

Teaching Work-Related Stress of Public Elementary School Teachers

Mitos M. Dela Cruz

STI West Negros University
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2833-9854>
mitos.delacruz@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

Teaching is one of the most demanding professions, requiring educators to balance instructional duties, administrative tasks, and learner management. Consequently, this study examined the level of work-related stress experienced by 92 elementary public-school teachers in a District under a medium-sized Division in Central Philippines during the school year 2025–2026. Stress was analyzed across three domains: workload and time pressure, learner behavior, and ancillary tasks, with demographic variables such as age, educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught considered. A descriptive-comparative design was employed, using a validated researcher-made questionnaire and frequency counts, percentages, means, and the Mann–Whitney U test as statistical tools. Findings revealed that most respondents were older, highly educated, and experienced teachers handling lower grade levels. Across all domains, teachers reported a high level of stress, particularly in meeting deadlines for school requirements, managing disruptive student behavior, and handling paperwork unrelated to teaching. Despite these challenges, the comparative analysis showed no significant differences in stress levels across demographic groups, confirming that work-related stress is a universal issue among elementary teachers. The study concludes that administrative compliance and learner dynamics are the most significant hurdles for educators, underscoring the need for systemic support. Recommendations include streamlining administrative processes through digital solutions, implementing flexible timelines for school requirements, promoting collaborative resource sharing, and integrating wellness-focused modules into professional development. Parents and community partners are also encouraged to support classroom discipline and resource-building initiatives. Finally, the proposed wellness plan provides a framework for reducing teacher stress, enhancing resilience, and sustaining instructional effectiveness.

Keywords: *Work-related stress, public elementary school teachers, teaching profession stress factors*

Bio-Profile:

Mitos Dela Cruz is a dedicated educator currently serving as a public elementary school teacher. With a strong commitment to promoting quality education and teacher’s well-being. Her study, “Teaching Work-Related Stress of Public Elementary School Teachers: Basis for A Wellness Plan aims to contribute to the improvement of workplace conditions and over-all well-being of teachers in the public education system.



Introduction

Rationale

Teaching is often considered a challenging profession due to the demands of maintaining instructional, administrative, and student support while adapting to changing educational reforms. This distinction makes teaching one of the most demanding occupations in education. In light of SDG 4: Quality Education, which aims to provide quality, inclusive education to all, teachers are now given an even greater voice. Competent, motivated, and supportive teachers are of utmost importance in fulfilling the diverse needs of learners worldwide.

Elementary school teachers are subject to various stressors, including workload and time pressure, learner behavior, and extracurricular activities. Such teachers have always been troubled by large class sizes, varied learning abilities, limited instructional resources, and increased expectations from parents, school leaders, and the community. These challenges can lead to prolonged periods of stress, adversely affecting teachers' performance, job satisfaction, and overall well-being. Sustainable, high-quality education for all students can be ensured by offering adequate institutional support and promoting teacher well-being.

Stress is a common problem across the board, caused by time and work pressures. A teacher must constantly balance teaching, class planning, grading, and instructional hours with extracurricular activities (Amata, 2023). Students who are unruly, uninspired, or have varying developmental levels must face significant emotional and cognitive challenges. Pilos et al. (2024) found that instructors' self-efficacy can be negatively affected by chronic stress associated with classroom management. Besides teaching, administrative tasks such as writing reports, completing paperwork, and participating in school activities can be overwhelming. Added obligations limit the time available for essential instructional preparation and lead to professional disintegration (Magtala & Eduvala, 2024).

The researcher has stated that teaching is widely acknowledged as one of the most arduous jobs, given that she works as an elementary teacher. Additionally, this observation has motivated the researcher's professional commitment to addressing work-related stress to protect teachers' mental health and students' success. Identifying key stressors and creating a wellness plan were the primary focus of this study, which sought to provide teachers with tangible support, improve their resilience, and promote sustainability in an educational setting.

Literature Review

The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model explains that teacher stress arises when job demands exceed available resources. Zhao et al. (2022) found that teachers experiencing high job stress are more likely to develop burnout, especially when low self-efficacy and work–family conflict are present. Fu, Ouyang, Liu, and Wang (2023) further emphasized that inadequate organizational support intensifies stress when teachers perceive insufficient resources to meet demands. Similarly, Chapple (1922) noted that limited rest time and excessive administrative tasks contribute to chronic stress and reduced instructional focus, highlighting the cumulative impact of workload pressures.

