low                |
| 5. Accepts the opinion of co-teachers                                           | 2.00        | Low                |
| 6. Understands the behavior of colleagues                                       | 2.16        | Low                |
| 7. Appreciates colleagues’ work                                                 | 1.97        | Low                |
| 8. Working relationship with a superior                                         | 2.11        | Low                |
| 9. Having a supportive environment will encourage your success in the classroom | 2.01        | Low                |
| 10. Demonstrates good work ethics with co-teachers                              | 1.98        | Low                |
| <b>Over-all mean</b>                                                            | <b>2.04</b> | <b>Low</b>         |

**Legend:** 3.25 – 4.0 Very High 3.24 – 2.50 High 2.49 – 1.75 Low 1.74 – 1.0 Very Low

Table 2 reveals the result on the level of stress of teacher’s in terms of their relationship with colleagues is “Low”. It appears that the statement of the relationship among teachers in terms of “Understand the behavior of colleagues” obtained the highest mean of 2.16. While “Appreciates colleagues’ work” obtained the lowest mean of 1.97. This implies that despite the individual differences of their behavior towards one another still could manage the stress and united to work as a team. The over-all mean of Teacher’s Level of Stress in terms of Professional Growth is “High” which obtained 2.52.

The results indicated that the public-school teachers were not that stressful in terms of dealing with their co-workers. Having established a good camaraderie with the different people when they encounter in their work and maintaining close, friendly relationship and being respectful to everyone in the workplace might be the reason why were not that stress. (Aurora Sarabia and Leila M. Collantes, 2020)

In one organization like school individual differences is prominent, pleasing everybody for several reasons requires social intelligence considering that people in the school are diverse which implies, different attitudes, values, beliefs

and perceptions which professional jealousy happens in the school which might be the reason of their stress with their fellow faculty. (Aurora Sarabia and Leila M. Collantes, 2020)

**Table 3. Teacher’s Level of Stress in terms of Professional Growth**

| Statement                                   | Mean        | Verbal Description |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| The teacher...                              |             |                    |
| 1. Attendance to webinars                   | 2.59        | High               |
| 2. Assignment to serve as facilitator       | 2.62        | High               |
| 3. Pursuing a master and doctoral degree    | 2.66        | High               |
| 4. Serves as speaker                        | 2.46        | Low                |
| 5. Participate in professional organization | 2.46        | Low                |
| 6. Willingness to accept assigned task      | 2.40        | Low                |
| 7. Form part in professional trainings      | 2.47        | Low                |
| 8. Indulges in research writing             | 2.69        | High               |
| 9. Attends skill-based trainings            | 2.53        | High               |
| 10. Participates in community services      | 2.33        | Low                |
| <b>Over-all mean</b>                        | <b>2.52</b> | <b>High</b>        |

**Legend:** 3.25 – 4.0 Very High 2.50 – 3.24 High 1.75 – 2.49 Low 1.0 – 1.74 Very Low

Table 3 revealed that the teacher’s level of stress is “High” in terms of “Indulging in Research writing”, which obtained the highest mean of 2.69. It implies that most teachers answered highly stress in conducting research studies because they lack the necessary skills to conduct research and they do not have enough support and resources. It was also evident that these were less guidance received by the teacher in terms of research.

It also reveals the result on the level of stress of teacher’s in terms of “Willingness to accept assigned task” is “Low”, which obtained the lowest mean of 2.40. It implies that the teachers are willing to accept role or functions in the workplace like special assignments.

Teaching requires a lot of energy because of the several responsibilities that a teacher should attend to. Aside from teaching, they are also engaged in extra and co-curricular activities like serving as earthquake and fire drill coordinator/ implementer, financier, entertainer, social worker, events manager, solicitors for fund raising activities, assistant of nurses in deworming and vaccination, adviser of several organizations or sometimes assuming or performing the tasks of an administer/ principal. This was supported by the findings of Archibong, Bassey, and Effiom (2010) that the greatest caused of stress is due to lack of career development and fund for career development. Moreover, Brown (2005) mentioned that lack of task management when handling paper work, teaching duties and other extracurricular activity can be a potential stressor to teachers.

