EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.57 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 12 | Issue:8 |August 2025

# WORK STRESSORS AND ITS INFLUENCE ON TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE: A DESCRIPTIVE CORRELATIONAL STUDY

**Shyra P. Capagngan[1], Elizabeth D. Dioso, Ed.D.[2]**
[1]*Master of Arts in Education Major in Educational Administration, Assumption College of Nabunturan*
*Teacher II Camanlangan National High School, Division of Davao de Oro*
[2]*Doctor of Education, Professor, Assumption College of Nabunturan, Philippines*

**Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra23606**
**DOI No: 10.36713/epra23606**

## ABSTRACT
*This study investigates the impact of work-related stressors on teachers' performance in the New Bataan District, Davao de Oro. It highlights the significant challenges faced by educators, including workload, administrative pressures, and interpersonal conflicts. Through a quantitative-descriptive correlational research design, data were collected from 110 teachers across four schools using a validated questionnaire. The findings reveal that while teachers experience various stressors, they generally maintain a high level of performance as measured by the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES). Notably, the correlation between work stressors and teaching performance was found to be negligible and statistically insignificant. The study underscores the necessity for improved communication, support systems, and clarity in job roles to enhance teachers' work environments. Recognizing and addressing these challenges is crucial for promoting educators' well-being and effectiveness, ultimately benefiting student outcomes. Recommendations for school leaders include fostering collaboration, defining clear roles, and prioritizing professional development to create a supportive atmosphere for teachers.*
**KEYWORDS:** *Work Stressors, Teachers' Performance, Descriptive Correlation Study*

## Chapter I
## INTRODUCTION
### The Problem and Its Background
Work-related stress is one of the most common problems experienced by many teachers which eventually affects their performance at school and their well- being. According to Agyapong et al. (2022) Work-related stress among teachers has garnered considerable attention in educational research, primarily due to its potential ramifications on both educators' well-being and the quality of instruction.

In Ghana, the study of Subbey (2023), revealed that teachers' work-related stress significantly affects their performance because they have to deal with mounting workloads, administrative tasks, and expectations from parents and the education system stress and burnout resulting from curriculum pressures, paperwork, and high-performance expectations which according to the study are the factors contributing to stress. These factors reduce the motivation and job satisfaction of teachers.

In General Santos City, Philippines, it was revealed in the study of Diomampo and Quines (2023) that work related stress greatly impacts the performance of teachers because they experience increasing pressures from heavy workloads, tight deadlines, and scarce resources. These results conform to the study of Shah et al. (2023) that stress tends to cause burnout, which lessens their motivation and capacity to interact with students. Consequently, the quality of education is compromised, emphasizing the schools' need to offer improvements in support and resources to assist teachers in managing stress and overall well-being.

In New Bataan where the researcher is teaching she personally observed and experienced as well that many colleagues complained about their overloaded work at school that made them tired after a day. They could not even focus in

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.57 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 12 | Issue:8 |August 2025

teaching because of the many paper works given to them aside from the overloaded responsibilities assigned to them by the principal. For her it was not easy to handle such many responsibilities since they had also their advisory classes and teaching loads. In the midst of these challenges, the teachers had to perform their responsibilities as teachers but the energy vested is quite low as compared to those who do not have more responsibilities to perform. The reason why the researcher would like to delve into this study to determine the specific stressors encountered by teachers how these stressors correlate with their job performance.

**Statement of the Problem**

This goal of this study was to determine the effects of work stressors on the performance of the teachers in New Bataan District, Davao de Oro for school year 2025-2026 . Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of work-related stress of the secondary teachers of in terms of:
   - 1.1 disagreement and indecision,
   - 1.2 pressure on the job,
   - 1.3 job description conflict,
   - 1.4 communications and comfort with supervisor
   - 1.5 job related health concerns
   - 1.6 work overload stress
   - 1.7 work underload stress
   - 1.8 boredom induced stress
   - 1.9 problem of job security
   - 1.10 time pressure
   - 1.11 job barrier stress
2. What is the performance of the teachers based on the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES)?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the work stressors of teachers and their teaching performance?
4. Which of the indicators of work stressors affect the performance of the teachers?

## Chapter II
## METHODS

**Research Design**

This study used the quantitative descriptive-correlational study, the correlation method was employed to investigate the relationship between the effects of work stressors and teaching performance. The degree of correlation between two variables was assessed using a correlation coefficient. This aligned with Creswell's assertion (2012) that correlational research designs utilize correlation statistical tests to describe and measure the strength of association between two or more variables.

**Research Respondents**

The respondents of the study were the 110 teachers who were teaching in New Bataan National High School, Camanlangan National High School, Magangit Integrated School, and Tandawan Integrated School for school year 2025-2026. Using the universal sampling method all the teachers in the four identified respondent schools were taken as the respondents of the study.

**Research Instruments**

Data were gathered using an adopted questionnaire. The instrument was adopted from the work stressors questionnaire which has 11 indicators and was developed by American Institute for Preventive Medicine (2019) disagreement & indecision; pressure on the job; job description conflict; communications & comfort with supervisor; job related health concerns; work overload stress; work underload stress; boredom induced stress; problem of job security; time pressure and job barrier stress.

**Statistical Tool**

The responses to the items were analyzed and interpreted using the following appropriate statistical tools:

**Average Mean.** This was used to describe the relationship between teachers' work-related stress and their performance in the classroom.

**Pearson r.** This test was used to determine the extent of the association between work related stress indicators and the performance of teachers in the classroom.