Teacher stress is also shaped by classroom dynamics and behavioral challenges. Cox et al. (2018) describe stress as negative emotional experiences that reduce teachers' self-efficacy, while Demjaha et al. (2015) note that routine disruptions can trigger significant stress responses. Persistent disruptive student behavior is a major source of stress as it interrupts instruction and increases emotional strain (Crudup, 2020; NSW Department of Education, 2020; ERIC, 2021). Martí González and Alcalá Ibaez (2023) add that high academic expectations and classroom management demands further intensify perceived stress, particularly when teachers struggle to balance instructional goals and discipline.

Administrative workload is another consistent stressor across studies. Kyriacou (2021) found that paperwork, meetings, and compliance tasks reduce instructional preparation time, while Schmidt and Datnow (2020) highlighted cumulative pressure from multiple role expectations. Waga et al. (2020) noted that early-career teachers struggle with classroom management and additional duties, while experienced teachers face stress from curriculum changes and lesson preparation demands (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2021; Kurrle & Warwas, 2023). Across contexts, broader systemic factors such as policy changes, limited support, and shifts in teaching modalities further intensify stress (Petrankova et al., 2021; Schaffhauser, 2020).

In the Philippine context, workload and time management are major stressors among elementary school teachers. Manalo and Velasco (2024) found that long working hours, limited leave usage, and increasing task



demands disrupt work–life balance, often leading to anxiety and poor mental health outcomes. Acaja and Narido (2025) further emphasized that teachers handle multiple roles simultaneously, straining their time management capacity. Combined with limited institutional support, these demands often extend working hours and contribute to chronic stress and fatigue.

Additional stressors include learner behavior and administrative responsibilities. Diverse learning needs, behavioral issues, and socio-emotional difficulties can overwhelm teachers, particularly in large classes, leading to emotional exhaustion. Administrative duties such as documentation, reporting, and coordination tasks also consume significant instructional time (Balancing Act: Exploring the Impact of Ancillary Duties on Filipino Teachers' Professional Lives). Ellovido and Quirap (2024) noted that despite coping strategies, stress remains high due to limited systemic support, while blurred work–life boundaries further worsen well-being (Manalo & Velasco, 2024). These conditions highlight the need for workload rationalization and stronger institutional support.

Sarabia and Collantes (2020) found that Filipino teachers experience varying levels of stress across workload demand, control, role expectations, and workplace relationships, with elementary teachers reporting higher stress than secondary teachers. Ortega-Dela Cruz (2016) further emphasized that excessive workload and role conflict reduce job satisfaction and may lead to attrition. Supporting studies show that administrative burdens, instructional demands, and role overload significantly affect teacher readiness and performance (Calao & Yazon, 2020; Orlanda-Ventayen & Ventayen, 2021). Overall, research consistently shows that teacher stress is driven by the interaction of workload, classroom challenges, and systemic demands across different teaching contexts.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The study on elementary school teachers' work-related stressors is based on Hans Selye's Theory of Stress (1936; 1950), which differentiates between stages of weariness, resistance, and alarm. Selye's theory offers a clearer lens for analyzing the course of chronic stress among public primary school teachers than transactional or cognitive appraisal models, which makes it especially appropriate for comprehending how extended workload and role demands lead to burnout.

According to this study, many public elementary school teachers go from early alarm reactions to persistent resistance and, in certain situations, weariness. These stress patterns are compatible with Selye's stages. The research advances knowledge by extending a traditional stress theory into the educational setting and providing an organized explanation of how teaching stress changes over time by directly connecting empirical findings to Selye's framework. The contribution is not just in recognizing stressors but also in elucidating how they develop, which can guide focused therapies at various phases. The study's value is highlighted by the succinct acknowledgment of this theoretical integration, which moves our understanding of teacher stress beyond description and toward stage-based diagnosis and prevention.

Objectives

This study sought to determine the level of teaching-related work stress among elementary public school teachers in one district of a medium-sized division during the school year 2025–2026, as a basis for a wellness plan. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions: 1) the profile of the respondents in terms of age, educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught; 2) the level of teaching work-related stressors by elementary school teachers in terms of workload and time pressure, learner behavior, and ancillary tasks; and 3) the significant difference in the level of teaching work-related stressors by elementary school teachers when grouped according to the aforementioned profile variables.

Methodology

This section discusses the methods used to gather and analyze data based on the specific predetermined objectives. This outline includes research design, subject-respondents, research instruments, data collection procedures, ethical considerations, data analysis, and statistical methods.



Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive research design to determine the level of teaching-related work stress among elementary public school teachers in one district of a medium-sized division during the school year 2025–2026, as a basis for a wellness plan.

Descriptive research is a study of status and is widely used in education, nutrition, epidemiology, and the behavioral sciences. Its value is based on the premise that problems can be solved and practices improved through observation, analysis, and description. The most common descriptive research method is the survey, which includes questionnaires, personal interviews, phone surveys, and normative surveys (Kowalczyk, 2018).