**Table 4. Teacher’s Level of Stress in terms Working Condition**

| Statement                                                            | Mean        | Verbal Description |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1. Change of school administration                                   | 2.44        | Low                |
| 2. Handling of subjects not in line with the field of specialization | 2.47        | Low                |
| 3. Unstable class schedule                                           | 2.40        | Low                |
| 4. Getting adjusted to learning modalities                           | 2.54        | High               |
| 5. Assigning heavy workloads                                         | 2.65        | High               |
| 6. Inadequate provision of school supplies                           | 2.36        | Low                |
| 7. Reproduction of Capslets and Modules                              | 2.51        | High               |
| 8. Slow internet connectivity                                        | 2.74        | High               |
| 9. Coping with meeting deadline                                      | 2.67        | High               |
| 10. Experiencing physical strain                                     | 2.63        | High               |
| <b>Over-all mean</b>                                                 | <b>2.54</b> | <b>High</b>        |

**Legend:** 3.25 – 4.0 Very High 2.50– 3.24 High 1.75– 2.49 Low 1.0 – 1.74 Very Low

Table 4 presents the teacher’s level of stress as “High” in terms of having “slow internet connectivity” which obtained the highest mean of 2.74. This only goes to show that learning resources are vital in the evolution of instruction just as how technology invades educational process. Technology helps people to become efficient and provides less repetition of work. Its significance in classroom instruction has been proven in much research yet it requires internet connection to be enable its full utilization and purpose. Sadly, most of the school have less priority of procurement due to constrained budget. Which further means that this becomes a challenge to the teachers because in this case, resourcefulness does not work.

On the other hand, the data also reveals that teacher’s level of stress in the “inadequate provisions of school supplies” is “low” which obtained the lowest mean of “2.36”. This implies that teachers can still manage this kind of inadequacy as they can contextualize instruction using available materials and be resourceful. Compared the procurement of internet connections, the provisions of school supplies are manageable because it does not require much of funds as technology does.

Nevertheless, the teacher’s level of stress in terms of working condition is “High” as shown in the over-all mean of 2.54.

**Table 5. Teacher’s Level of Stress in terms of Student’s Behavior**

| Statement                                                            | Mean        | Verbal Description |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1. Change of school administration                                   | 2.44        | Low                |
| 2. Handling of subjects not in line with the field of specialization | 2.47        | Low                |
| 3. Unstable class schedule                                           | 2.40        | Low                |
| 4. Getting adjusted to learning modalities                           | 2.54        | High               |
| 5. Assigning heavy workloads                                         | 2.65        | High               |
| 6. Inadequate provision of school supplies                           | 2.36        | Low                |
| 7. Reproduction of Capslets and Modules                              | 2.51        | High               |
| 8. Slow internet connectivity                                        | 2.74        | High               |
| 9. Coping with meeting deadline                                      | 2.67        | High               |
| 10. Experiencing physical strain                                     | 2.63        | High               |
| <b>Over-all mean</b>                                                 | <b>2.54</b> | <b>High</b>        |

**Legend:** 3.25 – 4.0 Very High 2.50– 3.24 High 1.75– 2.49 Low 1.0 – 1.74 Very Low

Table 5 shows that the level of stress of teachers is “High” in terms of “Comply with submission of modules on time” which obtained the highest mean of 2.54. Taking time to accomplishing their modules which be attributed to the fact that learners spend more time watching television or playing online games wherein parents think that they are researching using their gadgets but they are just playing online games. It takes time for them to finish the modules on time and also learners can’t quickly respond or answer the task in the module. It also reveals that the teacher’s level of stress is “Low” in terms of “Demonstrates responsibility in abiding with the health protocol” which obtained the lowest mean of 2.20.