**Multiple Linear Regression.** This analysis was used to assess the impact of various work stressors on the performance of teachers in the classroom.

## Chapter III
## RESULTS

### Level of Work-related Stress of the Secondary Teachers

Included the level of work-related stress of secondary teachers are disagreement and indecision, pressure on the job, job description conflict, communications and comfort with supervisor, job related health concerns, work overload stress, work underload stress, boredom induced stress, problem of job security, time pressure and job barriers.

**Disagreement and Indecision**. The disagreement and indecision among employees, measured through mean scores and descriptive equivalents. The findings indicate a general consensus of disagreement across various aspects. For instance, employees reported a mean score of 2.47 for being unsure of co-worker expectations and 2.40 for perceiving unfriendly attitudes among colleagues, both suggesting that they do not feel uncertain or perceive negativity in their interactions. Additionally, a mean score of 2.46 indicates that employees believe their job responsibilities do not conflict with their better judgment, while the lowest score of 2.14 reflects a strong disagreement with the notion of being unable to satisfy conflicting demands from superiors. Finally, a mean of 2.28 suggests that employees do not find it difficult to refuse overtime work. The overall weighted mean of 2.35 reinforces the trend of disagreement, suggesting a positive work environment where employees feel clear about expectations and do not face significant ethical dilemmas or conflicts in their roles.

**Pressure on the Job**. The pressure on the Job, highlighting various indicators assessed by employees through mean scores and descriptive equivalents. The findings reveal a general tendency toward moderate agreement regarding job-related pressures. For example, a mean score of 3.50 indicates that employees feel significantly overloaded, often unable to complete their tasks within a typical workday. Additionally, a score of 2.94 suggests that employees moderately agree with the perception of excessive supervision, while a mean of 2.80 indicates that job demands are impacting their personal lives. The score of 3.35 reflects a sense of urgency among employees, as they often feel rushed to complete work due to time constraints. Lastly, a mean of 2.90 suggests that the presence of bureaucratic processes contributes to their perception of pressure. The overall weighted mean of 3.10 reinforces the trend of moderate agreement, indicating that employees experience a considerable level of pressure in their roles, affecting both their productivity and personal well-being.

**Job Description Conflict**. The job description conflict, presenting various indicators evaluated by employees through mean scores and descriptive equivalents. The data indicates a mixed perception regarding job clarity and responsibilities. The mean score of 2.80 suggests disagreement with the notion of uncertainty about exact job responsibilities, indicating that employees generally feel clear about their roles. However, a score of 2.83 reflects moderate agreement that teamwork may be excessive, suggesting that some employees feel overwhelmed by collaborative demands. Additionally, a mean of 2.76 indicates moderate agreement regarding a poor flow of information, which may hinder their ability to perform effectively. The score of 2.60 suggests disagreement with the idea that employees lack the authority necessary to carry out their jobs, implying they feel adequately empowered in their positions. Lastly, a mean of 2.65 indicates moderate agreement that employees experience discomfort when handling unethical assignments. The overall weighted mean of 2.73 falls within the moderate agreement range, highlighting that while employees generally understand their job roles, they face challenges related to teamwork, information flow, and ethical dilemmas.

**Communications and Comfort with Supervisor**. The communications and comfort with supervisor, presenting indicators assessed by employees through mean scores and descriptive equivalents. The findings indicate a moderate level of agreement regarding communication dynamics with supervisors. A mean score of 3.16 suggests that employees moderately agree that their ideas often differ from those of their supervisor, indicating potential differences in perspectives. Conversely, a score of 2.38 indicates disagreement with the notion of having trouble communicating with the boss, suggesting that employees generally feel comfortable in their interactions. Additionally, a mean of 2.82 signifies moderate agreement that employees find it challenging to predict their supervisor's reactions, which may lead

to uncertainty in communication. The score of 3.01 reflects moderate agreement that supervisors provide limited feedback on employees' work, suggesting a potential area for improvement in guidance and support. Lastly, a mean of 2.81 indicates moderate agreement that supervisors may be overly critical, which could affect employee morale. The overall weighted mean of 2.84 reinforces the trend of moderate agreement, highlighting that while employees feel relatively comfortable communicating with their supervisors, there are notable areas of concern regarding feedback and the alignment of ideas.

**Job Related Health Concerns**. The job related health concerns, evaluating various indicators through mean scores and descriptive equivalents. The findings reveal a general consensus of disagreement regarding health-related issues in the workplace. A mean score of 2.47 suggests that employees do not perceive their work conditions as unhealthy. Similarly, a score of 2.40 indicates disagreement with the notion that physical dangers exist in the workplace, implying a sense of safety among employees. The mean of 2.46 reflects that employees generally do not find the physical tasks they are required to complete to be excessively demanding. Additionally, a low mean score of 2.14 suggests strong disagreement with the presence of hostile threats from co-workers, indicating a positive workplace environment in terms of interpersonal relationships. Finally, a score of 2.28 indicates disagreement with the idea that sick days are discouraged, suggesting that employees feel supported in taking necessary time off for health reasons. The overall weighted mean of 2.35 reinforces the trend of disagreement, highlighting that employees do not perceive significant health concerns related to their jobs, contributing to a sense of well-being in the workplace.