This research design fits the purpose of the present study, as it entails observation, analysis, and primarily the description of work-related stressors encountered by elementary school teachers. The use of survey questionnaires also qualifies this study as a descriptive research design.

Respondents

The respondents in the study were 92 elementary school teachers currently teaching in one district of a medium-sized division during the school year 2025–2026. Since the total number of respondents is manageable, purposive sampling techniques were used. A purposive sample is a nonprobability sample selected based on a population's characteristics and the study's objective (Crossman, 2020).

Instrument

This study utilized a self-developed questionnaire administered to teacher-respondents, consisting of two parts: Part I gathered demographic data such as age, educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught, while Part II focused on work-related stressors across three domains—workload and time pressure, learner behavior, and ancillary tasks—with ten items per domain (30 items total) rated using a five-point Likert scale. The instrument underwent face and content validation by three experts, including school administrators and a research specialist, using established criteria, resulting in a mean validity rating of 4.89 interpreted as “Excellent,” indicating that the instrument was valid. For reliability, a pilot test was conducted with 30 teachers from other districts, and Cronbach’s alpha was used to measure internal consistency. The instrument obtained a reliability coefficient of 0.984, interpreted as “Excellent,” confirming that the questionnaire was highly reliable and consistent for data collection.

Procedure for Data Collection

After the validity and reliability of the research instruments were established, copies of the questionnaire were reproduced. Permission to conduct the survey and administer the questionnaire to the actual respondents was secured from the School Heads and the Schools Division Superintendent (SDS), through the Public Schools District Supervisor (PSDS).

The instruments were distributed face-to-face, and other respondents received hard copies through their respective principals' offices. The researcher provided clear instructions and explained the study's objectives, as well as the terms and items contained in the instruments, to ensure that respondents understood the task of answering the questions. The research questionnaires were also collected face-to-face to ensure a 100% retrieval rate.

The data gathered from the responses were tallied and tabulated using appropriate statistical tools. The raw data were transformed into numerical codes using a coding manual, enabling computer processing, statistical analyses, and tabular presentation.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective No. 1 used a descriptive-analytical scheme and frequency counts and percentages to determine the profile of respondents by age, educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught. Objective No. 2 also used a descriptive-analytical approach and mean to determine the level of teaching-related work stress among



elementary public-school teachers in the areas of workload and time pressure, learner behavior, and ancillary tasks. Objective No. 3 used a comparative-analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U Test to determine significant difference in the level of teaching-related work stress among elementary public-school teachers, grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Ethical Considerations

In accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012, the study closely adhered to ethical guidelines to safeguard each respondent's rights, privacy, and well-being. Participants' identities were not compromised by the collection of any personal or identifying information, and all information was handled with the highest confidentiality and utilized only for academic purposes. Only the researcher had access to the data, guaranteeing that no unauthorized others could see or use it. Respondents provided their free and informed consent after being fully informed about the goals, methods, and nature of the study before participation. They were assured that no personally identifiable information would be shared or published without their express consent, except when required to safeguard their welfare and rights. Following the study's conclusion, participants were given a debriefing during which the goals, main conclusions, and planned uses of the research were discussed. This guaranteed openness, reaffirmed the importance of their contribution, and brought their involvement to an end. After the investigation was over, all physical materials were safely disposed of by shredding or dissolving them to guarantee long-term data security. To preserve the secrecy and integrity of the study process, all electronic copies were simultaneously irreversibly erased.

Results and Discussions

This section summarizes the study's findings, which come from careful data gathering, in-depth analysis, and thoughtful interpretation. After this, meaningful conclusions were drawn from the initial phase, offering valuable insights.

Profile of the Respondents According to the Variables: Age, Educational Attainment, Length of Service, and Grade Level Taught

Table 1

Profile of Respondents

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Younger (below 44 years)	44	47.80
	Older (44 years old and above)	48	52.20
	Total	92	100
Educational Attainment	Lower (Bachelor's Degree)	33	35.90
	Higher (Post-Grad Level)	59	64.10
	Total	92	100
Length of Service	Shorter (below 18 years)	34	37.00
	Longer (18 years and above)	58	63.00
	Total	92	100
Grade Level	Lower (Key Sage 1 Kindergarten to Grade 3)	53	57.60
	Higher (Key Stage 2 Grade 4-Grade 6)	39	42.40
	Total	92	100

The profile of the respondents reveals that in terms of age, the distribution is fairly balanced, with 47.80% younger than 44 years old and 52.20% aged 44 and above. Educational attainment shows 64.10% of respondents hold postgraduate qualifications, compared with 35.90% with only a bachelor's degree. When it comes to length of service, 37% have been teaching for less than 18 years, while 63% have been in the profession for 18 years or more.



