International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

"Teachers' Stress Management in Module Preparation, Distribution and Retrieval: Basis for Policy Formulation"

[1]Relan M. Juarez, [2]Ernesto P. Ardiente, [3]Genevieve Santorio-Palmares

Iloilo State College of Fisheries

ABSTRACT

This study used quantitative approach to determine the causes of stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery as basis for policy formulation of school principal in the Secondary Schools in the District of Dingle, Iloilo, Philippines, School Year 2020-2021. The research design utilized in this study is descriptive. The design refers to the conceptual plans which convey the approaches and strategies of exploration which was used by a researcher in the process of collecting data. This basic research will be focused on the determination of the stress causes among teachers in the preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules, knowing the stressful experiences of teachers in the activities mentioned and formulation of policy that will alleviate or at least aid the teachers in minimizing stress at work. The respondents will be the Secondary School Teachers in the Schools District of Dingle, Iloilo and this will be conducted in the second semester of School Year 2020-2021, from April to June 2021. A researchers-made questionnaire will serve as the instrument of the study.

The result shows that gender is a factor that could cause or affect stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery among Female Teachers in the district of Dingle. Extra-Occupational Environment, gender is a consideration as Male Participants showed higher mean than that of Female Participants. The Level of Education, that belong to Baccalaureate Degree reported higher mean than those who already earned their master's degree. Simply put, having a higher degree is not an assurance that a teacher is less affected by stress. It is also possible that the higher the educational attainment, the more disengaged a teacher becomes. The age bracket 46 to 50 years old presented the lowest mean for the Extra-Occupational Environment Factor. One can assume that the nearer a teacher to the retirement age, the lower is his or her interest as to engaging into other extra-curricular involvements. For the inferential results, significant differences were noted on the factors that could stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery when classified according to age, gender, and educational status. Gender showed a significant result as maybe assumed by the number of respondents that there were more Female Teachers who answered the survey than the Male Teachers.

Introduction of the Research

The thought ended almost before it started: "This is so overwhelming." It was all one teacher managed to type before they stopped short, vexed into silence, perhaps, by the sheer size of the problem. In the pregnant pause that followed, undoubtedly, every teacher tracking the unspooling thread about the dizzying, rapidly, escalating viral crisis that was closing schools across the country recognized the chasm they were all facing as well and took a deep breath (Cockburn, A. 2020).

In the Philippine context, when the imported and localized transmission of COVID-19 was recorded, the government considered it as a risk to national security (Nicomedes et al., 2020) (Nicomedes, Avila, & Arpia, 2020). Consequently, the Philippine government implemented the Enhanced Community Quarantine (ECQ) to contain the spread of COVID-19 on March 16, 2020. In the face of this continuing health threat, the Department of Education (DepEd) formulated its Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) to put into motion the marching orders of the Secretary to ensure that learning continues while ensuring the health, safety and well-being of all learners, teachers and other DepEd employees. The LCP recognizes that DepEd must adopt alternative modes of learning delivery if it is to reach all learners regardless of who they are. While school-based, Face-to-Face Learning is not possible, the LCP identifies three learning delivery modalities that schools may implement: Distance Learning, Blended Learning and Home Learning (DepEd Regional Memorandum No. 058, series of 2020).

Distance learning has stripped away the spontaneous conversations that people had in the staff lounge or while passing through the hallways, and during virtual meetings, we often get straight to the business at hand. Our initial surveys indicated that one of the things our staffs missed most was the social connection that naturally occurred in causal interactions on campus. In partnership with our school's social committee, holding a bi-weekly social hour where the only rule is "No work talk." It isn't quite the same as in-person gatherings, but it's a nice way for faculty and staff to connect with colleagues outside of a work setting especially in preparation, distribution and retrieval of modules to every barangay where the students are located. Teachers are following the health protocols imposed by the Department of Health to ensure their safety, while being exposed to parents and students, and these actions aligned with the continuity plan of the Department of Education that is stated in the Learning Delivery Modality (LDM).

Efforts to provide support to teachers should be collective. The success of the program lies among school administrators, counselors, and teachers working together toward the shared vision. The more connected and collaborated, the more effective and meaningful our program is (Cockburn, A.2020).

Living through this difficult time has been a good reminder that the social and emotional health of teachers are vital to students' success. The researchers of this study will propose a policy for the entire division to help overcome and manage the stress among teachers amidst this pandemic.