**Work Overload Stress**. The level of work overload stress presents indicators assessed by employees through mean scores and descriptive equivalents. The data indicates a mixed perception regarding workload and stress levels. A mean score of 2.18 suggests disagreement with the idea that employees cannot consult with others on projects, indicating that collaboration is likely facilitated in the workplace. Similarly, a score of 2.10 reflects disagreement with the perception that co-workers are inefficient, suggesting a positive view of team performance. However, a mean of 2.90 indicates moderate agreement that employees often take work home to complete, highlighting a potential concern regarding work-life balance. Additionally, a score of 2.71 shows moderate agreement that employees feel responsible for too many people or projects, suggesting some degree of overload. Lastly, a mean of 2.47 indicates disagreement with the notion of a shortage of help at work, implying that employees do not generally feel they are lacking support. The overall weighted mean of 2.47 reinforces the trend of disagreement, suggesting that while some employees experience stress related to taking work home and managing multiple responsibilities, they do not perceive significant overload or inefficiency in their work environment.

**Work Underload Stress**. The level of work underload stress presenting indicators assessed by employees through mean scores and descriptive equivalents. The data reveals a general disagreement regarding feelings of underload or lack of engagement at work. A mean score of 2.22 suggests that employees do not feel they have too little responsibility in their roles. Similarly, a score of 1.99 indicates strong disagreement with the perception of being overqualified for their jobs, implying that employees feel their skills are appropriately matched to their responsibilities. However, a mean of 2.54 indicates moderate agreement that there is little chance for growth, suggesting that some employees perceive limitations in professional development opportunities. Additionally, a score of 2.21 implies disagreement with the notion of trying to "look" busy at work, indicating that employees are generally engaged in their tasks. Lastly, a mean of 2.21 reflects disagreement with feeling unstimulated, suggesting that employees do not commonly experience boredom in their roles. The overall weighted mean of 2.23 reinforces the trend of disagreement, indicating that while some employees recognize a lack of growth opportunities, they do not generally feel a sense of underload or disconnection from their work.

**Boredom Induced Stress**. The level of boredom induced stress presenting indicators evaluated by employees through mean scores and descriptive equivalents. The findings indicate a mixed perception regarding boredom and engagement at work. A mean score of 2.74 suggests moderate agreement that employees experience repetitive or highly specialized routines, indicating that some aspects of their jobs may feel monotonous. However, a score of 2.17 reflects disagreement with the idea that employees are not learning anything new, implying that they feel they are acquiring new skills or knowledge. Similarly, a mean of 2.20 indicates disagreement with the notion that employees cannot see the final outcome of their efforts, suggesting that they find value in their work. Additionally, a score of 2.06 implies disagreement with the perception that the job is too easy, indicating that employees feel appropriately challenged. Lastly, a mean of 2.05 reflects disagreement with frequently daydreaming, suggesting that employees remain focused and engaged. The overall weighted mean of 2.25 reinforces the trend of disagreement, indicating that while repetitive

tasks may contribute to some feelings of boredom, employees generally do not experience significant boredom-induced stress in their roles.

**Problem of Job Security**. The level of problem of job security presenting indicators evaluated by employees through mean scores and descriptive equivalents. The data highlights a generally low level of concern regarding job security. A mean score of 2.33 indicates disagreement with the fear of being laid off or fired, suggesting that employees feel relatively secure in their positions. Additionally, a score of 2.19 reinforces this sentiment, reflecting disagreement with the notion of being able to be fired without cause. However, a mean of 2.52 indicates moderate agreement that employees worry about poor pension plans, suggesting some concern regarding long-term financial security. Similarly, a score of 2.80 reflects moderate agreement with worries about low wages, indicating that employees may feel their compensation is inadequate. Lastly, a mean of 2.45 shows disagreement with the idea that needing "pull" or connections is necessary to advance, implying that employees believe in merit-based advancement rather than nepotism. The overall weighted mean of 2.42 supports the trend of disagreement, indicating that while there are concerns about pension and wages, employees generally do not feel significant anxiety regarding job security or the conditions of their employment.

**Time Pressure**. The level of time pressure revealing that employees perceive a moderate level of stress associated with time constraints in the workplace. With a mean score of 2.93, employees moderately agree that there are constant reminders that "time is money," indicating a strong emphasis on productivity. Similarly, a score of 2.82 suggests that starting and ending times are rigid, contributing to a structured yet potentially stressful work environment. The mean of 2.66 reflects moderate agreement that the pace of work can be monotonous, which may amplify feelings of pressure to maintain efficiency. Conversely, a score of 2.42 indicates disagreement with the notion of insufficient break or meal time, suggesting that employees feel they have adequate opportunities to rest. Lastly, a mean of 2.81 shows moderate agreement that the work pace is demanding. The overall weighted mean of 2.73 underscores the trend of moderate agreement regarding time pressure, highlighting that while employees experience stress related to productivity expectations, they generally feel supported in terms of break times.

**Job Barrier Stress**. The level of job barriers stress presenting indicators assessed by employees through mean scores and descriptive equivalents. The data reveals a mixed perception regarding barriers to job satisfaction and advancement. A mean score of 2.95 indicates moderate agreement that employees feel their opportunities for advancement or raises are limited, suggesting concern about career growth and motivation. In contrast, a score of 1.94 reflects disagreement with the notion that sex or age discrimination exists in the workplace, indicating a belief in a fair and equitable environment. Similarly, a mean of 1.88 suggests strong disagreement with feeling unsuited to their jobs, implying that employees generally feel competent in their roles. Furthermore, a score of 2.05 shows disagreement with the idea that their work lacks personal meaning, indicating that employees find value in what they do. Lastly, a mean of 2.19 indicates disagreement that their work goes unrecognized, suggesting that employees feel their contributions are acknowledged. The overall weighted mean of 2.21 reinforces the trend of disagreement, indicating that while there are concerns about limited advancement opportunities, employees do not perceive significant barriers related to discrimination, job fit, or recognition.