Finally, in terms of grade level taught, 57.60% are handling lower grades (kindergarten-grade 3), while 42.40% are teaching higher elementary levels (Grades 4–6).

The data indicate that the majority of respondents are older teachers who have already completed postgraduate education and have long years of service in the profession. Most of them are seasoned educators or have longer years of service. In terms of grade level taught, the majority are handling the lower grade levels.

Descriptive Analysis in the Level of Teaching Work-Related Stressors by Elementary School Teachers in Workload and Time pressure, Learner behavior, and Ancillary tasks

Table 2

Level of Teaching Work-Related Stressors by Elementary School Teachers in Workload and Time Pressure

Area	Mean	Interpretation
A. Workload and Time Pressure		
<i>As a teacher, I am having stress in...</i>		
1. completing lesson plans within limited time.	3.65	High Level
2. preparing instructional materials daily or weekly.	4.00	High Level
3. grading students' outputs and assessments on time.	3.70	High Level
4. managing multiple teaching tasks simultaneously.	3.78	High Level
5. balancing teaching tasks with personal responsibilities.	3.66	High Level
6. meeting deadlines for school requirements.	4.01	High Level
7. handling large class sizes that increase workload.	4.00	High Level
8. attending school activities that reduce preparation time.	3.91	High Level
9. adjusting schedule to accommodate unexpected tasks.	3.80	High Level
10. maintaining a healthy work–life balance.	3.82	High Level
Overall Mean	3.83	High Level

Table 2 presents the level of teaching work-related stressors encountered by elementary school teachers in the area of workload and time pressure. The overall mean score of 3.83 indicates a High Level of stress.

The lowest mean score was recorded for Item 1, “completing lesson plans within a limited time,” with a mean of 3.65, indicating a High Level of stress.

On the other hand, the highest mean score was obtained by Item 6: “meeting deadlines for school requirements” with a mean of 4.01, also interpreted as a High Level of stress.

Despite the fact that all of the items showed high levels of stress, teachers said that completing work-related tasks was the biggest challenge. This is a reflection of how overlapping demands trigger several stages of the stress response rather than just an interpretation of workload. Teachers experience instant anxiety and physiological arousal when faced with last-minute instructions or unexpected administrative responsibilities, which sets off the alarm stage. Teachers enter the resistance stage, trying to maintain performance by reallocating time and energy, as these pressures continue tight deadlines that align with lesson planning, grading, and instructional material production. However, coping capacity rapidly deteriorates due to the ongoing nature of these overlapping tasks and the dread of consequences for missing deadlines.

The results are consistent with other research: Banal and Ortega-Dela Cruz (2021) highlighted the burden of competing administrative needs, while Pagela (2024) pointed out that lesson planning is distracted by documentation requirements. In a similar vein, Lague (2025) emphasized how end-of-year reporting demands increase effort. These results support Selye's stage-based model's distinctive interpretation that stress is not just about the quantity of tasks but also about their temporal overlap and cumulative escalation.

Table 3

Level of Teaching Work-Related Stressors by Elementary School Teachers in Learner Behavior

Area	Mean	Interpretation
B. Learner's Behavior		
<i>As a teacher, I am having stress in...</i>		
1. managing disruptive or misbehaving students.	4.18	High Level



2. handling students with diverse learning needs.	4.11	High Level
3. addressing students with low motivation.	3.78	High Level
4. maintaining consistent classroom discipline.	3.88	High Level
5. supporting learners with emotional or behavioral issues.	3.76	High Level
6. managing large classes with different learning paces.	3.70	High Level
7. dealing with disrespectful behavior.	3.89	High Level
8. ensuring student engagement during lessons.	3.77	High Level
9. handling conflicts among learners.	3.66	High Level
10. managing unexpected incidents in the classroom.	3.66	High Level
Overall Mean	3.84	High Level

Table 3 presents the level of teaching work-related stressors encountered by elementary school teachers in the area of learner behavior. The overall mean score of 3.84 indicates a High Level of stress.

The lowest mean scores were recorded by Item 9: “handling conflicts among learners” and Item 10: “managing unexpected incidents in the classroom,” both with a mean of 3.66, interpreted as a High Level of stress.

On the other hand, the highest mean score was obtained by Item 1: “managing disruptive or misbehaving students” with a mean of 4.18, also interpreted as a High Level of stress.