**Table 6. Summary Table Level of Stress of Teachers**

| Variables                       | Mean        | Verbal Interpretation |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Relationship with Colleagues | 2.04        | Low                   |
| 2. Professional Growth          | 2.52        | High                  |
| 3. Working Condition            | 2.54        | High                  |
| 4. Student Behavior             | 2.34        | Low                   |
| <b>Over-all Mean</b>            | <b>2.36</b> | <b>Low</b>            |

**Legend:** 3.25 – 4.0 Very High 2.50– 3.24 High 1.75– 2.49 Low 1.0 – 1.74 Very Low

Table 6 presents the level of stress of teachers in terms of “Working Condition” is “High” which obtained the highest mean of 2.54. While the level of stress in terms of Relationship with Colleagues is “Low” got the lowest mean obtained of 2.04. The Covid-19 pandemic brought huge challenges in teaching that’s created a new demands and stressors. With the sudden closure of schools, teachers are forced to shift from traditional face to face teaching to modular distance learning, online teaching or blended learning and later manage to hybrid learning with this working condition it will affects the physical and mental health of the teachers leading to increase of burnout of teachers across the world. Teachers had to deal with many of the negative aspects of COVID-19 over the past year. The demands associated with the sudden requirement to teach remotely, and later having to manage hybrid (both in person and online) learning may be having adverse effects on the mental and physical health of teachers. (Kotowski, Susan E//Davis, KermitG./Barratt, ClareL.,2022).

The level of stress in terms of Relationship with Colleague is “Low”. It implies that the teachers can manage to work despite of their individual differences, they could manage to work harmoniously one another with a common goal.

Filipinos are well known for this value Marunong Makisama and knows how to go along with other people.

Professional jealousy happens in the school which might be the reason of their stress with their fellow faculty.

The study of Addison and Yankyera (2015) that the relationship to co-workers or colleagues was one of the main sources of stress that is due to uneven distribution of the task, clashes difference group, and lack of community spirit.

1. What is the teacher’s performance of Zamboanga Central School?

**Table 7. Teacher’s Performance**

| Variable                      | Mean  | Verbal Interpretation |
|-------------------------------|-------|-----------------------|
| Teacher’s Performance (IPCRF) | 4.421 | Very Satisfactory     |

**Legend:** 4.5000 – 5.000 Outstanding  
 3.00 – 4.499 Very Satisfactory  
 2.500-3.499 Satisfactory  
 1.500 – 2.49 Unsatisfactory  
 1.000 – 1.499 Poor

The table 7 presents that based of the IPCRF rating, teacher’s performance is “Very Satisfactory” as shown in the obtained mean of 4.421. Which means that regardless of the level of stress they get from work, they manage to perform well.

The result describes the teaching performance of the respondents through the Individual Performance rating of the respondents in terms of the 4 Kra’s Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, Diversity of Learners and Assessment and Reporting , Curriculum and Planning, Community Linkages and Professional Engagement and Plus factor. Results shows that the over-all mean rating of teaching performance of the respondents is 4.421 and described as “Very Satisfactory”. This means that the respondents had exceeded the minimum requirements of the said rating but it was not able to reach the rate of outstanding, which is the highest rating in the IPCRF.

It implies that the respondents had a very satisfactory rating in their performance as teacher as evidenced by the overall mean obtained from the IPCRF.

3. Is there a significant relationship between the level of stress and teacher’s performance?

**Table 8. Significant Relationship between the Level of Stress and Teacher’s**

| X               | Y           | R-value | F-Value | Interpretation  |
|-----------------|-------------|---------|---------|-----------------|
| Level of Stress | Performance | -.060   | .565    | Not significant |



\*\*Significance level 0.05\*\*

The table 8 revealed the results of the correlation between teacher’s level of stress and teacher’s performance. As revealed in the findings, the level of stress is not correlated to teacher’s performance ( $p$ -value=.565). The data described that there is no correlation which is greater than assumed alpha of  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance. Therefore, the posited hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between teacher’s level of stress and teacher’s performance is accepted since the variables tested in the study are not statistically correlated. However, there is no bearing between teacher’s level of stress and teacher’s performance ( $R$ -value=-.060) with probability value lesser than assumed alpha of  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance.