**Level of Performance of the Teachers Based on the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) Teachers Performance.** The descriptive statistics for "Teachers' Performance" as measured by the Performance Measurement Evaluation System (PMES). The data includes responses from 110 valid participants, with no missing data. The mean score of 4.651 indicates a generally outstanding level of performance among teachers, suggesting that they are perceived as effective in their roles. The standard deviation of 0.1543 indicates that the scores are closely clustered around the mean, reflecting consistency in performance levels across the group. The minimum score of 4.231 and the maximum score of 4.955 further highlight this high performance range, showing that while there are slight variations, all scores fall within a relatively narrow band of high achievement. Overall, these statistics suggest that teachers are performing well, with little variation in their performance levels.

**Relationship between the Work Stressors of Teachers and their Teaching Performance.** The significant relationship between the work stressors of teachers and their teaching performance. Table 14 presents the Pearson correlation analysis between the work stressors of teachers (STRESS) and their teaching performance as measured by the Performance Measurement Evaluation System (PMES). The correlation coefficient (Pearson's r) for STRESS in relation to PMES is 0.005, indicating a negligible positive correlation between work stressors and teaching

performance. This suggests that as stress levels increase, there is virtually no corresponding change in performance, implying that stress does not significantly impact teachers' effectiveness.

The p-value associated with this correlation is 0.957, which is much higher than the conventional threshold of 0.05 for statistical significance. This result indicates that the correlation is not statistically significant, reinforcing the idea that there is no meaningful relationship between work stressors and teachers' performance. Overall, the data suggest that teachers' performance remains largely unaffected by the levels of stress they experience in their work environment.

**Indicators of Work Stressors Affect the Performance of the Teachers.** The indicators of work stressors affect the teachers' performance. The analysis of the relationships between various stress-related variables and teaching performance reveals that none of the examined variables significantly impact performance. For disagreement, the Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.013, indicating a negligible correlation, with a p-value of 0.896 suggesting no significant effect on performance. Similarly, pressure shows a Pearson r of 0.016, which is also negligible, and a p-value of 0.916, confirming that pressure does not meaningfully affect performance. Conflict has a Pearson r of 0.096, indicating a very weak correlation, and a p-value of 0.320, further supporting the conclusion that conflict does not influence performance. Communication demonstrates a Pearson r of -0.069, reflecting a negligible n correlation, with a p-value of 0.47, indicating no significant relationship. Lastly, health issues correlat performance at -0.071, also showing a very weak negative correlation, and a p-value of 0.461, suggesting that does not significantly impact performance. Overall, the findings indicate that disagreement, pressure, c communication, and health do not have statistically significant effects on teaching performance.

## Chapter IV
## DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION
### Discussions
**Level of Work-related Stress of the Secondary Teachers.** The work-related stress levels of secondary teachers are multifaceted, encompassing various factors that impact their well-being and job satisfaction. These factors include disagreement and indecision, pressure on the job, job description conflict, communication and comfort with supervisors, job-related health concerns, work overload and underload, boredom, job security, time pressure, and job barriers.

The data suggests a generally positive environment where secondary teachers largely disagree with indicators of workplace stress related to disagreement and indecision. This indicates clear co-worker expectations and a lack of perceived negativity, fostering a collaborative atmosphere (Dreer, 2023). Teachers also feel their responsibilities align with their judgment, minimizing ethical dilemmas, and experience comfort in refusing overtime, promoting a healthy work-life balance (Osias & Ladica, 2024). The ability to satisfy superiors' demands further highlights effective administrative support, contributing to overall well-being and job satisfaction.

Job-related pressure, leading to stress from various sources. Overwhelming workloads, including grading, lesson planning, and administrative tasks, contribute significantly to this pressure (Creagh et al., 2023). Teachers also report challenges in balancing work and personal life, with job demands often impacting their time and energy outside of school (Wang et al., 2025). These pressures can lead to burnout, reduced job satisfaction, and potentially affect the quality of teaching and student engagement (Li et al., 2024).

Job description conflict among teachers can significantly affect their job satisfaction and performance. Although teachers generally understand their roles, issues arise from excessive teamwork, poor information flow, and discomfort with unethical assignments (YILDIZ, 2023). Ambiguity in roles can lead to misunderstandings, underscoring the need for clear job descriptions (Cayrat & Boxall, 2023). This lack of clarity can increase stress and diminish self-efficacy (Zhang et al., 2022). To address these challenges, schools should promote open communication, provide conflict resolution training, and ensure teachers feel supported (Molina-Moreno et al., 2024). Additionally, ethical leadership is crucial for fostering job satisfaction and a fair work environment (Abrahamsen & Gunnulfsen, 2024).
Effective communication and comfort with supervisors are crucial for teacher well-being and job satisfaction. While teachers may generally feel comfortable communicating with their supervisors, differences in ideas and a lack of clear feedback can create challenges. When teachers feel their ideas differ from those of their supervisors, it can lead to feelings of being undervalued (Sartain & Morris, 2024). The ability to predict a supervisor's reactions and receiving constructive feedback are also essential for fostering a positive working relationship (Rabbani & Husain, 2024). Open

communication, where teachers feel heard and supported, promotes a more collaborative and respectful environment (Hall et al., 2024). Schools should encourage supervisors to provide regular, specific feedback and create opportunities for open dialogue to align expectations and foster a sense of mutual understanding and respect (Mukhia & Tenzin, 2025).