Review of Related Literature

Causes of Teacher Stress in a Normal Setting

Teacher stress can be caused from a variety of situations. Stress often comes about when teachers have difficult negotiating various aspects of interactions with students (Hepburn & Brown, 2001) or from any circumstances that are considered too demanding, depriving of time, and interfering with instruction (Blasé, 2005). Stress can best be explained by categorizing factors into first and second order stressors. First order stressors directly interfere with teacher effort and can include student apathy, student disruption or discipline, poor student attendance, high student to teacher ratios (large classes), paperwork, prep work, irresponsible colleagues, obtrusive supervisors, lack of effective leadership such as assistant principals or principals, and seemingly non-supportive parents. Stressors that occur most frequently tend to be organizational issues dealing with students, administration, other teachers, and other work relationships (Blasé,2005).

Second order stressors do not interfere directly with teacher effort and can include issues such as low salary, emotional fatigue, frustration, helplessness, stagnation, boredom, and loss of motivation or enthusiasm (Blasé,2005).

Teachers' experiences of stress and their coping strategies during COVID-19 induced distance teaching.

The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in unprecedented actions in education: From the 13th of March to the 23rd of April, all schools were closed, and teachers had to teach their students from home. Thereafter, schools opened partly and stepwise. The distance teaching imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic was a mixture of traditional public schooling and homeschooling (Wrase, 2020). Whereas schools set up the curriculum and teachers provided tasks and instructions, parents were expected to implement these tasks and instructions.

Neither the parents nor the teachers were well prepared to master the multiple challenges these changes imposed on them. Many parents experienced unstructured task transmission by teachers and a lack of teacher feedback (Wildemann & Hosenfeld, 2020), whereas teachers struggled with keeping their relationships to their students and missed advice and support from their schools (Goetz, 2020). Presumably, the gap in students' achievement between families of high and low socioeconomic status will be widened due to differences in material and educational resources, living space, or availability of time, when children were taught at home (Anger & Plünnecke, 2020; Bol, 2020).

Little is known about factors that contributed to difficulties of teachers to ensure continuation of instruction when most teaching was conducted from home. For example, schools and teachers became increasingly dependent on digital tools for both teaching and communication processes. Whereas for some teachers, using the internet, communicating via social-media channels or using video-conference tools did not pose a real problem, other teachers might experience remote teaching as a burden (Quezada, Talbot & Quezada-Parker, 2020). Depending on their (technical) skills some teachers may have perceived the situation as positive, whereas others considered it as irrelevant. Moreover, others may have perceived it as negative and stressful (Drossel, Eickelmann, Schaumburg & Labusch, 2019). If the latter is the case, it can be a potential stressor and might in turn result in the experience of stress and lower well-being (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2018).

In a survey conducted in Germany between the 2nd and the 14th of April 2020, Eickelmann and Drossel (2020) revealed that on average only 33 % of N = 310 teachers felt well prepared for remote teaching, with teachers serving in the highest track of secondary school (Gymnasium) feeling more prepared than those teaching in lower tracks of secondary school or in primary school. The authors explain the difference between the school tracks as a result of differences in supply with hardware and knowledge in software between students of different tracks, with primary-school students being the least skilled and worst equipped groups of students (Eickelmann & Drossel, 2020).

Furthermore, 34 % of the teachers in this survey experienced the new situation as a burden, whereas 36 % of the teachers indicated that they benefitted from remote teaching. Currently, we still do not know much about the psychological factors that account for the differences in teachers' experiences of remote teaching and their actual teaching behavior. For example, it is unclear why and how some teachers maintained daily contact to and relationships with students and parents during the lockdown, whereas others made contact to their students and parents only once a week (Porsch & Porsch, 2020), or why some teachers mastered digital technologies, whereas others experienced discomfort.

Major barriers limiting teachers' ability to use and integrate technology into classrooms are lack of resources, time, and support (e.g., Pittman & Gaines, 2015). Ample studies have shown that teachers are prone to experience stress when they feel lack of support and time when teaching students (e.g. Kyriacou, 2010; Pithers & Soden, 1998; Travers & Cooper, 1996). In addition, teachers are also likely to experience stress if they have to use technology for which they do not feel competent enough (e.g., Al-Fudail & Mellar, 2008). During the lockdown, both conditions certainly applied. Stressors outside of work can also play a key role, such as socio-demographic factors or coping strategies. Carver, Scheier, and Weintraub (1989) distinguished between different styles of coping with stress, which could be either active or functional on the one hand or could impede activity and hence be dysfunctional on the other hand.