8. Is there a significant difference in the level of teacher’s stress when variables are categorized according to age, educational attainment, and length of service?

**Table 9. Significant difference of Teacher’s Level of Stress according to Age**

| Variable        | Age                    | Mean | F-value | P-value | Interpretation  |
|-----------------|------------------------|------|---------|---------|-----------------|
| Level of Stress | 20-29                  | 1.59 | 2.36    | 0.61    | Not significant |
|                 | 30-39                  | 2.59 |         |         |                 |
|                 | 40-49                  | 2.33 |         |         |                 |
|                 | 50 years old and above | 2.37 |         |         |                 |

\*\*Significance level 0.05\*\*

Table 9 presents the result of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in the significant difference on the teacher’s level of stress according to age. The findings revealed that significant difference does not exist in the teacher’s level of stress in terms of age ( $F=2.36$ ) with the probability of occurrence under the null hypothesis greater than the assumed alpha of  $\alpha=0.05$  level of significance, therefore, the posited hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference among the variables tested in the study. The data indicates that regardless of age, the level of stress has no bearing.

**Table 10. Significant difference of Teacher’s Level of Stress according to Educational Attainment**

| Variable                                  | Educational Attainment | Mean | F-value | P-value | Interpretation  |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------|------|---------|---------|-----------------|
| Level of Stress by Educational Attainment | Bachelor’s Degree      | 1.59 | 1.136   | .339    | Not Significant |
|                                           | With Master’s Unit     | 2.59 |         |         |                 |
|                                           | Master’s Degree        | 2.33 |         |         |                 |
|                                           | Doctorate Unit         | 2.37 |         |         |                 |
|                                           | Doctorate Degree       |      |         |         |                 |

\*\*Significance level 0.05\*\*

Table 10 presents the result of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in the significant difference on the teacher’s level of stress according to educational attainment. The findings revealed that significant difference does not exist in the teacher’s level of stress in terms of educational attainment ( $F=1.136$ ) with the probability of occurrence under the null hypothesis greater than the assumed alpha of  $\alpha=0.05$  level of significance, therefore, the posited hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the teacher’s level of stress in terms of educational attainment is accepted since there is no statistically significant difference among the variables tested in the study. The data indicates that regardless of educational attainment, the level of stress has no bearing.

**Table 11. Significant difference of teacher’s Level of Stress According to Length of Service**

| Variable                             | Length of Service | Mean | F-value | P-value | Interpretation  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------|---------|---------|-----------------|
| Level of Stress by Length of Service | 1-5 years         | 1.59 | 1.136   | .339    | Not Significant |
|                                      | 6-10 years        | 2.59 |         |         |                 |
|                                      | 11-15 years       | 2.33 |         |         |                 |
|                                      | 16 and above      | 2.37 |         |         |                 |

*\*\*Significance level 0.05\*\**

Table 11 presents the result of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in the significant differences on the teacher’s level of stress in terms of Length of Service ( $F=.837$ ) with the probability of occurrence under the null hypothesis greater than the assumed alpha of  $\alpha=0.05$  level of significance, therefore, the posited hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the teacher’s level of stress in terms of age is accepted since there is no statistically significant difference among the variables tested in the study. The data implies that regardless of the length of service, the level of stress has no bearing.