Job-related health concerns play a significant role in teachers' overall well-being and job satisfaction. Generally, teachers do not perceive their work conditions as unhealthy, nor do they report significant physical dangers or excessively demanding physical tasks (Zhou et al., 2024). They also tend to disagree with the notion that sick days are discouraged, suggesting they feel supported in taking time off for health reasons (Schepers, 2023). A positive workplace environment, free from hostile threats from co-workers, is also crucial for maintaining teacher well-being (Dabrowski et al., 2025).

Work overload significantly impacts teachers, contributing to high levels of stress and burnout. Many educators report feeling overwhelmed by their responsibilities, which often leads to a struggle in balancing work and personal life (Chryssouli & Koutroukis, 2023). This persistent overload can result in chronic fatigue, reduced job satisfaction, and an increased desire to leave the profession (Li et al., 2024). To mitigate these issues, schools should consider streamlining administrative tasks, promoting collaboration among staff, and providing adequate support systems to help teachers manage their workloads effectively (Ha et al., 2025).

While employees generally do not feel underloaded or disconnected from their work, some acknowledge limited opportunities for professional growth. Addressing this perceived lack of growth is crucial, as it can lead to decreased job satisfaction and increased turnover (Wang & Hasan, 2024). Organizations should prioritize personalized professional development programs to foster a culture of learning and increase employee engagement (Saraiva & Nogueiro, 2025).

Repetitive routines may contribute to some feelings of boredom, employees generally do not experience significant boredom-induced stress in their roles. However, employees feel they are acquiring new skills and find value in their work, disagreeing with the notions of not learning anything new or being unable to see the final outcome of their efforts (Anusha & Rajesh, 2024). Organizations should consider job rotation and multi-skilling to reduce boredom and increase productivity, as well as provide opportunities for employees to work on projects of personal interest (Chatterjee et al., 2023).

Employees generally express confidence in their job security, concerns persist regarding pension plans and wage levels. The shift away from traditional employer-funded pension plans has placed a greater burden on employees to manage their retirement savings, leading to anxieties about long-term financial security (Sadeghi, 2024). Although employees disagree with the notion that "pull" is needed for advancement, organizations should still focus on merit-based systems to foster a fair environment (Makasa & Hapompwe, 2024). By addressing wage concerns and ensuring retirement benefits, employers can foster a more secure and motivated workforce (Syamilah et al., 2024).

Teachers often experience significant time pressure due to heavy workloads and rigid schedules, which can lead to emotional exhaustion and burnout . The constant reminders that "time is money" heighten this stress, impacting their ability to prepare effectively for classes (Wahab et al., 2024). To mitigate these pressures, schools should consider streamlining tasks and increasing collaboration time to help teachers manage their workloads more efficiently (Andargeery et al., 2025). Ultimately, addressing time pressure requires systemic changes and individual strategies that prioritize teacher well-being and promote a more sustainable work environment (Manning et al., 2024).

Job barrier stress significantly impacts employee satisfaction, particularly concerning perceived limitations in advancement opportunities. Many employees feel their chances for promotion or raises are constrained, leading to frustration (Lim & Moon, 2025). However, low agreement on issues like discrimination and job fit suggests a generally positive work environment, where employees feel competent and find personal meaning in their roles (Chompukum & Vanichbuncha, 2025). Addressing these limitations while maintaining support and recognition can enhance overall employee satisfaction and motivation (Jo & Shin, 2025).

**Level of Performance of the Teachers Based on the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES).** The analysis of teachers' performance reveals a generally outstanding level of effectiveness among educators, as measured by the Performance Measurement Evaluation System (PMES). The findings indicate that teachers are perceived as performing exceptionally well in their roles (Fadlun & Fatmawati, 2023). This suggests that the majority of teachers not only meet but exceed expectations, contributing positively to the educational environment (Li et al., 2025).

The consistency of this performance is highlighted by the close clustering of scores around the mean. Such consistency indicates that most teachers are performing at a similar high level, which is beneficial for maintaining quality education across the board (Omaweng, 2022). The narrow range of performance also suggests that even the lowest scores reflect a commendable level of achievement (Engida et al., 2024).

Overall, the data indicates that teachers are excelling in their roles, with little variation in performance levels. This consistency not only reflects positively on the individual educators but also on the overall teaching environment (Nurlina & Lestari, 2022). High performance among teachers can lead to improved student outcomes and a more effective learning atmosphere, reinforcing the importance of supporting and recognizing teachers' contributions to education (Juma, 2024).

**Relationship between the work stressors of teachers and their teaching performance.** The relationship between teacher stress and teaching performance is a complex and often debated topic in educational research. While the provided data suggests a negligible positive correlation between work stressors and teaching performance, with a statistically insignificant p-value, it is crucial to consider this finding within the broader context of existing literature.

Some studies indicate that high levels of stress can lead to teacher burnout, decreased job satisfaction, and a negative impact on student learning outcomes (He et al., 2025). For instance, teachers experiencing burnout may exhibit emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced performance, which can create classroom environments less conducive to learning (Maqsood et al., 2024). Furthermore, stress can compromise teachers' mental health, increasing the risk of anxiety and depression (Flenniken, 2024).