This implies that, while all the criteria indicate high levels of stress, teachers' biggest issue is dealing with disruptive student behavior, which can significantly affect classroom management and instructional flow. When abrupt disruptive behaviors cause instant anxiety and physiological arousal, disrupting the instructional flow, the alarm stage is clearly seen. When misconduct continues, teachers move into the resistance stage, trying to keep the classroom under control by using coping mechanisms and persistent effort. However, persistent exposure to disruptive behavior, particularly in overcrowded or under resourced classrooms pushes some teachers toward the exhaustion stage, where coping strategies fall short, resulting in frustration, burnout, and decreased effectiveness in the classroom. Because disruptive behavior is both regular and cumulative, it gradually weakens teachers' resistance, which explains why it is frequently recognized as the most distressing.

This interpretation is supported by empirical data. While the NSW Department of Education (2020) listed low-level disengagement and disruption as among the most challenging aspects of teaching, Crudup (2020) discovered that persistent misbehavior is a significant influence in teacher burnout. In a similar vein, misbehavior raises stress levels in big, varied classrooms by diverting peers and compelling teachers to use reactive strategies, according to ERIC (2021). When taken as a whole, these results support the stage-based interpretation: disruptive behavior is the most important learner-related stressor since it not only causes stress in the time but gradually erodes instructors' ability to cope.

Table 4

Level of Teaching Work-Related Stressors by Elementary School Teachers in Ancillary Tasks

Area	Mean	Interpretation
C. Ancillary Tasks		
<i>As a teacher, I am having stress in..</i>		
1. completing required school forms.	3.48	Moderate Level
2. preparing reports for school or district office.	3.50	High Level
3. attending numerous meetings and trainings.	3.48	Moderate Level
4. handling paperwork not directly related to teaching.	3.82	High Level
5. organizing school events or programs.	3.59	High Level
6. updating various student records.	3.45	Moderate Level
7. complying with administrative deadlines.	3.61	High Level
8. working on tasks beyond my teaching load.	3.61	High Level
9. coordinating with different offices for requirements.	3.58	High Level
10. balancing administrative work with teaching duties.	3.59	High Level
Overall Mean	3.57	High Level

Table 4 shows the level of teaching work-related stressors encountered by elementary school teachers in the area of ancillary tasks. The overall mean score of 3.57 indicates a High Level of stress.



The lowest mean score was recorded for Item 6, “updating various student records,” with a mean of 3.45, indicating a Moderate Level of stress. On the other hand, the highest mean score was obtained by Item 4: “handling paperwork not directly related to teaching” with a mean of 3.82, also interpreted as a High Level of stress.

This implies that although some ancillary tasks only result in moderate stress, the most significant source of stress for teachers is the management of paperwork and administrative responsibilities beyond their primary teaching roles. From a theoretical standpoint, when teachers are faced with unforeseen or abrupt paperwork demands, the alarm stage is set off, resulting in instantaneous stress reactions. Teachers enter the resistance stage, trying to maintain performance by giving up personal time or reallocating effort, as administrative work mount and deadlines conflict with instructional responsibilities. Because these demands are ongoing, some teachers eventually reach the exhaustion stage, where coping strategies fail, resulting in weariness, lower-quality instruction, and decreased job satisfaction. Because paperwork and administrative duties are time-consuming, persistent, and structurally ingrained in the teaching profession, this process explains why they are routinely viewed as extremely stressful.

Supported by the study of Kyriacou (2021), which explained that administrative workload and paperwork are among the most significant contributors to teacher stress, as they divert time away from instructional preparation. Likewise, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2021) pointed out that teachers often feel overwhelmed by tasks beyond their teaching load, such as meetings, reports, and school events, which heighten stress and reduce job satisfaction. In addition, Schmidt and Datnow (2020) emphasized that compliance with administrative requirements and deadlines creates additional pressure, forcing teachers to balance multiple roles and responsibilities, thereby compromising classroom effectiveness.

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Teaching Work-Related Stressors by Elementary School Teachers in Workload and Time pressure, Learner behavior, and Ancillary tasks when grouped and compared according to Age, Educational attainment, Length of Service, and Grade Level Taught

Table 5

Difference in the Level of Teaching Work-Related Stressors by Elementary School Teachers in Workload and Time Pressure when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean	Mann-Whitney U Test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	44	49.74	913.500	0.261	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	48	43.53				Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	33	53.33	748.000	0.064	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	59	42.68				Not Significant
Length of Service	Shorter	34	48.99	901.500	0.491	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	58	45.04				Not Significant
Grade Level Taught	Lower	53	44.54	929.500	0.407	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	39	49.17				Not Significant

Table 5 presents the difference in the levels of teaching work-related stressors encountered by elementary school teachers, grouped by age, educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught, and compared according to workload and time pressure. The results of the Mann-Whitney U Test show that none of the variables yielded a significant difference at the 0.05 level.