The current study aimed at closing the gap between what is already known about stressors affecting teachers' remote teaching practices, and how teachers overcame the stress during the COVID-19 imposed lockdown. Most teachers considered the lack of adequate computer equipment, alongside with a low internet connectivity, as major barriers for successful teaching. This result mirrors complaints that diverse agents in society have made years ago (e.g., Harwardt, 2020). Thus, teachers faced technological problems that were already known, but during the lockdown they became visible.

Furthermore, teachers felt constrained by excessive student workload and their low motivation for doing schoolwork at home. When teachers experienced that their students were overstrained by distance teaching and learning, they may have feared a tendency for them to employ a surface learning approach (Kember & Leung, 2006), which in turn might prevent them for reaching the learning goals. In addition, low motivation of students would also prevent them for reaching learning goals. Students' low motivation might have been the result of a combination of both students' low-to-medium computer and internet skills (Eickelmann, Bos, Gerick & Labusch, 2019), and teachers' low ability to facilitate online learning and to overcome technological limitations (Fryer & Bovee, 2016). However, there was no significant relationship between type of school and the number of barriers experienced by teachers. Since the mere number of experienced barriers and the level of stress did not correlate significantly, the number of barriers seems to cover a different aspect of subjective pressure than perceived stress.

Third, the result that teachers applied on average more functional coping strategies (e.g., planning or seeking social support) than dysfunctional coping strategies (e.g., giving up to attempt goals or drinking alcohol) underlines that most of them felt able to actively and deliberately manage distance teaching. However, although many teachers preferred functional over dysfunctional strategies, almost all of them also used dysfunctional strategies, like, for instance, watching more TV or abandoning personal goals.

Teachers were more likely to use functional than dysfunctional coping strategies when they attributed the causes of their constraints to external factors, like parents' low motivation or the school's low level of organization. However, when they internalized the constraints, e.g. when they complained about their own level of organization or the low level of digital competence, they preferred dysfunctional over functional coping strategies.

According to Abosede (2004), female workers are more stressed because they attempt to strike a balance between professional and home responsibilities.

Female teachers were more stressed than male teachers, but female teachers also used more often functional coping strategies than their male colleagues. Elevated work stress of females might stem from gender differences in domains outside of work, such that female teachers may experience higher workload for teaching and domestic tasks at the same time or a sharper conflict between work and family roles (Greenglass & Burke, 2003).

It may also be that teachers who perceived greater stress from responsibility for students' achievement exerted more effort during lesson planning and distance teaching and thus used more functional than dysfunctional coping strategies (cf. Klassen & Chiu, 2010).

Meta-Model of Stress

In the context of the worksite, the individual's attributes are interests, transferable skills, career motives and values, personality preferences, career orientations, self-concept, and sense of self-efficacy. The work environment includes individual's expectations and perceptions regarding workload, control over one's work, tangible and intrinsic rewards of work, the relationship and sense of community among co-workers, perceptions of fairness in the worksite and the role of personal and organizational values (Herr, Cramer, & Niles, 2004). Stress results if the fit between an individual and environment is incompatible. Similarly, lack of fit between the demands placed on individuals and their abilities to meet those demands can result in stress. Though there are evidences that stress occurs because of complex interaction between individual characteristics and issues in the work environment, research has not systematically considered the role of person variables, such as gender, in this direction especially studying the manifestation of stress among secondary school teachers in the area of the present study. Charlie (2001) noted that there is gender-based differences in teachers' stress. Ahlberg, Kononen, Rantala, Sarna, Lindholm and Nissinen (2003) also approved to the fact that females are more exposed to stress than their male counterparts.

The Critical Review of Theoretical Models Linking Work Environment, Stress and Health created a Meta-Model out of Seventeen (17) Theoretical Models and studies about work-related stress. This study categorized stress into four: physiological (heart rate, blood pressure, etc), experiential (affects, hope, etc.), behavioral (smoking, civility, etc.) and cognitive (concentration, decision making, etc.). The study presented that stress is caused by misaligned expectation of the worker with what the working environment can provide, resulting to negative effects on the health of the worker. The variables in the study were categorized into five, namely: Socio-demographic characteristics (gender, age, level of education, etc.), individual characteristics (personality, self-esteem, cognition, behavior, etc.), Work Characteristics (Job Design), Social Support (peers, superiors, etc.) and Extra-occupational Environment (social support outside the working sphere), (Althaus, Kop, & Grosjean, 2013).