However, other research suggests a more nuanced relationship. Some studies have found a negative correlation between work-related stress and job performance among teachers (Agyapong et al., 2023). Additionally, some researchers argue that certain levels of stress may even enhance performance, as stress can sometimes motivate individuals to meet demands and achieve goals (Padmanabhanunni & Pretorius, 2023). It's important to acknowledge that the impact of stress can vary depending on individual coping mechanisms, the availability of support systems, and the specific sources of stress (Tossici et al., 2024). Factors such as workload, administrative pressures, and student behavior have been identified as key stressors for teachers (Homann & Ehmke, 2025).

**Indicators of Work Stressors Affect the Performance of the Teachers.** The analysis of specific stress-related variables may not show a statistically significant impact on teaching performance in certain datasets, it is crucial to consider these findings within the broader context of research on teacher well-being (Emeljanovas et al., 2023). The teaching profession is inherently demanding, and various stressors can significantly impact teachers' mental and physical health, job satisfaction, and overall effectiveness (Dabrowski et al., 2025). Factors such as heavy workloads, student behavior, and interpersonal relationships can contribute to heightened stress levels and burnout, potentially leading to decreased teaching effectiveness and increased absenteeism (Dreer, 2023).

The impact of stress on teachers can manifest in various ways, including emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced personal accomplishment (Wang et al., 2024). Furthermore, teacher stress can negatively affect students by creating less conducive learning environments and impacting student performance and motivation (Agyapong et al., 2023). Recognizing and addressing these stressors is essential for supporting teachers and creating positive learning environments for students (Padmanabhanunni & Pretorius, 2023).

It's important to note that the relationship between stress and performance is not always straightforward, and individual coping mechanisms and support systems play a crucial role (Jennings & Min, 2023). A supportive school culture, strong principal leadership, and a collaborative environment can promote teacher engagement and effectiveness, mitigating the negative impacts of stress (Zhang & Luo, 2023). Therefore, a comprehensive approach that addresses both individual and organizational factors is necessary to foster teacher well-being and enhance educational outcomes (Kaihoi et al., 2022).

## CONCLUSION

The study highlights the significant impact of work-related stressors on teachers' performance in the New Bataan District, Davao de Oro. Despite facing various stressors such as disagreement, pressure, and workload, teachers

generally maintain a high level of performance, as indicated by the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES). The findings suggest that while stress can influence job satisfaction and well-being, its direct correlation with performance may not be as pronounced as previously thought.

Additionally, the research emphasizes the need for improved communication, support mechanisms, and clarity in job roles to enhance teachers' work environments. Addressing these aspects can foster resilience and job satisfaction among educators, ultimately benefiting the educational outcomes of students.

The findings underscore the importance of recognizing and addressing the unique challenges teachers face, advocating for strategies that promote their well-being and effectiveness in the classroom. By implementing supportive measures, school administrators can create a more conducive environment for teaching and learning, thereby reinforcing the critical role of educators in shaping future generations.

**Recommendation**

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations can be made to enhance leadership practices and support for teachers:

School heads should actively engage teachers in decision-making processes to foster a sense of ownership and collaboration. Regular feedback sessions and workshops can be beneficial in this regard.

Clearly defined roles for all staff members can improve accountability and efficiency. Developing comprehensive job descriptions and organizational charts may assist in this effort.

Administrators should ensure that financial resources are allocated for professional development. Providing teachers with access to training and materials will enhance their skills and job satisfaction.

Establishing a culture where teachers feel recognized and valued is essential. Implementing regular recog programs and maintaining open lines of communication can help build a positive school culture.

School leaders should prioritize curriculum development initiatives that involve teachers. This ensures that planning processes align with best practices and meet the needs of students.

## REFERENCES

1. *Abrahamsen, H., & Gunnulfsen, A. E. (2024). Successful School Principals Balancing Ethical, Personal and Collective – A Norwegian Case. Education Sciences, 14(9), 1014. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14091014*
2. *Agyapong, B., Brett-MacLean, P., Burback, L., Agyapong, V. I. O., & Wei, Y. (2023). Interventions to Reduce Stress and Burnout among Teachers: A Scoping Review [Review of Interventions to Reduce Stress and Burnout among Teachers: A Scoping Review]. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20(9), 5625. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20095625*
3. *Agyapong, B., Obuobi-Donkor, G., Burback, L., & Wei, Y. (2022). Stress, Burnout, Anxiety and Depression among Teachers: A Scoping Review [Review of Stress, Burnout, Anxiety and Depression among Teachers: A Scoping Review]. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(17), 10706. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191710706*
4. *American Institute for Preventive Medicine. (2019). Work Stressor Questionnaire. Healthy Life. https://healthylife.com/online/fullversion/stress/work-stressor-questionnaire.html*
5. *Andargeery, S. Y., Altaweel, E. A., Alkorbi, F. S., Alyousef, L. A., Alanazi, B. F., Idriss, S. H., Alqahtani, S. S., & Alkhamis, L. M. (2025). Nursing students' academic burnout: its prevalence and association with self-efficacy, psychological distress, and quality of learning experience. BMC Nursing, 24(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-025-03242-2*
6. *Anusha, K., & Rajesh, M. K. (2024). Impact of Employee Turnover on Organization Performance with Reference to Optum Global Solutions Pvt. Ltd, Hyderabad. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 5(7), 2362. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.0724.1810*
7. *Cayrat, C., & Boxall, P. (2023). The roles of the HR function: A systematic review of tensions, continuity and change [Review of The roles of the HR function: A systematic review of tensions, continuity and change]. Human Resource Management Review, 33(4), 100984. Elsevier BV. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2023.100984*