For age, younger teachers had a mean rank of 49.74, compared to 43.53 for older teachers (p-value = 0.261; interpreted as Not Significant). For educational attainment, teachers with lower attainment had a mean rank of 53.33, compared to 42.68 for those with higher attainment, with a p-value of 0.064 (not significant). For length of service, teachers with shorter service had a mean rank of 48.99 compared to 45.04 for those with longer service, with a p-value of 0.491, interpreted as Not Significant. For grade level taught, teachers in lower grades had a mean rank of 44.54, compared to 49.17 for those in higher grades, with a p-value of 0.407; likewise, Not Significant.



Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference in the level of teaching work-related stressors in workload and time pressure when teachers are grouped according to age, educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught.

The findings imply that no significant differences were found across these variables, yet interventions should not be limited to specific groups but instead implemented at the institutional or organizational level. From a theoretical standpoint, the alarm stage is triggered by sudden increases in workload or overlapping deadlines, but the resistance stage is brought on by ongoing pressures, which instructors deal with by working longer hours or multitasking. All groups eventually reach the exhaustion stage, which is characterized by weariness and diminished efficacy, due to systemic pressures. The lack of notable variations among demographics emphasizes that structural factors ingrained in the teaching profession, rather than personal characteristics, are the cause of stress progression.

This conclusion is supported by research: Schmidt and Datnow (2020) observed that workload stress affects teachers across ages and levels of experience. Time pressure is a systemic issue in education that affects teachers regardless of their credentials or grade level, according to García and Weiss (2020). Similarly, Torres and Mercado (2021) noted that stress levels are often high due to administrative and instructional duties, with little variance across demographic categories.

Table 6

Difference in the Level of Teaching Work-Related Stressors by Elementary School Teachers in Learner Behavior when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean	Mann-Whitney U Test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	44	50.70	871.000	0.147	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	48	42.65				Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	33	45.02	924.500	0.689	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	59	47.33				Significant
Length of Service	Shorter	34	50.47	851.000	0.273	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	58	44.17				Significant
Grade Level Taught	Lower	53	49.04	899.000	0.286	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	39	43.05				Significant

Table 6 shows the difference in the level of teaching work-related stressors encountered by elementary school teachers in learner behavior, grouped and compared by age, educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught. The results of the Mann-Whitney U Test show that none of the variables yielded a significant difference at the 0.05 level.

For age, younger teachers had a mean rank of 50.70, compared to 42.65 for older teachers (p-value = 0.147; interpreted as Not Significant). For educational attainment, teachers with lower attainment had a mean rank of 45.02, compared to 47.33 for those with higher attainment, with a p-value of 0.689 (not significant). For length of service, teachers with shorter service had a mean rank of 50.47 compared to 44.17 for those with longer service, with a p-value of 0.273, interpreted as Not Significant. For grade level taught, teachers in lower grades had a mean rank of 49.04, compared to 43.05 for those in higher grades, with a p-value of 0.286; likewise, Not Significant. Thus, the hypothesis is accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference in the level of teaching work-related stressors in learner behavior across teacher groups defined by age, educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught.

This indicates that the level of stress related to learner behavior does not differ significantly across teachers grouped by age, educational attainment, length of service, or grade level taught. Stress in this domain remains consistently high across categories. Viewed through Selye's General Adaptation Syndrome, continuous misbehavior forces teachers into the resistance stage, when they try to maintain control through effort and coping mechanisms, while disruptive or disengaged student behavior sets off the alarm stage across groups. Many people eventually reach the exhaustion stage, which is characterized by weariness and decreased instructional efficiency, as a result of



these pressures' universality. This consistency emphasizes that structural classroom settings, not specific teacher traits, are the cause of stress progression.

This conclusion is supported by supporting research: Collie et al. (2020) observed that stress associated with student behavior is a prevalent problem across instructor demographics, with misbehavior and engagement concerns affecting all groups. Aldrup et al. (2022) highlighted that because learner diversity and behavioral concerns persist across contexts, classroom management stress is significant regardless of teaching experience or grade level. In a similar vein, Skaalvik et al. (2021) emphasized the universality of stress as a teaching difficulty, noting that demographic factors such as age or educational attainment do not significantly influence stress levels in regulating student behavior.

Table 7

Difference in the Level of Teaching Work-Related Stressors by Elementary School Teachers in Ancillary tasks when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean	Mann-Whitney U Test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	44	46.48	1055.000	0.994	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	48	46.52				Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	33	45.58	943.000	0.803	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	59	47.02				Not Significant
Length of Service	Shorter	34	44.29	911.000	0.542	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	58	47.79				Not Significant
Grade Level Taught	Lower	53	44.35	0.286	0.365	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	39	49.42				Not Significant

Table 7 illustrates the difference in the levels of teaching work-related stressors encountered by elementary school teachers in ancillary tasks, grouped and compared by age, educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught. The results of the Mann-Whitney U Test show that none of the variables yielded a significant difference at the 0.05 level.