Summary of Literature and Reviews

The literature of the study focused on the causes of teacher stress in a normal setting that can be explained by categorizing factors into first and second order stressors., teachers' experiences of stress and their coping strategies during COVID-19 induced distance teaching that was a mixture of traditional public schooling and homeschooling and the meta-model of stress created a Meta-Model caused by misaligned expectation of the worker with what the working environment can provide, resulting to negative effects on the health of the worker.

Research Questions

This study aims to determine the causes of stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery as basis for policy formulation of school principals in the District of Dingle, Iloilo, Philippines, School Year 2020-2021.
Specifically, the study seeks answers to the following:

1. What are the factors that cause stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery when classified according to age, gender, and educational status?
2. Is there a significant difference in the factors that cause stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during

learning delivery when classified according to age, gender, and educational status?

3. What are the stressful experiences of teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery?
4. What policies are to be proposed to minimize or eliminate the stress among teachers in the preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules?

Scope and Limitation

This study aims to determine the causes of stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery as basis for policy formulation of school principal in the Schools District of Dingle, Iloilo, Philippines, School Year 2020-2021.The respondents will be the Secondary School Teachers in the Schools District of Dingle, Iloilo and this will be conducted in the second semester of School Year 2020-2021, from April to June 2021. A researchers-made questionnaire will serve as the instrument of the study. Results from their responses will be coded, recorded, analyzed, and interpreted using the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS). Based on the results, the researchers will formulate a policy on how to fight and overcome stress in the distribution of modules which is the implemented Learning Delivery Modality (LDM).

Research Methodology

Quantitative approach will be used to determine the causes of stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery as basis for policy formulation of school principal in the Secondary Schools in the District of Dingle, Iloilo, Philippines, School Year 2020-2021. This basic research will be focused on the determination of the stress causes among teachers in the preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules, knowing the stressful experiences of teachers in the activities mentioned and formulation of policy that will alleviate or at least aid the teachers in minimizing stress at work. This will be anchored on the study entitled Critical Review of Theoretical Models Linking Work Environment, Stress and Health: Towards a Meta-Model, in which, several Occupational Stress Models have been analyzed and a Meta-Model was developed for general use.

The research design utilized in this study is descriptive. The design refers to the conceptual plans which convey the approaches and strategies of exploration which was used by a researcher in the process of collecting data. The research design provides structure to the research and shows all the parts of the research work together to address the central question. In this study the research design that was used is descriptive survey design by Frankel and Wallen (2000).

This research will use a 10-point Likert scale as it offers more variance and higher degree of precision than using a 5-point or 7-point Likert scale. It also minimizes the problem of leniency, central tendency and the “halo effect” associated with such scales (Walker, 1994)

To validate further the results of this study, the researchers included a written response that describe the participants’ experiences during the distribution, retrieval and preparation of module during pandemic.

Participants and the Sampling Procedure

The participants involve in this study are the Secondary School Teachers in the District of Dingle, Iloilo. Convenience Sampling will be used to determine the samples and the researchers decided to take all the participants who have a stable internet connectivity that may be able to open google form only. Researchers decided to use this sampling procedure to avoid exposure to COVID-19 that is very much possible if the study will be conducted on a face-to-face set-up. Another reason for using this sampling procedure is that since the funding for this research is from personal funds, the researchers opted to conduct the study using online platform to minimize cost of reproduction and printing. The highest mean scores based on their responses serve as a basis for policy formulation of school principals.

Research Instruments

This study will use a researchers-made questionnaire that will be presented to the experts for content validation. The researchers prepared a questionnaire composed of descriptive questions with five parts namely Socio-demographic Characteristics, Individual Characteristics, Work Characteristics, Social Support and Extra-Occupational Environment of teachers in Learning Delivery Modality (LDM) Amidst Pandemic such as preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules.

After the validation of the experts in the same field of education and psychology, the researchers will incorporate all the comments and suggestions. This will be presented first to the BERF committee before administration to the participants. To gather data from the participants, the researchers will encode the questionnaire through google forms for online responses since COVID-19 pandemic still poses a serious threat everywhere. After the data collected from the respondents, the researchers encoded and generated the results using the SPSS. For descriptive statistics, the researchers recorded the means of the following variables and for inferential statistics, Mann Whitney U Test was utilized to find the significant difference between two variables when they were classified according to sex and Kruskal Wallis Test to find the significant result between three or more variables when group according to their level of education and age, since their responses were not normally distributed.