8. *Chatterjee, S., Shah, A., Sharma, R., & Wadhwa, M. (2023). Effect of Job Rotation Concept for Nursing Staff with Special Reference to Private Based Hospital, Vadodara. Indian Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 27(3), 197. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijoem.ijoem_354_21*
9. *Chompukum, P., & Vanichbuncha, T. (2025). Building a Positive Work Environment: The Role of Psychological Empowerment in Engagement and Intention to Leave. Behavioral Sciences, 15(2), 131. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15020131*
10. *Chryssouli, E., & Koutroukis, T. (2023). A Comparative Study of Burnout among Several Teachers' Specializations in Secondary Schools of Thessaloniki. Merits, 3(3), 478. https://doi.org/10.3390/merits3030028*
11. *Creagh, S., Thompson, G., Mockler, N., Stacey, M., & Hogan, A. (2023). Workload, work intensification and time poverty for teachers and school leaders: a systematic research synthesis. Educational Review, 1. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2196607*
12. *Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.*
13. *Dabrowski, A., Hsien, M., Zant, T. V. D., & Ahmed, S. K. (2025). "We are left to fend for ourselves": understanding why teachers struggle to support students' mental health. Frontiers in Education, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1505077*
14. *Diomampo, L. V. L., & Quines, L. A. (2023). RESILIENCE AND REFLECTION: ILLUMINATING THE JOY AND SORROW OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH MULTIPLE ANCILLARY SERVICES DURING THE TIME OF PANDEMIC. European Journal of Education Studies, 10(7). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v10i7.4868*
15. *Dreer, B. (2023). On the outcomes of teacher wellbeing: a systematic review of research [Review of On the outcomes of teacher wellbeing: a systematic review of research]. Frontiers in Psychology, 14. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1205179*
16. *Emeljanovas, A., Sabaliauskas, S., Mežienė, B., & Istomina, N. (2023). The relationships between teachers' emotional health and stress coping. Frontiers in Psychology, 14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1276431*
17. *Engida, M. A., Iyasu, A. S., & Fentie, Y. M. (2024). Impact of teaching quality on student achievement: student evidence. Frontiers in Education, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1367317*
18. *Fadlun, F., & Fatmawati, E. (2023). The Effect Of Teacher Performance On Academic Achievement Of Elementary School. An-Nidzam Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Dan Studi Islam, 10(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.33507/an-nidzam.v10i1.1128*
19. *Flenniken, W. (2024). Teacher Burnout and Mitigation. https://spark.bethel.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2067&context=etd*
20. *Ha, C., Pressley, T., & Marshall, D. T. (2025). Teacher voices matter: The role of teacher autonomy in enhancing job satisfaction and mitigating burnout. PLoS ONE, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0317471*
21. *Hall, A. J., Goodwin, V. A., Allchurch, L., Capon, L., Farrell, V. A., Olufunmilayo, O., & Griffin, R. (2024). Feeling valued at work: a qualitative exploration of allied health profession support workers. BMC Health Services Research, 24(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-024-11879-z*
22. *He, L., Huang, L., Huang, Y., Li, H., Zhang, Z., Li, J., Lin, S.-T., Wu, K., Huang, D., & Wu, F. (2025). Prevalence and influencing factors of anxiety, depression, and burnout among teachers in China: a cross-sectional study. Frontiers in Psychiatry, 16. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2025.1567553*
23. *Jennings, P. A., & Min, H. (2023). Transforming Empathy-Based Stress to Compassion: Skillful Means to Preventing Teacher Burnout [Review of Transforming Empathy-Based Stress to Compassion: Skillful Means to Preventing Teacher Burnout]. Mindfulness, 14(10), 2311. Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-023-02115-6*
24. *Jo, H., & Shin, D. (2025). The impact of recognition, fairness, and leadership on employee outcomes: A large-scale multi-group analysis. PLoS ONE, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0312951*
25. *Juma, A. A. (2024). Self-reflection in teaching: A comprehensive guide to empowering educators and enhancing student learning. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 12(1), 2835. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2024.12.1.1113*
26. *Kaihoi, C. A., Bottiani, J. H., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2022). Teachers Supporting Teachers: A Social Network Perspective on Collegial Stress Support and Emotional Wellbeing Among Elementary and Middle School Educators. School Mental Health, 14(4), 1070. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-022-09529-y*
27. *Li, K., Xu, X., Zhang, Y., & Xin-yu, X. (2024). The influence of environmental factors on the job burnout of physical education teachers in tertiary education. Scientific Reports, 14(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-59748-3*
28. *Li, L., Kanchanapoom, K., Deeprasert, J., Duan, N., & Zhou, Q. (2025). Unveiling the factors shaping teacher job performance: exploring the interplay of personality traits, perceived organizational support, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. BMC Psychology, 13(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02324-1*