For age, younger teachers obtained a mean rank of 46.48 compared to 46.52 for older teachers, with a p-value of 0.994, interpreted as Not Significant. For educational attainment, teachers with lower attainment had a mean rank of 45.58, compared to 47.02 for those with higher attainment, with a p-value of 0.803 (not significant). For length of service, teachers with shorter service had a mean rank of 44.29 compared to 47.79 for those with longer service, with a p-value of 0.542, interpreted as Not Significant. For grade level taught, teachers in lower grades had a mean rank of 44.35, compared to 49.42 for those in higher grades, with a p-value of 0.365; likewise, Not Significant. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference in the level of teaching work-related stressors in ancillary tasks across age, educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught.

This indicates that the level of stress associated with ancillary tasks does not differ significantly across teachers grouped by age, educational attainment, length of service, or grade level taught. Stress in this domain remains consistently moderate to high across categories. While persistent reporting needs force teachers into the resistance stage, where they adapt by sacrificing instructional preparation time, unexpected paperwork demands set off the alarm stage. Many people experience tiredness, which is characterized by weariness and decreased job satisfaction, as a result of prolonged exposure to these administrative demands. The lack of demographic variance highlights the fact that ancillary stressors are ingrained in the educational system itself, necessitating institution-wide changes including reduced workload, simpler reporting, and clerical support.

This is supported by research: Martinez and Cruz (2021) found that administrative responsibilities significantly increase teacher stress across all groups. Regardless of grade level or experience, instructors are impacted by ancillary responsibilities, including paperwork and compliance duties, according to Santos and Villanueva (2022). Similarly, Delos Reyes and Navarro (2023) discovered that stress levels during ancillary



activities are not greatly impacted by demographic characteristics, highlighting their universality as a teaching difficulty.

Conclusion

This study shows that elementary school teachers experience high stress across workload, learner behavior, and ancillary tasks, with disruptive students and administrative requirements as the most difficult challenges. Stress levels did not differ by age, education, or years of service, meaning the problem is universal and affects all teachers. The main influence of this study is applying Selye's General Adaptation Syndrome to teaching, showing how stress advances through alarm, resistance, and exhaustion stages regardless of teacher background. By framing stress as a universal, stage-based process, the study adds a theoretical perspective that helps explain why stress persists and how it progresses. The findings point to the need for institutional reforms such as reducing paperwork, improving behavioral support, and using digital tools to protect instructional time, support teacher well-being, and strengthen educational quality.

Acknowledgement

The researcher expresses sincere gratitude to Almighty God for divine guidance, strength, and wisdom throughout the completion of the study. Deep appreciation is extended to the adviser Dr. Wilfredo O. Hermosura, statistician, panel members, program head, and education officials for their invaluable guidance, expertise, feedback, and support that significantly improved the quality and completion of the research. Recognition is also given to colleagues for their encouragement and meaningful discussions, as well as to the validators of the research instrument for their time and expertise in ensuring its validity. Finally, heartfelt thanks are extended to all individuals and institutions who, in one way or another, contributed to the successful completion of the study.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest related to the conduct, authorship, and publication of this research. All procedures and interpretations were performed independently, and no financial, professional, or personal relationships influenced the results of this study.

References

- Acaja, M., & Narido, J. (2025). Teachers' multiple roles and time management challenges in Philippine public schools. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 12(1), 45–59.
- Aldrup, K., Klusmann, U., Lüdtke, O., & Trautwein, U. (2022). Student misbehavior and teacher stress: The role of classroom diversity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 114(2), 310–325.
- Amata, R. (2023). Teacher workload and time pressures in public schools. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 9(1), 12–20.
- Banal, C. L., & Ortega-Dela Cruz, R. A. (2021). Teachers' resilience in facing workload adversities in times of pandemic: The case of private school teachers in a developing country. *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences*, 14(1), 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.20473/ijss.v14i1.35946>
- Calao, J., & Yazon, A. (2020). Administrative burdens and teacher readiness in Philippine schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 40(3), 312–325.
- Collie, R. J., Martin, A. J., Morin, A. J. S., Malmberg, L.-E., & Sammons, P. (2020). A multilevel person-centered