**Table 12. Significant difference of Teacher’s Level of Stress**

**According to ICT Literacy**

| Variable                        | Educational Attainment | Mean | F-value | P-value | Interpretation  |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------|---------|---------|-----------------|
| Level of Stress by ICT literacy | Beginner               | 2.44 | .201    | .895    | Not Significant |
|                                 | Developing             | 2.34 |         |         |                 |
|                                 | Advance                | 2.35 |         |         |                 |
|                                 | Expert                 | 2.53 |         |         |                 |

*\*\*Significance level 0.05\*\**

Table 12 presents the result of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in the significant difference on the teacher’s level of stress according to Length of Service. The findings revealed that significant difference does not exist in the teacher’s level of stress in terms of ICT ( $F=.201$ ) with the probability of occurrence under the null hypothesis greater than the assumed alpha of  $\alpha=0.05$  level of significance, therefore, the posited hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the teacher’s level of stress in terms of age is accepted since there is no statistically significant difference among the variables tested in the study. The data implies that regardless to the teacher’s level of skills in ICT, the level of stress has no bearing.

**Conclusions and Recommendation**

Based on the findings of the study, the level of stress of the respondents in terms of Relationship with Colleagues, Professional Growth, Working Condition and Student’s behavior is “Low”. However, the respondents got stress especially on their working condition like slow internet connection and coping deadlines in submission of reports and difficult to adjust on the new different teaching modalities during pandemic and they also worry on their physical and mental health , it also found out that the level of stress of the respondents is high in terms of professional growth, the respondents got stress especially in research writing because the respondents lack trainings on research writings. Also, the respondents got stress in pursuing a master and doctoral degree in graduate school because they don’t have enough time and resources to pursue their studies. The teacher’s performance based on IPCRF SY. 2021-2022 is “Very Satisfactory”. There is no significant relationship between the level of stress and teacher’s performance. There is no significant difference of teacher’s level of stress according to age, educational attainment, length of service and ICT.

Based from the conclusions the following recommendations are presented for considerations:

Department of Education Official (DepEd). DepEd may continue the stress management or wellness program and intensify it to help to develop and enhance teacher’s performance, physical and mental health and able to have enough

maturity to handle stress. DepEd Division of Zamboanga City, create and implement seminars to teachers on stress management and coping on the different demands brought by improvement and evolution of the educational system and how to combat and alleviates the stressors faced by the teachers. School, the school head shall intensify the stress management program like creating a program and activities such as team building and LAC sessions every Friday afternoon.

### Dissemination and Advocacy Plans

The findings and results will be forwarded to the school principal for their recognition and approval. This study will be forwarded to the School Division Office for the top management to consider the findings and results for proper planning in helping our school administration to conduct a comprehensive stress management plan to teachers. The study's finding will assist teacher's knowledge on how to manage stress particularly during pandemic, and will allow them to attend stress management seminars or trainings. Also, how teacher's competence or prepared in the new normal education.

With the findings of this study, we could assess and help our learners in their difficult situation during pandemic most especially their mental health and the academic performance. Despite the threat of the Covid-19 virus, teachers continue to navigate the new normal in education which demonstrate their resilience.

For the school head, the results of the study will be their basis for designing program for stress management for teachers. In dissemination of findings of the study the researcher will conduct LAC session during Friday.

Future researchers may do further research as a continuation of this study which will help intensify the implementation of the stress management program that in times of emergencies in the different demand in our department, teachers could manage well the stress in workplace.

### Problem 3. On the basis of the findings, what intervention program can be designed?

Based from the findings of the study, a stress management program is designed in a form of training will be provided to the teachers with emphasis on wellness program and how to manage with stress in workplace.

#### I. Title

LAC Session on Stress Management Program for Teachers in Workplace

#### II. Rationale and Descriptive Program

This study reveals that the respondents got stress especially on their working condition like slow internet connection and coping deadlines in submission of reports and difficult to adjust on the new different teaching modalities during pandemic and they also worry on their physical and mental health, it is also found out that the level of stress of the respondents is high in terms of professional growth, the respondents got stress especially in research writing because the respondents have lack trainings on research writings. Also, the respondents got stress in pursuing a master and doctoral degree in graduate school because they don't have enough time and resources to pursue their studies. This session creates to teachers on stress and management and coping on the different demands in our educational system nowadays in the new normal education, help to decrease work-related stress in workplace.