29. *Lim, J. Y., & Moon, K.-K. (2025). The Public Service Motivation's Impact on Turnover Intention in Korean Public Organizations: Do Perceived Organizational Politics Matter? Behavioral Sciences, 15(4), 474. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15040474*
30. *Makasa, K., & Hapompwe, C. C. (2024). An Assessment of Factors Affecting Employee Performance in Zambian Local Authorities: A Case Study of Lukulu Town Council. Journal of Economics Finance and Management Studies, 7(2). https://doi.org/10.47191/jefms/v7-i2-41*
31. *Manning, J. B., Blandford, A., & Edbrooke-Childs, J. (2024). Facilitators of and Barriers to Teachers' Engagement With Consumer Technologies for Stress Management: Qualitative Study. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 26. https://doi.org/10.2196/50457*
32. *Maqsood, A., Gul, S., Noureen, N., & Yaswi, A. (2024). Dynamics of Perceived Stress, Stress Appraisal, and Coping Strategies in an Evolving Educational Landscape. Behavioral Sciences, 14(7), 532. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14070532*
33. *Molina-Moreno, P., Jurado, M. del M. M., Fuentes, M. del C. P., & Linares, J. J. G. (2024). Analysis of personal competences in teachers: a systematic review [Review of Analysis of personal competences in teachers: a systematic review]. Frontiers in Education, 9. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1433908*
34. *Mukhia, S., & Tenzin, K. (2025). Training academic staff for effective feedback in workplace-based assessment: a study in Bhutan. BMC Medical Education, 25(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-025-07314-4*
35. *Nurlina, N., & Lestari, N. D. (2022). Competency and Motivation Analysis on Educator Performance. JMKSP (Jurnal Manajemen Kepemimpinan Dan Supervisi Pendidikan), 7(1), 258. https://doi.org/10.31851/jmksp.v7i1.7002*
36. *Omaweng, J. B. B. (2022). Perceived Factors Affecting Academic Performance of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) Beneficiaries of Apayao State College. Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences, 1. https://doi.org/10.9734/arjass/2022/v18i330337*
37. *Osias, N. C., & Ladica, R. (2024). Work Ethics on Teachers' Behavior, Attitude and Performance: Basis for Professional Development Plan. American Journal of Arts and Human Science, 3(3), 41. https://doi.org/10.54536/ajahs.v3i3.3046*
38. *Padmanabhanunni, A., & Pretorius, T. B. (2023). Teacher Burnout in the Time of COVID-19: Antecedents and Psychological Consequences. In International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health (Vol. 20, Issue 5, p. 4204). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20054204*
39. *Rabbani, L., & Husain, S. H. (2024). Fostering student engagement with criticism feedback: importance, contrasting perspectives and key provisions. Frontiers in Education, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1344997*
40. *Sadeghi, S. (2024). Employee Well-being in the Age of AI: Perceptions, Concerns, Behaviors, and Outcomes. arXiv (Cornell University). https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2412.04796*
41. *Saraiva, M., & Nogueiro, T. (2025). Perspectives and Realities of Disengagement Among Younger Generation Y and Z Workers in Contemporary Work Dynamics. Administrative Sciences, 15(4), 133. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15040133*
42. *Sartain, L., & Morris, W. (2024). Are Teachers Satisfied With Their Evaluations? The Importance of Teaching Context and Trends Over Time. AERA Open, 10. https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584231221539*
43. *Schepers, O. C. (2023). Exploring the demographics of teachers who experience secondary traumatic stress. BMC Psychology, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-023-01217-z*
44. *Shah, M. (2017). Impact of Interpersonal Conflict in Health Care Setting on Patient Care; the Role of Nursing Leadership Style on Resolving the Conflict. Nursing & Care Open Access Journal, 2(2). https://doi.org/10.15406/ncoaj.2017.02.00031*
45. *Subbey, M. (2023). Stress Management Strategies Employed by Lecturers of Special Education in Selected Public Universities of Ghana. British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies, 4(1), 29. https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0117*
46. *Syamilah, A., Cahyono, D., Sanosra, A., & Sa'id, N. A. M. (2024). The Influence of Career Advancement, Job Promotion, and Competence on Employee Performance Through Work Motivation As An Intervening Variable. Journal of Economics and Business UBS, 13(1), 269. https://doi.org/10.52644/joeb.v13i1.1444*
47. *Tossici, G., Zurloni, V., & Nitri, A. (2024). Stress and sport performance: a PNEI multidisciplinary approach. Frontiers in Psychology, 15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1358771*
48. *Wahab, N. Y. A., Rahman, R. A., Mahat, H., Hudin, N. S., Ramdan, M. R., Razak, M. N. A., & Yadi, N. N. M. (2024). Impacts of Workload on Teachers' Well-Being: A Systematic Literature Review. TEM Journal, 2544. https://doi.org/10.18421/tem133-80*
49. *Wang, H., Sun, Y., Wang, W., & Hong, L. (2025). Exploring the relationship between teachers' perceived workload, challenge-hindrance stress, and work engagement: a person-centered approach. BMC Psychology, 13(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02537-y*
50. *Wang, L., & Hasan, N. A. (2024). Exploring organizational career growth: a systematic literature review and future research directions. Cogent Business & Management, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2398728*

51. *Wang, X., Li, Y., Chen, K., & Zheng, Y. (2024). Understanding teacher emotional exhaustion: exploring the role of teaching motivation, perceived autonomy, and teacher–student relationships. Frontiers in Psychology, 14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1342598*
52. *YILDIZ, C. D. (2023). Unveiling Job Satisfaction of Teachers through a Blend of Methodologies. Sustainability, 15(18), 13986. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151813986*
53. *Zhang, J., Hong, Y., & Smith, A. (2022). The Relationship between Role Ambiguity and Workers' Creativity during the COVID-19 Pandemic in China. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(23), 15977. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192315977*
54. *Zhang, S., & Luo, Y. (2023). Review on the conceptual framework of teacher resilience [Review of Review on the conceptual framework of teacher resilience]. Frontiers in Psychology, 14. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1179984*
55. *Zhou, S., Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. (2024). Factors Associated with Teacher Wellbeing: A Meta-Analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 36(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09886-x*