In the qualitative part, a simple thematic analysis will be used to validate further the responses of the participants from the results. The common stress that teachers’ experience during the preparation, distribution and retrieval of modules will be analyzed by the researchers to find out seriously which is parallel to the policy formulation.

Ethical Issues

To uphold the confidentiality of the research data, the researchers will ensure that the questionnaires will not reflect the names of the respondents and all research input will be safely archived. Moreover, the content of the questionnaires was discussed to all the secondary district principal to explained during their meetings to the teachers so that they would be able to know about the demands and benefits entailed by their participation in the study.

Discussion of Results and Recommendations

Findings

Table 1 presents factors that could cause stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery when classified according to age, gender, and educational status. The table shows that gender is a factor that could cause or affect stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery as shown by a higher mean of 8.22 among Male Teachers compared to a mean of 7.42 among Female Teachers.

In addition, the age of 46 to 50 years old showed the highest mean among the age bracket presented in Table 1 with the age of 35 to 40 years old showing the lowest mean. Simply put, the respondents aged 46 to 50 considers age as a factor that could cause stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery whereas those aged 35 to 40 perceived the opposite. As for Work Characteristics as a factor that could cause or affect stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery, the respondents nearing the retirement age of 60 showed the lowest mean of 7.75. The Factor Social Support showed that the younger age bracket had the highest mean amongst the other age brackets.

Finally, for the Extra-Occupational Environment, gender is a consideration as Male Participants showed higher mean than that of Female Participants. Surprisingly, as for the Level of Education, those who are graduates of Baccalaureate Degree reported higher mean than those who already earned their master's degree. Simply put, having a higher degree is not an assurance that a teacher is less affected by stress. It is also possible that the higher the educational attainment, the more disengaged a teacher becomes. The age bracket 46 to 50 years old presented the lowest mean for the Extra-Occupational Environment Factor. One can assume that the nearer a teacher to the retirement age, the lower is his or her interest as to engaging into other extra-curricular involvements.

In parallel to the study of Abosede (2004), female workers are more stressed because they attempt to strike a balance between professional and home responsibilities.

Female teachers were more stressed than male teachers, but female teachers also used more often functional coping strategies than their male colleagues

Table 1.

Factors that could stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery when classified according to age, gender, and educational status.

Factors	*n*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Description*
A. Individual Characteristics				
• Gender				
Male	*7*	*8.22*	*0.71*	Agree
Female	*44*	*7.42*	*0.88*	Mostly Agree
• Level of Education				
Baccalaureate	*31*	*7.51*	*0.88*	Agree
Master's Degree	*20*	*7.55*	*0.94*	Agree
• Age				
26 to 30 years old	*11*	*7.41*	*1.13*	Mostly Agree
31 to 35 years old	*7*	*7.72*	*0.68*	Agree
35 to 40 years old	*14*	*7.27*	*1.08*	Mostly Agree
41 to 45 years old	*9*	*7.8*	*0.70*	Agree
46 to 50 years old	*3*	*8.09*	*0.47*	Agree
51 to 55 years old	*4*	*7.42*	*0.74*	Mostly Agree

56 to 60 years old	*3*	*7.44*	*0.34*	Mostly Agree

B. Work Characteristics

- Gender

Male	*7*	*8.80*	*0.49*	Strongly Agree
Female	*44*	*8.75*	*0.87*	Strongly Agree

- Level of Education

Baccalaureate	*31*	*8.77*	*0.90*	Strongly Agree
Master's Degree	*20*	*8.74*	*0.71*	Strongly Agree

- Age

26 to 30 years old	*11*	*8.78*	*1.08*	Strongly Agree
31 to 35 years old	*7*	*9.23*	*0.58*	Strongly Agree
35 to 40 years old	*14*	*8.50*	*0.75*	Strongly Agree
41 to 45 years old	*9*	*9.01*	*0.62*	Strongly Agree
46 to 50 years old	*3*	*8.70*	*0.29*	Strongly Agree
51 to 55 years old	*4*	*9.00*	*0.71*	Strongly Agree
56 to 60 years old	*3*	*7.75*	*0.94*	Agree