This LAC Session will run for two Fridays at 3:00-4:00 PM with 2- hours each day. The first part of the will focus on the introduction of what is stress, explain the types and causes of stress, self-stress assessment and create a relaxing environment, remedies. The second part of the session, discussion the causes of anxiety or concern, stressors of teachers in workplace and activity for at least 5-minute instructions. List down things which stresses you at your workplace. Tips to reduce stress and how to be remove yourself from the stressful situation.

#### III. Program Outcome

At the end of the sessions the activities in the Lac Session should stress more on management program and teach teachers how to manage well the stress in a difficult situation in workplace in real-life situation and reinforce teacher’s well beings, performance and job satisfaction.

**IV. Participants**

The participants of this two-day Lac Session are the select 30 teachers from Kinder to Grades 1-6 in the Zamboanga Central School Sped Center, Division of Zamboanga City.

**V. Date and Venue**

This LAC Session will be conducted on May 20-21 , 2023 at Conference Hall.

**VI. Budget Requirement**

This Two-Day Lac Session will need the following:

| No.        | Quantity | Items        | Unit Price | Amount |
|------------|----------|--------------|------------|--------|
| 1          | 10       | Manila Paper | 10.00      | 100.00 |
| 2          | 10       | Markers      | 40.00      | 400.00 |
| 3          | 10       | Masking tape | 10.00      | 100.00 |
| Subtotal : |          |              |            | 600.00 |

**B. Snacks**

| No.      | Quantity | Items  | Unit Price | Amount |
|----------|----------|--------|------------|--------|
| 1        | 30       | snacks | 30.00      | 900.00 |
| Subtotal |          |        |            | 900.00 |

**References**

1. A.V. Petrakova, T.N. Kanonire, A.A. Kulikova, E.A. Orel ‘ Characteristics of Teacher Stress during Distance Learning Imposed by the COVID-19 Pandemic”.
2. Academia, Shafiq MUHAMMAD Gul “ Teachers’ stress, performance and Resources the moderating effects of resources on stress and performance”
3. Agus Purwanto, Masduki Asbari, Mochammad Fahlevi, Abdul Mufid , Eva Agistiawati, Yoyok, 2020 : Impact of work from home on Indonesia teachers during the Covid-19 pandemic: An exploratory study
4. Alyas Qadeer Tahir, 2011 : Effectiveness of teaching stress on academic Performance of College Teachers in Pakistan.
5. Ansis, 2017. CNN PH Poll entitled Filipino Top Causes of Stress in 2017
6. Ansley, Meyers, McPhee and Varjas, 2018. Chronic Stress or work-related can affect the effectiveness of the teachers
7. Arnold, Jari, Evangelia & Despoina, 2007. The Performance of teachers is Supposed to increase in presence of resources and positive personality traits and vice-versa.
8. Cox, Solomon and Parris 2018. Work –Related Stress
9. Ermitanio, 2015. Dealing with types of stress as cited in the Philippine Inquirer Article entitled “ Work-Related Stress Affects One’s life”
10. Ferguson-Cited by 443 “ Impact of Subject Matter and on teaching performance
11. Ishtiaq Ahmed, Sadia Shabbir, 2019: Causes of Teacher Stress : Its Effects on Teacher Performance and Health Problems.
12. Lazarus,Folkman, 1984, Coping Strategies threats psychological stress Nanyar, 1994. Job Performance

13. Rean, Kolominsky 2000. Teaching is one of the most exhausting social activities.
14. Rubina Hanif, Sadaf Tariq, Masood Nadeem, 2011: Personal and Job Related Predictors of Teacher stress and Job Performance among school teachers.
15. Selye, 1979. The Characteristics of Psychological Stress and Coping Strategies Schechner-cited by 102 Teaching Performance Studies
16. Watson, 2015. The Top 5 causes of stress of employee's performance