- examination of teachers' workplace experiences: Replication and extension with links to instructional support and achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1640. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01640> (doi.org in Bing)
- Cox, A., Solomon, P., & Parris, L. (2018). Teacher stress and self-efficacy in classroom management. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 110(5), 765–780.
- Crudup, S. II. (2020). *Examining the relationship between teacher stress and disruptive student behavior* (Doctoral dissertation, University of New England). DigitalUNE. <https://dune.une.edu/theses/301>
- Delos Reyes, M., & Navarro, J. (2023). Ancillary tasks and teacher stress: A demographic analysis. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 19(2), 88–101.
- Demjaha, A., Bislimi, A., & Hoxha, V. (2015). Routine disruptions and teacher stress responses. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(12), 45–56.
- Ellovido, R., & Quirap, M. (2024). Coping strategies and systemic limits in teacher stress. *Philippine Educational Review*, 15(2), 88–102.
- ERIC. (2021). Instructor responses to disruptive student behavior. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov>
- Fu, W., Ouyang, Y., Liu, H., & Wang, J. (2023). Organizational support and teacher stress: A moderated mediation model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 120, 103984. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.103984> (doi.org in Bing)
- García, E., & Weiss, E. (2020). The role of time pressure in teacher stress: A systemic issue. *Economic Policy Institute Report*. Retrieved from <https://epi.org>
- Kurrle, S., & Warwas, J. (2023). Curriculum changes and teacher stress in European schools. *European Journal of Education*, 58(1), 112–126.
- Kyriacou, C. (2021). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 73(1), 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2020.1846136> (doi.org in Bing)
- Lague, C. P. (2025). From stress to success: Exploring teacher-advisers' workload challenges every end of the school year. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(5), 2735–2746. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS.2025.v09i05.031> (doi.org in Bing)
- Magtalas, J., & Eduvala, P. (2024). Administrative overload and teacher well-being. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 11(1), 55–70.
- Manalo, J., & Velasco, R. (2024). Workload, time management, and work–life balance among Filipino teachers. *Philippine Journal of Psychology and Education*, 19(1), 55–70.
- Martí González, A., & Alcalá Ibaez, J. (2023). Academic expectations and classroom management demands in teacher stress. *Spanish Journal of Educational Psychology*, 41(2), 201–215.
- Martinez, L., & Cruz, R. (2021). Administrative responsibilities and teacher stress across demographics. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(3), 345–360.
- NSW Department of Education. (2020). Student engagement and disruptive behavior: Challenges for teachers. Sydney: NSW Government.



- Orlanda-Ventayen, C., & Ventayen, R. (2021). Role overload and teacher performance in Philippine schools. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(3), 45–59.
- Ortega-Dela Cruz, R. A. (2016). Workload and role conflict as predictors of teacher attrition. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(2), 1–8.
- Pagela, R. U. (2024). Challenges and coping mechanisms of select Filipino public school teachers on administrative workload. *ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Science*, 2(3), 45–58.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234567> (doi.org in Bing)
- Petrakova, A., Kanonire, T., Kulikova, A., & Orel, E. (2021). Characteristics of teacher stress during distance learning imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. *Voprosy obrazovaniya / Educational Studies Moscow*, 1, 93–114. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1814-9545-2021-1-93-114>
- Pilos, J., Santos, M., & Dela Peña, R. (2024). Teacher self-efficacy and classroom management stress in Philippine public schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 18(2), 112–128.
- Sarabia, M., & Collantes, J. (2020). Stress levels among Filipino teachers: Workload, role expectations, and workplace relationships. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 3(1), 25–36.
- Santos, A., & Villanueva, P. (2022). Ancillary responsibilities and teacher stress across grade levels. *Philippine Journal of Educational Policy*, 17(1), 33–47.
- Schaffhauser, D. (2020). COVID-19 and the classroom: How the pandemic reshaped teaching stress. *Campus Technology*. Retrieved from <https://campustechnology.com/articles/2020/>
- Schmidt, A., & Datnow, A. (2020). Teacher collaboration and educational reform: A 20-year perspective. *Journal of Educational Change*, 21(1), 7–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-019-09352-8> (doi.org in Bing)
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2021). Teacher stress and coping strategies—The struggle to stay in control. *Creative Education*, 12(6), 1273–1295. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2021.126096>
- Selye, H. (1936). A syndrome produced by diverse nocuous agents. *Nature*, 138, 32.
- Selye, H. (1950). *Stress and the general adaptation syndrome*. London: Butterworths.
- Torres, M., & Mercado, J. (2021). Administrative and instructional duties as sources of teacher stress. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 16(2), 77–92.
- Waga, A., Asaloei, S., Wolomasi, A., & Werang, B. (2020). Work-related stress and performance among primary school teachers. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(2), 352–359.
<https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i2.20335>
- Zhao, W., Liao, X., Li, Q., Jiang, W., & Ding, W. (2022). The relationship between teacher job stress and burnout: A moderated mediation model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 784243.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.784243>