C. Social Support

- Gender

Male	*7*	*7.80*	*1.31*	Agree
Female	*44*	*7.73*	*0.96*	Agree

- Level of Education

Baccalaureate	*31*	*7.73*	*1.02*	Agree
Master's Degree	*20*	*7.76*	*0.98*	Agree

- Age

26 to 30 years old	*11*	*8.07*	*0.89*	Agree
31 to 35 years old	*7*	*8.09*	*0.90*	Agree
35 to 40 years old	*14*	*7.46*	*1.09*	Mostly Agree
41 to 45 years old	*9*	*7.73*	*0.89*	Agree
46 to 50 years old	*3*	*7.27*	*2.00*	Mostly Agree
51 to 55 years old	*4*	*7.55*	*0.91*	Agree
56 to 60 years old	*3*	*7.80*	*0.53*	Agree

D. Extra-Occupational Environment

- Gender

Male	*7*	*8.23*	*1.21*	Agree
Female	*44*	*7.41*	*1.50*	Mostly Agree

- Level of Education

Baccalaureate	*31*	*7.59*	*1.46*	Agree
Master's Degree	*20*	*7.42*	*1.56*	Mostly Agree
• Age				
26 to 30 years old	*11*	*8.06*	*1.09*	Agree
31 to 35 years old	*7*	*8.05*	*1.95*	Agree
35 to 40 years old	*14*	*7.26*	*1.58*	Mostly Agree
41 to 45 years old	*9*	*7.74*	*0.81*	Agree
46 to 50 years old	*3*	*6.44*	*2.36*	Slightly Agree
51 to 55 years old	*4*	*7.00*	*1.44*	Mostly Agree
56 to 60 years old	*3*	*6.67*	*1.86*	Mostly Agree

Note: The description was based on the indicated scale.

Scale	*Descriptive Rating*
9.50 - 10.00	Very Strongly Agree
8.50 – 9.49	Strongly Agree
7.50 – 8.49	Agree
6.50 – 7.49	Mostly Agree
5.50 – 6.49	Slightly Agree
4.50 – 5.49	Slightly Disagree
3.50 – 4.49	Mostly Disagree
2.50 – 3.49	Disagree
1.50 – 2.49	Strongly Disagree
1.00 – 1.49	Very Strongly Disagree

Table 2 below presents the significant differences on the factors that could stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery when classified according to age, gender, and educational status. As shown in the table, only Gender showed a significant result as maybe assumed by the number of respondents that there were more Female Teachers who answered the survey than the Male Teachers. The sampling procedure is also one of the considerations that affected the result as Convenience Sampling was used. Also, when looking at the gender ratio in the Department of Education, the number of Female Teachers is higher than the Male Teachers, thus affecting the result of this study.

Charlie (2001) noted that there is gender-based differences in teachers' stress. Ahlberg, Kononen, Rantala, Sarna, Lindholm and Nissinen (2003) also approved to the fact that females are more exposed to stress than their male counterparts.

Table 2

Significant differences on the factors that could stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery when classified according to age, gender, and educational status.

Factors	*n*	*df*	Sig.(2-tailed)	Interpretation
A. Individual Characteristics				
• Gender				
Male	*7*	*49*	*0.029*	*Significant*
Female	*44*			
• Level of Education				
Baccalaureate	*31*	*49*	*0.985*	*Not Significant*
Master's Degree	*20*			

• Age	*51*	*50*	*0.483*	*Not Significant*
B. Work Characteristics				
• Gender				
Male	*7*	*49*	*0.956*	*Not Significant*
Female	*44*			
• Level of Education				
Baccalaureate	*31*	*49*	*0.735*	*Not Significant*
Master's Degree	*20*			
Age	*51*	*50*	*0.378*	*Not Significant*
C. Social Support				
• Gender				
Male	*7*	*49*	*0.519*	*Not Significant*
Female	*44*			
• Level of Education				
Baccalaureate	*31*	*49*	*0.735*	*Not Significant*
Master's Degree	*20*			
Age	*51*	*50*	*0.683*	*Not Significant*
D. Extra-Occupational Environment				
• Gender				
Male	*7*	*49*	*0.149*	*Not Significant*
Female	*44*			
• Level of Education				
Baccalaureate	*31*	*49*	*0.885*	*Not Significant*
Master's Degree	*20*			
Age	*51*	*50*	*0.448*	*Not Significant*

Note: $p < 0.05$

Stressful experiences of teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery.

Participant 1. Students do not pass answer sheets on time.

Participant 2. Exhausted every time there is distribution of modules, from packing of modules by subject areas, and segregating per barangay.

Participant 3. Lack of preparation and coordination with the teachers

Participant 4. We're running out of time in preparing and checking of modules.

Participant 5. When I still have a lot of papers to check and at the same time I need to print some modules that is not provided by the school who prints and need to sort out the papers and modules to be returned, plus the making of grades and passing it on or before the deadline. So, what I did is before leaving the house it is already programed in my mind of what should I do for that day. And of course, I give time to relax to relieve stress.

Participant 6. Time management in preparing modules at the same time checking six hundred fifty pieces of papers weekly plus paper works and report to submit.

Participant 7. Sorting of modules, going to the assigned barangay or reaching out students in their respective houses just to give the learning materials and waiting for the learners that cannot met the deadline of retrieval.

Participant 8. The module sometimes is delivered a day before the distribution and upon retrieval some parents did not submit on the deadline being set.

Participant 9. Sorting of answer sheet especially in MAPEH.

Participant 10. The module sometimes is delivered a day before the distribution and upon retrieval some parents did not submit on the deadline being set.

Participant 11. Late arrival of modules.

Participant 12. I think the most stressful experience is that, the preparation of modules for a large number of advisory students because I need to segregate the answer sheets and compile all of them in different subjects and also waiting of finish printed modules to be compiled. But I need to focus my work and give on time to finish my task.

Participant 13. Difficult to retrieved module specially in remote areas without means of transportation.

Participant 14. Parents who do not follow the exact schedule of getting the modules.

Participant 15. Collating and packing of module per student.

Participant 16. The most stressful experience was the very first day of packing of modules; First, wherein I need to identify all my students per barangay, their addresses, contact numbers and majors in TLE. Second, segregating the modules per subject and per student. Third, looking for printers to provide a copy for some lacking pages of the module.

Summary

The factors that could cause stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery when classified according to age, gender, and educational status are Individual Characteristics, Work Characteristics, Social Support, and the Extra-Occupational Environment of the Teachers.

Based on the result of this study, only gender showed a significant difference in the factors that cause stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery.

The stressful experience of the teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery include learners and parents not submitting their answer sheets on time, lack of preparation and coordination among teachers, the number of learners in one class and the difficulty in accessing remote areas in the distribution of modules. This is presented in narrative part of the survey answered by the teachers.

Conclusions

Therefore, based on the result of this study, only gender showed a significant difference in the factors that cause stress among teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules during learning delivery when classified according to age, gender, and educational status.

Recommendations

The researchers suggest the use of cluster sampling procedure in the reconduct of this study to really capture the totality of the respondents. The researchers used convenience sampling as of this moment due to the limitations in the mobility to conduct the study among schools. The researchers also suggest conducting the same study to the rest of the schools in the Schools Division of Iloilo. The proposed policy is attached in the manuscript.

Dissemination and Advocacy Plan

Upon the interpretation of the results, the researchers will make a policy to address the gap on the stress of teachers in preparation, distribution, and retrieval of modules. A formulated policy to minimize the stress among teachers will be presented to the Division Office to be adopted and copies of the study will be distributed to all Secondary Schools in the District of Dingle, Iloilo.

Action Plan

After the completion of this basic research study, the result of this study will be presented to the School Heads and Teachers through School Based In-Service Training. In the preparation of continuing the new normal education for the next school year, it is necessary to minimize the problems of teachers on stress, on how they could manage to promote a healthy mind and environment.

References

Alan M. Voelker, Charles A. Wall, Research and development in science education: A bibliographic history, Science Education, 10.1002/sce.3730570303, 57, 3, (263-270), (2006). Wiley Online Library.

Abidin, R. & Robinson, L. (2002). Stress, biases, or professionalism: What drives teachers 'referral judgments of students with challenging behaviors? Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 10(4), 204-212.

Bacharach, S., Bauer, S., & Conley, S. (1986). Organizational analysis of stress: The case of elementary and secondary schools. Work and Occupations, 13(1), 7-32.

Bachkirova, T. (2005). Teacher stress and personal values: An exploratory study. School

Psychology International, 26(3), 340-352.

Barmby, P. (2006). Improving teacher recruitment and retention: The importance of workload

and pupil behavior. Educational Research, 48(3), 247-265

Bindhu, C.M., & Sudheeshkumar, P.K. (2006). Job satisfaction and stress coping skills of primary school teachers. Calicut: Department of Education, Farook Training College.

Berryhill, J., Linney, J.A., & Fromewick, J. (2009). The effects of education accountability on teachers: Are policies too stress provoking for their own good? International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership, 4(5), 1-14.

Blasé, J. (2005). A social-psychological grounded theory of teacher stress and burnout. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(4), 93-113.

Blasé, J. (2005). A qualitative analysis of sources of teacher stress: Consequences for performance. American Educational Research Journal, 23(1), 13-40.

Burke, S., Rager, R., & Wallen, M. (2008). Stress Coping Behaviors Among College Students. American Public Health Association 137th Annual Conference. San Diego, CA, October 27, 2008.

Chaney, E., Burke, S., & Rager, R. (in review). Development of an instrument to assess stress, depression, and coping among Latino Migrant Seasonal Farmworkers.

Cockburn, A. (2020). Primary teachers' knowledge and acquisition of stress relieving strategies. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 63, 399-410.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). Qualitative inquiry & research design (2nd ed.). Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA. Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention Centre of British Columbia (2010). Coping with Stress. Retrieved December 20, 2020, from www.crisiscentre.bc.ca/get-help/coping-withstress/.

Crosby, R.A., DiClemente, R.J. & Salazar, L.F. (eds.). Research Methods in Health Promotion. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 2006.

Farber, B. (2006). Crisis in education: stress and burnout in the American teacher. Jossey-Bass Publishers: San Francisco.

Griffith, J., Steptoe, A., & Cropley, M. (2000). An investigation of coping strategies associated with job stress in teachers. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 69, 517531.

Guglielmi, R., & Tatrow, K. (2000). Occupational stress, burnout, and health in teachers: A methodological and theoretical analysis. Review of Educational Research, 68(1), 61-99.

Gulwadi, G. (2006). Seeking restorative experiences: Elementary school teachers' choices for places that enable coping with stress. Environment and Behavior, 38, 503-520.

Harden, R.M. & Crosby, J. (2000). The good teacher is more than a lecturer- the twelve roles of the teacher. Medical Teacher, 22(4), 334-347.

Hastings, R., & Bham, M. (2003). The relationship between student behaviour patterns and teacher burnout. School Psychology International, 24(1), 115-127.

Hepburn, A., & Brown, S. (2001). Teacher stress and management of accountability. Human Relations, 54(6), 691-715.

Howard, S., & Johnson, B. (2004). Resilient teachers: resisting stress and burnout. Social Psychology of Education, 7, 399-420.

Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. Educational Review, 53(1),27-35.

Lambert, R. et al. (2009). Measuring elementary teacher stress and coping in the classroom: Validity evidence for the classroom appraisal of resources and demands. Psychology in the Schools, 0(0), 1-16.

Mrozek, K. (2005). Teacher Stress Presentation. Retrieved March 3, 2010, from www.cedu.niu.edu/~shumow/itt/Teacher%20stress.pdf National Union of Teachers (2010). Retrieved April 8, 2010, from www.teachers.org.uk

Palmer, S., & Dryden, W. (2002). Counseling for Stress Problems. London: Sage.

Pettegrew, L., & Wolf, G. (2002). Validating measures of teacher stress. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), 383-396. Public Schools of North Carolina (2007). The annual report of the reasons, teachers leave the profession. Retrieved December 28, 2020, from www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/recruitment/surveys/turnover/reasonsteachersleave06-07.pdf

Quezada, R. L., Talbot, C. & Quezada-Parker, K. B. (2020). From bricks and mortar to remote teaching: a teacher education programmes's response to Covid 19. Journal of Education for Teaching. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1801330

Skaalvik, E. M. & Skaalvik, S. (2018). Job demands and job resources as predictors of teachers' motivation and well-being. Social Psychology of Education, 21, 1251-1275. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-018-9464-8

Sutton, R. (2001). Job stress among primary and secondary schoolteachers: Its relationship to illbeing. Work and Occupations, 11(1), 7-28. Stress Management (2010). Helpguide.org. Retrieved December 2020, from www.helpguide.org/mental/stress_management_relief_coping.htm United States Department of Education (2011). Retrieved January 3, 2021 from www.ed.gov